

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, March 12, 1974

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

QUESTIONS

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

RADIO PROGRAMMES

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (February 21).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter of variations to country breakfast shows and similar broadcasts on regional radio networks was taken up with the Australian Broadcasting Commission. The Manager for South Australia has stated that an inquiry is now being held into the overall programme commitment of these stations, with a view to possible improvements. As part of this, of course, the country breakfast session will be considered along with other commitments. However, at this stage no decision has been made on any possible changes. The Manager has stated that the views expressed in Parliament will be given full consideration when proposals are being evaluated.

BLUE POLES

In reply to Mr. BECKER (February 28).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Director of the Art Gallery Department states that since late in 1973 he has been negotiating with the Director of the Australian National Gallery, Canberra, for Jackson Pollock's painting *Blue Poles* to be exhibited in Adelaide during the Festival of Arts. After receiving firm assurances that the painting would arrive in Adelaide from the United States of America and be available during the festival, it was subsequently found that forwarding arrangements needed to be changed. Consequently, the picture will arrive in Australia too late for the festival. As Chairman of the Visual Arts Board, the Director of the Art Gallery has been asked to comment on the possibility of a tour of the painting, and he has recommended that it should take place. It is possible for the picture to be exhibited only in Adelaide, Melbourne, and Sydney, which can provide air-conditioned environments.

CALLINGTON AREA WATER SUPPLY

In reply to Mr. McANANEY (March 6).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: All the landholders between Callington and Strathalbyn who may be affected by a proposed water scheme have been interviewed. A scheme to serve the area has been designed, and when an estimate of cost and a revenue statement have been prepared the matter will be further considered.

CADELL DRAINAGE

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (February 27).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Irrigation states that a decision has not yet been made on whether it may be possible to assist growers at Cadell to have internal drainage facilities installed. Some of the proposals from the deputation seem to be impracticable, but nevertheless a thorough examination is being made to ascertain whether something more than the usual drainage design and replanting advisory services can be made available. In the meantime, any grower who needs to install drains and who has the resources to enable him to proceed would be well advised to do so, because additional assistance, if any, may be some time in materializing.

SOUTH-EAST ELECTRICITY

In reply to Mr. RODDA (February 27).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Electricity Trust has three contracts in progress in the Lucindale area: 1. Lucindale-Kingston rural extension, stage 2, 11 000-volt lines in the hundreds of Fox, Joyce, Conmurra, Coles, and Woolumbool within the District Council of Lucindale, and the hundred of Minecrow within the District Council of Lacedpede; this contract, involving 87 miles (139.9 km) of lines is about half completed. Forty-eight consumers have been connected, and it is expected that the remainder will be connected by early 1975; (2) Lucindale-Kingston rural extension, stage 2, single wire earth return service lines in the hundreds of Fox, Joyce, Townsend, and Conmurra within the District Council of Lucindale, and the hundred of Minecrow within the District Council of Lacedpede; this contract for 102 miles (164.1 km) of lines to serve 102 consumers is expected to be completed during the first quarter of 1975. Consumers will be progressively connected as sections of the line are completed; and (3) Lucindale-Kingston, 33 000-volt transmission line. It is expected that this contract will be completed by the middle of this year.

In reply to Mr. BURDON (February 27).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The present South-Eastern high-voltage transmission system has duplicate high-voltage lines between the metropolitan area and the Mobilong substation (just north of Murray Bridge) and between Tailem Bend and Mount Gambier substations. However, in the 21 miles (33.7 km) between Mobilong and Tailem Bend substations there is only a single high-voltage line. It was this section of the South-East system that failed on Tuesday, February 26, 1974, as a result of an act of vandalism when two strings of insulators were shot away, causing the interruption of electricity supplies in the South-East. A new 275 000-volt line is at present being constructed from the metropolitan area to Tailem Bend at a cost of \$5 000 000. When this line is completed, duplicate lines will be available all the way from the metropolitan area to Mount Gambier. This will then give much greater security of power supply to the South-East. It should be noted, however, that the outage was caused by wanton vandalism, and it is not possible to guard completely against such events. The Electricity Trust has offered a reward of \$500 for information leading to the conviction of the offender.

PETROL STATIONS

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (March 5).

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: There seems to be three questions asked by the honourable member, and the replies are as follows:

1. Information supplied by the oil industry under the voluntary disinvestment scheme is under two headings, namely, company-owned sites in the metropolitan area, and all other sites to which each company supplies motor fuel. Consequently, information is not readily available in a form suitable to indicate whether outlets closed were privately owned but leased to an oil company, or privately owned and on a contractual obligation to an oil company. Neither can the percentage reduction under those specific categories be determined from the information that the Government has. It is not customary to divulge information supplied by commercial organizations as part of a voluntary co-operative scheme operated in conjunction with the Government, particularly where the organizations have supplied that information on a confidential basis.

2. The legislation was proclaimed at the request of the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce, which represents the resellers. This organization was one of the

parties to the voluntary disinvestment scheme and, as it advised that it was not satisfied that the voluntary scheme was having the desired effect, it requested the Government to proceed to implement the legislation.

3. Consideration of the practice of petrol discounting will be a matter on which the Motor Fuel Licensing Board may advise the Governor, pursuant to Part IV of the Act should the board decide to do so. The board has been appointed to commence operation on the date from which the Act will come into operation, namely, July 1, 1974.

CLARE HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. VENNING (March 5).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I gave approval in November last for negotiations to be entered into for the purchase of land for the development of agricultural science courses at Clare High School. The price asked by the owners is considerably more than the Land Board's valuation. Consideration is now being given about what action should be taken to secure the land.

OUTPATIENT CLINICS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): What is the present waiting time for non-urgent appointments at outpatient clinics at the Royal Adelaide and Queen Elizabeth Hospitals respectively?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Details are as follows:

Royal Adelaide Hospital:	
Clinic:	Days
Medical	35
Surgical	3
Gynaecology	3
Dermatology	14
Otorhinolaryngology	13
Orthopaedic	24
Orthopaedic (fractures)	8
Gastroenterology	7
Renal	7
Endocrine	28
Diabetic	7
Plastic surgery	14
Neurosurgery	14
Neurology	28
Thoracic surgery	7
Cardio pulmonary	14
Allergy	7
Vascular surgery	7
Rheumatology	28
Haematology	7
Venous ulcer	21
Cardiac	14
Obesity	56
Eyes	5½ months
Queen Elizabeth Hospital:	
Clinic:	Days
Medical	57
Surgical	9
Gynaecological	11
Skins	14
Eyes	75
E.N.T.	8
Orthopaedic	10

UNLEY INTERSECTION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is there any reason why the traffic lights at the intersection of Cross Road with Unley Road and Belair Road should not be repaired, and why has there been a delay?

2. When will this work be done?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The existing traffic signals at the intersection of Cross Road, Unley Road, and Belair Road are operating though they have been disturbed by reconstruction work at the intersection. The present arrangement is a temporary measure only, as a contract has been let for updating the existing traffic signals. The contract has been delayed by the unavailability of materials manufactured in other States, and it is expected that this work will be completed in June, 1974.

BANKSIA PARK HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE (on notice): Has the transaction been finalized pursuant to the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1969-72, between Suburbs Proprietary Limited and the Education Department concerning land required to extend the Banksia Park High School site?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. The current position is that the notice of claim served on me as the acquiring authority is considered to be excessive, and will now be disputed.

FAMILY COURT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many judges are there in the Family Court and what is the total annual cost of their salaries?

2. How many persons are engaged in the administration of the Family Court and what are their positions and what is the total annual cost of their salaries?

3. What is the estimated total annual cost of the Family Court and how is this cost made up?

4. What is the jurisdiction of the Family Court?

5. Does the court exercise such jurisdiction throughout the State and, if not, for what part of the State does it exercise jurisdiction?

6. What court or courts exercise such jurisdiction in other parts of the State?

7. What court or courts exercised the jurisdiction of the Family Court before it was set up and at what total annual cost?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Four judges and one special magistrate exercise the jurisdiction of the Family Court and the Juvenile Court. The annual cost of judicial salaries for Family Court work is about \$49 400, made up of the salaries of two judges at \$20 200 a year (\$40 400), and the half salary of a special magistrate, \$9 000.

2. Details of officers directly engaged in the administration of the Family Court and their salaries are as follows:

Clerk of Court	\$ 6 430
Female office assistant	4 400
Two steno-secretaries at \$5 360	10 720
Two or three court reporters at \$7 050, say	17 625
Two court orderlies at \$4 380	8 760
	<hr/>
	\$47 935
Plus allowance for long service leave, recreation and sick leave (assessed at 11%)	5 270
	<hr/>
	Total \$53 205

Headquarters officers in the Local and District Criminal Courts Department indirectly engaged in administering the Family Court for part-time work assessed at \$2 350

3. The estimated total annual cost of the Family Court is as follows:

Judges and magistrate	\$ 49 400
Direct administration salaries	53 205
Indirect administration salaries	2 350
Proportion of departmental office expenses assessed at	4 700
Annual costs incurred by Public Buildings Department for accommodation provided for Family Court in I.A.C.	
Building	11 500
Rent of building	33 144
Electricity	800
Cleaning	1 606
	<hr/>
	\$156 705

4. The jurisdiction of the Family Court is as follows:—
 (a) Applications by minors to marry; (b) "Family" peace complaints (Justices Act); (c) Charges of assault by one member of a family against another member of a family; (d) Adoption applications; (e) Affiliation and separation proceedings (including ancillary matters, for example, custody and maintenance); (f) Maintenance proceedings; (g) Local Court proceedings under the Guardianship of Infants Act; and (h) Local Court proceedings relating to matrimonial property.

5. Part of the jurisdiction of the Family Court (Guardianship of Infants Act applications and proceedings relating to matrimonial property) is exercised on a State-wide basis with a judge from the Family Court visiting all country Local Courts of full jurisdiction. The other jurisdiction of the Family Court is confined to Adelaide and the nearby metropolitan area. The judges of the Juvenile Court exercise that jurisdiction at Adelaide, Port Adelaide, Elizabeth, and Christie Beach. In addition, many cases are referred to the Adelaide Juvenile Court from country juvenile courts.

6. The courts that exercise the jurisdiction of the Family Court and the Juvenile Court in other parts of the State are courts of summary jurisdiction presided over by magistrates.

7. Courts of summary jurisdiction—in particular the Adelaide Magistrates' Court. Departmental accounts are not segregated in such manner that this cost could be ascertained with reasonable accuracy.

COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What investigations are now made on a routine basis of the quality and safety of country water supplies?

2. Where are samples taken and where are the investigations conducted?

3. Has there been any report of pathogenic organisms since October, 1973, and, in particular, of the organism responsible for amoebic meningitis?

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

1. All country water supplies are examined comprehensively for microbiological, biological, and chemical characteristics and appropriate action is taken by chlorination and algicidal dosing to correct any deficiencies.

2. Samples are collected from reservoirs, mains, and the reticulated town water supplies. All examinations are carried out at the Engineering and Water Supply Department's laboratories at Bolivar.

3. None in public water supplies.

NOISE LEVELS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Is legislation relating to the control of noise levels, particularly in relation to air-conditioners and other domestic appliances, in the metropolitan area being prepared?

2. If so, when is it expected that it will be introduced into Parliament?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: A brief has been prepared for a Noise and Vibration Act, which will include provisions for control of noise from air-conditioners and other domestic appliances, following consultation between officers of the Environment and Conservation Department and the Public Health Department. This brief has been forwarded to the Parliamentary Counsel for preparation of the draft Bill.

RADIOLOGICAL EQUIPMENT

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. On what date was the order placed for new radiological equipment for Queen Elizabeth Hospital extensions?

2. On what date was the order confirmed by the suppliers?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Letters of acceptance were forwarded to two tenderers on March 15, 1973, and March 28, 1973.

2. Contracts were signed by these tenderers on April 7, 1973, and April 18, 1973, respectively.

DEQUETTEVILLE TERRACE INTERSECTION

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. When is it now expected that roadworks at the intersection of Dequetteville Terrace, Kensington Road, Wakefield Road and Fullarton Road will begin?

2. Has a decision been made on the general design of the intersection, and will Wakefield Road be diverted to enter Dequetteville Terrace opposite Angas Street, Kent Town?

3. When is it expected these works will be completed?

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

1. Not known.

2. No.

3. Not known.

POLICE FORCE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How are the conclusions concerning the allegations of brutality against a South Australian policeman made by Senator Cavanagh at variance with his complaint?

2. Has there been any response to the appeal by Deputy Police Commissioner Draper for the motor cyclist to come forward and, if so, what response?

3. If a response has not been made, is the appeal to be renewed?

4. Are any other, and what, attempts still being made to locate the motor cyclist concerned?

5. When is it intended to finalize this matter and how?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. A complaint was made and a warrant has been issued in this case, and, until such time as the matter is decided by court action, the police testimony is *sub judice*.

2. No.

3. No.

4. Normal inquiries that police make in respect of a warrant.

5. When the warrant is executed and court procedures are concluded.

HUMAN RIGHTS BILL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What matters were raised by the State officers at the conferences between them and Commonwealth officers concerning the implications of the Human Rights Bill with respect to State law?

The Hon. L. J. KING: State officers discussed the Bill, almost clause by clause, with Commonwealth officers, raising questions as to both the content of the Bill and the way in which it had been drafted. Particular topics of State law discussed included police powers of seizure and arrest, trial and detention procedures for juveniles, criminal appeals, and the jurisdiction and appellate supervision of the Supreme Court.

PORT LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. BLACKER (on notice):

1. When is it expected that stage 1 of the Port Lincoln High School will be completed?

2. When will work commence on stage 2?

3. How many students will the completed school accommodate?

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

1. The latest scheduled date for completion is June, 1974.

2. It is not possible at the present time to give any indication as to when stage 2 will be built. Because of the heavy demand on funds to meet the secondary division's building programme and the effect of escalating costs, it has been found necessary to introduce a policy of staged upgrading of existing schools to ensure that at least a proportion of the accommodation is brought up to a standard commensurate with modern educational requirements.

3. About 550 students will be accommodated in the new buildings that are being constructed in the first stage. Plans for stage 2 provide for an additional 400 places. Although the present enrolments have reached 1 006, the estimate for 1978 is 960, which suggests a downward trend. However, before stage 2 is built, plans will be reviewed and, if necessary, amended to allow for a larger school enrolment than was originally expected.

MONARTO

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Development and Mines assure honourable members that landholders in the Monarto area are being offered for their land a price that will enable them to purchase land that will give a similar agricultural return, and will be table in the House details of recent transactions relating to land of similar quality in other parts of the State? I believe that all along the position has been that, with increases in property values, landholders have been and are experiencing more and more difficulty in finding, at the price placed on their land by the Valuation Department, similar agricultural land that gives a return similar to that given by their present land. I should like the Minister's assurance that all aspects of this problem are being considered fully and that landholders are receiving the benefit of this consideration.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The assurance I can give to the honourable member is that the Government is carrying out its obligations under the relevant legislation. I think it important for honourable members to realize that the cardinal principle under which Monarto is being established is that the Government should be able to get the land at agricultural prices free of any inflating effect that the Government's announcement of the project should have on those prices. I can well understand the way in which a person would feel, finding his property, within the designated site, being acquired under these conditions, as opposed to the case of a person whose property is within half a mile (.8 km) of the boundary of the site, whose land values are possibly being affected by the Government's decision to establish Monarto, and who can therefore get an inflated value on the open market for his property. I can understand people in the former category viewing that situation with some misgivings, but there is no way out of the situation. The Government decided to draw roughly a circle on the map somewhere. Obviously people within that circle would not get the sort of benefit out of the decision that would be received by landowners in adjacent areas. However, in effect, that is the name of the game; we must protect our own position and that of the taxpayers of the State to ensure that we can get this land at values that are not affected by the announcement of the setting up of Monarto.

I can make available now details of sums paid for properties acquired in the last month. In these figures,

I am not including sums that have been paid for disturbance, although I can assure honourable members that those sums have been considerable. The figures are as follows:

Date	Area (acres)	Price an acre cleared, fenced and watered \$	Price an acre including improvements \$
11/2/74 ..	484.81	81.70	82.00
11/2/74 ..	437.14	74.87	134.35
25/2/74 ..	659.02	74.87	98.39
25/2/74 ..	699.05	84.08	111.26
4/3/74 ..	471	93.08	134.21

That is the scale of valuation that is operating. Added to that is a considerable compensation for disturbance. That is the present situation, and the Government is obliged to carry out its responsibilities under the Act. One of the problems has been the concept of attributed price, which is based on sales occurring outside of the area, so that in the event of a case going to the Land and Valuation Court comparable sales are not being influenced, in the court's decision, by the Government's decision to set up the city. A committee has been set up to advise the Government on the attributed price system, and I remind members that this committee consists of a representative of the Institute of Valuers. It also includes the State Valuer-General (Mr. Petherick), and Mr. Tony Richardson (General Manager of the Monarto Development Commission), as my nominee. It is on the recommendation of this committee that the attributed price is fixed.

This question arises partly from the honourable member's involvement in the area and, I understand, from a report that was given wide currency in this State in the *Sunday Mail* over the weekend. I make two points regarding that press report: first, it seems a little out of date, because one of the persons listed as a complainant has subsequently settled with the Government (I therefore suggest that the report may have been drafted some time ago) and, secondly, much of the report talks about lease-back. I should like to conclude my reply simply by making six points regarding lease-back so that there can be no confusion about the Government's policy on this matter. First, owners must ask for a lease-back; the obligation is on the owner to approach the Government in this respect. I have been informed that so far few approaches have been made for lease-back arrangements. Secondly, no outsiders (in the sense of people other than the owners of land within the designated site) will be given lease-back arrangements. The system applies only to the original owners. Thirdly, leases are at present being given for the next cropping season or, at the most, two seasons. Fourthly, long-term leases cannot be given until the consultants' plans are available. I remind members that the Government intends to commence the building phase of Monarto as soon as it can, so it does not know at this stage exactly what portions of the site will be going into urban use as early as 1976 or 1977. The Government therefore cannot extend lease-back arrangements at this stage beyond those dates until it has a clearer idea of where the town centre will be, what will be open space and what will be set aside as residential areas. Fifthly, when it is known what land will be required by the commission, it will be possible to give leases of a longer term, and it is hoped that this can be clarified soon. Finally, there will definitely be no long-term leases in the proposed park areas. That is the situation, and I can only say that the Government is trying to carry out its responsibilities under the Act passed by this place.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier explain how farmers in the Monarto area whose property has been purchased could have been led to believe that their livelihood would

be protected by engaging in a lease-back arrangement, when, in fact, this has been denied them? The Minister did not answer this point clearly when he replied to my colleague. The newspaper report indicates positively that Mr. Richardson (Chairman of the commission) told a meeting of the people that they would not be able to proceed in this way beyond 1975, whereas, in fact, the people of the Monarto area understood that the lease-back arrangement would exist for an indefinite period until a specific block went under development. On this basis, and as the matter relates to the Government's policy in this regard, I ask the question of the Premier.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I think the Leader's assumption arises from a statement in the weekend report to which I have referred. It states:

On December 21, 1972, the Environment Minister (Mr. Broomhill) had told them at a public meeting that some farmers would be able to stay on their land for several years on a lease-back system.

There is no reference to an indefinite period for which that would operate. The Minister made his statement in 1972 and the press report has been made now on the basis of the memory of those who were there then. I have checked with my colleague and it is clear from his statement that there was never any undertaking given that these people could stay there for an indefinite period.

Mr. Gunn: Were you at the public meeting?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am willing to accept my colleague's statement. The time limit we are adopting has been hastened only in the respect that we are acquiring land over an 18-month period rather than over the four-year period originally contemplated. I suppose this throws the lease-back system into a highlight situation, because, obviously, people whose land would have been acquired, say, in two years time will now have their property acquired before then and they will be asking us for lease-back before they otherwise would have done so. However, to say that these people would get a lease-back for an indefinite period on the basis of a statement which a couple of years later says that it would be for several years is simply something that we cannot accept. The Government is continuing to carry out its policy. In conclusion, I should like to table a pamphlet that was made available to the people at that public meeting. It sets out their rights in relation to lease-back and states:

The aim of the authority is to keep landholders as fully informed as possible concerning their property acquisitions but if you require further advice, any general inquiries relating to the new town should be directed to the Secretary, State Planning Authority, Box 1815, G.P.O., Adelaide 5001, and any inquiries concerning acquisition procedures or compensation should be directed to the Land Board, Department of Lands.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not necessary to table the document. The honourable Minister may make it available to honourable members.

Mr. RODDA: In view of the Minister's rather peremptory message to the farmers in the Monarto area, I ask him what plans, if any, he has to recommend to his Cabinet for the successful rehabilitation of these farmers when they are displaced from their land. I think that the Minister, in passing, mentioned something about a farmer receiving \$90 an acre (-4 ha) for about 600 acres (240 ha). That farmer would get out with about \$6 000 in his pocket, but that would be insufficient for him to re-establish a farm on land of similar quality to that in the Monarto area. The Minister is not being mindful of the situation that will face these young men who wish to continue in

their profession; perhaps he has missed the point. He did tell the House that his authority did not cover the payment of inflated prices. However, these people must re-establish themselves at inflated prices if they are to carry on their profession. I ask the Minister what plans he has to assist them, because he made the decision to replace them.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I can give the honourable member no assurances whatsoever on that matter. I merely repeat that the Government has a responsibility to carry out under the Act, and it is trying to carry out that responsibility.

Mr. Gunn: How many—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I merely make the point that a minute to the Land Board states:

Lands Department told meeting of December 21, 1972, that compensation would be in accordance with Land Acquisition Act and they would get market value of properties plus disturbance, not reinstatement.

That was made clear to the people at a meeting as long ago as December 21, 1972, and we are continuing to carry out that policy.

RENT CONTROL

Mr. JENNINGS: Will the Premier say whether the Government intends in the next session of Parliament to reintroduce some form of rent control and tenant protection? My attention has been drawn to the many iniquities existing at present, the most spectacular being by an excrement named Saccone, of Greenacres, who owns a block of flats in my district. He accepts tenants on a lease basis and, when a lease expires, he renews it at the tenant's expense for a shorter period and at a higher rent. This goes on progressively until the tenant is squeezed dry and forced out, when the whole procedure starts again.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Submissions have been made on this matter but no decision has yet been taken.

FESTIVAL FRINGE

Mr. DUNCAN: Will the Premier say whether the Government is aware of the difficulties facing many of the Festival of Arts fringe attractions during the current festival, because of misunderstandings between the festival administration and those connected with the fringe attractions? Will he say what action can be taken during this festival to make funds available in order to ensure that adequate listing of the fringe attractions takes place in newspapers and other media? As members will be aware, the festival administration announced, I think last May, that it would for the first time recognize the fringe officially this year and that it would take action to support it financially. I think one of the steps was to appoint an officer of the festival to co-ordinate the fringe activities and to ensure that those involved were told at the time that the fringe would be given satisfactory publicity. Also at that time, it was announced that a fringe booklet would be published and made available widely, and that the participants in the fringe would each be asked to contribute \$60 to the cost of producing that booklet. I understand it was stated at the time that the booklet would be widely distributed. However, I am now informed that in fact the booklet, which costs 30c, is available only at four venues in the city of Adelaide. As a result, many of the festival fringe attractions have been put in financial jeopardy and in some regional areas outside the city of Adelaide this could have a serious effect on some of the amateur and semi-professional groups operating in this State. I should be grateful if the Government could examine this matter

urgently with a view to taking steps to ensure that the fringe activities are widely publicized during this festival.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will discuss this matter with the festival Administrator, but I point out to the honourable member that the booklet has been available at several venues, these being the venues to which people go to find out about the festival and which have been widely publicized as such. Precisely how else one distributes this booklet I do not know. Certainly, people inquire for it, and there have been advertisements concerning this. I do not imagine that people can expect that the Government can afford to letter-box the fringe festival booklet.

Mr. Coumbe: Don't you support the fringe?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, we do and we have given it far more support than has ever been given it previously.

Dr. Eastick: Does it accept that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Most of the people concerned accept it. The extent to which the festival can involve itself in paid advertising in the newspapers is limited by funds, although we have provided more funds for the festival than it has ever had before. However, our funds do not come from a bottomless pit. We really have tried more than has ever happened previously to help the festival fringe activities co-ordinate publicity and bookings with what happens regarding the normal sponsored festival attractions, and I regret that this kind of controversy has occurred. It is simply not possible for a Government to meet the cost of a massive publicity campaign for fringe attractions. What we can do is make available through the festival Administrator what facilities we have, and that has certainly been done.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY BOARD

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry indicate the qualifications and occupations of some of the members of the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board? In both the *Government Gazette* of March 7 and the *Advertiser* of March 8 we see that the board has been set up by the Government and that it comprises certain people. These are Mr. Lindsay Burton Bowes (Chairman), and Messrs. Barry Frederick James Cavanagh, Arthur Royston Griffiths, J.P., Leonard George Lean, Hugh David Flehr, Ronald Thomas Patterson and Neil Sarah, who is obviously a builder.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Messrs. Lean and Cavanagh are union officials in this State. The other representatives on the board, which is headed by the permanent head of my department, are associated with the building industry.

HOUSING TRUST RENTS

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister in charge of housing say what categories of pensioner will be entitled to reduced rents under the recently announced Housing Trust rent increases?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: They will be the holders of a pensioner medical entitlement card. In other words, they will be the same people who get rebates at present on Engineering and Water Supply Department rates, local government rates and land tax. At present, two kinds of pensioner live in trust accommodation: those whose pensioner status is known to the trust and those whose pensioner status is not known to the trust as a result of their being tenants of long standing. Because the pensioner status of the first category is known to the trust, these people will not be notified of rent increase. The second class of pensioner is in a different position, and it is necessary that such pen-

sioners be notified of the rent increase and then be told that there will be an automatic rebate. That is, the increase in rent will not apply on the application of the tenant. Such an application must be made because in this case the trust does not know they are pensioners and hence entitled to the exemption. A few notices have gone out without the accompanying letter but this deficiency has now been remedied. I have instructed the trust that all tenants shall receive a notice saying that, if they hold a pensioner medical entitlement card, they should notify the trust of their status and they will be granted exemption immediately. May I request that this reply be given as wide publicity as possible because I can imagine the consternation on the part of a pensioner who, thinking that he was exempted from the increase in rent, received the notice asking him to pay the increase and did not read the accompanying letter explaining the machinery under which he would become exempted automatically from paying the increase.

FAR NORTH ROADS

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Transport consider making more road-making equipment available in the Far North where roads have been damaged by recent floods? Recent heavy rains in the Far North have severely damaged roads outside local government areas, totalling about 6 000 miles (9 600 km). The roads east of the Flinders Range are in particularly bad state of repair. I am informed today that Lake Callabonna and Lake Blanche have joined. This has resulted in the cutting of the Strzelecki track. The water will flow into Lake Frome. In addition, this has cut the gas pipeline. The maintenance men from Peterborough are finding it extremely difficult to maintain this pipeline. At present, they are using boats and four-wheel drive vehicles. Moreover, in the North-West of the State, in the Oodnadatta area, during my visit last Wednesday I saw a road transport vehicle being unloaded after arriving from Adelaide. Normally, such a vehicle can reach Oodnadatta by travelling 670 miles (1 080 km), via Marree, and Oodnadatta. However, because of the state of the road from Marree to Oodnadatta, the vehicle had to travel 1 070 miles (1 720 km) via Kingoonya and Stuart Highway, to the Northern Territory border, through the Granite Downs station to Oodnadatta. On this vehicle were four 44-gallon (200 l) drums of cylinder oil that had burst owing to the corrugations and potholes in the road. In addition, four 13-gallon (59 l) drums had burst. The works of an upright refrigerator were loose on the floor of the transport as a result of the rough condition of the road. In the area, people estimate that it will take 12 months to put the roads back into the condition in which they were before these rains. People are asking that additional equipment be sent to the area. If no Highways Department equipment is available, could some machinery belonging to a private organization be taken to the area to try to expedite the carrying out of repairs to these roads?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department is conscious of the problems facing people using northern roads; it is fully aware of the condition of the roads. The department, together with the Pastoral Board, has been engaged in extensive survey work. Only this morning, a verbal interim report was submitted to me; in due course, I will receive a further report. I doubt very much whether any more than is currently being done can be done because, as I have pointed out previously to the honourable member and to other honourable members, if additional manpower or equipment is to be made available to the North it will have to be taken

from somewhere else. Frankly, I should not care to upset the present allocation of these facilities, because, if I took a road gang and its equipment from the District of Eyre, putting it into the District of Frome, although I would satisfy the member for Frome, I would then have, three days a week, the member for Eyre on his feet asking me when more equipment would be taken into his area. Perhaps the two members can solve the problem between themselves and let me know the result.

SOUTH ROAD CROSSING

Mr. WRIGHT: Will the Minister of Transport undertake to have investigated the area of South Road directly opposite Kintore Avenue and the Queen of Angels Catholic Church in that area? The Catholic priest in this parish wrote to me complaining that this area lacked street lighting and "go slow" caution signs. Unfortunately about two or three weeks ago, one of his parishioners (Mr. Joe Mittiga) was critically injured and subsequently died. The priest also states that other accidents have occurred in the area. Yesterday, accompanied by the priest, I inspected the site. There is no doubt that, once one leaves the traffic lights on Henley Beach Road and travels north, one is apt to pick up speed, arriving at this curve quickly. Anyone crossing the street at that point is in extreme danger. In fact, the priest and I were in danger when we crossed the road from the point opposite where the accident to which I have referred occurred. I should appreciate the Minister's having the area thoroughly investigated with a view to having proper lighting installed. As I have suggested, "go slow" caution signs should also be installed to alert drivers travelling north.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will certainly ask the Road Traffic Board to investigate the problem and bring down a report to me.

OUTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say when the next stage of the outer metropolitan development plan will be made available to the public for inspection?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I have been speaking about this matter only in the past day or two. Although the stage is being reached when publication of the plan will be possible, I cannot give the exact date at present. However, it is not far away. I will see whether I can find out the exact date, and I will let the honourable member know.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM

Mr. HALL: In view of Industrial Instruction No. 300 which is dated June 22, 1970, and which deals with unionism in relation to Government employees, can the Premier say whether present Government employees who are not members of unions are free to maintain that position or whether the Government will allow them to be forced into joining a union?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: It is interesting that the Minister of Labour and Industry should laugh at my question.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. HALL: I remind the Premier of the following two paragraphs of Industrial Instruction No. 300:

Therefore, a non-unionist shall not be engaged for any work to be exclusive of a well conducted unionist if that unionist is adequately experienced in and competent to perform the work.

Cabinet also desires that, where possible, present employees who are not unionists be encouraged to join appropriate unions.

Ever since that instruction, most Government employees who have spoken to me about union matters have said that they understand the second paragraph to mean simply what it says; they have taken it to advocate encouragement and not force. However, a Government employee who has approached me says that he is under great pressure in this regard, to such an extent that he will probably lose his job if he does not join a union. This man is at present a Government employee, not a person looking for engagement. I ask the Premier to state the Government's policy on this issue, saying whether, during the Government's administration, there has been stronger pressure than just encouragement.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The policy on this matter has been stated on several occasions. The honourable member read the instruction, and it is plain on the face of it.

NAGEE II

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Marine say what is the situation regarding the vessel *Nagee II*?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I understand that the *Nagee II* is almost totally submerged in a shipping lane about 11 miles (17.69 km) from Fairway Beacon, Port Adelaide. The vessel constitutes a hazard to shipping in the shipping lane, shipping having been warned, through the Marine Operations Centre in Canberra, that the hazard exists. The vessel has on board about 3 500 gallons (15 900 l) of diesel fuel which is in fact seeping into the sea at present (at least, it was when I had the last report). Both the Marine and Harbors Department and the Commonwealth Department of Shipping are keeping a close watch on this oil. However, because it is a thin type of oil and is just seeping, it is expected that it will disperse naturally. The Government does not believe that it will be a hazard to Adelaide's beaches but, if it does not disperse, arrangements can be made quickly through the joint Commonwealth-State oil protection programme for dispersants to be made available to disseminate it. However, because of the likely effect that such action would have on the marine ecology of the area the Government does not want to do this until it is absolutely necessary. This vessel passed a survey conducted on March 8 and, although the surveyors have completed their work, they have not yet issued a certificate. I do not know what type of voyage the vessel was on, but I have ordered a preliminary inquiry to be carried out by the Marine and Harbors Department. Whether I will institute a court of marine inquiry will depend on the information that comes from the preliminary inquiry.

RURAL UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Lands, ascertain whether rural unemployment relief money is still being paid to district councils in this State and, if it is, how much has been made to each council? All councils in South Australia have been told that this financial assistance would not be made available from the end of last September, although it was possible that some council areas might receive assistance thereafter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Certain councils have received this assistance, which has been based on the rate of unemployment in the respective council areas. I will obtain the exact information for the honourable member and let him have a reply in due course.

STATE'S FINANCES

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Treasurer say what the State's deficit is likely to be at June 30 next? Also, does he recall

that when introducing the last Budget he forecast an estimated revenue deficit of \$11 250 000? Will he also say in what state the Loan Account is likely to be at the end of the fiscal year compared to the estimate he gave previously?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I forecast a revenue deficit of \$11 250 000, and the actual deficit will not be worse than that: indeed, it could be better. Earlier this year, I expected that the State would probably come out with a deficit of about \$8 000 000. However, it may be more than that. The original budgeted figure has been affected by over-award payments, annual leave loadings, and so on. The position, which will be explained later when I introduce the Supplementary Estimates, is that both revenue and expenditure are up considerably on previous estimates. However, it appears that what we gain on the swings we may lose on the roundabouts in relation to balancing the Budget. Regarding the Loan Account, we have had expenditure additional to that which was forecast, but I cannot give the honourable member the precise figure at present. However, that is entirely separate from the revenue deficit.

BERTHING FACILITIES

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Marine say what plans are in hand for the provision of berthing facilities for the fishing fleet at Port Lincoln, which is the largest fishing port in Australia but which, as such, does not have proper berthing facilities. At present, catches from larger fishing vessels must be unloaded at Brennan's jetty or Kirton Point jetty, necessitating the use of complex winches and cranes. It is impossible for lobster and shark catches to be unloaded at these jetties because of the height of the wharf above deck level. This makes it impossible to man-handle the catch, as is done with the shark and crayfish catch. The handling of fresh fish at Brennan's jetty leaves much to be desired because of the dust hazard from the loading of grain ships and the unloading of rock phosphate. Fertilizer and export tuna do not mix. In New South Wales, the port of Eden has a gross annual turnover of \$2 000 000, with facilities worth over that sum. At Ulladulla there is a gross annual turnover of nearly \$1 000 000, with port facilities valued at more than \$1 500 000. As Port Lincoln has an annual turnover of more than \$10 000 000, will the Minister say what facilities are being planned for that port?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member would realize that the State Government has, in the last three or four years, spent about \$8 000 000 on harbor facilities at Port Lincoln. It has also spent about \$120 000 in the last 12 months on fishing havens in order to improve slipping facilities. Discussions have often been held with the fishermen of this area regarding improved facilities for the landing of their catches, and I have been given to understand that, when the work is completed and the new harbor facilities are operating, other arrangements will be made and these should be satisfactory for fishermen (if ever all fishermen's needs can be provided for). The honourable member would realize, too, that \$300 000 is voted annually for fishing havens, and that this sum must be allocated over the whole State. In this respect, I think the honourable member would agree that Port Lincoln has had its fair share over the last few years. I agree that the fishing industry is important not only to Port Lincoln but also to the whole State, and I do not dispute the figures with which the honourable member has provided me. However, the honourable member will find that the fishermen at Eden in New South Wales pay for the use of their facilities. That is not the case at

Port Lincoln or at any other port in South Australia and, if the honourable member advocates that these fishermen should pay for their facilities, as a result of which the Government would be able to provide even better facilities for them, let him say so. However, the Government does not intend to do that at present. If necessary, I will obtain any further additional information required by the honourable member.

SUPERANNUATION

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier say what major concessions he conceded to the Public Service Association in his negotiations with Mr. E. S. Knight on February 18 concerning the Public Service superannuation scheme and what will be the additional cost of these concessions the Government granted, if, indeed, it did grant any? In the *Public Service Review* of February 25 it is stated that Mr. Knight negotiated with the Premier on February 18 and that major concessions were obtained from the Premier regarding the superannuation scheme. Further, a report in the *Advertiser* of February 19, 1974, made the same claim. Last week I asked a question about the costs of the superannuation scheme for the first 12 months of operation and was told that the additional cost would be \$3 400 000. I now wish to find out whether these costs have been increased. I am extremely suspicious that no concessions were granted, that in fact the negotiations were a complete sham and merely window-dressing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know who the honourable member thinks is window-dressing in this matter. The Government, in accordance with its undertaking to both the Superannuation Federation and the Public Service Association, considered submissions about difficulties or anomalies that could arise from the Government scheme. In fact, it was not the Government scheme: it was the scheme submitted by the working party which the Government appointed and on which the Superannuation Federation was represented. One of the representatives was the President of the Public Service Association. In the week before my meeting with the Public Service Association, after considering several submissions that had been made the Public Actuary and the Under Treasurer recommended certain amendments to the scheme. These were adopted, the necessary minutes were provided, and the Superannuation Federation was informed. I then, in the next week, met a deputation from the Public Service Association and at that deputation the main spokesman was Mr. Knight. I listened for some time and then said that it seemed he was not aware that the Government had taken several decisions during the previous week, and I arranged for these to be detailed to him immediately. They were a result of the Government's consideration of submissions that we had received from both the federation and the association and they were in accordance with undertakings we had given when the working party was originally appointed that, after the working party's report had been provided, any difficulties raised by the Superannuation Federation would be examined. I understand that at a later meeting it was suggested that at the meeting with me concessions had been wrung from the Government, but I thought that was rather an emotive term to use to describe what had happened. However, as to the costing of the extra amounts, frankly the Public Actuary has difficulty about giving a completely accurate costing, because at this stage it is impossible to calculate several imponderables.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It spreads over the whole scheme.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN. It does. However I will find out whether I can get a further report for the honourable member on the costing.

REGIONAL COUNCILS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Premier say whether the South Australian Government agrees with the views of Mr. Ted Baldwin, the Labor Party's shadow Minister for Local Government in the Queensland Parliament, who stated, when addressing the Western Queensland Local Government Association, that the establishment of regional councils would result in the States being phased out? Mr. Baldwin also said that State Governments were a luxury that Australia could no longer afford. I ask the Premier whether these statements are in accord with the South Australian Government's policies.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is not admissible, as it has no relevance to this House.

WATER STORAGES

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Works say whether the Government has taken the initiative to instigate discussions or negotiations through the River Murray Commission to promote the need for a further storage on the Murray River to increase South Australia's water entitlement above 1 500 000 acre feet? In recent years the Government has often stated that, on completion of the Dartmouth storage and on the 1 500 000 acre feet of water becoming available to South Australia, we in this State will still be over-committed. When we consider the building of Monaro and the ever-increasing demands on the Murray River from Adelaide and other industrial centres, it seems that the Government will not have water available for additional irrigation, although there is a real economic need to increase the production of crops under irrigation and to use the processing factories that we have, especially those in Riverland, where there is a big capital commitment in these plants.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member will be aware that the various Governments that are members of the River Murray Commission have recently concentrated their efforts on improving the quality of water in the Murray River, and he will know that one of the major factors contributing to a deterioration in water quality is extended irrigation.

Mr. Arnold: In the other States!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It applies in this State as well as in the other States. Does the honourable member disagree with my statement that extended irrigation activity is one of the major causes of deterioration?

Mr. Arnold: Not in this State.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Is the honourable member suggesting that irrigation in this State has no bearing on the quality of water in the Murray River in this State? It does have a bearing, and the honourable member knows that one of the problems experienced in his own district concerns the need to provide evaporation basins because of irrigation. The solutions to this problem are extremely costly and, in the event of further irrigation taking place in this State, an evaluation would have to be made of such increased irrigation, including an examination of what it would cost to prevent a deterioration in the quality of water in the river in this State. In other words, the economics of increased irrigation in this State have to be closely examined before a decision can be taken.

The honourable member also knows that at this point we are well and truly over-committed in regard to irrigating from the Murray River, and that situation will not improve:

even when Dartmouth dam is operating, we will still be over-committed and will not be able to engage in further irrigation. That is the assessment at this point, but this Government has never given up the hope (it never will, and it will continue to press the other States and the Commonwealth Government) of having Chowilla dam constructed as the next storage on the Murray River. The honourable member will know that the River Murray Commission is constantly examining the need to construct additional storages, wherever they may be. If it is possible, and if the commission is willing to release the relevant details, I am willing to obtain for him a report on the commission's latest thinking regarding additional storages on the Murray River and their possible effect on additional irrigation in this State. However, I ask him to bear in mind the points I have made, and I impress on him the fact that, even though additional water obtained in South Australia may ease the situation as regards our total commitment, it does not necessarily or automatically mean increased irrigation from the Murray River in this State.

BIKIE GANGS

Mr. BECKER: Can the Attorney-General say what action the Government intends to take to restrain the activities of bikie gangs? I refer to recent reports of alleged activities of and damage caused by bikie gangs in this State. Also, I have been informed of an incident in which a young woman motorist was recently forced off a road in the country by a group of bikies, although fortunately she was not seriously injured. It has been suggested to me that, even though only a few of the members of these gangs are totally irresponsible, the police should have power to impound the motor cycles of those riders who have contributed to accidents on our roads or caused considerable property damage.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The law provides a very effective way of dealing with this situation without impounding the motor cycles: customarily, the magistrates disqualify the people concerned from holding or obtaining a driver's licence, and that has the same effect. I am sure that the police are well aware of the publicity that has attended the activities of some members of these groups and are doing all they can to ensure that there is no unlawful behaviour on their part. However, I will direct the honourable member's question to the Chief Secretary and see whether further information can be obtained.

KANGAROO ISLAND TRANSPORT

Mr. CHAPMAN: In view of Kangaroo Island's isolation and its complete dependence on the Port Adelaide to Kingscote transport link for the dispatch of exports from the island as well as for the delivery to it of essential items, including food, etc., will the Minister of Transport use his influence in having eliminated in future the effects of strike action that is unrelated to any island events?

The SPEAKER: Order! On the basis of what I have heard of the question so far, I rule that it involves a matter over which the Minister has no jurisdiction whatsoever and that it is therefore an inadmissible question.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Sir, on a point of order—

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I have ruled that the question is inadmissible, because the honourable member for Alexandra asked the Minister to take some action, or to consider taking action, in a matter over which he has no jurisdiction. Therefore, the question is inadmissible.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I point out that Standing Order 123 refers to questions

relating to public affairs, and I respectfully remind you that in this instance the Minister has complete jurisdiction, as he and his department virtually own the vessel that provides the link to which I am referring. Indeed, in this House on previous occasions the Minister has boasted of having complete control over the motor vessel *Troubridge*. My question involves that control and the desire to have the Minister exercise his good offices in regard to protecting the interests of those members of the public that are served by this vessel.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order, and I repeat that the honourable member's question asks the Minister to take some action in a matter over which he has no control, that is, strike action. The point of order is not upheld.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Sir, I move:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member bring up his reasons in writing?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I will do that.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Alexandra has moved to disagree to the Speaker's ruling for the following reason:

Because the Minister is responsible for the department owning the transport link to which I referred, I ask that he answer my request to use his Ministerial influence in the matter.

Is the motion to disagree to the Speaker's ruling seconded?

Mr. GUNN: Yes.

Mr. CHAPMAN: This matter is of extreme importance to the Kangaroo Island community, as this community has been denied a transport service as a result of action taken by union strikers in a matter not concerned with the Government-owned m.v. *Troubridge*, the port of Kingscote, or Kangaroo Island generally. My question to the Minister of Transport was asked on behalf of those people affected, so that he could use his influence to prevent such a situation occurring again. You, Mr. Speaker, gave me no chance to explain why I asked the question. I believe that your ruling, on that basis, was unreasonable and out of order, and that is why I objected to it and sought the chance to explain the reasons for asking the question in the first instance.

Mr. GUNN: In supporting the member for Alexandra I am rather amazed at the light-hearted way in which the Deputy Premier has treated this matter. The honourable gentleman, on behalf of his constituents, referred in this House to a matter of importance to those constituents, but he has been denied the chance to receive a reply from the appropriate Minister. The member for Alexandra represents a large district that has difficult transport problems to which he has drawn the attention of this House both now and previously. Because you, Mr. Speaker, have not allowed him to raise this matter and so receive a reply on behalf of his constituents, I believe you are discriminating against the honourable member's constituents, and I strongly support his action.

Motion negatived.

The SPEAKER: Order! Call on the business of the day.

Mr. Chapman: Divide!

The SPEAKER: Order! I called on the business of the day before the member for Alexandra attempted to get out of his seat. That stands. Call on the business of the day.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) (1974)

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D. A. Dunstan:

That he have leave to introduce a Bill for an Act for the further appropriation of the revenue of the State for the financial year ending on June 30, 1974, and for other purposes.

(Continued from March 7. Page 2360.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I wish to refer to one or two matters of grievance that I consider are important to the House and the people of this State. I have received a petition from 91 residents of this State in relation to the use of nets for fishing. The wording of the petition has prevented its being presented to the House but, to explain its effect, I shall read it, as follows:

We, the undersigned, request that you recommend to the relevant authorities that the South Australian Government urgently consider making the following amendments to the Fisheries Act:

1. That the use of a gill or drag net be totally prohibited from all beaches and in all rivers between Outer Harbor and Victor Harbor from the high-water mark to 500 metres from the shore beyond the low-water mark.
2. That the use of a gill or drag net be prohibited on all South Australian coastal beaches and in all rivers and in the Coorong from high-water mark to 500 metres from the shore beyond the low-water mark except by those persons holding a class A or B fishing licence (that is, full-time or seasonal commercial fishermen).

The reasons for the above recommendations are as follows:

1. Rod and line, and handline angling is one of the largest participant forms of recreation and, therefore, a major tourist attraction to beach areas. It is an inexpensive pastime enjoyed by all levels of society and by both sexes, from young school-children to elderly pensioners. The pleasure and recreation of literally thousands of anglers is being sacrificed to the greed and thoughtlessness of the amateur netters operating in our coastal waters, particularly on the metropolitan beaches.

I agree with the first point that the matter of controlling the use of nets for fishing on the metropolitan beaches should be considered, but I do not agree to the total banning of the use of nets outside the metropolitan area. The beach at Glenelg is within a short distance of an area from which most of the people would use the beach. One or two amateur fishermen set their nets, leave them for up to an hour, then drag the nets to the beach. Several times young children, who did not realize what was happening, were playing in the water, but, when the fishermen decided to drag the nets, the children were hunted away. I understand that adult swimmers have been ordered away from one popular beach in my district. Obviously, people will complain if they are ordered from the water during the heat of a summer's day. There would be no finer or healthier sport or recreation than swimming, and to be asked to leave the water or to swim in another area simply because a fisherman wants to drag his net to the beach cannot be accepted by most people.

It is time that we faced facts and legislated to prevent the dragging of nets on our beaches. A few weeks ago small crabs were seen on the beach at Glenelg North for the first time for seven years. Probably, the ecology is being balanced in this area, but a person dragged his net to the beach and left hundreds of small crabs on the sand. They died in the sun and the smell was unbearable. This practice makes it difficult for children to understand that species of fish must be preserved, and to observe the balance of ecology. We must have rules and regulations in relation to fishing so that we can retain several species of fish in our waters, and particularly to prevent such action being taken by a couple of idiots on our beaches. These people will

receive no sympathy from me, and I support the 91 persons who have signed this petition. I hope that the Minister of Fisheries will consider the banning of the use of nets on our metropolitan beaches from the high-water mark to a distance of 500 metres from the shore beyond the low-water mark. I have already referred to the second recommendation, but as I am not familiar with the area I will leave that matter to the department. The petitioners explained the reasons for the petition as follows:

Mr. Olsen acclaimed the tyre reef off Glenelg as being a potential refuge and breeding ground for fish. We hope he is correct! Nevertheless, why not also preserve the fishes' natural environment? Why not protect them from mass slaughter in the coastal shallows? Why not provide a relatively safe corridor all along our coast between their natural feeding and breeding grounds?

That is the situation applying in the Glenelg North waters whilst people are allowed to drag nets on the beach. The petition continues:

It seems rather unrealistic that an angler is specifically allowed no more than two lines with three hooks on each, whereas a netter uses as many nets as he likes and in a given period would take more fish than a hundred anglers could ever take in that same period. Many of the fish discarded as undersize or unwanted by the netter have damaged gills and scales, and consequently they do not survive their period on the water's edge even if they do escape the various sea birds.

That is true. Immense damage has been done to young fish breeding in the Glenelg North area. I strongly urge the Minister to consider amending the regulations so as to prohibit net fishing along our metropolitan beaches. Such a move may not be popular with a few people, but we must consider the overall benefit to anglers in this State.

My next point relates to Questions on Notice. When a member places a Question on Notice in this House he expects that it will be answered on the following Tuesday. I have been told that the reply is taken to Cabinet, which makes a decision and authorizes the reply, and then the member is given the information. On Tuesday, March 5, I received answers to Questions on Notice from the Minister of Transport. These questions were handed to the Clerk on the Tuesday and Wednesday of the previous week to be placed on the Notice Paper. In one of the questions I asked for the total cost of operating the Bee-line bus service and how many passengers had been carried to date. I was a little annoyed when I saw that the Minister was reported in the *Advertiser* of March 1 as saying that the Bee-line bus service had carried more than 500 000 passengers since it started on December 3 last year. This may not mean much to the people reading the paper, but it means that the Minister made a statement to the press before he had answered my question. He cannot argue that he did not know the question would be asked.

Mr. Mathwin: They give all these answers in the paper. We have seen that today.

Mr. Jennings: Do you remember what Playford did?

Mr. BECKER: I am not worried about what someone else did. This has happened to me; I do not like it, and this is my opportunity to say so. I also asked the following Questions on Notice relating to the take-over of private bus operators:

1. What is the total cost of acquiring private bus services in the metropolitan area?
2. Is any goodwill included in the purchase price?
3. What is the total number of buses acquired and their respective make and model?
4. If any of these vehicles are to be replaced, what kind of vehicles will replace them and when?

The Minister of Transport then made a cunning press release on Monday, March 4, the day before I received my reply. He said:

The State Government is planning to spend at least \$8 000 000 on 200 new buses to upgrade the M.T.T. metropolitan fleet in the next three years . . . They would be necessary to replace many of the buses that the Government bought in its take-over of the private operators in the metropolitan area.

Are we to believe what we read in the press or the reply that was authorized by Cabinet on the same day and given to this House on Tuesday, March 5, that a decision had not yet been made? I have always said that the Minister of Transport's right hand does not know what his left is doing, or his press secretary does not know what he is doing or the Minister does not know what his press secretary is doing. A principle is involved in this. Members of Parliament exercise their privilege on behalf of their constituents by asking fair and reasonable questions of Ministers, and we read the answers in the press the day before they are to be given to the House.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's rude, isn't it?

Mr. BECKER: It is not only rude but is also an insult to members of Parliament, to their constituents and to the people of this State. It would be one of the lowest tactics we know of, and the Minister in the Chamber at the moment tried it once or twice, but thank goodness he does not carry on that practice any more. I am not prepared to accept it. I will stand up for my individual rights and protect those of other people. I will not be subjected to such treatment in this House. I will not be given misleading answers to Questions on Notice. How many statements will we receive from the Minister in relation to the private bus take-over, and how many statements will we receive in relation to the number of buses that will be acquired by the M.T.T. and their cost? If this Government and the Minister run true to form, we will get a statement every six months on various aspects of replacing the M.T.T. buses, but the answer I got in this House was completely dishonest and was misleading to Parliament. Any Minister who is prepared to mislead his Cabinet and Parliament should be severely dealt with by his Party, and the Minister of Transport should not be excepted. I also placed on notice two questions, the first one of which was as follows:

Does the Government intend to acquire or build a new residence for the Governor?

On Saturday, March 2, three days before I received the reply, a statement was made in the *Advertiser* to the effect that a cliff-top house would be built for Governors of South Australia. I do not wish to deny the Governor the opportunity of having a country residence. That is fair and reasonable. However, the newspaper report states:

A modest four-bedroom builder's project house is being built on a clifftop at Sellick Beach as a viceregal summer residence . . . It is expected to be finished in July. Furnishing and landscaping with belts of trees and a brush fence will follow.

In a Question on Notice, I asked the Premier:

Is it the intention of the Government to acquire a country residence for the Governor?

In reply, the Premier said, "No". I also asked the Premier the following question:

If a residence is to be provided, where will it be and what progress has been made in this matter?

The Premier gave the following reply:

Land has been purchased at Sellick Beach on which it was intended to erect a country residence for the Governor. However, the letting of a contract has been deferred indefinitely because of the stringent situation in regard to Loan funds.

Bearing in mind that this project was to cost an estimated \$28 000, what effect would that sum have on present Loan funds in this State? However, if we delve into that matter, we still will not get a straight answer. If what the Premier said in that reply was true, it would mean that the Government was fully committed. This brings me to the question (and I know I will not get an answer to this question, either): how long does the Government take to pay its accounts? I have been told that it takes 30 days, 60 days, or 90 days. The Government's accounting system needs thorough investigation. However, members on this side do not have access to information to which we would like access.

I have referred to three Questions on Notice. I believe that press statements were made deliberately before replies to those questions were given in this House. Then the replies I received were different from what was stated in the press. Neither the Minister nor the Premier denied what was in the press reports. If the replies I was given here were correct, why was no denial made? A deliberate conspiracy has taken place to deny me the opportunity of receiving replies before public statements have been made, as is the normal protocol in this Parliament.

It is this sort of contemptuous treatment of Opposition members and the people of the State that has caused members of the public at long last to wake up to the fact that the Government is not working in their best interests. The people are realizing that they are paying the penalty for the luxury of having in office a Party whose main policy is to follow the popular will of the people, irrespective of the cost. The affairs and destiny of the Government are controlled by the trade union movement. In some cases, private enterprise organizations have been forced to sell or dispose of businesses in order to survive. In these circumstances, the future looks gloomy.

The situation at Marineland developed out of an industrial dispute. As a result, the number of people attending Marineland dropped by about 60 per cent. The proprietor was not willing to continue to carry on the business, having reached the stage where he would close down the business and release the fish into the sea, where they would probably have survived for only a few days. In those circumstances, the Government had no alternative but to take over Marineland. This situation arose from and was engineered by an industrial dispute that should never have occurred. This was a deliberate plan to bring the company to its knees. The Minister has used this opportunity to his advantage. A considerable sum has been spent in cleverly promoting Marineland, the attendance figures now exceeding normal estimates. Ironically, when the Government signed the contract to buy Marineland, the private enterprise advertising agency then employed was dismissed.

The whole advertising of Marineland since the Government has taken over has been undertaken by the advertising agency that does the work of the Australian Labor Party. This is good business for that agency. This is a case once again of the old golden handshake. Through an industrial dispute, private enterprise has been denied a business, whereas another private enterprise organization, which has been working as the advertising agent for the A.L.P., has received a nice little bonus in the sum being spent on promoting Marineland in an attempt to build up attendance figures. In supporting an advertising agency that is controlled by oversea investment, this Government has been hypocritical to a greater extent than has the Labor Party in any other State. When we were in office, if we had given Government business to such an agency, it is easy to imagine the tremendous abuse our Party would have received. Therefore, I believe the Government

stands condemned with regard to its hypocritical policy, a policy that is not serving the best interests of the people of the community, whether they be young or old.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I want to raise a matter regarding the Agriculture Department.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You want to occupy the crease

Mr. RODDA: I will not say anything about the Minister's department. I want to refer to decentralization in the location of the Agriculture Department. Last week, the announcement was confirmed that the Agriculture Department, the Lands Department, and the Environment and Conservation Department would be transferred to the new city of Monarto. In a question, I expressed concern that Adelaide should be without officers of these departments, especially the Agriculture Department, as three-quarters of the rural population of the State are served at the focal point of Adelaide. Nevertheless, I believe that we can support the concept of a new city.

At first hand, I have seen the activities and enterprises of the new Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission (Mr. Ray Taylor). It became apparent to me that, if anyone could make Monarto go, it would be Ray Taylor. He has thrown himself into looking at new cities, and is well qualified to build a new city here. Through him, I was privileged to see the city of Glenrothes, Scotland. It is a blueprint of good planning. With regard to my district and the district of Mount Gambier, the new regional centre of the Agriculture Department at Struan has been occupied. This concept of a regional centre was born when the Government of which I was proud to be a member was in office and when the Hon. Ross Story was Minister of Agriculture. It was decided that officers of the department who were then located at Naracoorte would ultimately transfer to Struan, which would be set up as the regional agricultural centre serving the South-East. I have seen only a portion of the work that has been done, but it has been done well and it has a foundation to serve the district adequately. However, people in the South-East (and I am sure you would have been questioned about this, Mr. Deputy Speaker) want to know when the Government will complete this Struan complex.

As far as I have been able to find out, no money is provided in the Estimates for work on the old home at Struan, and the top part of the building is in an unkempt condition with no apparent plans for completion. The people of the South-East, and indeed of the State, look forward to this regional centre being set up in its entirety as a conference centre with offices. Half of the old home at Struan is apparently awaiting the appropriation of some money, and the balance should be developed to provide offices to supplement those already established by the Government. Although the current shortage of furniture is affecting the working of those offices at present they are well appointed. Struan is ideally situated to serve the district, being on the site of the beef research station and only 20 miles (32 km) from the Kybybolite research centre. If the Government has plans for development in this area, I wish it would make them known. An anxious and enterprising agricultural community could make use of this place as an in-service centre where farm schools could be conducted; it could be used as a conference centre for 40 weeks of the year.

Naracoorte is not without good motel accommodation, and more is under construction. In-service schools for about 60 or 70 people could be conducted at the Struan centre, in the heart of the beef country that will make such a contribution to the economy of the State. I hope the

Minister will say what plans are in train for the completion of the Struan centre and give some indication of when they will be carried out. I hope that this will be only a part of a chain of agricultural extension. The Budget last year gave the Minister of Agriculture only \$7 000 000, and I know, too, that Governments of my own philosophy cannot be excused: they failed to recognize the great need for adequate expenditure in this industry that provides the food for the nation. If we are to see the planned extensions at Monarto, I hope Ray Taylor is to have a far better appropriation than the Minister of Agriculture appears to be getting with the Monarto project. It is distressing to hear that some people in our farming community are to be victims of the progress being made at Monarto. The Minister of Development and Mines left no doubt in anyone's mind that some farmers would receive high-handed treatment at the hands of this Government.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: In what respect?

Mr. RODDA: That is what the Minister conveyed to us. The people of Monarto will get \$90 an acre to go off and establish themselves as best they can with the money in hand. The Minister is aware that 90 per cent of people on the land were battling before the upturn in agriculture less than 18 months ago. These people will receive only a small sum (and that is underlined by the Minister's remarks, which will appear in *Hansard*) to re-establish themselves. If they were to move into my district, \$50 000 or \$60 000 would not enable them to set up. It is a hard-hearted Government that would cast these people into the cold, hard world. We will not let the Government forget about this.

I turn now to livestock marketing in the South-East. A committee has been appointed under the chairmanship of Dr. Harvey (Agriculture Department), the other members being Mr. Potter (Agriculture Department), Mr. Norman (Engineering and Water Supply Department), Mr. Grzesik (Treasury), Mr. Wilson (Public Health Department), Mr. Shepherd (Mines Department), and Mr. G. Inglis (Environment and Conservation Department). The Stockowners' Association and the Liberal and Country League Rural Committee have approached members on this side to ask that two rural producers be appointed to this committee but, from his reply given in another place, it seems that the Minister of Agriculture will not agree to this. I express my protest and consternation that the people most affected by its decisions are not to have a voice on this committee.

Another matter causing worry in my district relates to registration or licensing in relation to fishing. I have been told of cases where persons have been a little lax in sending in their dues for renewal of fishing licences and, because the money has been received a little late, it has been returned and the fisherman then has had to make a fresh application. In such a situation the department is not being very co-operative. At some time in our lives I am sure we have all overlooked paying money on the due date, and when people are treated in this way it is a matter to be raised in a debate such as this. I hope the Minister will heed what I have said about the Agriculture Department and the needs of these people, who are doing so much for the economy of the State. The Minister and Cabinet must give due consideration to those needs. I hope my remarks will not fall on deaf ears.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I wish to raise a matter of concern to that part of this State's film industry that appears to be divorced from the South Australian Film Corporation. Not long after its establishment in 1972, the corpora-

tion issued a creed setting out its aims and intentions and, although I do not wish to read all those aims and intentions, I will refer to one or two paragraphs that are relevant to my comments about this organization. Its first aim was as follows:

To establish a viable film industry within this State.

Another was as follows:

To produce, through contracted film companies, our own productions aimed at a high artistic merit and experimentation.

Another was as follows:

To stimulate the existing film organizations . . .

All that has happened is that the existing film organizations have been throttled and virtually put out of existence. I will name some of the private film companies which existed before the corporation was established and which consider that they have been disadvantaged by receiving no benefits in this respect. Another intention was as follows:

To stimulate the existing film organizations and encourage the establishment of new commercially viable companies by investing, guaranteeing loans, locating commercial investment of film-maker. Savings in staff, premises and equipment would naturally follow and overall costs would be considerable reduced.

There is no doubt that a move was made (a matter to which I will return later) to establish new companies in South Australia. The Premier admitted that he took part in the negotiations to have a company established here, possibly to the benefit of the film industry in the long term, but without considering the effect that it would have on existing organizations. When the Act was promulgated and the corporation formed, the Premier stated certain intentions: at least, I took it that what he stated was what was intended. If it was not, I can criticize him not for his intentions but for stating something different from what was intended. On March 14, 1972 (page 3824 of *Hansard*), the Premier, when giving the second reading explanation of the South Australian Film Corporation Bill, said:

The need for a centralized film centre is very clear—to rejuvenate the sluggish pulse of the local film industry, to remedy weaknesses in the production and distribution of Government-sponsored films, and to create an awareness in the community of the value of films.

He later continued:

In the commercial sector, film-making activities are virtually limited to the production of television commercials and in the public sector, only about three or four films are made for Government departments or instrumentalities each year. It has been revealed that the current need for films in the Government sector greatly exceeds the number actually produced, and the Government believes that the Film Corporation will crystallize need into demand and thus fill the gap between film requirements and film production.

He further said (and this is important):

It is not intended that the corporation will enter into the role of film-maker. Savings in staff, premises and equipment would naturally follow and overall costs would be considerably reduced?

When speaking in the second reading debate on March 22 (page 4125 of *Hansard*) the Leader of the Opposition said:

The Opposition is disappointed with this Bill for several major reasons. The Bill must surely go down as one of the greatest pieces of blank-cheque legislation that has come before this House in my memory and in the memory of many of those who have been members for a longer period than I have.

The Leader pointed out at that time that a blank cheque was being given to this organization, and the personnel in that organization should have realized the concern that was expressed regarding the responsibilities being placed on their shoulders. I refer also to the speech made by the member

for Bragg on the same day (page 4130 of *Hansard*), as follows:

I think all honourable members know that the producing of films is not the same as film-making, although this is not always apparent in the mind of the general public. Nevertheless, I am sure that local film-makers breathed a sigh of relief when they heard that the corporation would not engage in film-making. I am a little disturbed, however, on their behalf to find that film work will be contracted out to appropriate film-makers in this and in other States, because I am not sure who will get priority here. I sincerely trust that it will be the South Australian film-makers, and I hope that, if they do not have the facilities available here, they will be encouraged, and perhaps subsidized and helped, to obtain facilities that will enable them to meet the requirements in South Australia.

However, that has not happened. Indeed, the reverse has occurred: the help and encouragement has gone not to people from South Australia but to those from other States. I am reported as having said on the same day (page 4131 of *Hansard*) the following:

I believe in the principle of promoting a film industry in this State—

and I still do—

Under the Bill, the corporation will have powers to farm out work and to undertake film production for other people. This could mean that any other operator in the State who wishes to produce films might be forced to compete against a State organization, which would be able to operate without the normal taxation charges.

I made that statement, which has proved to be factual, and I will say later why that is the case today and why the private sector (that is, those who were operating before the corporation was established) has been disadvantaged. I continued:

This could be a problem for a private operator. If the corporation farms out the work, that will be different, but if it solicits work it will take away opportunities from private operators. This will be direct competition with private enterprise, with the balance really lying in favour of the Government enterprise.

The Premier, when replying to the second reading debate, tried to enlighten honourable members, and gave them a guarantee. However, that guarantee has not been honoured. On the same day (page 4132 of *Hansard*), he said:

Members opposite have suggested that preference would not be given to South Australian studios: preference would certainly be given in accordance with the general Government policy for the provision of services by South Australian companies.

That has not occurred. He continued:

The actual film-making would take place in commercially owned facilities and not in facilities owned by the Government.

That has not proved to be factual, either. The Premier continued:

True, some feature film work will be done here, but it is clear from the feasibility study that we are not justified in undertaking the establishment of a large sound stage or processing facility.

The Leader of the Opposition said earlier in the debate that he wanted to establish whether it was necessary for the corporation to put all the work out to tender. In reply, the Premier said:

No. It is made clear in the feasibility study that producers must be able to draw on what they consider to be the best talent available but, at the same time, the film centre will be directed to give preference—

and I emphasize that—

to South Australian film-making studios. A central part of this activity is to provide additional employment in South Australia.

Mr. Coumbe: That seems clear, doesn't it?

Mr. EVANS: That is what is reported in *Hansard* as having been said when the Bill to establish the film corpor-

ation was introduced. All the persons in the film industry in South Australia to whom I have spoken are disgusted with what is taking place. They believe that, if one has friends within the organization, one may get an appointment or a contract. They are totally disillusioned with the operation of the corporation. I want to see that organization succeed, but it cannot succeed unless it has the confidence of the South Australian film-makers. If the film corporation believes it can continue to bring people from other States to form companies here, perhaps by offering loans with the agreement of the Premier in the long term, the corporation will fail. That will be detrimental to the film industry in Australia, particularly in South Australia, and a permanent financial loss to the State.

A card put out by the film corporation listed the personnel engaged in administration and the personnel engaged in production and distribution. I do not challenge anyone there on his expertise or qualifications, but more than 50 per cent of those persons (there are 14 of them) have been brought in from outside South Australia. One person was brought from Canada. I believe that is good, because I have some knowledge of that person, who was an excellent choice. I am pleased that he is at the head of distribution and has the capacity for understanding distribution in Canada and the United States. I do not challenge the expertise needed for the appointment of any of the others, except that most of them have been brought in from the Eastern States, and South Australian personnel have been left out in the cold.

Mr. Coumbe: That is not what the Premier said, though.

Mr. EVANS: No. I also read from the publication *Lumiere*. The month is not stated, but that publication contains a report from the Director of the South Australian Film Corporation, Mr. Gil Brealey. When asked how the corporation would operate, and about finances and other matters, he said:

When I was appointed to the position, I asked again about money, and was told that it was going to be raised through Loan funds. One of the main reasons that the corporation had been set up as a statutory body by Act of Parliament was to enable it to borrow money. So I queried it, and was told not to worry. "Everyone borrows millions of dollars", they said, "but it isn't paid back for millions of years." It took me a month after I got here to find out that I did have to worry about it—not the capital, but the interest. And it didn't take me long, as a Bachelor of Commerce from some years back, to work out that we'd be up for about \$200 000 over five years just on interest. Nobody had worked it out.

That was a statement by the Director on the basis on which the film corporation was set up: no-one had bothered to work out the overall cost. Initially, before the Bill was introduced, the Government appointed a group to bring in a comprehensive study on the feasibility of a film unit starting in this State. That group reported that it was not possible to set up a major operation in this State: it would not survive. So the Government decided on this similar (so we were told by the Premier) operation to encourage the private sector of the film industry in the State. However, the industry has no faith in it. I do not know the total number of films put out to tender since the organization has been in operation, but before last Christmas I asked a question of the Premier about the personnel employed by the organization. I do not wish to refer to that now, but members can see in *Hansard* the number of personnel, the amount of money paid for travel, and other matters.

I come now to the operation of some of the early tenders that were put out. The film *Kurrajong* was put out to

tender to Production Centre, Bosisto Productions, Arkaba Films Proprietary Limited, and Ray Beale Film Productions, and resulted in Production Centre, a South Australian company, getting the contract. *Flinders Ranges* was put out to tender to Production Centre and Bosisto Productions—and that is all. No other company, even within the State, got the opportunity to tender. When Bosisto Productions was informed that it possibly had the contract but that its price was too low, it was invited along to have a discussion about it. It was told that its price was a little low but, if it cared to reconsider the matter and employ a certain cameraman, it would have a fair chance of getting the contract—not that it would win the tender for the contract but that it would have a better chance. It agreed to that and had its very first job for the film corporation. I make that point now because later I shall be referring to what the Premier said about getting the best personnel: here is a case where the corporation recommended a certain cameraman. Bosisto Productions' fees for the picture were unsuitable and it had to go back and refile, at considerable cost, which slowed down the overall making of the film.

The film corporation knows what regard Bosisto Productions had for that cameraman, but he was from another State. We are trying to help the South Australian film industry, yet we take people from over the border who are supposed to be experts in their fields, but in this case that proved to be false. The cost of that film was affected by a recommendation of the film corporation. The film *Adelaide* went out to tender to Mastersound (which is interested not in film production but only in sound recording), to Bosisto Productions, and to Production Centre, a South Australian firm. The film *Kangaroo Island* went out to tender to Production Centre, Bosisto Productions, Arkaba Films Proprietary Limited, and Film Makers Australia, the latter of which was not in existence before the Bill was introduced. I asked the Premier on October 12 last year about this matter, when Film Makers Australia was given the contract. At that time an advertisement appeared in the newspaper, as follows:

Super Secretary Bird. Two guys, experienced, fortyish, one year crash hot cameraman/director, the other a Piscean director/writer, one setting up a new film production company in Adelaide, with the aim of making it the hottest film shop in town. We need a girl Friday/Saturday/Sunday, etc., who can keep our books, us in line and our clients happy. A charming manner and good typing are essential. This job will be demanding, but rewarding for the right head.

The applicant was asked to ring such-and-such a number at any time over the long weekend. The advertisement continued:

Ask for John Dick; with a bit of luck he'll be there. Film Makers Australia.

At that point of time, Film Makers Australia was not formed. Mr. Ron Lowe was invited here by the film corporation earlier and was paid \$1 400 expenses up to the time of the setting up of the film corporation. The company Film Makers Australia was set up, with Mr John Dick, with the sanction of the Premier and of the corporation. The company was given a guarantee that it would be given the film *Kangaroo Island* as long as this company was formed, and it finally received that contract. At that time, the Premier, in reply to my question about the overall matter, said that Mr. Lowe was one of Australia's most experienced and expert cameramen, and I do not doubt the man's expertise and the film work that he may have accomplished. The Premier also stated in his reply:

I point out to the honourable member that he was the cameraman almost entirely responsible for the film *In the*

Round, which was shown with such enormous success at the Adelaide Royal Show and the distribution of which has now been arranged throughout Australia.

I do not doubt that, either. I was privileged, after asking that question, to be invited, with all other members to a special show put on by the film corporation, and I think that members would thank me for the invitation they received, because as a result of my asking the question we had a few eats and drinks and saw a good exhibition of films. The Premier also stated:

It was vital for the film industry in South Australia that we have available within South Australia film cameramen of a standard that would encourage additional film-makers to come here, because, in the case of a previous film that was to have been made in South Australia, it was lost to this State simply because of the cost of flying in technicians to South Australia. In order to build the film industry we have to attract here on a permanent basis people who have had the necessary experience. . . . True, the film corporation and I have encouraged Mr. Lowe to locate permanently in South Australia, because that can be of great benefit to us.

I shall try to draw a comparison between a man in this State and Mr. Löwe, to show that we did have here a person with some expertise and the benefit of some credit to his name for his past work. The film *Time in Summer* was produced in this State by Arkaba Films Proprietary Limited, and the cameraman working for that company received credit in many parts of the world for his efforts. A report in the *News* of March 18, 1968, states:

Time in Summer, a 35 millimetre black and white produced in Adelaide by Arkaba Films, is distinguished by Jan Davidson's photography. In its consciously specialized genre his camera work is the most imaginative I have ever seen in an Australian-made film. It has a limpid, cool and sunny quality that reminds one, quite forcibly at times, of Bergman's gentler compositions in *Seventh Seal*.

In addition, on the same date two other reports in different newspapers praised that project. This cameraman still resides in South Australia, and in association with Arkaba Films he produced *Transfiguration*, which was "an experiment in metric montage" and which received the Kodak medal for the best black and white cinematography in Australia. That production is now in the Museum of Modern Art in New York. This person has the ability to produce that kind of work and should be given the opportunity, with Arkaba Films, to work on some of the contracts.

Other contracts that have been flowing through the field after *Kangaroo Island* have been *Co-operative Bulk Handling*, which went to Scope Films in Sydney, *South-East*, which went to Trojan Films in Sydney, and the most recent one, *Police Department*, which has gone to Bob Talbot Productions. St. Kilda, Victoria. Mr Bob Talbot was a reporter with channel 7 in this State. He was not a film reporter, but he has formed a company in Victoria and has received a contract. I do not doubt that it is possible for a person to start a company and employ all the expertise needed to produce a good film, but I consider that that also applies to people who reside in this State and to the companies that are operating here.

The companies which are operating in this State now (Production Centre, Bosisto Productions, Arkaba Films Proprietary Limited, Ray Beale Film Productions, Jack Hume Proprietary Limited, and Film Makers Australia), with Ron Lowe, were encouraged to come here. They are the people with whom the film corporation must be concerned about working in this State so that the corporation can find out whether they can work together successfully. If it is proved, through work given to South Australian film-makers, that those film-makers are not

satisfactory, I will accept that. However, I do not consider they have been given a fair trial up to this time.

It has been reported to me that \$500 worth of spilt spools have disappeared from the film corporation and I should like the Premier, if he replies to my comments, to tell me whether the Police Department has been told about that, or whether the statement made to me is incorrect. Further, a Steenbeck editing machine was bought at public auction in Victoria. This is an old machine and the Government price for the machine new is \$3 000, whereas the price paid was \$2 800 and the previous owner had bought it five years ago for \$2 500. Most people in the industry here consider the machine is out-dated.

Mr. Coumbe: They're serious allegations.

Mr. EVANS: Regarding the calling of tenders, in one case a company was given one day in which to prepare its quote for a contract. In the case of a new contract for the Highways Department which has not been decided yet, a person who had been offered the opportunity to tender did tender a contract price for that film but was told, "We do not think you have the expertise to carry out that work." Why was that man not told, "Get out of the business, we do not want you"? That film is on roadmaking, and all that the cameraman is required to do is take about six photographs at various points across Australia between Perth and Sydney and then go to the National Library and take out photographs of roadmaking methods used in the past few decades. However, a cameraman in this State has been told that he has not the ability to carry out that work. The company involved in that matter is Ray Beale Film Productions.

I have mentioned the names of companies. That is not my normal practice, because the companies know that they will suffer and that they will be lucky if they get any work in future, but they consider that they are finished, anyway. The member for Hanson made a point about big advertising companies in America and other places taking over smaller companies here. Similarly, when there is any work to be done in film-making here, all the work goes to the Eastern States. Private work for film-makers here has been taken to the Eastern States, even though the Government has established an organization here and has undertaken that it will promote the industry here and give preference to South Australia. However, that organization is not only getting personnel from other States but also giving contracts to people in other States. The Government has done this after encouraging companies to establish here.

I should like the Premier, if he replies to the debate, to say whether money has been given from Loan funds or elsewhere to Film Makers Australia. One of the more recent productions for which tenders have been called is *South-East*, and I compliment the writer of that script, because persons in the industry to whom I have spoken have said that it is the best script that has been produced. The script has been written by Greg Barker, and I do not know whether he comes from South Australia or from another State. I do not dispute the statement that he has done good work, but there is a racket in the industry. People are getting a job because they have known someone in the Eastern States. Local people would be pleased if they were given the opportunity. If their work was not satisfactory, they could bow out of the industry.

In the case of the work that was given to a South Australian, dealing with the Flinders Range, when a corporation official was asked whether it was a satisfactory production he said, "Yes; no complaints, it was well done." What

more can a person do to co-operate? The Arkaba company was the first group which came to me with a complaint; and it was satisfied of having been prejudiced to the detriment of the State.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I will proceed to examine this Government's management of public finance. The Opposition brings forward this important public matter, which concerns the lack of responsibility by the Government, in particular the Premier, during the last four years. It has been said that the public does not understand the State's finances, and the Australian Labor Party obviously thinks so, but that in no way detracts from the overriding responsibility of Parliament to ensure that the State's finances are managed in the best interests of the public. This mismanagement of public finance covers a multitude of areas: it involves the expenditure of public funds to encourage an inflation rate in South Australia higher than in any other State; it involves the use of public funds in public projects that have been ill conceived and poorly planned; and it involves the use of public funds as guarantees or direct financial assistance for private enterprises that were poorly managed or financially unsound.

The 13.5 per cent inflation in South Australia during the past year was the highest of any State in Australia. Such an inflation rate is against the best interests of the public, the home buyer, the worker on a fixed wage and the competitive position of South Australian industries compared to other Australian and overseas industries. The Government has already directly contributed to the inflation rate through its policy of rapid expansion of the public sector at the expense of the private sector. The Premier's Department, for example, has a planned 28.5 per cent increase in staff during the coming financial year. This Government's legislation has created new and enlarged Government departments and a growing bureaucracy.

The Government has bowed to pressures from minority sections within the trade unions, particularly from the left wing, against the best interests of the public. During 1973 the South Australian public experienced its third major petrol strike in three years. The State had an 82 per cent increase during the first 11 months of 1973 in days lost because of industrial disputes; this was almost double the number of days lost during the preceding year. This staggering increase was much greater than the national increase of 32 per cent for the same period, even though I consider 32 per cent to be a dramatic increase.

South Australia has become a State of industrial unrest because of the spineless industrial policies of the Dunstan Government. Even at this stage, when the left wing of the trade union movement is striving to achieve effective control of the Trades and Labor Council and A.L.P. councils by its gangster-style tactics, the Premier meekly refuses to become involved. Last year the Government introduced legislation to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act extensively. This legislation has already had the effect of doubling the cost of workmen's compensation premiums, and an additional increase of up to 50 per cent has already been forecast. This legislation has increased the cost of building projects by 7 per cent over the original cost. The insurance industry has said that the cost of a \$20 000 house built with contract labour may increase by as much as \$1 300. This is one example of financially irresponsible legislation.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Can you justify that statement?

Mr. Gunn: Can the Minister deny it?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have already justified it. I gave this information to the Minister about three weeks ago. He has not denied any of the statements I made on that

occasion, yet he still asks me to justify it. It is up to him to come forward. Another area of financial irresponsibility by the Government is the granting of guarantees for the repayment of loans made to companies under the Industries Development Act. Within the last four years, at least three companies have collapsed within 2½ years of a Government guarantee having been given or renewed. In July, 1970, the Dunstan Government granted David Shearer Limited a guarantee of \$950 000, that company has now been placed in receivership and the guarantee has been executed. In January, 1972, the Dunstan Government renewed the guarantee of Rare Earth Corporation of Australia Limited to the value of \$500 000; in the same year that company was placed in the hands of a receiver. In both cases the guarantees were made against the advice of Treasury officials. The Government lost \$1 450 000 of public funds through blatant financial mismanagement. Similarly, in 1970-71, the Government more than doubled the existing \$200 000 guarantee in respect of South Australian Barytes Limited, which is now in receivership. As members are aware, I have previously—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It appears to me that the honourable member is reading his speech in defiance of Standing Orders. I hope that he is only using notes to refresh his memory and does not continue to read his speech. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am using the pieces of paper in front of me as copious notes. I was pointing out that I have previously brought this matter—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It appears to me that the honourable member has very copious notes, and that is in defiance of Standing Orders. However, if he uses them only to refresh his memory, that is all right. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will use them only as copious notes. As I was pointing out, I had already brought the matter regarding South Australian Barytes Limited to the attention of the public. I do not condemn the Government for granting financial assistance to establish and maintain private companies, provided that they are run efficiently and economically. However, I object when Governments use public funds to support companies against the sound financial advice of Treasury officials. Governments are then using public funds for purely political purposes, as was the case with Rare Earth Corporation, which operated in the district of the Minister of Labour and Industry. This practice boils down to nothing more or less than a political decision on the use of public funds. Only last week in a Question on Notice I requested from the Government details of guarantees to private enterprise in this State and a list of guarantees which had been executed by the Government. Typical of its recent performance, the Government refused to release information from which one could condemn it for financial mismanagement and financial incompetence.

The previously proposed introduction of Databet could be described as the gambling of \$1 500 000 of public funds. It was announced last year that the Government, with the Totalizator Agency Board, had become involved with Dataline Systems Proprietary Limited, first, in the contract for the manufacture of computer equipment for on-course totalizator operations and then, secondly, it became involved as a major shareholder. The board has become involved in a scheme involving a series of advances, guarantees on bank overdrafts, equipment and programming development, and it is now committed to an expenditure of more than \$1 500 000. The Government has admitted it has a moral

obligation in terms of the legislation to back the board financially. Such admissions deserve not praise but, rather, condemnation for the Government's not appreciating such obligations at the time and then not acting to ensure responsible financial investment by the board. The Government is of course guilty of neglecting its financial duties and, hence, of financial mismanagement. Again, it is the public that will pay for this mismanagement, and in this instance it will pay through a rebate of stamp duty.

About two weeks ago I released some of the financial details concerning the leasing of Ayers House as a restaurant. I stated that the Government loaned \$20 000 to the lessee in the form of an unregistered bill of sale on \$20 000 worth of furniture at an interest rate of 7½ per cent, which is less than that charged for a bank overdraft. Other furnishings were on loan to the lessee from the Government without any lease contract or a stipulated time. The rental rate for Ayers House is less than half the normal rate for similar property on North Terrace. Despite the generous rental rate, the lessee has never paid his rent on time. Furthermore, I understand that nine months after the restaurant had opened no payment had been made by the lessee to the State Government Insurance Commission for insurance on the furnishings, although this could have been done through a cover note. The Premier admitted in his reply that payments have not been made by the due date and that his own department had grave doubts about the lessee's financial position. In my question I said that the Government stood condemned of financial mismanagement unless it explained its actions and released details. That accusation was made two weeks ago but there has been no attempt by the Premier to explain the Government's actions. The Government must therefore yet again stand condemned for financial mismanagement.

Mr. Gunn: Incompetence!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I would refer to it as incompetence in other areas: in this case it is financial mismanagement. In this specific case the Government leased the restaurant to a lessee who had insufficient financial backing to enter such a high-risk enterprise as a new and exclusive restaurant. Furthermore, the Government leased out the premises on such easy terms as to imply an abuse of public funds. I challenged the Government to deny that it stood condemned for financial mismanagement unless it explained its actions. However, two weeks later we have heard nothing and, by its actions, the Government still stands condemned.

Mr. Coumbe: Why hasn't it replied?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Government would be too embarrassed to reply, but I am surprised that it has so peacefully accepted my charge of financial mismanagement. Other examples are evident of financial mismanagement. The Government may have to pay \$250 000 to buy back 10 acres (4 ha) that it sold to West Lakes Limited four years ago for only \$7 500. This land will be used only for recreation, and it is understood that the company's development costs of the 10 acres have been less than \$10 000 an acre (4 ha). Yet the Government is to buy back the land at \$25 000 an acre with a development cost of only \$10 000 an acre and an initial cost of \$7 500 an acre.

Another example is the implementation of a new super-annuation scheme without carrying out adequate feasibility studies on the cost of any new scheme. It was not until I asked a Question on Notice two weeks ago that the Government realized that the new scheme would cost an additional \$3 400 000 in the first 12 months of operation.

The commitment of public funds without estimating the consequences is yet another form of financial mismanagement. Under this new superannuation scheme there would be an additional cost of \$3 400 000.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I draw to the honourable member's attention that he is referring to a debate that is now the subject of a Bill on the Notice Paper: he referred to superannuation and to a figure of \$3 400 000, but that matter is not the subject of this debate. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I was referring to a reply to my question two weeks ago. If the Government is to commit public finance, we should expect it to undertake proper feasibility studies before the money is committed. It stands condemned in the same way in relation to Monarto. When we ask for information from the Government about the management of its finances, it refuses constantly to release any details. On this and other counts the Government is guilty of financial mismanagement of public funds. The cause of this mismanagement varies from Government neglect, to political bias, to incompetence, and to socialistic policies. The Government is guilty not only of financial mismanagement but also of deliberately hiding the facts of its financial incompetency from the public and this Parliament. Such failings and guilt cannot and should not be forgotten or forgiven by the people of this State.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): This is the first time in this part of the session that members have been able to discuss matters of concern and, as it has been some time since the House previously met, I have one or two matters to raise that affect my district. I am sorry that the Minister of Community Welfare, who administers Aboriginal affairs, is not present in the Chamber, because in the past few months I have had several cases brought to my attention about incidents in parts of my district in which many Aborigines live. In this morning's *Advertiser* the Commonwealth Minister for Labour (Mr. Cameron) was reported to have said, "No jobs for slackers." The Minister explained that people who were not willing to work should not receive unemployment benefits. Many Aborigines living in my district receive unemployment relief, as do many Europeans, and these people do not intend to work. A group of surfies now living at Point Sinclair is abusing social service benefits. Most of the money Aborigines receive as unemployment relief is spent on cheap wine, for which they have a great liking. These conditions cause many problems, particularly in Ceduna, to the police and others.

These problems should be considered by the Minister of Community Welfare and investigated by departmental officers, in order to rectify a serious situation. I understand that the Minister is still Minister in charge of Aboriginal affairs, but I am aware that he and the South Australian Government wish to wipe their hands of this problem, although they have previously involved themselves (and particularly the Premier in 1965) in these matters. However, having burnt their fingers and made a complete mess of the situation, they wish to shed their responsibilities and transfer them to their Commonwealth colleagues, who, I believe, are even less competent to handle the situation than is the South Australian Government. I received a letter dated March 5, 1974, from a constituent, and I should like to quote parts of it. I will not refer to the person's name, but I would be willing to give it to the Minister in confidence. The letter states:

I always thought that Ceduna next to Port Lincoln would be the most up-and-coming town on Eyre Peninsula. It had all sorts of possibilities, and I thought once the Eyre

Highway was completely sealed, Ceduna would have to be a good town. The drawback is of course Aborigines. Last Saturday my husband went down for his usual glass of amber and was talking with a friend when up came an Aboriginal and threw a schooner of beer in the friend's face. My husband immediately pushed the Aboriginal out of the way. The Aboriginal then threw the schooner glass at my husband and hit him on the right side of the forehead, which necessitated a local doctor putting seven stitches in his head. The doctor said that if the glass had hit a fraction lower it would have been fatal.

This matter was reported to the police, and I (and I am sure other members and the Minister) am aware of the problems the police are having in this area. If an Aboriginal is arrested, charged, and sent to Port Lincoln or Adelaide, nothing is achieved, because there is no social stigma for an Aboriginal to be gaoled. Many times they treat it as a joke, because they are well fed and looked after, and regard the episode as a sort of status symbol.

Mr. Slater: What would you do?

Mr. GUNN: I will tell the honourable member when I have finished reading the letter. The letter continues:

Aborigines are definitely getting or have got out of hand here. On Saturday it was estimated that at least 100 of them were in the front bar, the majority being filthy, dirty, and unkempt. One of them even jumped the bar and put his feet in the wash trough where the glasses are washed because he was refused a pint of beer. One of our local ladies went to go to the toilet and, when she walked in, there were about 20 Aboriginal women and children in there. The bus runs from Koonibba to Ceduna, six, sometimes seven times a week, always crowded, and what do they do but visit the hotel and buy flagons of wine and then scatter themselves along our seafront where drunken and sex orgies take place in broad daylight. As you know Ceduna, its main appeal from a tourist point of view is our seafront.

The woman goes on to make what I believe is a sensible suggestion; she suggests to the Premier and the Minister of Community Welfare that drinking facilities should be provided at the Koonibba Aboriginal Reserve. At present, because there are no facilities there, the residents of the reserve are not legally permitted to have liquor on the reserve. The woman's suggestion should be seriously considered and at least put into operation for a trial period. I could give other examples, but they would not serve a useful purpose. Today I have tried to bring a serious situation to the attention of the Minister of Community Welfare. Many responsible people in the local community are concerned at what is taking place: The issuing of unemployment relief payments should be altered so that these people can receive rations and clothing. I do not believe that we are assisting some of these people by handing them money, because many spend their money on wine. It has been brought to my attention that these people try to borrow money from strangers, so that they can continue their drinking sprees. Some people have died because they have drunk only wine and have not bought food.

I hope that, if the Minister of Community Welfare does not agree with what I have said, he will go to Ceduna and the other areas affected; the member for Frome could give more examples. The Minister should also talk to his Commonwealth colleague, Senator Cavanagh who at least had the courage to admit that the Commonwealth Government's policy on Aboriginal affairs was in chaos; I agree with that admission. I do not believe that the Minister of Community Welfare had previously been spoken to in the way he was spoken to when he last visited an Aboriginal reserve in my district. To my knowledge, that was the last occasion the Minister visited a reserve, and he did that within six months of his being appointed Minister. I

am sorry that the Minister has not been in the House this afternoon while I have been raising this matter.

Mr. Jennings: It is a Commonwealth matter.

Mr. GUNN: I have already explained that the Government, after allowing the situation to get completely out of hand, endeavoured to wash its hands of the situation. It cannot run away from its responsibilities by passing the buck, as the member for Ross Smith would like it to do. I challenge the responsible Minister to go to the areas referred to and investigate the situation at first hand. Before this debate is over, I hope the Minister of Community Welfare or the Premier will make some comments about the matters I have raised. Yesterday, at the launching of a book in Adelaide, the Premier made a statement about what we should do in relation to the Aboriginal problem. I hope he will put into practice what he preached then, and I hope he will investigate the problem at first hand. Nothing can be achieved by sitting in an office in Adelaide, writing letters, and talking on the telephone, if the Premier does not have first-hand information. What I have described is happening not only in the area I referred to but also in other parts of South Australia. I have been led to believe that the amount of wine sold each month at one hotel amounts to hundreds of flagons.

I turn now to the action of the Minister of Works, as Deputy Premier, following the referendums held last December, when the Australian people were asked two questions by his Commonwealth colleagues in an attempt to advance their socialistic policies. Following the defeat of the referendums the Deputy Premier made two statements—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Good ones, too.

Mr. GUNN: An article in the *Advertiser* of December, 10, 1973, headed "Australia 'fooled' into No vote", states:

"The people of Australia were fooled," the Deputy Premier (Mr. Corcoran) said last night

As usual, the Premier was out of the State, and the Minister of Works was acting in his capacity as Deputy Premier. An article in the *News* of December 10, 1973, states:

The Acting Premier, Mr. Corcoran, today offered to hand over control of prices and incomes in South Australia to the Federal Government.

That was a disgraceful course of action to suggest, because the people of Australia had resoundingly defeated the referendum proposals put forward by the Deputy Premier's Socialist colleagues in Canberra. The people had rejected the plans that Mr. Whitlam and Dr. Cairns had been endeavouring to force on the Australian people so that they could centralize all control, as part of their plan to destroy the States and have a few Socialists in Canberra directing the lives of all citizens. Surely the action of the Deputy Premier should be condemned. If he was so sure that what he was saying was in the best interests of South Australia, why did he not call Parliament together and let Parliament discuss it? After all, Parliament exists for this very purpose. But the Deputy Premier was happy to be like a little puppy dog, barking at the heels of his Commonwealth colleagues and hoping that they might toss him a few more dollars, with strings attached.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you think it was a carrot?

Mr. GUNN: Yes, a carrot hung in front of the donkey which, in this case, was the South Australian Government. I sincerely hope that, before this debate concludes, the Premier will reply to the charges I have made in relation to the other subjects to which I have referred.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glennelg): First, I wish to refer to stobie poles, this forest of concrete, iron, and copper wire that decorates the roadways of the State, being neither

aesthetic nor beautiful, and not the least bit safe. Many people would agree that these poles are killers of the highest order, being placed, as they are, right at the edge of roadways and being especially dangerous at street corners. Millions of dollars is spent on road safety and city beautification. Town planners are employed and zoning regulations passed by most councils. These regulations, designed to produce the beautification of cities and towns, must be adhered to rigidly, and these policies are followed at high cost by councils. Despite all this expenditure, stobie poles have been and are being erected at the kerb of all main thoroughfares throughout South Australia, particularly in the metropolitan area. It would be interesting to know whether statistics are available to show how many deaths or injuries have involved collisions between motor cycles or motor cars and stobie poles. I know it is on the tip of the tongue of the Minister of Transport to ask when I have seen a stobie pole come out and hit a motor cycle or a car.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Such an interjection would be contrary to Standing Orders.

Mr. MATHWIN: I can read the Minister's thoughts. The sensible and proper place to erect these poles would be along the fence line of properties. Although aesthetically they are a monstrosity, they must be taken right away from the carriageway on which people travel. I commend the Minister of Transport for his road safety programme. Although I know he has had many disappointments, he has certainly had much success. I do not disagree with the sum being spent on road safety, but I point out that we are not receiving the full return for that money when stobie poles are left to present such a danger. In my own district, even though Brighton Road is being widened, poles are still being resited right at the edge of the roadway. This is completely wrong, as the poles present a grave danger. Has the Government not learned the lesson of past experience?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: When is the Brighton council going to close portion of King George Avenue?

Mr. MATHWIN: When the Minister gives me a reply about Bowker Street, I may reply to him about King George Avenue. On October 11, 1972, I asked a question of the Minister of Works about resiting stobie poles along Brighton Road. The report, at page 1974 of *Hansard*, is as follows:

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Works arrange for the resiting of stobie poles along Brighton Road? I understand that work on widening Brighton Road northwards from Dunrobin Road is to be commenced soon and that this will entail removing and resiting many stobie poles. As at present many of these poles are sited on the corners of streets and are dangerous, I ask whether the Minister will consider having these poles, when they are replaced, sited away from the corners.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I understand the situation, if widening a highway is involved the Highways Department is responsible for the cost of removing and resiting the stobie poles.

Mr. Mathwin: The road is going to be widened, so the poles have to be moved, anyway.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If that is the case, it is not the responsibility of the Electricity Trust to resite the poles. However, I will have the matter examined and let the honourable member know whether, in fact, the Highways Department is involved and, if it is, I will refer the question to my colleague, who will, in turn, reply to the honourable member. The Brighton council may even be responsible for removing and resiting the poles, but I will check for the honourable member.

On October 24, 1972, the Minister of Transport supplied the following reply to my earlier question:

The stobie poles along Brighton Road will be relocated as necessitated by road widening, and this work will be

done by the Highways Department in advance of actual construction work. In all instances every effort is made to have poles sited as far from corners as possible for safety reasons.

At least he agreed with me that, for safety reasons, the poles should be resited. On November 7, 1972, I asked the Minister of Works whether electricity cables in Brighton Road could be placed underground. In reply, the Minister said that the estimated cost of placing the cables underground was \$130 000 a mile of road, whereas relocating the poles would cost only about \$20 000 a mile. I wonder what these calculations actually involved. As the whole of Brighton Road has been dug up, surely the cost of putting the cables underground would have been less. Considering what is spent on road safety and the beautification of cities, I suggest that putting the cables underground could have been a cheap job by comparison. Even if the work was not cheap, the result would have been most satisfactory. In any case, the Minister of Transport did give the assurance that the stobie poles would be resited as far as possible from the roadway.

I will now outline the position in the section of Brighton Road in my district; I will not trespass on the section in the Brighton District (the district of the Minister of Education), as I am sure that he can look after his district. The length of Brighton Road in my district on which work has been or is being done is about 1.2 miles (1.92 km). First, there is Cecelia Street.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Is that the northern or the southern side?

Mr. MATHWIN: This is on my side: the northern side. The kerb at the corner of this street is 4in. (102 mm) to 4½in. (115 mm) wide. I suppose that this provides a buffer between the stobie pole and motor vehicles. However, the stobie pole at this corner is 10in. (254 mm) from the kerb. Something went wrong at the next street, Francis Street. Here, the stobie pole has been placed 22in. (560 mm) from the kerb. In Somers Street, the next street travelling northwards, the pole is about 10in. (254 mm) from the kerb, but in Quondong Street apparently a mistake has been made, because the pole is 2ft. 2in. (660 mm) from the corner.

Mr. Slater: How did you measure it?

Mr. MATHWIN: I measured it with my 2ft. (610 mm) rule; it is a 24in. gauge. I measured the distance from the kerb to the stobie pole in Quondong Street: it was 2ft. 2in. (660 mm). One would imagine that the authorities had seen the light, but on the other corner is a monstrosity, a structure to cope with sewage, 20ft. (6 m) or 30ft. (9 m) high and 1in. (25 mm) proud from the corner. This monstrosity is outside the kerb line.

Mr. Keneally: What are those measurements in metric terms?

Mr. MATHWIN: I leave that to *Hansard*; they are very good at converting Imperial to metric. Wilton Avenue has another stench pipe about 2ft. 6in. (760 mm) from the corner, and on the opposite side of the street we have a combination of these things. In Wilton Avenue the stobie pole is about 4in. (102 mm) from the kerb. On the western side of Brighton Road, a stobie pole in Harrow Road is 4in. (102 mm) from the kerb, but in Eton Road the pole is 8in. (204 mm) from the kerb; in Paringa Avenue it is about 2ft (610 mm) from the kerb. In College Road the stobie pole has been taken well back from the kerb and it has been placed around the corner. When I asked questions about this I was told that it was very difficult to take the cables over private property. In College Road the cables go over the shop verandahs and the pole is well back from the corner.

However, it is situated only 2in. (51 mm) from the edge of the kerb.

Today, I travelled 1.2 miles (1.92 km) along Brighton Road checking up on the stobie poles on the western side, and not one is more than 2in. (51 mm) from the kerb. Some are even embedded in the kerb and some are set out from the concrete of the kerb. If this is how the Minister gives his attention to a matter of safety, I am sorry for him. To me, the whole thing is ridiculous. The Government had an opportunity to do something about this matter of grave importance, a matter of whether people live or die. Modern cars, with their overhang, could collide with stobie poles set so close to the kerb. A driver turning a corner and faced with oncoming traffic might have to cut it fine and he could sideswipe the pole, damaging his car and possibly injuring his passengers.

The situation in Brighton Road gave the Government a wonderful opportunity to do something constructive about this problem. Perhaps the Government is not concerned about the appearance of Brighton Road, but when it is able to do something constructive, especially in the matter of road safety and the safety of the road users, it has failed miserably to grasp the nettle. I denounce the Government for being so apathetic and for taking no action to relocate these killers on the road—the stobie poles.

Mr. Crimes: But they are not on the road.

Mr. MATHWIN: They are on the road. I have just explained to the member for Spence that at least one stench pipe and one stobie pole are on the road. I continued to travel along Brighton Road, without going into the district of the member for Brighton, although I did go into the district of the member for Hanson. My constituents in that area have a problem here in trying to cross the road at the intersection of Maxwell Terrace, Jetty Road, and Brighton Road. Heaven help us when we get the mall there, if we ever do; if it takes as long as it has taken to get the mall in Rundle Street I shall be under the sod by then. I have in my district many old people and many young ones who find it almost impossible to cross this intersection to buy an evening paper at one of the shops on Jetty Road. They gave me a petition, which I presented to the Highways Commissioner, asking for protection in crossing the road. I should have thought we would have an activated signal for pedestrians crossing there. It could be placed south of the corner, but not so far south that crossing is made difficult for elderly people. I thought the Highways Commissioner would give me a time limit of perhaps two or three months, considering the urgency of the matter. Although his reply came quickly, it contained the information that no crossing would be provided until about February of next year.

When I looked up the accident statistics for this corner I found that they were not so bad, but I think this is because everyone knows it is so dangerous. They take their lives in their hands when they cross the intersection, and sometimes they walk beside a tramcar; otherwise, they have to run the gauntlet of the traffic. It is tragic to think that my constituents should have to wait until February of next year to get some protection from the Highways Department or the relevant authority so that they can cross the road in safety. In the minds of some people, of course, it is audacity to ask for such protection. The present situation is simply not good enough, and it is most disappointing that action cannot be taken earlier than February next. True, the Commissioner must have his priorities for pedestrian crossings, but I wonder what must happen before action is taken. Farther south on Brighton Road are two crossings for Brighton High School and Paringa Park Primary School, and the Road Traffic Board in its wisdom (which is

debatable) informed the council that one crossing should be removed. Because Brighton High School is between the two signs, in my opinion, that is the safest area in front of any school in South Australia. Cars travelling along Brighton Road reduced their speed to 15 miles an hour (24 km/h) over the crossing and stayed at the same speed until they had passed the second crossing. Now, however, that will be altered, and we will have only one crossing. One would have hoped that with the material that was removed from one of the two crossings the department would have constructed a temporary crossing for my constituents farther to the north to give them some security when crossing Brighton Road. It would not have been hard to use that material in this way.

I was disappointed to see that no relief was to be given to my constituents to cross Brighton Road in this area, and that the matter has now been shelved. My constituents will now have to wait at least until next February, and heaven knows what could happen in the meantime. The road will be widened up to Jetty Road, and people will find it difficult to cross the road. It is all very well for the Minister and the Road Traffic Board to say that a safety area has been put there for the assistance of pedestrians and that, once those people reach that area, they are safe. However, I venture to say that all members, when crossing a busy road like Brighton Road, would feel most uncomfortable in the safety zone. This applies more particularly to older people, who feel extremely uncomfortable when trying to cross the road and stay in one piece.

I have raised these two matters regarding the crossing on Brighton Road and the stobie poles to see whether the Minister can do anything about them. A mile or two of Brighton Road has still to be widened in my district, and many stobie poles have to be removed. One would hope that the Minister would, even at this late stage, take some notice of what I am saying and direct his departmental officers to do something about these major problems that we are experiencing. When we widen a road like Brighton Road (and it will have a 9ft. (2.7 m) footpath), we are encouraging the traffic to speed up. Already, everyone uses this road like a speedway, and we will not in this way prevent more accidents from occurring. It is the Government's responsibility to do something about these matters, even if it acts only in relation to the last mile or two of Brighton Road that remains to be reconstructed.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I wish to refer, first, to teacher housing in the country areas of South Australia, which has been a problem in rural areas for a long time. Teachers once boarded with country people, full accommodation having been provided for them. Today, however, the pattern has changed, to the extent that teachers (like so many of us in other walks of life) want to be more independent and to have their own accommodation, so that they can pay full attention to their work. One can imagine what it must have been like years ago when teachers boarded with country residents: the latter were doing teachers a favour by taking them in as boarders, as a consequence of which the teachers helped with the washing up after dinner, and so on. Today, teachers want their own facilities so that they can pay full attention to their duties. The facilities must be improved for our teachers who are willing to go to the country. It is some time since questions were asked regarding the Government's intentions in this regard. In 1972, in reply to a question regarding the Jamestown hostel, the Minister said:

The erection of a residence at Jamestown to accommodate single temporary teachers has been delayed because of the difficulty of providing a suitable site.

However, a suitable site was selected, and its purchase was being settled by the Crown Solicitor. When I tried to follow up this question, the docket could not be found. Eventually, however, it was found with the Crown Solicitor. The Minister continued:

Site plans have been prepared but, because of the heavy teacher-housing programme, finance is not immediately available for tenders to be called.

That was nearly two years ago, and one now finds that this area has been placed low on the priority list in relation to teacher housing. The Minister has since stated that 35 solid construction houses will be built throughout the State for headmasters and for teacher housing. I know of only one that has been constructed in my district since then, and it could be argued that that house was probably built before the announcement was made, anyway. I refer to the house at Koolunga, which was made available to the department for purchase. Indeed, it was held for about 12 months to enable the department to decide whether or not it would purchase the property. However, the owner eventually became so sick and tired of waiting for the department to decide that he ended up selling the property to someone else in the area. The department thereafter built a new home in the area that cost the taxpayers twice as much as the other property would have cost.

These sorts of problem occur all the time in the country and, although the Government has said that it would provide accommodation for teachers in the country, little has been done about it. A fortnight ago I asked the Minister what was the Government's policy regarding housing for teachers in country areas. In explaining that question, I said:

About two years ago, the Minister announced that his department would build 37 solid construction houses throughout the State. I have been informed that many of these houses have yet to be constructed; in some areas transportable houses have been considered as a substitute. I have also been told that either the Government or the Minister's department has now called a halt with regard to supplying transportable houses because of the high cost involved, this type of house costing about \$24 000 to install on various sites throughout the State.

That was a straight-out question to the Minister regarding the Government's present policy. But what do we find in the Minister's reply?

Mr. Chapman: Nothing.

Mr. VENNING: At Booleroo Centre a brand new home, only two years old, had been constructed and not occupied. It was made available to the Government, it having promised that it would supply a house for teacher accommodation within 12 months. That time passed and no home was made available, and the local teacher had been living in an empty farmhouse six miles from the town. It was said that the new house provided for the department could have been purchased for \$18 000, but what do we find? We find that the Public Buildings Department was asked to report on this house. It eventually got around to making a report, in which it stated that the house was not suitable. Consequently, the Education Department did not buy it.

Mr. Coumbe: Why was it not suitable?

Mr. VENNING: Because the department considered the house was not structurally sound. We asked the Public Buildings Department from Adelaide to make a similar survey. It came up with a similar report. I do not know how anyone can estimate how much reinforcement there is

in the foundations but a similar report has been produced, and the Minister has stated the Government will not buy that house.

The situation is that the Government is going to send to Booleroo Centre a transportable house that was supposed to go to Peterborough, but the teachers there had refused to live in it. So it has been allocated to Booleroo Centre. A fortnight ago I was asked to go to that area and inspect a transportable house being constructed at Laura for the headmaster there. It is a shame what has happened: it is a transportable house costing the taxpayer about \$24 000, consisting of 11 squares; furniture cannot be put into the bedroom as there is not enough room. One has to step down 2ft. 6in. (.76 m) at the back door to put the washing out on the clothes line, and there is a similar area in front. Yet the Minister says he cannot override the decision of the Public Buildings Department. What do we find today in the House? The member for Davenport was talking about the situation at Port Pirie regarding the rare earth plant. The Treasury recommended against the Government's spending \$500 000 to prolong the agony for that set-up. The Government overrode the Treasury to the extent of \$500 000, yet the Minister is not prepared to spend \$18 000 because the Public Buildings Department says the house is not sound.

It is interesting that opposite the house at Booleroo Centre is a similar house built by the same contractors. It has been occupied by the headmaster there for about four years, with no problems. The other house has been up for two years and has stood up to a fair amount of weather. The report says there is insufficient timber in the roof and insufficient reinforcement in the foundations. These are some of the problems confronting our rural people, and it is about time the Government got its priorities right and seriously considered helping out in these areas. We know that the country area is not an area where the Government expects much support, but the Government is here to govern the people of the State, as my Party did when it was in office. So I ask the Government, and the Minister in particular, seriously to consider getting their priorities straightened out so that the country facilities and the housing of teachers can be considerably improved. I know the Minister said in his reply to me recently that there was a shortage of finance and that, if we built more houses, there would be fewer schools. But in other areas Government policy can be altered so as to provide more money for teacher housing—for instance, in the many wasteful areas mentioned by my colleagues in the debate today.

Another point I want to make this afternoon is in connection with Samcor. The people in the country are asking: what has the setting up of Samcor done for anyone? That is the big question. Has it done anything for the producers of this State or for the consumers of meat in this State? Meat is a dear product; the cost of slaughtering has increased. The abattoirs were the dearest ever constructed in the Commonwealth before Samcor came into being. I ask the Government: what has the formation of this new organization called Samcor done for South Australia?

Mr. Coumbe: What do you think it has done?

Mr. VENNING: It has increased considerably prices to the consumer, so that today there is consumer resistance to the price of meat. The cost is \$1.90 a head for the slaughtering of sheep and lamb, and the slaughtering of cattle has increased to between \$17 a head and \$18.50 a head. This creates buyer resistance to consuming meat in this State, and it is about time someone did something about it.

Before I resume my seat, I want to refer to Monarto. The Government's attitude is highlighted when it lists the Agriculture Department as one department to be shifted to the new town. Agriculture is important to this State; it is important to the Commonwealth, since agricultural exports still form the greatest part of the overall exports from the Commonwealth. The Government's "couldn't care less" attitude has allowed the department to run down to its present state, and now it has decided to shift it to Monarto. We hear continual rumblings from the staff of the Agriculture Department, showing how they have lost confidence in the whole situation and are not prepared to be shifted to Monarto. Who wants to be shifted? Many of the officers are getting on in years. It indicates clearly to this Chamber that the Government's attitude towards primary producers and the Agriculture Department is one of very low priority. One wonders just how the State as a whole will survive in this situation. Agriculture is something about which everyone from time to time needs to ask questions, especially by contacting the department. One wonders just how it will work out.

We know that the set-up was not ideal at Gawler Place, but at Northfield a fairly effective situation has been developed, and any move by the Agriculture Department should be in that direction, and not to Monarto. I am disappointed and concerned at the Government's attitude that the move to Monarto will take place soon, bearing in mind the large amounts of money that have been spent at Northfield. It would be only common sense if the Government pursued this area, and not Monarto, for the future development of the Agriculture Department in this State.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): It may be appropriate if I take up the argument where my friend, the member for Rocky River, left it, at Monarto. I want to reiterate what he has said about the minority group not being taken very much notice of, when he said that the Government perhaps did not get many votes from country areas. But that was no good reason why country areas should not receive attention with regard to teacher housing. I cannot help but wonder whether this is why Monarto has not received more attention than it has and, shall I say, more sympathy, better understanding and a closer liaison with the Government because it represents only about 40 people at present. This is no reason why these people should not receive the attention they deserve. Simply because they are few in number and perhaps because most of them do not vote for the Labor Party are no valid reasons why they should not receive their just due.

That brings me to the point of property valuations at Monarto. Unfortunately, some landholders at Monarto decided early in the piece to settle for about what they expected, in order to save themselves trips to Adelaide and further bother, for the sake of peace, quiet and contentment of the wife and children. That has been tragic because they all discovered that, when they tried to find other land a comparable distance from Adelaide, most of them had to move between 200 miles (321 km) and 300 miles (482 km) away, especially those who moved to Bordertown or even farther.

Mr. Venning: They'd add to the existing competition for land.

Mr. WARDLE: My colleague tells me that they did not help their own position by having cash in their pockets when looking for land; that made them competitors, thus increasing the cost of land. The most disappointing feature was when these people accepted a price and proceeded to purchase other property. It has been my understanding

that the original Murray New Town (Land Acquisition) Act provided that landholders would receive compensation equivalent to the cost of like land elsewhere in the State. In other words, while the valuation of land at Monarto would be to some extent fixed, latitude would be given so that regard could be paid to land of near value elsewhere in the State. If land resembling the land at Monarto was to rise in price by, say, \$20, it was expected that compensation for the land at Monarto would likewise increase to the extent of at least \$20.

I hope that, when the Minister studies in *Hansard* the question I asked today, he will be appalled at the reply he gave. I am glad that he has now entered the Chamber. He is a conscientious Minister, but I believe that he will be absolutely staggered when he reads the reply he gave me. He will see readily that he first compared the ability of a person outside the area to negotiate a price to the inability of the person inside to negotiate a price, the person inside having to accept a valuation.

I did not ask the Minister about that matter. He went off on that tangent, but I had asked him whether he considered that landholders in the Monarto area were being offered a price for their land that would enable them to purchase other land that gave a similar agricultural return. I hope that tomorrow, when I ask another question about Monarto, the Minister will answer the part of my question that dealt with "similar agricultural returns". I am sure that, if he had the opportunity now, the Minister would say that he was sorry that he did not reply to that part.

Mr. Evans: He may say that he did not intend to.

Mr. WARDLE: I do not think so, because I do not believe the Minister thinks along those lines. That has not been my experience of the Minister and I should be disappointed if he did that.

Mr. Venning: Do you think he understood the question?

Mr. WARDLE: He understood the question and I am sure that he will give me a reply tomorrow. Further, the information the Minister gave in reply to the second part of my question was not relevant to the question, either, although I and many other people appreciate the information. Probably the Minister expected that questions would be asked about Monarto today and therefore brought that information to the House. However, the Minister will also be appalled when he reads the second part of my question and then realizes that he gave me prices of land purchased within Monarto.

Mr. Millhouse: Has it occurred to you that he may not read *Hansard*?

Mr. WARDLE: If he does not, I should hope that someone in the department would bring the matter to his notice, telling him that he did not reply to my question and that it would be fair and reasonable for him to do so. In the second part of the question, I asked the Minister whether he would table in the House the details of recent transactions in land of similar quality in other parts of the State. If we are to set a value according to my interpretation of the Murray New Town (Land Acquisition) Act, if land equal in quality to land at Monarto in other parts of the State is permitted to increase in price, surely it is reasonable for the price of Monarto land to increase.

The Hon D. J. Hopgood: But not as a result of the decision to locate the city there.

Mr. WARDLE: I am not suggesting that for a minute. I see that the Minister agrees with me that the Act provides for what I have said. I did not refer necessarily to the increase in the value of land at Monarto. Surely it must be obvious that the Valuation Department has had information about sales of similar land in other parts of

the State. If it has not set a precedent on that basis for its existing valuations at Monarto, the whole of the work was not done and there would be no authority for the basic valuations being offered now. That is an important part of what ought to be done, and I hope it has been done.

In the second part of my question I was asking for these figures and, although the information about 600 acres (240 ha) being purchased for \$90 an acre (.4 ha) was interesting, I hope that tomorrow when I ask a further question the Minister will give me the information readily, instead of leaving a vacuum. The question was completely avoided today, but I am not suggesting that the Minister deliberately avoided it: he did not have the information at hand. If he had told me that the reply to the first part of the question was "No" and that he would tomorrow bring down the information about the second part, I would have been satisfied, because I consider that that is the position. Instead of doing that, the Minister spoke for 20 minutes, giving us interesting but not precise information in answer to my question.

Another aspect of the development of Monarto is the leasing back, which the Minister mentioned during Question Time today. Irrespective of what the Minister may have recorded in his file, on about December 20, 1972, it was sad to see between 150 and 200 people in the small local hall receive a Christmas present (which it virtually became) in the way of an announcement about what would happen to their land and property. I am satisfied that most people left that meeting thinking that the Government would not expect or require them to sell immediately. They thought they would have perhaps some years before they needed to sell and move, because they were told that they could lease back their land. That is less than two years ago, yet the Government expects now to buy the whole area within months.

I know that the Minister could not be at that meeting, because he did not have the Ministerial responsibility then, but surely all those people could not have been wrong. Their impression was that they had a longer tenure as owners and that they had some tenure as people able to lease back their farm. I do not blame the Government for deciding not to lease back the acquired land to people who come from outside the district and want to lease a homestead and 1 000 acres (400 ha). I know that "flog" is not a good word to use in this context, but it expresses what I want to say. People would go to that area to get every bit of feed and value that they could out of the property and, in doing so, they would cause the property to drift. Vermin probably would increase in number and, generally, these people would not give the land the husbandry required to keep it in good order. I understand the Government's decision that will not allow outsiders to come in and use the land as an investment.

Mr. Venning: What's going to happen to it in the meantime?

Mr. WARDLE: Much of the land that is vacated by those who have sold it to the Government will run wild. Probably, the conservationists who have been part of the decision to allow it to run wild consider that it will do the country more good. I am not denying that it will help the country, but there will be some problems. It will result in a fire hazard, an enormous spread of noxious weed, and also an increase in the number of vermin. Whilst the decision has been made to leave the land idle, local people outside the area are not pleased because they can see some of the distinct disadvantages in the land being idle.

Mr. Evans: Would you like some African daisy plants?

Mr. WARDLE: We do not want any African daisy in that area, which is free from that pest now. One other aspect of the influence of Monarto on my district is the inability of councils to purchase and develop park lands and recreation areas to be used by the population of the projected city of Monarto. Several times I have asked whether the Government has decided to assist councils and, if it has, when it will assist them. Several council areas are affected, from the District Council of Mannum in the north to the District Council of Meningie in the south and through to the District Council of Mount Barker in the west, and including the councils within the area—the District Council of Moblong and the Corporation of the Town of Murray Bridge. I know that councils are concerned that they do not have the ability to develop parks and recreation areas that they possess now without any increase in the number of these areas within their boundaries. I ask again that those responsible for planning this project will try to assist councils and tell them what is to be done about grants to purchase and develop all recreational areas. I consider that nothing less than \$1 000 000 should be made available to the five or six councils to enable them to purchase and develop parks and recreational areas.

I refer now to water licences. I was under the impression that, in the past with a Liberal and Country League Government, water licences were issued on an acreage basis, and that a farmer was generally given a licence for up to 50 acres (20.2 ha) for the irrigation of that area. I believe it was understood and accepted that in later years (and those years have passed and metering has been introduced) the equivalent quantity of water consistent with the crop the producer was growing would be granted, so that the acreage would no longer apply and that there would be an appropriate quantity allowed to him for his agriculture or horticulture.

However, the system as I understood it to operate several years ago has been changed considerably, to the extent that now, if an irrigator changes (and it is necessary sometimes to change the use of land from agriculture to horticulture) and grows a crop that requires less water than his original allocation consumed (in order perhaps to put back something into the soil that was lacking), he is never able to revert to the quantity of water he was allotted originally that grew a crop requiring a larger quantity of water. If the original allocation was for a crop requiring 50 in. (1 270 mm) a year and the irrigator changed to a crop requiring 35 in. (889 mm) a year, he would never be able to return to his 50 in. (1 270 mm) a year crop. This seems to be a tremendous injustice to the irrigator: it limits his crop rotation and his ability to manipulate and use his land to the best advantage. One of the greatest weaknesses of this system is that it removes from the irrigator the ability to take advantage of a cash crop or a crop that is in demand at that time.

If onions are over-supplied and the grower wishes to grow peas, cabbages, or lettuces, he cannot do so because he is not able to reduce the quantity of water used to a lower figure, otherwise he loses in the next allocation the licence for that crop. This is an unjust situation. Now that the irrigator will be metered, surely it is reasonable that he can receive his quota of water, because it is his responsibility to grow whatever crop is economical and he should be able to obtain that quantity of water for the remainder of his agricultural life or until he surrenders his licence.

I refer now to the matter of compensation for persons who will be expected to move premises that are within 300 ft. (91.44 m) of the water's edge on the Murray River.

I hope that the Minister will further consider this question, and that compensation will be available for those with pigsties or other outbuildings used for agriculture erected within 300 ft. (91.44 m) of the river. I trust that several years will be allowed before changes are made, and that compensation will be paid for buildings that have to be removed and resited.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I should like to endorse the views expressed by the member for Rocky River in connection with the rural policies of the State Government and the Commonwealth Government. These policies cause considerable concern to country people, who are away from the centres of political power. We have seen people in outlying areas ignored, the superphosphate bounty removed, and unsympathetic policies adopted by the Postmaster-General's Department. Unfortunately, the State Government does not protect the primary producer. Superphosphate is subject to price control, and I shall be interested to know whether the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs believes that the elimination of the bounty is justified.

The attitude of the State Government and the Commonwealth Government toward primary producers is easily explained: so few members of those Governments are primary producers that the Governments are no longer interested in the man on the land. Only two members of the State Labor Government and only two members of the Australian Labor Government have been primary producers; that is, there are only four people with primary production experience out of 125 members of the Commonwealth and South Australian Parliaments. This situation is clearly reflected in the Labor Party's policies toward the man on the land. The primary producer has enjoyed reasonably successful times, but he has been bled.

Mr. Duncan: You've forgotten the Premier: he's a primary producer.

Mr. BLACKER: Yes, as regards chickens, maybe. For how much longer can the primary producer be bled? For how much longer can advantages and incentives be taken away from the primary producer? Ultimately someone will have to foot the bill. At this stage the primary producer is footing the bill but, when his resources run dry, what will happen? Then, it will hit the man in the street. Some people at Coffin Bay came to me with a reasonable request to find land at Coffin Bay where a golf course could be established.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I will support that.

Mr. BLACKER: I am pleased. I do not know whether the Minister has a shack, but I can certainly find one, if he wants to go there. When the Coffin Bay Progress Association made an official approach for land near Coffin Bay for a golf course, the request was refused on the ground that the area was rich in flora and fauna and should therefore be protected. This was accepted, and ultimately the progress association sought my support. I then wrote to the Minister of Recreation and Sport, seeking his support. We have perhaps a conflict of interest inasmuch as the Minister was, on the one hand, interested in the conservation of the area while he was, on the other hand, interested in promoting recreation and sport. I wrote to the Minister in his capacity as Minister of Recreation and Sport and received a reply from him as Minister of Environment and Conservation. This causes concern, because the letter clearly stated that there was no ground suitable for a golf course at Coffin Bay. It belittles the Minister's office to make such a sweeping statement. Surely some of the extensive area near Coffin Bay could be made

available for a golf course. In the area proposed by the progress association for a golf course, trees do not have to be removed. If the department had a look at the area, it would agree that a golf course there would complement the conservation of the area.

The reply that the Minister of Marine gave me earlier today about a fishing jetty was in accordance with the policy he had previously outlined. The fishing craft along our shores are valued at many millions of dollars. On a day other than a calm day one can find \$3 000 000 worth of fishing equipment and boats at the Port Lincoln jetty. So, a considerable amount of capital is tied up in the industry. The Minister said that only \$300 000 was available for boat havens and other fishing facilities in South Australia. I can appreciate that money is hard to get, but we need additional consideration in one case. Early in the summer damage was done not only to the fishing craft but also to the wharf. As a result, it was announced that fishing craft were not to be moored at the town jetty. It has also been suggested that the Minister has spent large sums on the slipway; I grant that, but unfortunately the size of the boats has increased to the extent where the slipping facilities are being used to maximum capacity. An adjunct which has been planned but which has been deferred for the present has been a fitting-out wharf to complement the existing slipway. This facility is absolutely essential so that the maintenance work on the fishing fleet can be thoroughly carried out.

I wish to refer briefly to one aspect that has arisen from the newspaper coverage of the Redcliff project. I do not wish to deal with pollution problems or the merits of the proposal. I wish to clarify some statements made at the Tunarama festival. On that occasion, referring to a press statement issued under the name of the Minister of Marine, I said:

In last Wednesday's *Advertiser* (January 23, 1974), it was stated that a port at Redcliffs would provide berths for shipping up to 100 000 tons. This in itself is a source of concern because the amount of dredging necessary would disturb thousands of hectares of natural sea bed and consequently destroy the natural breeding grounds for prawns. The real facts are that we are trying to protect a \$2 500 000 industry from the backwash of a \$300 000 000 complex.

The reference to dredging is what has caused concern. Before the report of the Minister's statement appeared, I had seen a copy of the Admiralty chart. The report referred to a port to take shipping of 100 000 tons (101 600 t). I examined the Admiralty chart for depths of water of about 50ft. (15.24 m) to 60ft. (18.29 m). I found that, at a distance of 2½ miles (4 km) from Red Cliff Point, it was possible to get 60ft. of water, but that was in a hole. To get 60ft. away from that hole, 27ft. (8.19 m) had to be dredged around Middle Bank. The Spencer Gulf Pollution Survey stated that this project would be at Red Cliff Point. However, because of the Minister's statement, I now assume that the port will not be at Red Cliff Point but will be at the Red Cliff escarpment. I make that assumption on the basis of the Minister's saying that, at the end of a 2½ mile (3.6 km) jetty, there will be 50ft. of water. With a 2½ mile jetty from the Red Cliff escarpment, it is possible to get to 48ft. (14.59 m) of water. However, I point out that a depth of 48ft. is not sufficient to allow shipping of 100 000 tons. Therefore, there must have been a re-adjustment of appraisals somewhere.

At the Tunarama festival I was reported as saying that, because of dredging, we would have an underwater desert. An examination of the Admiralty chart shows that dredging of about 7 miles (11.27 km) or 8 miles (12.87 km) is

necessary to provide 60ft. of water to cater for shipping of 100 000 tons. Apparently, shipping of 100 000 tons will not now be considered. I want to know what size of shipping is contemplated and whether the depth of water being made available will be suitable for that shipping. It is also doubtful whether the shipping lane is sufficiently wide to cater for ships of 100 000 tons. In any case, a swinging basin would be required. As it was impossible to provide for shipping of 100 000 tons at Red Cliff Point, it was therefore assumed that the port would be at the Red Cliff escarpment, as this would avoid the necessity of traversing Middle Bank.

Conflicting statements have been made about this matter. First, the Spencer Gulf Pollution Survey stated that the port would be at Red Cliff Point. Then, the Minister of Marine said that the port would be able to handle shipping of 100 000 tons. This statement was made in an effort to justify the deferment of harbor extensions at Port Pirie. The Minister then said that the jetty would be 2½ miles long and that there would be no dredging. If we assumed that the port was not to provide for shipping of 100 000 tons, the rest of the Minister's statement would be fairly accurate. However, if the port is to provide for shipping of 100 000 tons, at least two points in the statement must be incorrect. Although I do not think that the Minister has deliberately tried to mislead the public, his statements have led to confusion. The confusion has not arisen as a result of the interpretations of the context of the statements or because of someone's impression of what is going on: it has arisen directly from statements emanating from the Minister's department. Surely the Minister does not expect members on this side to accept these statements without question.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I wish to refer to a matter affecting the Motor Vehicles Department. I assure members that I do not desire to reflect on the Registrar or the staff of his department. I know that, over the years, the number of vehicles to be registered has escalated, the workload of the department increasing accordingly. I can vividly recall that years ago it took some hours to register a vehicle. Procedures have been streamlined since then, with delays no longer occurring. When one calls at the office of the department now, one is given good and reasonable service. I am concerned about mail applications for the transfer and renewal of vehicle registrations. Once again, I accept that the amount of business in this connection has increased greatly over the years.

It appears that it now takes longer for the registration disc to be returned from the department. I do not know the reason for this. I appreciate that, in country areas, permits are made available so that a vehicle can be used while the owner is waiting for the return of the registration papers and disc. I am told by one car dealer who operates in a large country area and who handles much work in this sphere that in 50 per cent of cases it has been necessary to extend the time of operation of the permits. I realize that the position may be aggravated by the cancellation of Saturday morning postal deliveries. However, because many permits must be extended quite a procedure must be followed: the department must first be contacted (usually by telephone), after which it contacts the local police station, where, more often than not, and possibly in all cases, the permit is extended. I am also informed that the time between the expiration of the registration and when the expiry notice is sent out is decreasing. As a result, country people are not given sufficient time to return the application form with their remittance and thereafter receive the necessary disc.

In bringing this matter to the Minister's attention, I suggest that the problem could be solved by establishing additional regional departmental offices in the country. I understand that there are at present regional offices at Mount Gambier and possibly at Whyalla. The Mayor of Kadina has informed me that the Registrar of Motor Vehicles has been contacted regarding the establishment of a regional office in one of the northern Yorke Peninsula towns. I am confident that, as a result of bringing this matter to the Minister's attention, something will be done to rectify the situation so that country people applying to register motor vehicles will be able to receive their registration discs more quickly. I object to the recent 300 per cent increase (from \$1 to \$4) in the fee to transfer the registration of motor vehicles. Although I realize that costs are rising and that it is necessary for the Government to obtain additional revenue, this seems to be a steep increase. I therefore bring it to the Minister's attention as well.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I should like to bring several matters to the notice of honourable members during this debate. The first of these concerns the South Australian fishing industry, about which I have asked many questions on behalf of members of the industry during my short sojourn in this Chamber. I should like again to express concern on behalf of those persons who are on the edge of the industry and who, because of departmental requirements, cannot enter it. Many of this State's fishermen, although well equipped to fish for certain varieties of fish in this State's waters, have found that, as a result of competition, those fish are in short supply. These men have family responsibilities as citizens of the area and are burdened with the responsibility of meeting their commitments. However, as a result of the restrictions placed upon them, they, unlike other primary producers, cannot diversify their activities.

I cite, as an example, the lobster fishermen who have spent large sums of money in equipping themselves with a vessel and associated requirements and who have been permitted to fish in the prescribed waters. Having entered this competitive industry, and in some cases having done quite well for a period, these men have been faced with the need to branch into other fields. Not only must they face competition from their own area: they must also cope with intruders from other areas who are trying to fish for lobster outside their prescribed area, and the department will be informed of these incidents. I refer, particularly, to fishermen who have been licensed to fish for lobster in the South-East and who have encroached on the northern zone. The fishermen who are licensed to fish in the northern zone have recently told me that their resources are diminishing. In an attempt, first, to preserve the lobster industry and, secondly, to cope with their commitments on their vessels and equipment, these fishermen have sought permission to enter other fields, particularly prawn fishing. Of their own accord and, indeed, at their own expense, these fishermen have found to the north and to the south of Kangaroo Island what they describe as thousands of acre feet of prawns. They have continually applied to the Fisheries Department for permits to enable them legally to fish for and market these prawns.

Denying these fishermen the permits they have sought, the Government has encouraged illegal practices. Indeed, these fishermen are being denied an opportunity of gathering this natural resource, which, they believe, will give them a reasonable income to enable them to meet their commitments. These men are being held up in the ordinary course of a free enterprise industry. This is being done for no

valid reason, but allegedly to preserve the industry, and I contend that the Government is encouraging these men to break the law. Indeed, the Government has challenged these men to go into the open sea, be they State or Commonwealth waters, catch these fish, and bring them into port to market them, merely for the purposes of determining where they will stand in future. On March 6, the Premier said, *inter alia*:

Neither Commonwealth nor State can know for certain exactly what type of administration is valid in an offshore area.

I realize that the Premier has made every possible effort in his negotiations with the Commonwealth Government to determine these areas, but at this stage, years after these fishermen have applied for permits to fish in the areas to which I have referred, they are still being denied a proper picture of where they stand. It is high time this Government set aside officers in the Fisheries Department to make a real and positive attempt to iron out some of the anomalies in the fishing industry. There is uneasiness in this field about some of the officers in the department. I call on the Minister of Fisheries to investigate this matter seriously and urgently in the interests both of the State generally and of those people in particular who, let us not forget, are part of the primary industry.

I have raised in this House on several occasions a situation that exists at American River, on Kangaroo Island. It is one of the oldest tourist townships in this State but has been denied an adequate water supply, as a result of which the promoters of tourism in American River have been denied fair competition in the tourist trade across the State. I hope the State Government, under the recent amendments to the Waterworks Act, will at least review this situation with the seriousness it deserves, and will in fact relieve the primary producers on the route between the water supply and the township I have mentioned of the unreasonable rating burdens that are proposed for them if and when the town is adequately served.

By the recent amendments to the Act, I understand the Minister can now use his discretion and at least reduce the water rating that applies to the primary producers *en route* to the point in need at the end of the line. While I am dealing with Kangaroo Island, let me also mention the importance of the sea link between Kangaroo Island and the mainland. The sea link, as we have come to know it, is now directly under the control of this Government. In fact, most Kangaroo Island residents depend upon the Highways Department for the mainland linking service. The m.v. *Troubridge* was purchased by the State Government in June, 1972.

Mr. Keneally: A move that you applauded.

Mr. CHAPMAN. It is temporarily bridging a gap that will always exist and that deserves a reasonable service, whether Government owned or privately owned.

Mr. Keneally: Wasn't it purchased as a service for your constituents?

Mr. CHAPMAN: The residents of the area depend largely on a continuous service by way of a sea link. This Government, in its wisdom or otherwise, chose to purchase that link. It purchased the vessel (or "bridge") but did not purchase any vehicles to use on that "bridge". It left that to the residents of Kangaroo Island and others to provide and finance. In fact, it is like a pub with no beer. The only difference between that bridge and the one at Murray Bridge or any other bridge in South Australia is that one has to pay a toll on it. In all cases throughout the State, the bridges linking one part of the State with another are free. In this case the State Government

continues to demand and accept a toll from that community but denies it the bridge link that applies everywhere else in South Australia.

I concede that at one stage punts crossed the Murray River, which had the effect of linking one part of the State with another, but even the charges that previously applied to those punts have been removed for the bridges. However, the charges on the link between Kangaroo Island and the mainland have been increased. Recently, we have been warned by the Minister of Transport that from July 1, 1974, we can expect about 20 per cent rise in charges, although this was the first community in South Australia to settle and although during the whole period that community has been assisting with a subsidy for a State-owned transport system, the railway system. However, that area is now to be victimized at the will not only of the Government but also of the machinery that makes the Government work—the trade union movement.

Mr. Harrison: The same old broken record!

Mr. CHAPMAN: There will be more than a broken record in this State if we do not watch out. We were reminded recently of the real machinery that governs this State now.

Members interjecting:

Mr. CHAPMAN: Only a week ago we had a situation in the trade union movement in South Australia concerning the metalworkers union.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: And a very fine union, too!

Mr. CHAPMAN: It chose to go out on strike. Another union in South Australia chose to go out on strike in sympathy with it, but that particular union involved the workers on the Birkenhead bridge, including the fellow who presses the button. As a result of the second union going out on strike in sympathy with the metalworkers union, the situation that followed caused the Kangaroo Island community considerable embarrassment, both financial and otherwise. Because that worker on the Birkenhead bridge walked off the job and refused to press the button to open and close the bridge at the appropriate time, the Government-owned *Troubridge* was held up at Kingscote.

Mr. Keneally: What would you have done?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Unfortunately, I am not in a position to say what I would have done.

Members interjecting:

Mr. CHAPMAN: I have said previously what I would do with that type of person, and in no way do I retract the statement I made nearly 12 months ago.

Mr. Keneally: Will you repeat it?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I would replace him forthwith. As a result of the action of that union worker, who had no direct connection with the dispute over which the metalworkers went out on strike, that whole community was denied the opportunity of getting food and other essential items, and of disposing of their rural exports. I have evidence to support this. There were growers on Kangaroo Island who had loaded their trucks on the Wednesday morning to travel on that vehicular ferry with livestock. As a result of that action by the union those growers were placed in the position of having to unload the trucks on Wednesday night, reload them on Thursday morning, and have them shipped to Adelaide on Thursday night, having missed the whole of the week's markets at the abattoirs and having been caused the expense and deterioration of the stock involved in carrying that stock over until the following week. The shortsightedness of this Government and of the machinery that makes it tick is costing this State a fortune.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I may be said to have tried to promote the interests of a small sector of this State, but I bring to the notice of this House the importance of effects on that area. It may house only comparatively few people, but it is a valuable part of South Australia. I am sure that the Minister of Environment and Conservation appreciates that, and it would not be a bad idea if his colleagues on the front bench tried to appreciate what applies there and to share the appreciation of the value of Kangaroo Island to the rest of the State.

Another matter that concerns many primary producers in this State is also important. We all know how necessary it is to conserve water in this dry continent and to remove from watershed areas stock and other rural activities that are likely to pollute the water. Growers who own land in areas that are surveyed and proclaimed as watershed areas are entitled to a fair and reasonable living. When their land is acquired or intended to be acquired in preparation for the construction of reservoirs in South Australia, it is reasonable that they have some guidelines about how long they may stay in the area, and we recall the arguments advanced by the member for Murray this afternoon in this regard. This is another clear example of land occupiers not being told properly about their future.

When the Government surveys land as watershed areas for proposed reservoirs, it ought to give the occupiers of that land positive information about how long they may stay there and when they will be paid for the land. In that way, the occupiers will know where they stand, but primary producers in such areas in this State are not fairly and properly told about when the reservoir works will commence. They are told that they must not continue to construct capital or structural improvements, increase the value of the land, increase their milking herd where dairies are involved, or increase the value of their improvements.

If they sell (and if they can sell) they are required to tell the incoming purchaser that possibly the land will be acquired. It is an unsatisfactory situation and something that the Government ought to determine before it discloses such long-range details or forecasts about these areas.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Before we know, demands are constantly made on us to disclose it, and you're one who wants that.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Bigger fool you for disclosing it! I am saying that, when you are ready to disclose it, you ought to be able to tell people where they stand.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We don't get to that stage. The pressure is on to tell before that, and your people do it.

Mr. CHAPMAN: If the Minister of Works wishes to enter this debate—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Answer what I am saying to you. You haven't got an answer.

Mr. CHAPMAN: If the Minister had been in the House a few minutes ago, he would have heard me refer to the lack of water in the American River area, an area that has been denied water for as long as I can remember.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Go on. I can tell you a few things about that, too.

Mr. CHAPMAN: You told the House a few unreasonable things about that.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: If you want the rest of the State to pay for it, that's all right. Let's be fair about this.

Mr. CHAPMAN: As far as I am concerned, the Minister of Works has done everything in his power to deny that area a fair go.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's rubbish, and you know it.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Until he makes a positive move to provide water to American River, I will retain that view.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I can provide water to American River—

Mr. CHAPMAN: That is exactly what we want.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: —if the rest of the people pay for it and you pay nothing!

Mr. CHAPMAN: What are you talking about? They have been paying taxes for 150 years towards the State transport system on the mainland and now we have an extension of that State transport system and those people are paying for that. Despite that, and when I had only five minutes of my time remaining, you tell me that the State should not subsidize a scheme for American River!

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The State subsidizes the transport system.

Mr. CHAPMAN: We have made a big contribution towards it. The Minister of Works knows well that a fair and valid application for a water scheme at American River has been in existence for as long as he has been in this House, but I have yet to see him or his department take any real action to provide it.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You know we've done everything possible to help those people.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Except supply them with water.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Because those people won't provide any payment towards it. They don't want to pay anything.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I deny the Minister's comments emphatically. The people of American River are willing to pay, at the same rate as applies across the State, for the water that they use.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's not true.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The people of American River township are willing to do that, and have been throughout the whole of the application period.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's not true, and you know it.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am pleased to know that the Minister has denied the claim that I made on behalf of these people.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It's like transport.

Mr. CHAPMAN: You now switch to another subject, but I am speaking about the American River water supply.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What you're saying is not true.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra should know by now that every member is entitled to be called by the office he holds or the district he represents. To continually call a member "you", "you", "you", is not allowed, and the honourable member cannot continue in this way.

Mr. Gunn: The Minister was calling him a liar!

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Eyre interjects he will get what is coming to him. I have pointed out to the member for Alexandra what is incorrect and what is correct, and he cannot keep saying "you", "you", "you": he must refer to an honourable member's district or to a Minister by his correct title.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your explanation. You have taken away one of the three minutes that I have left.

Mr. McAnaney: Tell him he's wrong.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I have brought before the notice of the House the observations I have made during the short

time I have been the member for Alexandra. I have tried to do so with every reasonable control.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You could have fooled a lot of people, I am sure.

Mr. CHAPMAN: It is difficult to retain one's control after the experience I had this afternoon when I tried to bring forward in Question Time part of the material that I have brought forward during this debate. Having been what I regard as denied a fair go on that occasion with the matter put before the House—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must withdraw that statement, because it is a reflection on the Chair.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will withdraw the statement.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must withdraw the statement that he did not get a fair go this afternoon. The honourable member for Alexandra will withdraw that statement, because it is an insinuation against the Chair.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what you mean by the request.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member made an insinuation against the Chair, and he must make an unqualified withdrawal of that statement. The honourable member for Alexandra.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Mr. Speaker, I apologize if the reflection was directed to the Chair. What I was doing in my comments was explaining how I saw the position today. Is there any law against that?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must make an unqualified withdrawal. The honourable member for Alexandra.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Without understanding in any way, shape, or form what you are requesting of me, if it is a matter of conforming to the procedure of the House—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Alexandra to withdraw the insinuation he made against the Chair.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Mr. Speaker, what insinuation did I make against the Chair? I explained the position.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member is not willing to withdraw, I will name him: he must withdraw the insinuation.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Name him!

Mr. Gunn: But—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Eyre. The honourable member for Alexandra must withdraw the statement he made that he did not get a fair go this afternoon. That statement is an insinuation against the authority of the Chair, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have apologized before, and I do so again—

The SPEAKER: Order! Withdraw the statement.

Mr. CHAPMAN: —if I have insinuated against or made a reflection on the Chair. Does that satisfy you as far as the withdrawal is concerned?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) introduced a Bill for an Act for the further appropriation of the revenue of the State for the financial year ending June 30, 1974, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I submit for the consideration of the House Supplementary Estimates totalling \$17 670 000. In the normal course, appropriation authority to supplement that approved by Parliament in the main Appropriation Bill would be sought somewhat later in the financial year. In this year, however, the Government intends to avoid further sittings between the end of this session and the commencement of the new financial year. Accordingly, it is necessary to introduce Supplementary Estimates now to ensure that sufficient authority exists for payments to be made until June 30 next. Therefore, although I intend to acquaint members with the position on Revenue Account in the usual way, any observations made here in relation to a possible final result for the year must be viewed with the fact in mind that more than a quarter of the year has yet to run. Large fluctuations are possible, of course, in the next few months.

The Revenue Budget presented to the House on August 30 last forecast a deficit of \$11 250 000. Recent reviews have indicated that both receipts and payments are running at higher levels than expected. These higher levels are, of course, a reflection of the general inflationary trends in the economy. However, despite the marked increases on both the receipts and payments sides of the Budget, it seems that the net effect may be fairly small and that the final deficit may not be far away from the original forecast. The volume of land conveyance and mortgage transactions has continued to rise, and the stamp duty payable on these transactions forms one of the major components of the higher receipts. Pay-roll tax receipts are also in excess of the Budget estimate, reflecting the generally higher wage and salary levels obtaining throughout the community compared with those used in the Budget projections. These two items and other smaller variations may produce additional receipts of State taxation of about \$8 000 000 to \$9 000 000.

Railway earnings seem likely to show an increase of about \$2 500 000 for the year, because of the handling of greater volumes of grain from the 1973 harvest and because of an increasing quantity of goods moving into rural areas as a result of the improving agricultural situation. Interest earned on cash balances not immediately required, may return about \$1 000 000 more than the estimate included in the Budget. This can be attributed largely to higher interest rates prevailing as a result of the Australian Government's initiatives in financial policy in September and October last.

Grants from the Australian Government for education purposes may be about \$3 500 000 above estimate. The excess will arise from arrangements to pay university recurrent funds earlier than previously planned, from special contributions not yet determined in detail towards pre-school services, and from grants sufficient to cover the costs of certain higher salary and wage rates. Salary and wage rates are also a major factor in the formula determining the level of the State's financial assistance grant from the Australian Government. The recent review suggests that, because of higher wage levels, this grant could be about \$3 500 000 higher than earlier estimates.

I have referred only to those items of receipts in which a very big movement is expected. There are many others showing smaller but still significant increases, and the end of the year could see total receipts exceeding the Budget estimate by more than \$20 000 000. These increases are being matched in the broad by correspondingly higher payments. Higher salary and wage rates impact on the Public Service in much the same way as on the private sector, and they are resulting in payments well in excess

of the Budget estimate. Higher income from interest earned is offset to some extent by an increased commitment to pay interest in respect of moneys held in certain trust and other accounts at the Treasury. Additional receipts from the Australian Government for education purposes are balanced by increased grants to the individual institutions. I will comment in a moment on the detail of some of the larger increases in payments.

In summary, present trends indicate that the final result may not be far from the \$11 250 000 deficit forecast in the Budget. I hope that we may see some improvement on that figure, but would repeat my observation that more than a quarter of the financial year remains and that large fluctuations could occur between now and the end of the financial year.

Before moving on to an explanation of the individual expenditure lines on the Supplementary Estimates, it may be useful if I remind members of the appropriation procedures within which the Government is able to operate. Early in each financial year Parliament grants the Government of the day appropriation by means of the principal Appropriation Act (supported by Estimates of Expenditure). If these allocations should prove insufficient, there are three other sources of authority for supplementary expenditure, namely, a special section of the same Appropriation Act, the Governor's Appropriation Fund, and a further Appropriation Bill supported by Supplementary Estimates.

Appropriation Act—Special section 3 (2) and (3): The main Appropriation Act contains a section which gives additional authority to meet increased costs due to any award, order or determination of a wage-fixing body, and to meet any unforeseen upward movement in the costs of electricity for pumping water. This special authority is being called upon this year to cover part of the cost to the Revenue Budget of a number of salary and wage determinations, with part being met from within the original appropriations. It is not available, however, to cover the costs of such decisions as the recently announced over-award and service pay increases and leave loadings. If these cannot be met from the Governor's Appropriation Fund, then Supplementary Estimates must be presented. With regard to pumping costs, because of the summer rains it is not expected that the special authority will be needed this year.

Governor's Appropriation Fund: Another source of appropriation authority is the Governor's Appropriation Fund which, in terms of the Public Finance Act, may cover additional expenditure up to the equivalent of 1 per cent of the amount provided in the Appropriation Acts of a particular year. Of this amount one-third is available, if required, for purposes not previously authorized either by inclusion in the Estimates or by other specific legislation. As the amount appropriated by the main Appropriation Act rises from year to year so the extra authority provided by the Governor's Appropriation Fund rises but, even after allowing for the automatic increase inherent in this provision, it is still to be expected that there will be the necessity for Supplementary Estimates from time to time to cover the larger departmental excesses.

Supplementary Estimates: The main explanation for this recurring requirement lies in the fact that, whilst additional expenditures may be financed out of additional revenues with no net adverse impact on the Budget, authority is required nonetheless to appropriate these revenues. Also, the appropriation procedures do not permit variations in payments above and below departmental estimates to be offset against one another. If one department appears

likely to spend more than the amount provided at the beginning of the year the Government must rely on other sources of appropriation authority even though another department may be under-spent by the same or a greater amount.

The appropriation available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund is being used this year to cover a number of individual excesses above departmental allocations, and this is the reason why some of the smaller departments do not appear on Supplementary Estimates even though their expenditure levels may be affected by the same decisions as those which do appear. It is usually only the larger amounts of excess expenditure for which appropriation is sought by way of an Appropriation Bill supported by Supplementary Estimates, the remainder being met from the Governor's Appropriation Fund. As explanations of the details of the Supplementary Estimates have been circulated to members, I ask that the remainder of the explanation be inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

Bearing in mind the special authorities referred to, the Government has decided to introduce Supplementary Estimates totalling \$17 670 000. The estimated cost of the two salary and wage decisions recently taken forms a large part of this additional expenditure and is part of the reason for the very high figure of appropriation required. The other reasons may be seen from the detailed explanations which follow.

Over-award and service pay: Over-award and service payments for the Government's weekly-paid employees were last reviewed in 1972. The Government recently agreed to a further review in the light of generally increasing salary and wage levels and after having regard to what had been agreed by other Governments. The cost to the Government of the higher rates now adopted is estimated to be about \$10 000 000 in a full year inclusive of the effect on overtime and other penalty payments. In the current year the cost is expected to be about \$5 000 000, of which about \$3 500 000 will impact directly on revenue and about \$1 500 000 on other accounts, including the Loan Account, the roads funds, the forestry fund and various departmental reimbursement and working accounts.

Leave loading: In October of last year, the Government approved the payment of an annual leave loading for all of its daily-paid and weekly-paid employees. Day workers were granted 17½ per cent whilst shift workers received 20 per cent of the amount of wages the employee would have received in respect of ordinary time he would have worked had he not been on leave, inclusive of certain allowances but exclusive of shift premiums and weekend penalty rates. The loading is payable on all leave due and taken after July 1, 1973.

The policy was extended in December, 1973, to include salaried Government employees, excluding teachers. A maximum of \$100 was granted to those employees whose salary does not exceed \$7 500, with an abatement of \$1 for every \$5 by which an employee's salary exceeds \$7 500. The total cost to the Government of these policies, which are similar to those operating in other States, is estimated to be about \$3 250 000 this year, of which about \$2 250 000 will impact on revenue.

Combined effect on salaries and wages: Amounts representing the anticipated cost of both over-award and service pay increases and leave loading are included in the Supplementary Estimates as follows:

Departments	\$
Police	170 000
Lands	80 000
Engineering and Water Supply	600 000
Public Buildings	350 000
Agriculture	70 000
Marine and Harbors	105 000
Highways	70 000
Railways	1 465 000
Hospitals	1 080 000
<i>Authorities</i>	
Municipal Tramways Trust	360 000

As I indicated earlier, the excesses for the smaller departments will be met from the Governor's Appropriation Fund.

Police: In recognition of the additional work load imposed upon members of the Police Force in an effort to reduce the road toll during the Christmas holiday period, the Government introduced a system of bonus payments. The cost of these payments this year is about \$100 000, and this figure is included in the sum shown under "Police Department—Salaries and wages and related payments", in addition to the provision of \$170 000 for the leave loading mentioned earlier. A further \$80 000 on this line provides for increases in pay granted to the staff of the Women's Police Auxiliary, giving a total of \$350 000.

Treasurer—Miscellaneous—Expenses of conversion and public loans: Current information relating to the movement of prior issues of special bonds into the new Series 2C, which offers interest rates ranging from 8 per cent to 8·4 per cent, indicates that the cost to the State for premiums and capital gains on the older series so converted will be much higher than the previous estimate. A provision of \$350 000 is made for this purpose.

Interest on Trust funds and other moneys: This line provides for the additional payment of interest, amounting to \$450 000, now estimated to be required because of the higher rates prevailing.

Municipal Tramways Trust—Contribution towards deficits: In addition to the \$360 000 provided to cover the effects of over-award and service pay increases and leave loading, the trust's deficit is expected to be influenced by the national wage case decision, flow-ons from changes to the metal trades award and costs associated with the take-over of private bus services. It is difficult to make any accurate assessment at this stage of the additional costs which will be incurred as a result of these decisions but they may be about \$240 000. This sum is included in the provision on this line of the Supplementary Estimates, giving a total of \$600 000.

Engineering and Water Supply—Metropolitan water-works—materials, etc.: The quality of water pumped from the Murray River has been markedly lower than usual owing to the flood conditions on the river, and this has necessitated additional water treatment. An abnormal incidence of algae blooms in metropolitan reservoirs has also contributed to treatment costs, and an additional \$400 000 may be required.

Public Buildings—Maintenance, minor additions, etc.: Higher costs incurred for office accommodation leased for use by departments, together with a slightly accelerated programme of maintenance of hospital buildings, are the major reasons for the provision of an additional \$300 000 on this line.

Education—Miscellaneous: I have already referred to the need for additional appropriation to make payments to education institutions. The amounts sought in respect of the two universities are related to arrangements made with the Australian Government for the earlier payment of grants covering recurrent expenditure, together with increases in the grants as a consequence of higher wage and

salary rates. The two colleges of advanced education will also receive additional Australian Government grants almost entirely due to wage and salary increases. The provision for additional payments to the Kindergarten Union derives from Australian Government special purpose grants and grants towards the cost of wage and salary increases.

Agriculture: Four outbreaks of Mediterranean fruit fly have been reported in the metropolitan area this year and additional staff has been employed to carry out the necessary eradication and preventive programme. The sum of \$280 000 for this purpose is included in the supplementary salaries and wage provision in addition to the \$70 000 for over-award and leave-loading payments previously described.

Railways: Some additional operating costs will be incurred in coping with the unusually high loadings I mentioned earlier, and \$600 000 is included in the salaries and wages provision to meet the cost of overtime, giving a total, including over-award and service payments and leave loading, of \$2 065 000. The increase in costs (other than overtime) as a result of larger volumes carried is relatively insignificant.

Minister of Community Welfare—Miscellaneous—Payment of portion of pensioners' rates and taxes: The Budget introduced in August included a programme of rates and taxes remissions for pensioners under which those people in possession of a pensioner concession card would be entitled to a 50 per cent remission of corporation and district council rates, water and sewerage rates and land tax up to certain maximum limits. It was pointed out to the Government after the Budget had been brought down that increases in valuation and higher rates in the dollar of valuation had resulted in some pensioners receiving little effective remission as compared with the previous year, and, after consideration, the Government decided to increase the remission to 60 per cent.

Originally, it was intended that the cost of this programme would be recorded as a payment in respect of local government rates but as a reduction in the revenue received from water and sewerage rates and land tax. I consider now that a more accurate view of the Government's income-generating services, taxation measures and welfare provisions would be given if the amounts remitted were appropriated in the welfare area of the Budget and the requisite transfers made to revenue receipts. In the August Budget, the reimbursement of corporations and councils for rates remitted by them was included under "XIII—Minister of Transport and Minister of Local Government—Miscellaneous" but, in line with the proposal to show the cost of the other two parts of the programme under "Community Welfare", this section is to be moved also.

Some \$2 830 000 of the estimate now shown, then, will have no net effect on the Budget result since it was brought to account in other areas during the preparation of the Estimates. The subsequent 10 per cent increase and experience to date in the operation of the programme have been considered when framing this latest estimate, however, and the provision is now increased to a total of \$3 200 000.

Hospitals: In addition to the \$1 080 000 for service and over-award payments and leave loading, \$1 100 000 is provided to cover higher fees for visiting medical specialists and other payments for which alternative appropriation authorities are either not available or insufficient. Also, the department has found that general cost increases on hospitals contingencies items have been running at about double the 8 per cent used to frame the original Budget and a further \$1 250 000 will be needed to cover

these increases. The total provision in the Supplementary Estimates for the Hospitals Department is therefore \$3 430 000.

Minister of Health—Miscellaneous: Similar wage and salary adjustments and cost increases have, of course, impacted on the budgets of those hospitals and institutions which are in receipt of Government grants and it is not expected that they will be able to carry the burden of these extra costs until the end of the year. The provision of \$1 500 000 made here will enable the Government, after examination of individual Budget trends, to pay appropriate additional amounts periodically by way of grant and so ensure that the efficiency of the subsidized hospitals and institutions does not deteriorate because of cash shortages.

As to the clauses of the Bill, they give the same kinds of authority as in the past. Clause 2 authorizes the issue of a further \$17 670 000 from the general revenue. Clause 3 appropriates that sum for the purposes set out in the schedule. Clause 4 provides that the Treasurer shall have available to spend only such amounts as are authorized by a warrant from His Excellency the Governor and that the receipts of the payees shall be accepted as evidence that the payments have been duly made. Clause 5 gives power to issue money out of Loan funds, other public funds or bank overdraft, if the moneys received from the Australian Government and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to meet the payments authorized by this Bill.

Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1973. Clause 7 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly appropriated.

Dr EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The Treasurer has attempted to gloss over the fact that his budgeting has for certain reasons been very close to exact; I am referring to the deficit of \$11 250 000 expected to apply at the end of the 12-monthly period. He indicated that there had been increases not only in expenditure but also in income. In fact, he accepted and acknowledged the claim made against him when the Estimates were considered last September. It was indicated then that the Estimates were based on inflation, and it was assumed that inflation would have to continue unimpeded if the State was to be able to carry out the programme outlined. We have seen in the details given this evening that we in this State are able to meet the majority of the increased costs, because there has been a rapid escalation of salaries and wages, as a result of which the income to the Treasury has been greater. The Treasurer has pinpointed the fact that there has been an increase in pay-roll tax. This means that moves made by him and supported by many of his colleagues have been adversely affecting the ability of industry in this State to compete in interstate markets. As a result of the increased expenditure announced by the Treasurer since the last Budget and the expenditure detailed in the Supplementary Estimates, we in South Australia are seeing a further erosion of our ability to meet the challenge across the border.

The community also has to face increases in transfer fees and other costs associated with land transactions. These are only some of the many areas where actions taken by the Government have increased the cost of living to every man, woman and child in South Australia. The increased costs have related to essential services; for example, water rates, sewerage rates, electricity charges, and mortgage charges. The brunt of these charges is being met by what the Treasurer has frequently termed the small man. Let us bear in mind that the Treasurer has also

referred to the tall poppies that must be lopped off. That situation will never arise. Certainly it will not arise while the Treasurer and his Government are willing to approve the type of salary increases that they have approved for high-ranking officers in the State Public Service. I do not say that I am averse to the increases granted, as I realize that, in order to keep these people in the Public Service, salaries and conditions in this State must compare favourably with those in other States and in the general business community. However, I point out that the emotional claim often made about trimming the tall poppies and applying the same standard to everyone is without foundation. The Treasurer realizes that this ambition cannot be achieved; his policies over the years have not attempted to achieve it.

The cost involved in providing essential services is creating a major problem, as the working man is affected. It is interesting to compare actual costs with earlier announcements made. When the Treasurer introduced over-award and service payments, reducing the margin between skilled and unskilled workers, we said that this would bring about industrial unrest and difficulties within the service. Only a week or 10 days ago, in reply to a question the Treasurer spoke about the difficulty in relating conditions of skilled and unskilled labourers, other than those working for the South Australian Railways, with similar workmen in the other States. The difficulties brought about by the Treasurer's action on an earlier occasion are markedly illustrated in the requirement this year for these payments. In his explanation, the Treasurer states:

In the current year the cost is expected to be about \$5 000 000, of which about \$3 500 000 will impact directly on revenue and about \$1 500 000 on other accounts including the Loan Account, the road funds, the forestry fund and various departmental reimbursement and working accounts.

I suggest that this is just the tip of the iceberg. Certainly, in the next financial measure introduced by the Treasurer we will find marked changes with regard to the funds required to meet over-award and service payments, this problem having been brought about by an earlier decision of this Government.

Last October, it was announced that the Government had approved an annual leave loading for all daily-paid and weekly-paid employees. I do not oppose the introduction of this loading right across the board, not only in this State but elsewhere as well. However, I should like to know from the Treasurer how many daily-paid employees there are in this State. I should like to know how the present number of these employees compares with the number in each of the years between 1970 and 1973. Last week, figures given in reply to a question indicated that there were fewer of these employees now. About four weeks before that, when an inquiry was made of the responsible department, the inquirer was told that it was almost impossible to obtain the figures. Indeed, he was told to telephone a series of departments, asking each department how many daily-paid employees it had. By adding up the various figures, he could arrive at the total number of such employees in this State. The expense involved in employing people on a daily-payment basis, as opposed to employing a permanent work force, can be examined in many areas. A case in point is the work being done in this building at present. There is an urgent need for the Government to reappraise the situation in relation to daily-paid employees, and to re-examine the cost of altering buildings. It should look at its method of accepting tenders, and it should consider the use of expensive materials and other

commodities, as well as the overall position of daily-paid employees.

Mr Payne: What do you suggest?

Dr. EASTICK: The honourable member can suggest what he likes later. I suggest that there is a need for reappraisal.

Mr. Payne: Tell us the ones you'd sack.

Dr. EASTICK: That interjection suggests that the only interest there could be in reappraisal is in sacking.

Mr. Mathwin: That's a favourite word.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes. The Minister of Transport has told us that he does not believe in sacking employees, yet he has reappraised his attitude in the case of the Islington workshops by not replacing people who resign or retire. The member for Mitchell must agree that that is a starting point. The honourable member should also consider the statements in the Commonwealth Parliament of his Commonwealth colleague the Minister for Labour about the need to retrain certain people to change their occupation, so that there can be more purposeful and meaningful employment of people in areas in which they are required. What I was saying a few moments ago is in line with the programme that the honourable member's Commonwealth colleague is preaching about. There is a vital need for this Government (and the Parliament if necessary) to look at means of getting the maximum value for every dollar spent.

I do not blame individual workmen for the situation obtaining in many Government projects at present, where they have no incentive or opportunity to work meaningfully or productively. This matter could be debated for a long time. I have highlighted the expense that this State must incur on what I consider to be an unnecessary luxury daily employment that would be better stood aside and replaced by a more productive work output. I accept the need for the passage of this Bill, the progress of which I do not intend to impede any more than by the remarks I have made. I emphasize, however, that it is necessary in the best interests of the people of this State, in view of the costs they are being asked to bear and the escalation in costs that is occurring as a result of inflation, which neither the State Government nor the Commonwealth Government is attempting to control—

Mr. Mathwin: It's galloping inflation.

Dr. EASTICK: That is so. The honourable member can use as many similar adjectives as he likes to describe it.

Mr. Mathwin: What about "streaking"?

Dr. EASTICK: It is a bare fact that members, as a competent group of people, must look to alternative methods so that we can maintain the type of service that both Parties in this Chamber would like to see in South Australia, but at a cost which the people can bear and which will not reduce one's spending power or one's pleasure in making use of those services.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill, which involves an expenditure of about \$17 600 000. One would have expected the Bill to be in the same form as previous similar Bills as, indeed, it is. Before I saw this document, I asked a question regarding the possible position of this State's Revenue Account. I asked what would be the position regarding the estimated \$11 250 000 deficit which was forecast when the Estimates were introduced in about last September or October. The Treasurer said that, taking into account some imponderable matters, that forecast would be fairly correct at about the end of this financial year. One can see why this is so. Although the Government has been faced with certain additional

expenses, some of which were allowed for, the Treasurer, in forecasting the deficit of \$11 250 000, went to great pains to state that an intelligent guess was being made regarding the likely effects of wage increases, and so on. However, that guess will be fairly near the mark. One also finds that several items of income have exceeded expectations. Why, therefore, should we have this deficit?

Obviously, the matter of inflation, to which the Leader of the Opposition referred, is one of the important factors to be considered. Three areas of finance (that is, payroll tax, stamp duty and increases in interest income) are greatly affected, the first of which is having a marked effect on the community, particularly the private sector. Of course, every increase granted by tribunals in awards means more payroll tax for the Treasurer of this State and, indeed, more income tax for the Commonwealth Treasurer. They are the cold, hard facts of life. The Opposition expects that the \$11 250 000 deficit will be met by certain inflationary measures that are occurring in the community and that the Government believes it would certainly be in its interest to perpetuate those measures.

Mr. Gunn: You'd be right, too.

Mr. COURCE: Also, there appear to be one or two curious statements in the second reading explanation, one of which relates to the treatment of water, to which the member for Alexandra so pertinently referred this evening. This involves expenditure of \$400 000 for the treatment of water affected by the algae that have crept into our reservoirs as a result of the reduced pumping from the Murray River. The Treasurer also said that the Government would save considerably on the pumping of water. He referred to the normal provision for the pumping of water, stating that a certain amount was allowed for this item in September but that the position appears to have been relieved considerably. But how much will the Government save in this respect? Although this is only a relatively small item, the Government does not say how much it will save.

The Leader also referred to wage increases, to which a significant part of the Bill relates. Earlier this session the Treasurer made a stab (and I agree that he was prudent in this respect) at what wage increases would amount to during the financial year. We have seen the effects of the national wage case and other wage increases, on top of which have been granted over-award payments and increased leave loadings. A little more than a week ago I asked a question regarding wage increases, particularly regarding over-award payments, when the Premier told me that he could not say what the exact position was. I asked whether he could give me a firm indication of what over-award payments and leave loadings the Government had decided to award to daily and weekly-paid employees. The Treasurer also said that he had not received any official information from the Trades and Labor Council. The only conclusion one can draw from that is that he is obviously waiting to hear from his masters regarding what should happen.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That's rubbish, and you know it.

Mr. COURCE: That is the obvious interpretation that one can place on that statement.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: To the contrary. When you make an offer, you generally wait to see if it is accepted; otherwise you are not party to a negotiation.

Mr. COURCE: Then you would be in real trouble.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No. The original offer was first rejected and then accepted. I do not know what this "masters" business is. It is all baloney.

Mr. COURCE: As can be seen from *Hansard*, the Treasurer said:

As I have not had any official information from the Trades and Labor Council concerning the matter we have under discussion, I cannot tell the honourable member what is the final result.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: And that's right.

Mr. COURCE: That was the position about seven days ago. We now find there is an answer, and that the amount is to be about \$10 000 000 in over-award and service payments in a full year.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I do not know how this "master" business comes in. An offer was made and considered.

Mr. COURCE: The Treasurer can make his peace with the people I have been referring to.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I already have. It is just you who have suggested this: I have not.

Mr. COURCE: We have got out of the Treasurer today that it will cost about \$10 000 000 in a full year, but I also asked in that question, which I believed to be important and pertinent, whether the differential for skills would be maintained. I understand that this was one of the contentious issues at stake. As regards margins, it has always been my philosophy that a tradesman should be rewarded for the training and skill he has acquired, and I have always supported the maintaining of a differential for skills in various awards. I should like to hear from the Treasurer, when he replies, what he considers is the real effect of the amount agreed upon and whether the differential for skills has been maintained. I hope it has.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It has been increased.

Mr. COURCE: I shall be delighted to hear the details.

Dr. Eastuck: That is because the Government went overboard before.

Mr. COURCE: It is then said that the leave loading has been extended to Government employees (excluding teachers, of course) but a number of Government employees have expressed some concern at why the \$7 500 cut-off level was arrived at. I notice there was a sliding scale to be applied to the leave loading. I shall be interested to hear from the Treasurer about this figure that has been arrived at. From what I have been saying, one may infer that I am against leave loadings, but I make clear that in this regard with any Government, and especially in the circumstances that the Treasurer outlined to me in his reply—on railways, a point that he emphasized—there must be some parity; otherwise, there will be much industrial strife. When tribunals hand down proper awards, that parity must be maintained, and it is the right of any individual or organization to make application in the proper way.

I point out in the interests of the community that someone has to pay for these items, and it will be you and I and all the taxpayers in this State who will have to pay. The over-award and service payments will be about \$10 000 000, and the leave loading will be about \$3 250 000 in a full year. There is only one other matter to which I wish to refer now, and that is under the heading "Community welfare", which is expanding considerably. We are dealing in this Bill with the remission of rates and taxes, which in the various categories outlined is a useful exercise. What is now proposed is that they all be collated under the heading "Community welfare". To me, this appears to be logical and a much better system of control and book-keeping, but I presume that this Bill legalizes the position where this Parliament has voted moneys under specific lines before, under the original Estimates, which were brought into Parliament.

I support the new system of book-keeping and payments under the heading "Community welfare". It seems to me that, instead of three or four departments controlling it, one department will handle it. Getting back to the whole premise of this Bill, it is a Bill that provides for over \$17 000 000 in Supplementary Estimates, and the reason why we have been able to keep the deficit to the original estimate is simply that inflation has brought into this State, on the income side, far greater amounts of money than we originally estimated, and they have been offset by certain items; but, in the end result, it is inflation that enables the Estimates to be met.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I shall not delay the passage of this Bill but I must support the remarks made by the Leader and the Deputy Leader. It seems to me that in presenting this statement the Treasurer is too proud of the fact that we are to receive \$3 500 000 more than we were to have received from the Commonwealth, because of the increased wages and salaries now pertaining in this State. I welcome this, as the Treasurer has indicated in his statement, but I do not think it is anything to be too proud of, because I do not like the inflationary situation in this State and this country. It is reflected by the higher rates of interest now payable as outlined at page 11 of the Treasurer's statement. It covers the leave loadings and over-award payments, which have been set out under almost every heading, but it makes no allowance for the people on fixed incomes, for what I have previously called the "little people". I do not say that at all derogatorily. They have given of their best to this country, have worked for this country, and now have retired on fixed incomes or pensions. These are the people who are disadvantaged every time a document of this sort is brought before this House. These are people who, having paid their fair share in their day, are no longer getting value for the money on which they are now retired.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They are not at a disadvantage but at a signal advantage.

Dr. TONKIN: It is nothing to be proud of. It is an inflationary document.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No.

Dr. TONKIN: The Supplementary Estimates are based on inflation. This does nothing at all to reassure the people of Australia or of South Australia that inflation is being controlled by any action of this Government or the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: How can the Supplementary Estimates control inflation? You are hawking

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): To budget for a deficit in a time of inflation, as we have in Australia today, is bad management by the Treasurer. He is smiling but he has said this himself many times in the past. What should we do to keep the economy going? Surely in a State where there is a red-hot economy and an excessive demand for goods, it is wise husbandry on the part of the Treasurer to keep his expenditure down to the income he has. We have had the great example of Sir Thomas Playford who, for many years, managed the economy of this State so wisely. In times such as these, he put a little away into the kitty so that he had it to spend when the economy slackened. This is what worries me at the moment: we have in this economy a rise in taxation through the volume of business done.

If we run into a slight recession in South Australia, it is inevitable, unless we get a better system of management at the Commonwealth level, that our revenue instead of being increased by \$6 000 000 over the first seven or eight months of the year will decline by about that amount, and the Treasurer of the day will be in a most difficult

situation. When he should be spending more money to get things kicking along, he will have to pull in his horns. We should not budget for a deficit under present conditions. During the past year or two the Treasurer has claimed that he would have a deficit, and then, through money received in grants or in some other way, he has more or less balanced the Budget. I cannot say whether that will happen this year, but there is a likelihood of it.

We were told that, if we changed the Commonwealth Government, money would pour into the State's coffers and everything would go well. However, I have reports by the Treasurer, made in 1973 and 1974, and, despite the higher rate of inflation in Australia, the percentage increase in the amount received from the Commonwealth Government has decreased rather than increased. It may be said that we have received an increased amount for education, but part of that money will go towards eliminating university fees and that money is of no direct assistance to the State. Therefore, this year we are receiving less from the Commonwealth Government than we have received in previous years, having regard to the reduced value of money during this period.

This year receipts to the end of January have exceeded payments by \$500 000 more than in the same period last year, so possibly we will not be in such a precarious position as the Treasurer forecast. From January, 1973, to January, 1974, the surplus in Loan Fund declined by \$1 400 000 and we hope that trust funds will not have to be used to finance the deficit. The Treasurer told me, in reply to a question, that there was a much bigger demand for Loan funds at the end of a financial year. If that is the position this year, our finances could be in a serious situation.

It has been stated that the railway revenue increased because of the cartage of grain, but railway expenditure has increased rapidly and for the first seven months of this year an additional loss of more than \$3 000 000 has been incurred on railway workings. I do not want to argue about whether employees should receive additional service pay or over-award payments, but this loss will increase during the next five months and the total working loss on the railways will increase. Until someone takes action regarding the railways (and the present Minister of Transport will not do this) the people of South Australia or, to a certain extent, of Australia will be expected to pay more and more taxation to meet the accumulated losses.

If we are to have co-ordination of road transport, let us hope that the present transport system, which is making a profit without being a drain on State finances, is not placed in a position similar to that of the private bus lines, which have had to ask to be taken over. That has added to the financial loss. We have budgeted to give \$1 650 000 to the Municipal Tramways Trust for the take-over of the private bus lines and next year the cost will be between \$3 000 000 and \$4 000 000. For how long can we expect the taxpayers to make up the losses on a service used by someone else?

In the first seven months of the year, \$20 000 000 more was received in taxation than was received last year. January may have been a good month for stamp duty, and pay-roll tax receipts were \$5 600 000. If that rate is maintained, we will receive much more in pay-roll tax than the Treasurer has suggested this evening. That is an inflationary tax and it will not be paid by the companies and people employing labour. With the present economic position that the Commonwealth Government has got us into, companies can make larger profits than previously

and there is not the same need for efficiency and competition. Therefore, inflation will increase.

It is a bad economic practice to budget for a deficit in times such as these and the Treasurer should restrain his hand-outs to certain societies. I am not saying that the groups should not have assistance when the time is ripe and the money is available, but we must work out our priorities, and this Government, in spending much of this money, is not working out its priorities correctly. It has been stated that \$3 200 000 will be required to pay part of pensioners' rates and taxes, and I support this action. It is assistance from the State Government to those who have saved money and have bought a house and property, whereas the Commonwealth Government's attitude is that, if a person rents a house, he should get an extra payment.

It is difficult to understand why the amount of payment has been increased from 50 per cent to 60 per cent. The payments will involve much book-keeping, and councils will be put to expense. I understand that the Unley council must send out 6 200 refunds, and many staff and much paper will be required to do this. The Minister of Transport has stated that these refunds must be paid by cheque, but surely it would not be a hardship on these people if the small amount of credit was carried forward and set off against the payment for the next year. I refer now to the supplementary amount provided for the Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Forests for salaries and wages. From speaking to people in the Agriculture Department, I understand that there is much dissatisfaction and frustration with the present Government and its administration. The staff have no defined future. I think only one or two of the senior officers in the department have read the Callaghan report. Many highly trained officers are employed in this department, and occasionally they receive a visitor from the Treasurer's Department inquiring about an agricultural problem. They report on this matter using the benefit of their knowledge, but that is the last the officers hear of the matter. This sort of thing is not good for the morale of members of the department.

Whether this department should be moved to Monarto I shall not argue, but obviously a new Motor Vehicles Department building should not be erected in Wakefield Street at which locality there is insufficient parking space. This department could be transferred to Monarto without inconveniencing the public. An office could be retained in Adelaide at which people could pay their fees, but a small staff only would be required. Many applications for registration are now received by mail, and a move of this department would not inconvenience most people. However, the Agriculture Department has many sections located in different parts of the city and has facilities at Northfield, so perhaps the Government has chosen the wrong department to move to Monarto. We know that we must support the Government's financial commitments, but we need not necessarily agree with what has been done.

The Government is making a mistake in budgeting for a deficit in these times and conditions. If there is a slight recession next year, the Government could be in difficulties. The Commonwealth Government has spent already many more millions of dollars than it has received, a situation that has caused inefficiency and has reduced living standards throughout Australia. The State Government should not add to the difficulties of this country at present.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill, but I emphasize that we are faced with what one could call demand inflation. The Commonwealth Government bene-

fits from inflation, because it reaps increased taxation from any wage increases.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the second reading explanation of this Appropriation Bill, and ask him to confine his remarks to matters dealing with the appropriation of money for Government departments in this State. Reference to Commonwealth taxation is not allowed.

Mr. MATHWIN: I was referring to the second reading explanation which states:

High levels are of course a reflection of the general inflationary trend in the economy.

Dr. Eastick: Why not quote from page three, which states:

This can be attributed largely to higher interest rates prevailing as a result of the Australian Government's initiatives in financial policy in September and October last.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Leader that the member for Glenelg has the floor, and I ask that honourable member to deal with the appropriation of moneys for State Government departments.

Mr. MATHWIN: It seems to me that every page of the second reading explanation refers to wage increases and extra leave loadings, and to inflation. Those troubled by inflation are pensioners and persons living on fixed incomes, plus the lower-income group. They suffer most in inflationary conditions, and we should be concerned about them. I believe that one man's wage increase is another man's price increase. I agree with what the member for Heysen said about the rebate of council rates, water and sewerage rates, and land tax. The Treasurer stated in his policy speech for the last election that he would allow a 50 per cent remission on these charges, but he has now, at this time of the year, increased this rebate by 10 per cent to make it a 60 per cent remission. However, the Minister of Local Government has demanded that all councils send cheques for that additional 10 per cent to those affected. Many elderly people live in the area of Brighton, Glenelg, and Marion, and sending these cheques for such a small amount will involve much work for the councils. Would it not have been far easier for the Minister to agree that a credit for the extra 10 per cent could be made in connection with next year's rate assessment? I have been told that that has happened in connection with water rates and sewerage rates. Yet the Minister has forced councils to send out a cheque to every person eligible for the extra 10 per cent concession. I register my disapproval of the Minister's action in this respect (not the extra concession), and let us bear in mind the administrative and postal costs that are involved. I conclude by reminding members that these Supplementary Estimates will be inflationary.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): In about 1962 the Government of the day, through the Agriculture Department, established an artificial breeding board, one of the functions of which was to conduct surveys in country areas and engage officers to carry out the work. In the past eleven years the board's operations have cost \$250 000 over and above the returns from the services made available to the rural community. There is utter confusion in the organization I have referred to. Some officers have left its employment and set up in opposition to it in the Adelaide Hills. As a result, the board has been made ineffective, and the employees still with the board have been burdened with extremely long hours. One of the officers stationed in the Myponga district claims that he is not being fairly paid, and he is unable to get satisfaction from the officers in charge of the department.

Before further funds are directed to the Agriculture Department an inquiry should be made into the operations and effectiveness of the artificial breeding board. I have also been informed by the same source only today that we cannot refer in detail to recent activities of the board because the Director of Agriculture, Mr. Marshall Irving, has not yet provided a report on the operations of the department for the year 1972-1973. One wonders why there has been a lack of information. I repeat that the Government should conduct an inquiry into the activities of the artificial breeding board.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The Government is still enjoying the benefits of revenue from a large volume of land conveyancing and mortgage transactions. When we were asked to consider legislation controlling the price of land, we were told that it would be effective, but this has not happened. We challenged the Estimates in relation to the amount that the Government would receive from pay-roll tax. If ever the previous Commonwealth Government handed out a generous tax to the States, it was the pay-roll tax. Here again, the States have been provided with a means of obtaining additional revenue. Pay-roll tax has affected the whole community, because it cannot be absorbed by industry and must be passed on in the form of price increases. The State has benefited by between \$8 000 000 and \$9 000 000 as a result of the additional income received from mortgage transactions and pay-roll tax.

Income received by the Railways Department has increased by about \$2 500 000 as a result of a reasonably good harvest last year. The buoyant rural economy has certainly assisted the railways, because of the greater quantities of goods that have been carried to and from rural areas. The long-term debts of the railways have affected the overall financial performance of that department, but we must bear in mind that the railways can trade reasonably efficiently. I believe that from time to time that department has been unfairly criticized in connection with its overall financial result. The State has to contribute \$30 000 000 towards the department's deficit, but actually the trading operations of the railways are nowhere near as poor as that. The financial results of the railways have been adversely affected by the huge amount of capital involved and the interest thereon. In his explanation, the Treasurer states:

Interest earned on cash balances not immediately required may return about \$1 000 000 more than the estimate included in the Budget.

In other words, the State receives money from various avenues of tax raising and, in line with this Budget, at times has a considerable surplus of cash money. In the same way as private enterprise operates, the Treasurer invests the surplus money on the short-term money market. It is interesting to note that the Treasurer has admitted that the State will benefit by \$1 000 000 in this area alone. He said that this could be attributed to the higher interest rates resulting from the initiative of the Australian Government in its financial policy in September and October of last year. If the Australian Government had acted responsibly and tried to control inflation, this is an area in which it could have taken action. Although the increase in interest rates may be fortunate in one sense for the South Australian Government, the community generally will suffer because of the high inflation rate. Young people who want to borrow money to build houses have been affected, as have all forms of industry.

The Government has also been affected, with the result that we have to authorize about \$17 000 000 in this Bill. Therefore, I am surprised that the Treasurer is delighted

with this policy of the Commonwealth Government, as it has created inflation at a level as high as 13½ per cent, the highest rate for many years. In this document, we find that the bulk of the expenditure will be needed to take care of salary increases. No-one will deny that this is necessary, as we must keep pace with inflation. However, unfortunately no-one is acting responsibly in trying to curb inflation, and the lead should come from the Commonwealth Government. Although the Commonwealth Government will offer money to the State Government and local government, the Government and councils will have to match those special payments according to some formula that will be devised. This all creates extra pressure on our Budget. I appeal to members of this House and of the Australian Government to reconsider the whole financial policy so that inflation may be tackled. The first step is to reduce interest rates.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Schedule.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to honourable members that debate must be confined strictly to the matters dealt with in the schedule and must not develop into a general debate on the headings.

Police, \$350 000.

Dr EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I believe that the bonus payments to the Police Force of \$100 000 are well merited. I suggest to the Government that, during the forthcoming Easter holidays, the Police Force should be given the opportunity to exercise the same sort of control and surveillance as was exercised over the Christmas holidays and on previous occasions. The work of the police had the effect of reducing the number of accidents. Although accidents will never end, special surveillance on the roads is helpful at times of maximum risk. When Prince Philip was here recently extra police were required for surveillance. Subsequently, to maintain police surveillance of Parliament House, it was necessary to take policemen out of patrol cars, leaving the patrol cars in the depot yard. I appreciate the need to have policemen on duty at Parliament House whenever Parliament is sitting. It is unfortunate if we take policemen away from essential patrols. Perhaps it would be possible to use special constables or people with special training and so relieve the requirement on the Police Force to provide the officers needed at Parliament House. I would appreciate information from the Treasurer about this. This matter is closely linked with the need to have police officers on patrol exercising surveillance, and therefore effectively helping to prevent road accidents.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I do not know offhand, but I will find out.

Mr. BECKER: I endorse the Leader's comments regarding the State's road toll. Perhaps the blitz carried out at Christmas should be carried out every day. Unfortunately, however, we do not have enough patrol cars or policemen to enable this to be done. This State has already had 70 road deaths this year and, if fatalities continue to occur at this rate, 400 people, or 100 more than the normal average, will have died on our roads this year. Even at this late stage of the financial year, could not the number of patrol cars, particularly unmarked patrol cars (of which, despite statements to the contrary, I believe we have none at present), and policemen be increased? Although I know it will place a strain on the State's Budget, I make the suggestion in an attempt to reduce South Australia's road toll.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot increase Police Department expenditure without going further into deficit or raising additional taxes beyond those contemplated this year.

Dr. Eastick: Or altering priorities

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader wants me to tax road users more heavily, that is up to him. If members want expenditure in certain areas increased, it is up to them to suggest where the finance should come from.

Mr. Mathwin: Have we any Q cars at present?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member advocates additional imposts on road users for the purpose of increasing patrols on the road, that will be noted.

Line passed

Treasurer, Miscellaneous, \$1 400 000.

Mr. BECKER: The sum of \$350 000 is provided for expenses incurred in relation to conversion and public loans. Can the Treasurer give members more information in this regard?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although I do not have additional figures, I should have thought that the explanation I have already given was clear.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I refer to the contribution towards deficits for the Municipal Tramways Trust, in relation to which the Treasurer referred to the takeover of private bus services. Earlier I asked the Treasurer whether the Government would again consider allowing Lewis Brothers, which originally operated the service to Weapons Research Establishment, to increase its fares on that run.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! This line has nothing to do with the takeover of the private bus service to W.R.E. As it refers only to a contribution towards the deficit, I cannot permit the honourable member to continue in that vein.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Treasurer's second reading explanation clearly refers to the costs associated with the takeover of private bus services.

The CHAIRMAN: It deals not with fares or the takeover of private bus services but with wages.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It deals with increases in wages paid. Because more buses are operating, more people must be paid. I sought information in regard to the number of buses being operated because the number could be reduced if the original service provided by Lewis Brothers was allowed to operate with a fare increase. It is therefore reasonable to ask whether the Government has considered the request made by Lewis Brothers to the trust for a fare increase so that it can continue profitably to run the original service from the eastern suburbs to Weapons Research Establishment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter of the service to Weapons Research Establishment is being considered, but no final decision has been taken.

Mr. EVANS: The Treasurer's second reading explanation refers to changes to the Metal Trades Award and costs associated with the takeover of private bus services. Do the costs to which the Treasurer referred relate to over-award payments to drivers, or administrative costs over and above those normally incurred in the private sector? To what costs was he referring?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The takeover of private buses by the M.T.T. means that the drivers previously employed by private companies will now be under the M.T.T. award, which is markedly better than that of the transport workers under which they would previously have been working.

Mr. EVANS: The words "award" and "costs" have been used. Does this mean that the costs are different from

costs normally associated with the award, or have both words been used to describe the same thing?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The phrase "flow-ons from changes to the Metal Trades Award" refers to those employees of the M.T.T. who are employed under the Metal Trades Award or those awards that flow on from it: that phrase refers to the previously existing employees of the M.T.T. The phrase "the costs associated with the takeover of private bus services" refers to a number of payments including award payments to private bus employees. Payments of this kind are made in relation to transfers and the like in connection with the takeover of services.

Mr. Evans: I wondered what those words referred to.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member wants those figures, I shall try to get them for him.

Mr. BECKER: In reply to my earlier question, the Treasurer said that his original statement was self-explanatory, but it is vague because here we are considering a provision of \$350 000 compared to a provision of \$400 000 in a whole year. Can the Treasurer say what this amount would be and how that compares with the previous eight months of this financial year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not the figure but will get it for the honourable member.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Treasurer say why an additional amount of \$350 000 is required for the conversion of public loans and why interest on trust funds and other moneys requires an additional amount of \$450 000, which makes \$800 000 in all, almost \$1 000 000? Does he consider that compatible with the statement he made when explaining the Bill that the increase in the amount received by virtue of an increase in interest rates obtained as revenue "can be attributed largely to higher interest rates prevailing as a result of the Australian Government's initiatives in financial policy in September and October last"? We have lost in one sense and gained in another. One can hardly say that the initiative gained by the Commonwealth Government in raising the interest rate is of any benefit to the people of this State or to Australians generally.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not suggest anything of the kind.

Dr. Eastick: You were trying to gloss the cake over.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not consider it a gloss. I was simply referring to the fact that the Australian Government had taken this action and that it had had those consequences.

Line passed.

Lands, \$80 000—passed.

Engineering and Water Supply, \$1 000 000.

Mr. CUMBE: This department obviously employs many daily and weekly-paid employees. Can the Treasurer give me the information I sought earlier on the rates that were agreed on for over-award payments? Also, has the differential in margins for skill been retained?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position is that the first-year tradesman will now go to a combined over-award and service payment of \$16.70; in the second year to \$19.15; and in the third year to \$21.50. The non-tradesman in the first year will go to \$13.50, in the second year to \$15.95, and in the third year to \$18.30. That is an application to South Australia of the Victorian increases on the existing payments made in over-award and service pay in South Australia.

Dr. Eastick: How were they arrived at?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In South Australia the Government has adopted the attitude that, if it is paying over-award and service payments to railway employees,

that should apply to all weekly-paid employees in its service. That is not the case in Victoria. As to the differential, I point out that the effect of the application of the Victorian increases to the existing South Australian position is to increase the differential between tradesmen and non-tradesmen.

Dr. Eastick: Can you give the specific differential?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have given the actual figures.

Dr. EASTICK: What is the actual figure? I think the Treasurer will agree that on a previous rearrangement of skilled and unskilled wages the Government created a situation in which the differential between the two, at every level of employment, was \$1.50. I suspect from the figures just read out that there is a variable figure that applies for the various years of service, that figure not being the same in each case. What is the difference between the one-year, two-year, and three-year levels?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The first-year non-tradesman gets \$13.50, and the tradesman gets \$16.70. The second-year non-tradesman gets \$15.95, and the tradesman \$19.15. The third-year non-tradesman gets \$18.30 and the tradesman \$21.50.

Dr. Eastick: That is a consistent differential of \$3.20.

Line passed.

Public Buildings, \$650 000.

Mr. BECKER: I refer to the higher costs incurred for office accommodation leased for use by departments. Has the Treasurer the break-down of that figure? Have higher office accommodation costs been incurred because of the increase in the number of portfolios and a new department, or does this refer mainly to the Education Department?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The money for the Education Department is a significant amount. The Education Department is out of its building and in leased accommodation. There are minor cases where we have had to get additional accommodation. I have not the break-down of that figure.

Line passed.

Minister of Education, Miscellaneous, \$3 470 000—passed

Agriculture, \$350 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I seek information about the fruit fly outbreaks and the eradication programme. Much finance is being allocated for the control of fruit fly. It is most unfortunate there have been so many outbreaks this year in the metropolitan area. Four have been reported, and a fifth has occurred in the north-eastern suburbs. How effective is the new technique, and what is the saving in cost compared with the cost of the former technique? It is important that this State continue to maintain an effective control of fruit fly. News released recently indicated that the New South Wales Government would have to spend about \$1 000 000 in compensation and eradication costs incurred in combating the outbreak of fruit fly in the Murrumbidgee area. Unfortunately, some people in the Adelaide metropolitan area are at present hampering the officers dealing with fruit fly eradication, and this attitude is shortsighted. If they appreciated the overall effect that fruit fly would have if it became endemic, I am sure they would co-operate with the Agriculture Department in the eradication programme.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know the reply to the honourable member's question, but I will ask my colleague.

Line passed.

Marine and Harbors, \$105 000—passed.

Highways, \$70 000.

Mr. GUNN: Will the Treasurer ensure that some of this money is spent on the wages of workmen to upgrade the road between Pimba and Andamooka, which is in a bad condition, and the Stuart Highway between Pimba and Coober Pedy? These roads carry a large volume of traffic and both Andamooka and Coober Pedy have been cut off for a long time, causing much inconvenience to residents of those towns. Coober Pedy is the twelfth largest town in South Australia. Further, will the Treasurer say whether the Commonwealth Government will provide funds immediately to seal the Stuart Highway?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think any of these funds will be allocated for the purposes that the honourable member has mentioned but I will try to get a reply for him.

Line passed.

Railways, \$2 065 000—passed.

Minister of Community Welfare, Miscellaneous, \$3 200 000.

Mr. MATHWIN: I understand that the refund to pensioners of water and sewerage rates will be credited to the account for the next year but that councils must send out refund cheques to each person concerned. If councils must do this, will the Treasurer have this position altered, because much work and expenditure are involved in sending out these cheques?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of this administrative arrangement but I will inquire of the Minister of Works, under whose administration this matter comes. Earlier the honourable member referred to the extra 10 per cent remission, and the Government decided on this remission because it was apparent that the valuations of property in the metropolitan area were to some extent depriving pensioners of the real benefit that the Government's original proposal intended to give them. If a rent remission is granted and then the property is revalued upwards so that the total amount of rates is increased, the person concerned does not receive much benefit. On examining the changes in value, it was found that, by granting an extra 10 per cent, we could, on average, provide for the pensioners in real terms the remission that they had expected and had been entitled to expect from the Government's promise last year. Because the valuations were increasing in this way, we called for a report and made the decision. Obviously, this change involves administrative difficulty, but we considered that the benefit to the pensioners was worth it.

Mr. BECKER: I support the Government's action, but I ask whether the present system has been considered. Pensioners with medical concession cards receive this concession but widows who receive a small repatriation pension are excluded and are being discriminated against. Whilst all retired people receiving fixed superannuation should benefit, the real hardship lies on widows. If the Government has not considered this matter, will it do so in future?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The question of bringing widows' pensions within the means test has been considered many times in relation to pensioner concessions given by the South Australian Government. On an examination of the means available, it was thought not proper to do this. Governments of all political complexion in Australia have adopted this attitude.

Dr. EASTICK: Only last week a war widow raised the very point the member for Hanson has raised. There are grave difficulties for a person who has lost her husband under these conditions, and consistently, whether for advantages that may be obtained at the Adelaide festival

theatre or, as in this instance, by way of council rates and water rates, these people are denied the opportunities that other people enjoy. Although Governments of all political Parties may have considered the matter, I would support the Treasurer's obtaining figures on the increased cost or the number of people who would benefit by including war widows. I hope the Treasurer will consider obtaining those details urgently.

The member for Glenelg said that the administration of these remissions was within the province of the Minister of Works. This evening I have received from the Kapunda council a letter pertinent to this issue. The letter states:

The council was recently informed that the pensioner rate concession, introduced this year by the Government, has been increased from 50 per cent to 60 per cent, retrospective to July 1, 1973. As all pensioners have now paid 50 per cent of the current year rates, the Minister of Local Government has directed that the extra 10 per cent be refunded to them in cash. This means council is required to post out approximately 120 cheques for an average of \$2 each.

The letter specifies the Minister of Local Government as being the initiating force in this matter. I think the Treasurer will accept that, whilst the cost involved for a country council in sending out 120 cheques would not be large, the bigger city councils would be involved in a heavy expense. The letter continues:

The council feels this places unnecessary costs upon them at a time when cutting costs is of paramount importance. They feel it would be far simpler for these amounts to be credited against next year's rates. All costs to council have to be met by the ratepayers (including pensioners), so that, naturally, increased costs mean increased rates.

I do not think the Treasurer would quibble with that assumption, and I ask whether he would consider sending a Government directive to councils suggesting that they might decide whether to make the repayment in cash or credit the amount against next years rates

Line passed.

Hospitals, \$3 430 000.

Dr. TONKIN: More than \$1 000 000 is provided for re-engaging visiting medical specialists. As there seems to be doubt about the basis on which visiting medical staff and consultants will be appointed (that is, whether on an individual contract basis under which they are not eligible for annual leave or other benefits or on a regular basis under which they will be eligible for these benefits), has the Treasurer details of the basis on which appointments will be made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN. I do not know offhand, but I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Minister of Health, Miscellaneous, \$1 500 000—passed.

Schedule passed.

Clauses 1 to 7 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1) (1974)

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

That he have leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to apply, out of the general revenue, the sum of \$100 000 000 to the Public Service for the year ending June 30, 1975.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I refer to the subject of pornography, which is a matter requiring the attention of this House, on behalf of the people of South Australia. Last Thursday I asked the Treasurer a question and I was surprised and rather disgusted (as were several other people in the community) at the weak attempt by the Treasurer to denigrate me for having intro-

duced this matter because it was opposed to his views. I appreciate that a person may have different views on these matters, but when such a person tries to introduce a denigrating comment and the suggestion of porno politics and other similar remarks as a result of views expressed in this House, I believe one should draw attention to this fact. The views then expressed by the Treasurer are not the views held by many people in this community. Since last Thursday many people have written letters to me, telephoned me, and communicated directly with me, and others have indicated their views by a letter to the press and by contributions to radio talk-back programmes, all clearly indicating the extreme interest of many thinking people in this community in this matter.

It has been a most interesting revelation of activities being undertaken in the South Australian community by people who fail to accept the general direction that has been given by the Treasurer about the way in which people may distribute, sell, or have in their possession for sale, material of the nature that I highlighted. Also, deficiencies have been indicated that exist in relation to the fate of that material subsequent to its purchase and in relation to the distribution and sale of that material. I have received a letter from a headmaster of one of the northern district primary schools. For obvious reasons I do not identify the school or the name of the headmaster, but the letter is available for any member to see. Dated March 8, 1974, the letter states:

I listened with interest to your interview on *This Day Tonight* concerning availability of pornographic literature to the general public. To substantiate your claim I am posting you under separate cover two papers which I confiscated from 10-year-old children in this school. Each publication was discovered when I investigated groups of children clambering over each other for closer views.

Sent under separate cover was a publication called *Searchlight*, dated March 15, 1973, accompanied by a book *Taboo* (Photo Studies No. 1), available for 75c and containing several pictorial descriptions of lesbian acts. I table these two documents.

The SPEAKER: Order! They cannot be tabled.

Dr. EASTICK: Under what rule?

The SPEAKER: They are publications and not documents, and cannot be tabled.

Dr. EASTICK: That being the case, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how it was that publications were tabled last Thursday.

The SPEAKER: They were not tabled on my instructions: they cannot be tabled.

Dr. EASTICK: The record of *Hansard* clearly indicates that they were tabled.

The SPEAKER: The record of *Hansard* is incorrect, because at the time the Leader offered to table them I said that they were publications and could not be tabled, and they were not tabled.

Dr. EASTICK: With due respect, I indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that the official record shows that they were tabled.

The SPEAKER: The Leader can quote from them, but he cannot table them.

Dr. EASTICK: The record of this House will clearly indicate the fate of the publications to which I referred last Thursday. Today I received information by telephone from a person who is well known to members opposite and who lives in the Salisbury district. This person's husband recently went to a Salisbury hotel to meet friends, and he found within the bar area a child, whom he estimated to be 14 years old, selling newspapers to the hotel patrons: the man, being an ex-schoolteacher, is

experienced at estimating ages. The child had spread out on the floor of the bar a number of publications the titles of which I indicated last week, and the child was selling the publications. He was also reading the publications and he had material on open display.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What was the name of the hotel?

Dr. EASTICK: It was a hotel in Salisbury, and I will give the Premier the name of the person. Last Friday, in the presence of the member for Kavel, the Prime Minister referred to the debate in this House last Thursday and said that he had become aware of the nature of the discussion, I suspect as a result of radio coverage of the subject, although it could have been as a result of newspaper reports. After the Prime Minister had said that he had not been aware that such material was available in the community, I made the material available to him, and I hope he will soon contact me further on the matter.

Mr. Coumbe: Were the publications the same as those you mentioned the other day?

Dr. EASTICK: The material I gave him was identical to the material referred to earlier. As a result of a talk-back programme on the radio last week, it has become apparent that newsagents in this State are being black-mailed into receiving and offering for sale a number of these publications. One newsagent said that, unless he took the material forwarded to him, he would be denied the opportunity of receiving other material that had a large market. This has been confirmed by other people who have subsequently contacted me: unless they accept on consignment a number of these objectionable publications, they are faced with the threat of having supplies of what may be considered the more legitimate material cut off. Although they have the opportunity of returning the objectionable material that is genuinely not sold, if all material of this nature is returned they may have supplies of the other material cut off.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Which distributor is involved?

Dr. EASTICK: This is a completely undesirable situation and, if the Government is at all interested in the matter, it will investigate it and do something about it. In reply to a question last week, the Premier indicated that this objectionable material could be made available subject to its not being within the reach of children and not being available to people under 18 years of age. In his reply the Premier said:

It has been made clear to the publishers, distributors and retailers that, where there is sexually explicit material that may be offensive to any reasonable adult, it may not be placed on public view, available to minors and without warning to adults. If there is warning to adults they cannot very well complain if they go in and have a look at it, any more than a lady could be held properly to complain if she climbed on a box in the kitchen to look out through a window.

A man from Elizabeth South telephoned my office yesterday morning regarding the display of pornographic papers. He went into a Salisbury newsagency on Saturday morning to buy the *Australian Angler* and he noticed a little girl reading a magazine containing nude photographs which had been taken from a rack 18in. (457 mm) from the floor. The gentleman who contacted me is not against such magazines being available to adults, but he believes that they should be available where children cannot read them, and I concur in his attitude. Following the revelations of last Thursday, a gentleman in business in the inner city area adjacent to a delicatessen that sells paperbacks and newspapers indicated that any person could walk in at any time and find this objectionable type of material presented on

a table adjacent to the main counter in full view of children who came in to buy cool drinks, etc. In his observation, on many occasions while waiting for service children read the objectionable publications. That is hardly a very responsible method of presenting this type of material. I will give the Premier the address of the delicatessen where the material is presented in that way.

It is all very well to criticize what is taking place without putting forward a possible solution: I point out that the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs could possibly help in this area. Will the Premier have an investigation undertaken by the Commissioner into this type of material? The price of the material, including that referred to here last week, ranges from 30c to 60c. If other industries must justify their prices, surely the publishers of this objectionable material should be required to justify their prices. It might be argued that to reduce the cost of the publications might make them more readily available. However, I point out that the overall distribution of the material is such that an inflated value is needed to make it worth while to continue its publication and distribution.

On this basis, I seek from the Premier an undertaking that he will ask the Commissioner to look into this matter. Apart from the erotic advertising material (and persons advertise that they are available to others, and include a photograph not of their head and shoulders but of their sexual organs), these publications have only few advertisements. Therefore, considering the cost of production and distribution, the inflated price of the publications is essential if they are to continue to exist. By forcing economies of the type that I suggest may be recommended by the Commissioner, the Government may achieve the removal of this material from bookstalls and delicatessens. As I have said, I believe that, as most members of the general public do not support the Premier's permissive attitude in this connection, they will approve the suggestion I have made.

I now refer to the announcement of the Minister of Local Government that the Government intends to introduce quarterly payments of local government rates. I fully appreciate that the Minister also said that it was not possible for enabling legislation to be prepared in time to be introduced this session. In foreshadowing this action, I believe the Minister has done the Government a grave disservice because what is proposed is against the best interests of local government and the ratepayers of this State. A quarterly billing system will clearly increase the cost of collection, handling and stationery. In addition, it will reduce the income now derived by local government from investing on term deposits funds surplus to immediate needs. Earlier this evening, in his explanation of the Appropriation Bill, the Treasurer said that the Government had improved its financial position by almost \$1 000 000 by investing its funds in a term deposit. Quarterly payment of rates will increase the administrative costs of local government, resulting in a marked increase in costs to the ratepayer. The only alternative to increased costs to the ratepayer would be for local government to reduce the service that it now makes available. There is no other course open to local government. I believe that, before the House meets again, Government members will make sure that this iniquitous provision for the quarterly payment of rates is not introduced.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): Since they were introduced last year, the alterations to the Standing Orders have operated long enough so that members on this side have been able to examine them closely. In some respects, there has been an advantage in the changes, but other changes

have led to disadvantages. In dealing with the effects that the changes have had on Question Time, I speak for all members. With the present time allowed for Questions without Notice, if we divide the 47 members of the House (and I realize that Ministers and you, Mr. Speaker, do not ask questions) into the time available, we arrive at the ludicrous conclusion that, if each member asked a question each day, there would be only 80 seconds available for the question and the reply; that is, 40 seconds for an honourable member to explain and ask his question, and 40 seconds for the reply. Considering the long-windedness of the replies of some Ministers, the time of 40 seconds for a reply is really ridiculous. On several days this year and last year, because of the lack of time available (this has nothing to do with any decision of yours, Mr. Speaker), several members on this side of the House have not received even one call to ask a question.

Dr. Eastick: Even when members opposite didn't ask a question.

Mr. CUMBE: That is a completely ludicrous situation. Although greater use is being made of Questions on Notice, certain types of question cannot be fully explained by that means. A Question without Notice, with the explanation that can be given, is the obvious way of eliciting information. Such questions should be asked in the interests of not only the member but also the constituents on whose behalf the question is asked. What I am saying applies equally to Government back-bench members. I believe that, having had the experience of the change that we have had, we should refer the matter back to the Standing Orders Committee, and I suggest that it is not unreasonable that an extra 15 minutes should be made available for asking Questions without Notice.

I also wish to refer to the matter of urgency motions. For ages, the old 4 o'clock rule operated in this House in relation to such motions. On several occasions, when Opposition members have moved to suspend Standing Orders to enable them to move a motion, in opposing such motions (as he is perfectly entitled to do) the Premier has pointed out that members have other opportunities to bring forward matters of importance. He has almost invited members to raise such matters as urgency motions rather than suspend Standing Orders to raise them. When one examines this matter, one finds that certain opportunities, which have been the basic rights of members, have been whittled away, perhaps by default. The Standing Orders Committee and the House, by default, overlooked this matter when examining the old 4 o'clock rule. In order to retain the fundamental rights of members of raising matters of urgency you, Mr. Speaker, could reintroduce that rule. Under the new system, once the formal business of the day has been dealt with after the Speaker reads prayers at 2 p.m., questions can proceed for one hour only or until 3.15 p.m., whichever is the earlier.

When urgency motions are moved, they cut off at 3.15 p.m. or one hour after the cessation of normal business, whichever is the earlier. This has resulted in a farcical situation. Indeed you, Mr. Speaker, will recall what happened only last week, when we had the ludicrous situation in which an urgency motion was moved and, to enable him to reply, the Premier had to move to suspend Standing Orders. In other words, there was not only insufficient time for a member to support the motion: there was also insufficient time for another member to oppose it, because the time had expired. That is a complete farce, and this cuts completely across the fundamental right of members to raise matters by way of urgency motions if they cannot get Standing Orders suspended. This is certainly a cur-

tailment of free speech. All members should know of the quotation of Voltaire regarding persons being permitted to be heard. The incident to which I referred last week was one on which both sides should have been entitled to be heard. The only way to solve the problem was for the Premier to move the suspension of Standing Orders so that both sides of the argument could be put. This is the fundamental right of all members, and this matter should be corrected. I have referred to the inability of Opposition members and back-bench members generally to get the call from you, Mr. Speaker, to ask a question because enough time is simply not available. The Standing Orders Committee should be convened to examine both these matters as soon as possible and, if necessary, during the recess, it should consider introducing as soon as possible the amendments that I have suggested.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the Deputy Leader. I, too, believe that something should be done about the provision regarding urgency motions moved in this House. I do not believe it was ever intended that they should close off at 3.15 p.m. Although you, Mr. Speaker, and I had a difference of opinion, I agree entirely with the ruling you gave.

The SPEAKER: Order! I allowed a certain amount of latitude to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who sailed fairly close to the wind. However, I cannot allow the honourable member for Bragg to continue along the lines of disputing a decision of this House. If the honourable member disputes a decision of this House, the Speaker can only interpret it accordingly. I cannot allow the honourable member to continue along those lines.

Dr. TONKIN: I hoped you would allow me to explain. Mr. Speaker, because you have obviously misunderstood me. I said that I entirely agreed with the ruling which you gave and which it was your prerogative to give at the time. I agree with the member for Torrens that this matter should be examined by the Standing Orders Committee in order to clarify the situation. I apologize if you, Sir, had the wrong impression but, on reading *Hansard*, you will see that that was the line I was following.

The SPEAKER: Order! *Hansard* is not an official record.

Dr. TONKIN. Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, I refer now to another matter concerning the business of the House, that is, questions and the arrangement of business as presented to members. We find ourselves sitting in this Chamber at nearly 11 p.m. on the first day of the fourth week of sitting, having been subjected to a blast of publicity, in which it was stated that members would be sitting late in this part of the session because they would have so much work to do. However, as is traditional, we found that we did not sit at night in the first week, and we have sat only briefly at night since then. At no time have we sat very late. Then suddenly this week we have seen the introduction of two financial Bills, and we are told that we must sit even later this evening to consider the most important and, indeed, the largest Bill that we will consider in this part of the session. I cannot understand why the business of the House cannot be arranged more equitably or rationally. I do not see why, at such a time of night, members should be forced to consider the Bill which is on the Notice Paper and which, they have been told, will be considered tonight.

I am sure that no-one else in the Parliament wants to spend his time considering that important Bill at this late hour. However, this will not stop members from raising their genuine grievances, because this is the time

when Opposition members can do so. Indeed, it is the only time that they can speak of their grievances, and that is exactly what they are going to do. Nevertheless, I believe a great case can be made out regarding the suggestion made by several of my colleagues that a grievance debate should be held on the motion for adjournment every day of sitting. I wholeheartedly support the suggestions that have been made by my colleagues in this regard, and believe that those suggestions should be referred to the Standing Orders Committee.

Members have lost much of the time in which they can ask questions. As a result, they will have noticed the difference in the Notice Paper, as there has been a great increase in the number of questions asked on notice. All members take the replies to all questions asked on notice as being entirely accurate, and they are told that they should be satisfied with the answers that are given. One honourable member recently asked what check, if any, was made on the accuracy of replies to Questions on Notice before those replies were given, and by whom the check was made. The Premier replied that Questions on Notice were distributed to appropriate Ministerial officers with a request that the replies be provided no later than 9.30 a.m. on Mondays so that they could be considered by Cabinet. The departmental submissions were then settled in Cabinet. Officers of the Premier's Department then transcribed the settled replies to the forms submitted to Parliament, and those typed forms were then checked for typographical errors. However, that does not mean a thing, and it is not an answer to the question that was asked regarding what check, if any, was made regarding the accuracy of the replies. All that the Premier did in answering that question was relate the procedure that was used, he did not in any way say that a check was made; he implied that a check of the accuracy was made but he does not say that it is made.

The matter comes up further in an answer to a question that I placed on notice in this House, which was answered on March 5, in relation to the stamp duties office:

What is the reason for the limit of 12 placed on the number of documents presented for stamping by any one person on any one day by the stamp duties office?

The reply was:

No limit is placed by the stamp duties office on the number of documents presented for stamping by any one person on any one day.

In reply to the question:

What action is it intended to take to relieve this situation, and when is it expected the limit will be lifted? the answer was:

See 1. above.

As short a time ago as yesterday, a land broker in this city telephoned the stamp duties office and was told there was a limit of 12 on the number of documents that could be stamped. Someone somewhere along the line, intentionally or unintentionally (I suspect unintentionally) is misleading this House. This brings me to wonder just how accurate are all the answers to Questions on Notice. We are used to the equivocations, to working around the question, to the dodging of the question, and to the loquacious and over-loquacious answers which hide the answer to a part of the question but which do not get to the crux of the question. We are used to all these tactics that are used regularly and that we have come to accept as par for the course for this Government; but, when it gets down to the answer to the member for Mitcham's question about checking Questions on Notice, which is a perfect example of it, and when it gets down to the point of pure accuracy, we have the right to expect from the Government accurate answers to our questions.

It may be that the limit of 12 placed on the stamping of documents submitted by any one person to the stamp duties office is a necessary limitation.

Mr. Chapman: What about the answer of the Minister of Transport to the question asked by the member for Davenport about dial-a-bus?

Dr. TONKIN: Of course, the Minister's record in answering questions is well known in this House and was the subject of a detailed speech I made earlier, but it may be there is a perfectly rational explanation for this limit of 12. If so, let us hear it. If it is not so, let us find out why people are being told that a limit is imposed and why they are not getting their documents stamped. It is only a minor irritation to land brokers and other people wishing to have documents stamped. It does not matter much to the rest of the community but it is a fundamental matter of principle. It is something that this Government must answer and answer correctly, accurately, and in full.

What is the principle of answering Questions on Notice? Are they to be used to dodge the issue? Are we to get correct answers? How many of them are correct? Into how many other answers have errors crept? The matter I have raised is an unequivocal issue: on the one hand, I am told there is a limit; on the other hand, the Attorney-General answers that there is not. Who is right? This Opposition has the right to be told the exact position. I will not go into the matter of questions and the time for asking them being shortened, because all honourable members know this, but we have a right to get the right answers when we ask questions.

I wish now to refer to strata titles again. This was a question I asked on November 29, on the last day that this House was sitting in 1973. I will refresh members' minds about the circumstances that led to this. Having been approached by a constituent living in a home unit, I found that she had been in occupation of that unit since May, 1973, and, in spite of having paid all her charges, the cost of the unit, and everything that was owing, she still did not have a title to that unit, there had been no transfer through the Lands Titles Office. No strata title had been put through and, because of that, that individual had no rights at all (this became clear) in relation to that property, because she had no piece of paper.

The matter arose further when she applied for concessions for her water rates and council rates, and was told that because she was not the registered owner of the property she was not eligible for those concessions. That was the first she had heard about her situation. Inquiries made further to that revealed that this was not an uncommon situation in our community. In Bragg, which I speak of with first-hand knowledge, and in other areas where home-unit development has been extensive, there are many people in similar situations, having paid their money and having no title whatever. If anything was to happen to this individual in this in-limbo state, the beneficiaries of this person, who had taken legal advice, would be hard put to it to prove they had a claim to that property, which is still in the name of the developer. I will not go into who the developer was because not merely one firm is involved in this transaction.

There may be reasonable difficulties in relation to the Lands Titles Office, and strata titles may not have been getting through as quickly as they should have been, but there have also been delays in the agent's and developer's office, and not every effort has been made to put those strata titles through as quickly as possible and to transfer them to the new owners. As far as I can understand the

position, this is a legal hiatus. The legal advice I have been given is that there is no provision at present in law to cover these people. If that is so, the position should be remedied rapidly. I should be interested to know whether the Government intends to do anything about it and, if not, whether it will support any private member's business brought in at the beginning of the next session to deal with the situation. I believe it will and should support such a measure.

Mr. McAnaney: It'll do nothing for individuals.

Dr. TONKIN: On this unusual occasion, the member for Heysen is probably in error. It does not happen often, but I think that members of the Government will consider that something should be done about this. A further matter of complaint relates again to strata titles and to Question Time. On November 29, I asked the Attorney-General to look into this matter for me. I admit it was the last day of sitting of 1973 and there had been some difficulty in the proceedings of the House on that day, so the matter may have slipped his memory, but he did in his answer undertake, if I gave him the particulars of the people involved, to have the matter investigated to see what could be done. I provided the officers of his department with details of these persons whom I knew to be disadvantaged by this system. I know that action has been taken and I have been told that those people who made representations to me in the first instance have now received their strata titles. They are secure and happy in the possession of their home units but the Attorney-General has not made any announcement or given any answer to my question about the general situation and what should be done. I have reminded him. I understand that there may be reasons why it has not been possible to reply previously, but I consider that replies to questions, whether they are asked on notice or without notice, tend to be given after too long a period has passed. Since I have been asking questions on notice of the Minister of Health, I have been getting a remarkably good service, much better service than I received before that time. If it is an advantage to ask them on notice, I am pleased about it, but I still cannot be sure, after what has happened now, that those replies to my questions are entirely accurate.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am amazed at the lack of interest shown in the debate by Government members. Obviously, they are not worried about matters that concern their constituents or about matters that involve this State Government or the Commonwealth Government. Obviously, Government back-benchers sit back as yes men to the Premier and his colleagues and they have not the courage to speak in the debate. They are completely dominated by the front bench, and we have known this for a long time.

The member for Torrens and the member for Bragg have discussed the operation of this House and the Standing Orders, and it is high time that the customs of this House were changed to give members on both sides the opportunity to occupy the Chair as Acting Deputy Speaker and as Acting Chairman of Committees. I understand that this practice is adopted in the Commonwealth Parliament. I do not reflect on any of the members who occupy those positions from time to time at present, but I consider that the proceedings of the House would be improved considerably if members on both sides were given that opportunity. In this House all members are equal and all should have equal opportunity. The positions that I have mentioned should not be reserved for members on one side of the House or for one political faction.

We are dealing with a financial measure, and the financial decisions of the Commonwealth Government that came to

office in December, 1972, have had a serious effect not only on my constituents but on all Australians. That Government likes to regard itself as being the Australian Government, but I prefer to call it the Commonwealth Government, because this is the Commonwealth of Australia. That Commonwealth Government has launched a bitter attack on country people. Like the member for Flinders and the member for Rocky River, who represent wheatgrowing districts, I am alarmed, as are other people in country areas, at the violent anti-rural attitude of the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. D. J. Hoggood: Come on! Be honest.

Mr. GUNN: That is correct, and the junior Minister—

Mr. Wright: He may be junior, but he is fairly capable. You got your answer today, when he slayed you.

Mr. GUNN: I hope that, when the Minister reads the silly reply that he gave the member for Murray at Question Time today, he will decide to make a Ministerial statement tomorrow to correct the situation. We now have in office a Commonwealth Government that has set out to destroy the whole system of free enterprise as we know it and to embark on a course that will smash rural industry. It is all right for the Minister of Development and Mines to laugh. He is a self-confessed Socialist and obviously is pleased to go along with that policy.

The Hon. D. J. Hoggood: State delicatessens?

Mr. GUNN: I did not mention State delicatessens. I was referring to the present attitude of the Minister's Commonwealth Government colleagues and friends. Perhaps they no longer are friends of this Government, judging from what I have been told about how the Minister of Transport looked the other day when the Prime Minister was addressing the Local Government Association. I would not be surprised if they were not friends, because the Commonwealth Government has not many friends in the country now. I gather from telephone calls to me and my colleagues that the present Commonwealth Government and this present State Government will not be in office much longer.

Mr. Wright: When did the Labor Party get big ratings in a rural area?

Mr. GUNN: What about the State District of Millicent and the Commonwealth District of Riverina?

Mr. Keneally: Laurie Wallis wins in Grey and he represents you very well.

Mr. GUNN: The present Commonwealth Government is attacking country people. Recently the Prime Minister announced, to the dismay of his colleagues and the whole nation, that at the end of this year he would stop paying the superphosphate bounty. That decision has caused much concern to wheatgrowers and graziers. When the Prime Minister was trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the Australian people, he stated:

We come to Government with malice towards none.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the attention of the honourable member for Eyre to the fact that, in a grievance debate, an honourable member may raise any subject matter that is of concern to this Parliament and this State. It cannot be a matter that affects some other Parliament in its entirety. If the honourable member wants to continue on those lines, he will have to link up his remarks with this State.

Mr. GUNN: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you for your guidance. I will link up my remarks by referring to the effect that decisions of the Commonwealth Government are having in relation to the amount of revenue allocated to this State from the taxes raised here. Because of the attitude of the Commonwealth Government, people

will cut down production or cease it. Then the railways will not have the same amount of grain or superphosphate to carry and the finances of this State will be affected directly.

I have had several contacts with members of the Commonwealth Government about that Government's unwise decisions in the most recent Commonwealth Budget. The first point was the decision to abolish income tax concessions for the provision of water conservation measures and related matters on country properties. Honourable members know that, unfortunately, many parts of South Australia have not got reticulated water schemes. Earlier today the member for Alexandra raised the matter in another debate and had a long discussion with the Minister of Works. Several areas in my district do not have a reticulated water supply: Coober Pedy, Andamooka, and areas west of Ceduna, south of Streaky Bay, and north of Elliston. It seems that the people living in these areas will not be given their just rights in future because, from the attitude of this Government, it will not provide funds for this purpose.

Mr. Keneally: How much help did you get from the previous Commonwealth Government for reticulated water supplies in these areas?

Mr. GUNN: This Government is unwilling to allocate funds to assist these people. Under the previous Liberal and Country League Commonwealth Government people who built dams and installed bores received income tax deductions.

Mr. Keneally: Who was responsible for constructing the Kimba to Poldia main?

Mr. GUNN: It was the foresight and common sense of the previous L.C.L. Commonwealth Government that provided special assistance to the State by creating the National Water Resources Council development fund of \$50 000 000, and made another \$100 000 000 available to assist people in the Kimba area and in other parts of this State and of Australia. Under the present Administration no further funds will be made available under that programme because of the completely irresponsible financial policy that the Commonwealth Government has adopted. That Government has impeded the progress of people by taking away the income tax concessions. When the Kimba to Poldia scheme was first suggested to the Commonwealth Government, it was rejected because this Government did not provide the Commonwealth Government with the correct information.

Mr. Keneally: The scheme was never suggested before, because we had a Liberal Government in this State.

Mr. GUNN: The Dunstan Government did not make available to the McMahon Government or its predecessor the correct information. When this scheme was rejected, the Hon. Mr. Whyte and I contacted the Commonwealth Government and discussed the matter in Canberra with the Prime Minister and the Minister for National Development (Mr. Swartz) and after the discussion we were confident that the South Australian Government, if it provided an up-to-date submission, would receive the necessary funds, and that is what happened. I give full credit to the South Australian Government for providing an excellent submission, and the money was granted in October, 1972. I am pleased to know that people at Kimba have benefited from those funds. However, under the present Commonwealth Government, no further schemes will be approved because funds will not be available, as that Government does not wish to help people living in outlying country areas.

Has the State Labor Government applied to the Commonwealth Government for assistance to help at Coober

Pedy? I doubt it. The member for Stuart makes naive interjections but rarely says anything sensible. He has said that the rural community is well off under the Labor Party Government, but that statement is complete nonsense. The present position of the rural industry is not the result of actions taken by the present Commonwealth Government, but the result of droughts occurring overseas and a strong demand for grain and wool. I represent a wheatgrowing district, and the railways revenue is increased because of income earned for carrying wheat on the railways system. The Prime Minister and his colleagues rushed off to China, and Dr. Cairns said what a wonderful thing he had done for Australian farmers by selling wheat to China.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have allowed the honourable member plenty of latitude, but he should not refer to the activities of the Commonwealth Government as they have no direct relationship to this Bill. The honourable member must link his remarks with references to the activities of this State.

Mr. GUNN: This is a wheatgrowing State and many electors are engaged in this important industry. I have the privilege of representing a wheatgrowing area. The carriage of wheat and other grains is an important function of the South Australian Railways, and I was explaining the serious effects the decisions of the Commonwealth Government could have on returns to wheatgrowers in this State, and the effect of the actions of the Minister for Overseas Trade.

Mr. Keneally: Our wheat is going to countries your Government would not trade with.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Eyre to study the motion being considered, and I refer the same motion to the member for Stuart. We are dealing with the matter of applying from general revenue the sum of \$100 000 000 to the Public Service. A grievance motion is normally allowed much latitude, but not as much as the member for Eyre is making out that it does. The honourable member must confine himself to this motion.

Mr. GUNN: I shall be pleased to discuss how the Government intends to spend \$100 000 000, but Opposition members are concerned that this sum will not provide the same services that it would have provided about two years ago because of the rate of inflation that has increased from about 4 per cent a year to about 14 per cent a year as a result of the actions of a Labor Government. People in South Australia are not receiving value for their money, and this State Government, having little regard for correct financial management, is glibly following the line set by its Commonwealth colleagues. Whilst it receives hand-outs from the Commonwealth Government and does not worry about the strings that are attached to this assistance, it is pleased to go merrily on its way. We believe that this Parliament should have the right to decide how and when money received from the Commonwealth Government is spent. We do not believe that there should be strings attached to the funds that this State receives from the Commonwealth Government. It is the policy of the Liberal Party of Australia that the States should receive a set proportion out of taxation.

Mr. Duncan: That is not the Liberal and Country League.

Mr. GUNN: The Liberal and Country League of this State is affiliated with the Liberal Party of Australia, and L.C.L. members are proud of that. The Liberal Party's policy is that a set proportion of the income tax revenue will be allocated to the States, without strings attached.

This is an important breakthrough and a complete contradiction of the policy of the present Commonwealth Government, which has used section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution to strangle the States.

Mr. Payne: You have not yet mentioned the term "octopus".

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member can make a speech later, if he wants to. I am firmly convinced that it is the policy of the State Government to follow glibly the policy of the Commonwealth Government and gradually to destroy the States and substitute a regional system; that policy was announced by the shadow Minister—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must come back to the motion.

Mr. GUNN: I do not wish to keep the House unduly.

Mr. Payne: Every time you get on your feet you keep the House unduly.

Mr. GUNN: I am concerned that the Government is not getting value for money, as a result of inflation, which has been caused by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): Following the questions asked and semi-answered in the House concerning the proposed township at Monarto, I draw attention to one or two inconsistencies in what the Government is doing. The Government is reputed to have spent \$1 200 000 already in acquiring land at Monarto. A report in yesterday's *Australian* indicates that this is very much ahead of the planned time of acquisition by the Government; it further indicates that the Commonwealth Government is to be approached for more funds to make up deficiencies that have apparently arisen. In reply to a recent question, the Treasurer said:

We are spending the money at present. With the assistance of the Commonwealth Government, we have acquired more than 70 per cent of the site of Monarto. My information (and I believe it is correct) is that the Government has paid for only 30 per cent of the land at Monarto. I wonder whether the Treasurer took it that acquisition meant final payment. If the Minister on the front bench reads the record he will find that my information (that the Government has paid for only 30 per cent of the land at Monarto) is correct. I do not believe that the Treasurer is doing a service to the House by saying blandly that the Government has acquired 70 per cent of the site of Monarto.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: If he is talking about area, he is correct.

Mr. HALL: As I understand it, only 30 per cent has been paid for.

Mr. Payne: The Minister tried to help you.

Mr. HALL: I challenge the honourable member to get up and say that what I have said is incorrect. The Government has spent more than its allocation of money for Monarto. There are people at Monarto who want settlement, and they are complaining about the deal offered by the Government. From the information that the Minister gave today, it seems to me that those people are not going to be relocated on comparable properties outside Monarto without cost to themselves.

Mr. Evans: The member for Murray made that point.

Mr. HALL: Yes. How do those people stand if the Government has paid for only 30 per cent of the land at Monarto? Further approaches are being made for funds, but the Treasurer has insulted a member of the cities commission.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That is irrelevant.

Mr. HALL: It is irrelevant that the Treasurer has insulted a member of that commission!

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Come off it.

Mr. HALL: Am I to understand that the Minister would insult Professor Scott? Does the Minister agree with the Treasurer? Evidently the Government believes that the commission is a rubber stamp for the Commonwealth Government. The Premier said that it was a Government decision, but I ask: why have a cities commission if it is nothing more than a rubber stamp? The Treasurer said:

I am not concerned about getting Professor Scott on side. We have a commitment from the Commonwealth Government and from the commission.

The commitment has been over-used and people are waiting to be paid. Will they be paid? No wonder they are not being paid at a rate that allows them to relocate. Many people believe that Monarto is one vast mistake, and not all of those people are laymen: experts will tell members that it is not possible to have a sufficiently fast rail transport system between Monarto and Adelaide without providing for immense and costly work in the Adelaide Hills. The public servants who work in the three departments that are to be moved to Monarto are now subject to the discipline of the Government, and the Treasurer has said, in effect, that they will not be able to retain their jobs if they remain in Adelaide. If we have over-full employment, how many such public servants will leave Adelaide and go to Monarto? Has the Government assessed the loss of expertise from the departments that will occur when they are moved? The Government cannot say there will be no such loss of expertise. Professor Scott said that the new city should be next to the coast, and many people say that it should be in the Willunga area.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: It would be near Adelaide then.

Mr. HALL: Will it be a new city at Monarto? It will be an inconvenient adjunct to Adelaide, and nothing else. It will not in any way represent decentralization: it will be an extension of Adelaide that is not convenient to Adelaide. It will be in an area that is extremely vulnerable to pollution. The Minister of Environment and Conservation is supposed to protect Adelaide's water supply. There was an apt cartoon in a newspaper recently depicting the Minister of Works inviting people to the "dirtiest show in town", referring to Adelaide's water supply. Yet the Minister intends to build the city astride one of the sources of our water supply. How will he keep people away from the banks of the Murray? He knows that is impossible. This area will become more polluted than it is today. It is no good the Minister's saying that he will filter Adelaide's water supply, as he has announced it three times and nothing has happened. We will believe it when it happens and not before. There is great indecision about Monarto on the part of the landowners, and employees of Government departments. There is doubt over the whole project because it is undesirable in site and concept. It does not represent decentralization, and it is not a successful extension of Adelaide.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Do you say we should have it at Willunga?

Mr. HALL: The Minister should not try to put words into my mouth. If he wants to talk, let him defend his Government's industrial record. I have a new statistical bulletin, giving figures of industrial disputes up to December, 1973. When this figure was high in 1969, the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) and the member for Mawson—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I wasn't here in 1969.

Mr. HALL: Well, since he has been here the Minister has had his say on this issue. I remember how members

opposite criticized the previous Government in 1969 about the huge number of working days lost because of industrial disputes. Let us look at the figures. The number of days lost in 1969 was high, amounting to 129 000 days lost. In 1968, the figure was 51 100 days lost, and in 1967 it was 18 700. In 1970, the number of days lost was 93 100; in 1971, it increased to 111 200, in 1972, it was 60 900; and in 1973, it increased to 130 600. Therefore, last year in South Australia 130 600 man-days were lost through industrial disputes, the highest number on record. How does the Government defend that?

Mr. Wright: What about the population?

Mr. HALL: What is the position with regard to the standardization of the Adelaide to Port Pirie railway line? How long has this Government been in office? Who is working on this matter? Who is aggregating machinery and materials and planning the work force? What agreements have been concluded to standardize this line? As far as we know, no action has been taken. We faced another barrage of hot air from the Government on this issue, but there is silence from Government members now. What is the position in South Australia with regard to workmen's compensation? If ever a chaotic situation has been imposed on this community by Government action, it has been imposed with regard to workmen's compensation. On the *Newsbeat* programme on television this evening, the Minister of Labour and Industry debated the matter with Martin Cameron from another place.

Mr. Becker: Oh, yes?

Mr. HALL: The member for Hanson is not noted for his ability to oppose. Perhaps he should listen to what I am about to say, and then he may be able to attack the Government on these matters. The situation is that the Premier said that the increase in workmen's compensation payable in respect of an ordinary house would be \$125. The Minister of Labour and Industry said that the increase would be \$225. Yet customers are receiving bills for from \$700 to \$1 400.

Mr. Duncan: They're being robbed.

Mr. HALL: Then why does not the honourable member prosecute them? Who will confirm what is the right figure being paid?

Mr. Duncan: It depends on the price of the house.

Mr. HALL: These figures are in relation to a \$20 000 house. About half that cost is made up of labour costs. This evening the Minister said that the premium on that type of house would be \$450, or a rate of 4.5 per cent. I understand that one insurance company is quoting a figure of 19.5 per cent, and the member for Elizabeth can check that if he wishes. Who is right? Would the State Government Insurance Commission accept 4.5 per cent as the commercial rating for workmen's compensation? The Minister has given this figure this evening, stating it publicly to tens of thousands of South Australians. He was dealing with their emotions, their hard-earned cash, and their long-term loans. Members know that what he said is misleading, because it cannot be correct.

Mr. Chapman: You know that he really doesn't know what he's talking about.

Mr. HALL: That would be a charitable explanation.

Mr. Duncan: You're mendacious.

Mr. HALL: I do not care what the honourable member says I am. All I know is what the Minister (and apparently his colleagues now find this amusing) said to the South Australian community this evening. Members opposite can laugh. They know it is 11.45 p.m. and that what happens in this Chamber now will not be reported to the South Australian public. It has been suggested that the proceedings here should be televised. I should like the

inane reactions of Government members to be shown to the South Australian people. When the public gallery of this House is full, people get a chance to see members opposite, and those members should hear some of the reactions of members of the public about them when they leave the gallery.

This evening I have referred to Monarto, the Adelaide to Port Pirie rail standardization, workmen's compensation payments, and working days lost through industrial disruption. The House does not know where the Government stands on those four issues. I spent only about three minutes collecting those issues, and there are plenty of others. The Minister for Development and Mines thinks that what I am saying is funny, and that illustrates the point I want to make: that this is a totally arrogant Government. Never in my 15 years as a member have I seen a Government as arrogant as this one. If there is one thing a Government owes to the people it is to state its position in Parliament so that the public can know that position. We do not have such a statement of position. The Premier has now entered the Chamber; he has been a party to this deception. He said that the workmen's compensation increase on houses would be \$125; his Minister has said it will be \$225; and builders say it is \$700 to \$1 400. The Government has not stated its position, and members on the front bench are divided on this issue. This community goes on and on without leadership. All we have is the bludgeoning on the part of the Government by virtue of the numbers it has in this House. I cannot see anything happening to solve this problem. The Government will continue on its way until it is defeated, and goodness know when that will be. The public's position will worsen consistently. In the meantime there will be much wrong planning, suppression of individual rights and a continuation of the introduction of Bills such as the Privacy Bill, which is the greatest attack on freedom, under the name of good intentions, that has even been introduced in this or any other Australian Parliament. This Government's arrogance can be illustrated by its introducing that Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Heyesen): I am about to make a 30-minute speech under objections, as members have sat in this House for three weeks during which the Government has introduced few Bills. Parliament rose at 3.30 p.m. on several occasions, and now members are told that they must, in a limited time, get through the 20 Bills on the file. This is the way the Government is running the State: it is a stop-go sort of action, and anything goes. The first question I want to ask relates to water. The member for Eyre referred to the unfortunate people who live hundreds of miles away from the source of water. However, the people who live at Callington, which is about 25 miles (40 km) from the Murray River, have been asking for water for about 100 years. Towards the end of last year the Minister said that his department would come up with something by the end of the year and now he has said that all the landholders between Callington and Strathalbyn who may be affected by a water scheme have been interviewed. A scheme to serve the area has been designed and we are told that, when an estimate of cost and a revenue statement have been prepared, the matter will be further considered.

This situation has obtained for many years, and the scheme could eventually cost \$750 000. Yet the Government has, despite what the member for Goyder said about its being a few months behind time, committed itself to an expenditure of \$11 000 000 on the Hope Valley purification scheme and a further \$22 000 000 on the

Little Para scheme, which will give clean water to 400 000 people living in Adelaide. The people who live in the Callington area and whose stream has been polluted farther upstream and by the Kanmantoo mine have been deprived of water that has been their heritage ever since they have been there. However, nothing has been done for them.

The Minister of Works has said that the Government is over-committed in relation to water supplies. Although this is probably true in dry years, surely in years like this it should use the millions of acre feet of water that are going out to sea at Goolwa. There is no reason why licences to grow lucerne in the lakes and in the Lower Murray area should not be issued. If there was a shortage in a certain year, it would not matter that the lucerne was not watered. There is a growing need for proteins in the world today, and these products can be sold at good prices. Despite this, water is let go to waste. I have never seen so many people who are so set in their ideas as are officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Although I have a great admiration for the Minister of Works, I think he has been hoodwinked by his departmental officers in this regard, as valuable water that could be used to South Australia's advantage is being let go to waste. I strongly object to that wastage. I should like now to refer to schools, many of which are being replaced in South Australia. I refer specifically to the Norton Summit school which has no playing area and, indeed, less standing room than any other school.

Mr. Mathwin: Is it on the side of a hill?

Mr. McANANEY: It is on the top of a hill, and four years ago much money was to be spent to level the hill. It was only a small hill and, when the school committee agreed to forgo this action, it thought it would have a new school within a reasonable time. However, three or four years goes well beyond what could be considered a reasonable time. Only this week I saw a school which has lovely playing grounds but which is to be replaced. Some action should therefore be taken quickly in this area. On another matter, the Minister of Development and Mines, who interjected while another member was speaking, seemed to think that Willunga would be too close to Adelaide. However, once the new freeway has been completed, one will get to Adelaide more quickly from Monarto than one will from Willunga.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's why Monarto is a better proposition.

Mr. McANANEY: The Minister was making the point that it had to be isolated from Adelaide. I refer now to the Superannuation Act Amendment Bill, which will give some people the equivalent of capital assets worth \$90 000. Surely, in all sense of justice, we cannot have succession duties being levied on estates valued at about \$6 000 or more. This anomaly must be corrected. A person involved in primary or secondary industry or one who has saved for his future should not be penalized when the State Government is subsidizing another person to the equivalent of a high capital sum.

I now ask what is privacy. Any landholder in South Australia can find surveyors or other Government officers on his property, many of whom do not have the courtesy to tell him that they want to go on to the property or that it might be needed for housing or for a road. This is bad manners and is an interference with the privacy of the people of South Australia. In the 100 years or more since South Australia became a colony, no Attorney-General has messed up the lives of the people of South Australia more than has the present Attorney.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's a cruel remark.

Mr. McANANEY: It is an accurate remark. More South Australian people are living in fear at present because of the actions of this Government than they have in my lifetime. The Premier said, "Why are you worrying whether you have leasehold or freehold properties, because I will grab it from you at any time I feel like doing so?" Do people lead happy lives when they know that that sort of thing can happen?

[Midnight]

I do not disagree that at times it is necessary for the Government to acquire property, but surely it should see that it leaves the person concerned in at least a similar position to that in which he was before his property was acquired. The Premier has always boasted about price control in South Australia: he has everything under control. I notice that the last figure for the average cost of building a house in South Australia has increased. Since this Government has been in power, South Australia's population has increased by less than 3 per cent, which is a comparatively low rate.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That would be the Attorney-General's fault, too?

Mr. McANANEY: When the Government causes people to live in fear, it is not an attractive proposition to stay in the State or to come to it. Although over 20 000 young people reach the age of 21 in South Australia every year, instead of 15 000, as it was in 1969, there are fewer marriages now in South Australia than there were in 1969. If the former rate had been maintained, there would have been a 33 per cent increase in the number of marriages, and ultimately, we would hope, in the number of children. This decrease in the marriage rate is the reason why we have a low increase in population. Some people argue that we need zero population increase, but we do not want it in Australia, where great open spaces and facilities should be developed to a far greater extent than they are being developed. We can produce much more food provided that the Commonwealth Government does not try to eliminate the primary producer.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You mean the Australian Government

Mr. McANANEY: The Commonwealth Government. Another issue that must be dealt with in South Australia is the export of live sheep. The unions are considering not allowing sheep to be exported. That would be a shameful thing if it happens in South Australia without the Government making some effort to stop it. I am not against the unions; they have a rightful place in the community but, when they take political action and interfere with the trade or occupation of people, they are invading the privacy of those people who want to send sheep overseas.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're all in favour of privacy in private enterprise.

Mr. McANANEY: I am in favour of the privacy of the individual to do so as he likes with his own commodities. For instance, recently in Jervois milk had to be thrown down the drain because someone got upset when he was dismissed because he had gone to play cricket. A Bill dealing with privacy of the individual was going to be introduced this year. It is sheer hypocrisy if the Government is not strong enough to act against the political actions of individuals who interfere with the liberties of other people in the community. That happens far too often. Victoria is the most progressive State in Australia, and has been over the last few years.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Oh, come off it!

Mr. McANANEY: We have no-risk insurance here: Victoria has work-release gaols. We are talking about having no gaols here at all. I do not agree with that but I am a great believer in work-release gaols.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: There are only two Victorias—early and mid!

Mr. McANANEY: It is certainly the most progressive State as far as I know. Perhaps it has not gone to the limit of trying to restrict people, as this State has done, but Victoria introduces helpful legislation to assist people. I think Victoria is well ahead of this State. I should add that I am very proud of South Australia, despite the liability it is labouring under at present.

People owning forests, and that is the Government, should pay rates on forest land. It is not right that the Government should run a private enterprise concern, make a good job of it (I agree that it does) and not pay rates. I have always been fair and reasonable in this House and have praised the Government when it merited praise. I praised the Education Department until it victimized a male teaching aide at Basket Range. In a month I had not had an answer. I have telephoned the Minister, his secretary, the superintendent and clerks, and all I get is the run-around, that someone is going to do something; but no-one has done anything yet. When I telephoned the Education Department, it gave the person concerned six weeks pay within 24 hours, so I praised the department for its prompt action in helping a poor unfortunate couple left without money. It is most unjust for the district councils of Gumeracha, Meadows, and several other places, which have large areas of forest land and cannot collect rates on that land. The railways have more noxious weeds than the forests have. I came by train through the Adelaide Hills recently, and I have never seen such a lovely display of African daisy; so I give the Railways Department a medal for growing African daisy.

Weeds do not grow in the forests: they grow on the outskirts. The Government of which I was a member did nothing about it but it is high time that rates were paid on forest land so that the people in those areas are not penalized. The councils close to Adelaide also have an increasing area of national park land, and people of Adelaide and from other States, and even from the country, use the roads through those areas more than do the local people. All Government-owned property should pay rates. If it did, we would not have the Prime Minister trying to by-pass the State Governments and deal directly with local government. If the State and Commonwealth Governments paid rates on Government-owned property, local government would be viable and able to pay its own way without being subjected to undue outside influence. Our Attorney-General even attacked the Governor, when a week previously the Governor had praised the Premier and said he was a good chap. I do not know whether that statement upset the Attorney-General.

I have difficulty following some court decisions. One magistrate imposed a fine of \$100 on a person convicted of a drink driving offence and said that the man would be dealt with more severely if he committed another offence. I do not agree with this way of dealing with such offenders and the Bill that we passed indicated that a second offender should be dealt with severely. I consider that such an offender should not be allowed to drive for six years.

I have already mentioned the Minister of Works, and when the Commonwealth Government offered a loan for sewerage work, with a high interest rate and repayment over a short period, our Minister grabbed the offer with both hands, whereas the Victorian Government said it could

not afford to take a loan on those conditions, and then the Commonwealth Government relented and offered a more reasonable rate of interest and a longer repayment term.

Labour Governments do not act in a businesslike way and, as long as they are spending money, they think they are accomplishing something. This Government has not stated that a 35-hour week would destroy the Australian economy, but, until we have more schools, hospitals and houses, we should not think about a 35-hour week or six weeks recreation leave. People are living in shocking conditions at Northfield Hospital and these buildings will be replaced quickly only if people work reasonable hours, instead of asking for more recreation time. I agree that factory work is not interesting for the people employed there. They are doing the same type of work all the time and this must be changed to make the work interesting.

I consider that in future our young people will object to paying high rates and taxes. At a recent election in Denmark a candidate topped the poll after stating that, if elected, he would abolish all taxes. Again, the people of Sweden are becoming increasingly dissatisfied with the higher taxes. The young people will demand a larger share of their earnings and will want to spend their money as they wish. They will not want to contribute towards the cost of running the railways if they do not use them.

I agree with helping those who, because of mental or physical incapacity, cannot look after themselves. However, I am pleased that the Commonwealth Minister for Labour intends to take action against people who are receiving unemployment relief and who will not work. Surely those people could be given light work, such as developing national parks, if they could not do heavy work. America has good national parks now because of the work done in them by young people during the depression in the 1930's.

This State received a poor deal in the roads allocation under the five-year agreement, compared to the grant to Western Australia. It amazes me that there has not been a greater uproar about this matter. I have given a half-hour speech free to this Parliament and one cannot expect more out of me, but I will have to be paid for the next half hour.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Since the changed arrangements regarding Question Time, whereby an Opposition member is lucky to ask one question a day, this is the first chance I have had to raise an important matter on behalf of several of my constituents. It is odd to raise it at 12.20 a.m., but we have been sitting for just under a month and we were told that we would be burdened with much work. Nothing appeared on the Notice Paper that required the time of the House for three weeks, but suddenly we have a full Notice Paper, and I believe we are to discuss another measure this evening. To me this seems ludicrous, and the blame must fall fairly and squarely at the feet of the Government.

Several times I have referred to the activities of the Government concerning the watershed areas, and the members for Fisher and Heysen have raised the question of hardship that people in those areas have suffered as a result of the Government's activities, particularly those of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Woods and Forests Department, and more recently the Lands Department.

We all know that the township of Chain of Ponds has been acquired by the Government. The Minister of Works gave some undertakings to the people of that town that were subsequently not honoured, namely, that the land would not be acquired, if the people so desired, for nine

years from the time of the announcement. Notices of acquisition have been served on some of the residents contrary to the Minister's undertakings, which were given at a public meeting that I attended and the proceedings of which were recorded on a tape recorder. The Minister of Works likes to cast himself in the role of peacemaker at this type of meeting, but when he finds that his officers are contradicting him an unfortunate situation develops.

People at Chain of Ponds have been forced from their properties, which were acquired, presumably, to protect the public from pollution in the waters of the Millbrook reservoir. Watershed regulations have restricted the activities of rural producers, and people do not have the traditional use of their land. I refer particularly to the regulations concerning subdivision of land. It is impossible for a landholder in zone A of the watershed area to subdivide his land if its area is less than 30 hectares. Recently, a sale of leasehold land was held on the property "Amaroo" close to Millbrook reservoir. I noticed the sale signs and have received many queries from constituents about this sale. From my inquiries I learned that this was leasehold land under the control of the Lands Department, and the gentleman who leased it had applied to split the lease into 13 parts. This request was granted in November 1972 for sections numbered 441 to 453 inclusive.

From my inquiries I understood that it was Government policy to allow the lease to be split into subleases. The Government had decided to divide this land into small allotments and allow the landholder to sell them but, at the same time, it denied people holding freehold land to do anything with that land. This is an example of a Minister allowing a subdivision in the watershed area, but not allowing people who hold freehold land to cut off one block. One can understand the consternation and resentment that this activity has created in my district, and it is little wonder that the Government is not held in high regard. I hope this action will be explained, because people in my district want to know why they are subjected to strict controls so that they cannot carry on as primary producers as they have wanted to, and cannot dispose of their properties because the value has been downgraded as they are not allowed to subdivide, whereas the Government allows a leaseholder to subdivide his property into 13 subleases and sell them at a considerable profit.

A satisfactory explanation must be forthcoming before the people of this district are satisfied. If no reply is received to my query in this debate, I intend to take the matter further and to elicit from the Minister an explanation of the Government's activities in the watershed areas.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): Only two weeks ago the House was informed by the Premier that the Callaghan report was being considered by Cabinet. I assume that that means that it is also being considered by senior officers of the Agriculture Department. I greatly admire the work of Sir Allan Callaghan, one of the world's best-known agricultural scientists, who has contributed much to this State through the research field and through the marketing field, as Chairman of the Australian Wheat Board. So, it is with much interest that I look forward to receiving Sir Allan's report on the future role of the Agriculture Department. I believe that the report was completed before Christmas, so we have now been waiting for more than two months for Cabinet to consider it.

The Agriculture Department has been in a state of uncertainty for so long that the Government should give directions as to where it is heading. When examining the future role of the department it is necessary to outline first the functions that the department must fulfil. The first

function of the department is the regulatory function, involving the administration of regulations connected with all legislation under the control of the Minister of Agriculture; for example, controls over dairy products, fruit fly inspections and eradication, quarantine control, etc. I would not decry the importance of these essential functions. It is important to realize that the department must carry out these functions effectively, and I believe it is doing that at present.

The second important function of the department is the extension of research knowledge to the rural community. In this connection it is essential that the department should be in constant contact with all people associated with primary industry. This influences the department's location and its attitude to the news media. The people who require this information must have easy access to the department.

The third function of the department is its research function, involving basic research and applied research. There is a constant argument as to whether the Agriculture Department should be involved in basic research or applied research. It can carry out basic research effectively, particularly in association with the universities and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization. However, its main research function must be in relation to applied research. A new emphasis must be given in this area. Many sections of the rural industry have desperate needs, and the only way of meeting them is to carry out much more applied research.

Other important functions are the administration of the department and the servicing of sections of the department; for example, the biometric section and analytical services. Another important area is the personnel department, including staff training. There are also miscellaneous functions, including advice to boards, particularly the Artificial Breeding Board and the Barley and Wheat Boards, the printing of the annual herd testing report, and the education of people involved in the rural industry. The rural youth aspect has come under a great deal of criticism recently because the Government has failed to replace the staff members who have left. The rural youth section of the Agriculture Department is working with below 40 per cent of the number of staff members required a few years ago. One can only assume that the present Government's policy is to destroy the rural youth section altogether.

I now turn to the future goals that agriculture will have to adopt if it is to face economically the demands of the future. Agriculture, of course, is vital, because it provides food for the world. Its first goal is that it must ensure the economic viability of the farming unit. The second goal is the ability to adapt to change, involving constant communication with research people and the news media. The third goal of agriculture is the protection and conservation of the environment; we must particularly bear this in mind in connection with the use of pesticides and weedicides.

The fourth goal is the marketing of agricultural products, requiring specific skills. The fifth goal of agriculture is the increased mechanization of farms, essentially because of ever-increasing labour costs. The final goal is for agriculture to have flexibility to cope with change. I have heard Dr. Callaghan speak at one or two dinners, and I know that he has basically outlined these same goals for agriculture. Perhaps some of these ideas are more his ideas than mine. We must keep these goals in mind in considering the future of the department. I have also heard Dr. Callaghan say that, in the past, agricultural research has

been orientated mainly towards increasing productivity, and that this has been by far its most important goal. He argues (and I agree) that in future it must adopt the second goal of economic efficiency and viability. In looking to the future of the department, we must keep both those goals in mind.

I now turn to what I believe the specific recommendations should be when planning the future role of the department. In late 1971 and early 1972, two important committees were established, the first being the Research Policy Committee and the second being the Research Liaison Committee (I was secretary of that committee for a short time). As the Research Policy Committee initiates suggestions for research projects, it must be in constant contact with primary producers. For research projects to be effective, they must relate to the problems of the day. The Research Liaison Committee co-ordinates research. As ecological research is now carried out in many areas, work tends to overlap, liaison being most important. My first recommendation is that both these committees be maintained and strengthened.

Secondly, I recommend that regional research centres and groups be established. My other recommendations depend on these centres being established. In other States, Agriculture Departments have adopted a similar policy, I have seen these centres work well in New South Wales and Victoria. Such a centre has already been established at Struan in the South-East of South Australia, and other centres should be established throughout the State. The officers at these centres should be selected depending on the type of research the group has undertaken. At a centre such as Struan, which is in a pastoral district, there should be the following officers: an agronomist, a soil scientist, an animal scientist, a veterinary surgeon, an economist, several extension officers, and a research leader or officer-in-charge of the entire group. Other centres should be established in the Mid North (possibly at Jamestown), and at Minnipa on Eyre Peninsula.

A centre at Loxton in the Upper Murray region should be particularly orientated towards horticultural research. Another centre for dairying should be maintained for the Adelaide Hills and Murray Flats areas. At present, the centre for dairying is based at Northfield and I would not like to see it shifted from there. In addition there should be a centre for dairying in the South-East, possibly at Mount Gambier. In the Barossa Valley, a centre should be established to carry out viticultural research. There should be one basic centre in Adelaide for general research throughout the State. That centre should be located at Northfield and not (as I suspect the Government would like it to be) at Monarto. Earlier in the session I gave reasons why the Agriculture Department should not be shifted to Monarto.

Other industry research groups should be established at Parafield (a unit is already established there) for poultry, and at Northfield, where a new unit has just been built, finance being provided from industry funds, for pig research. There are many advantages in establishing regional research groups, the main advantage being that such a group can work as an ecological group looking at all aspects of the problem; the members of this group are actually in the area where the problem exists. By this means, close liaison with the rural community is maintained with the research personnel to ensure a proper appreciation of problems in the area. As a former research scientist, I know that one of our major difficulties was in finding out what were the most important problems existing at the time.

Mr. Venning: How much of industry funds has been spent on this?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The honourable member has asked me a question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River is out of order in asking a question.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I think that I said in a previous debate that about \$2 000 000 to \$3 000 000 had been spent at Northfield. Therefore, it would be a breach of faith with the industry boards for the Government to move the main centre from Northfield to Monarto. The main problem for a regional research group is with regard to lines of responsibility, because the Agriculture Department is currently set up according to industry branches. In addition, there is a research centres branch. Therefore, certain people from a regional research group would have to report both to the industry branch and, through the officer-in-charge, to the research centres branch. This is where the research policy and liaison committees can assist and ensure that there is no conflict of responsibilities and duties.

My third specific recommendation is that there should be a central analytical laboratory. Such a laboratory would be able to carry out the department's analytical services, although it would be necessary to provide certain facilities at the various regional centres. There is already certain staff at Northfield, where analytical techniques are carried out, and I am certain that those who are involved would not want to shift to Monarto.

Dr. Eastick: How many of our senior people do you think we will lose?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Most of them, provided they can find a job elsewhere. My fourth point is that the Northfield research centre should be retained in its existing form. A new dairy has recently been constructed, and paddocks, sheds and pastures have been developed. It will take many years to repeat that work elsewhere, say, on the Murray swamps or in the Adelaide Hills. This centre should be maintained also because it is the centre of pig and viticulture research in this State, and to repeat the work done in this respect would set the State back 10 years from its present position. The fifth recommendation is that the department must improve its communications, which must be two-way: those within the department must know of the reaction of farmers, and research knowledge must be passed on to the farmers by the department. In order to improve communications, the most important aspect is contact with the news media. In this way, technical information can be passed on quickly to many primary producers. The present liaison with the news media is not good because of insufficient staff. Public relations with the Agriculture Department is one of the most important functions that the department performs, and its advisers must be trained to communicate with the news media and farmers.

The extension staff within the department should also be organized on a regional basis centred around the regional research centres. Specialist training of this staff should occur more than it occurs at present and, therefore, greater sums of money should be made available for this purpose. The sixth recommendation (and possibly one of the most important) is that there should be a complete revision of the economic and marketing aspects of the Agriculture Department. It is important that the department make market predictions in relation to quantity, price and quality. A bulletin containing this information was recently produced for primary producers, and the department should be congratulated for this. Also, the economics section needs to be enlarged. It must examine the economic efficiency of farms through the regional research groups. Also, the department must move into the area of marketing

advice and must give that advice to co-operative and other marketing bodies in South Australia. Australia lags behind the United States of America in this respect.

The seventh recommendation is that agricultural education needs to be extended. This agricultural education should be carried out around the regional research groups. Live-in schools should be established for farmers. This will involve a new role for the Rural Youth Movement and a new importance being placed on its function. The eighth recommendation is that the administration, biometric services and staff training aspects should be located not at Monarto but at Northfield. To place them at Monarto would be to place them away from the focal point of this State's rural community and, indeed, would break down the very functions of the Agriculture Department. I wish to refer briefly to the Rural Youth Movement. There should be a rapid increase in the number of staff available to carry out its important role. This should be based on existing clubs, and those clubs should have ready access to the regional research groups. There also needs to be a central organization, which should be based at Northfield. Finally, approved staff training should be carried out and a staff training centre established at Northfield. This would require the mixing of research and extension staff. I look forward anxiously to the tabling of the Callaghan report. It is important that the Government lay down quickly the guidelines for the future role of the Agriculture Department.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): This is one of the few opportunities the Opposition has for discussing matters of grievances but, at this early hour in the morning, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

The Hon. L. J. King: No.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is refused. The honourable member for Victoria

Mr. RODDA: My colleague, the member for Davenport, has told the Government and the House what he thinks about the Callaghan report and has given the Government an up-to-the-minute run-down on agriculture. Many problems in the rural scene centre on the Agriculture Department. The member for Davenport has underlined practically and scientifically, as he is qualified to do by his academic training, the benefits of applied research. He said clearly that those benefits are receiving scant treatment from the Government. We have only to look at the appropriation the department has received: it can only be described as a Cinderella department.

We must get our products to the market. I draw the Government's attention to the need for adequate facilities, not only in the fringe areas but in the hinterland, and the need for adequate beef roads. There has been talk of the facilities afforded by the beef roads in the North-East of the State. Apart from the proposal concerning the railway line from Tarcoola to Alice Springs, a large area in the North-West of the State is bereft of transport facilities. I speak of a beef road in that area now serviced by the Port Augusta to Alice Springs railway. The member for Frome is constantly bringing the problems of these people to the attention of the House. He spends much of his time in that area meeting the station owners and living with their problems. The State is looking down the barrel at a sum of \$2 500 000 needed to provide a beef road. The Minister of Transport cannot be unmindful of this highway, which must be built in that area for the beef trains, to move cattle into and out of those stations and which, from the point of view of the nation, will improve transport for most of Australia; but it is a State responsibility to see to it that we can get the stock out in all sorts of

seasons. At present, Central Australia is enjoying more than enough rainfall; it will be a bounteous season there, and the fat stock will need to be moved to market. This situation will benefit the State in the years to come.

This matter should receive serious consideration by the present Government and any following Government. The member for Frome is constantly keeping the Government advised of this need. The importance of regional meatworks has been amplified. In Naracoorte we have just opened a regional meatworks, which is doing very well but, to have a quality product to be placed on the markets of the world, the beast must be slaughtered where it grazes. I draw the attention of the Minister to the need to see to it that works like the works at Naracoorte are constructed strategically across the State to take advantage of being able to kill the beast where it grazes and to supply world markets, in a world desperately short of protein, that will take all the beef that this country can produce.

Mr. MATHWIN. Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. RODDA: The Government should interest itself in regional meatworks. The Premier, who did us the great honour of opening the Naracoorte works, will not be unmindful of the benefits to agriculture of strategically placed meatworks in the cattle regions of this State. The member for Davenport has drawn attention to the problems in agriculture, and I refer now to the shortages that the man on the land is subject to in his work-a-day programme. A brochure issued by the Stockowners Association of South Australia contains a report that the association's buying service no longer can accept orders for hormone weed sprays. That may be a good thing in the opinion of some members of this House, but the service cannot take orders for delivery in 1974 and any orders taken for 1975 will be charged at prices ruling at the date of delivery. Substitute chemicals will be subject to delays and will increase in price.

The construction of fences is a major problem. With the upset in beef numbers, there is a delay of three to four months in the supply of prefabricated fence wire, and plain wire fences are subject to delays of from six weeks to five months, and this situation is unlikely to improve for the next six months at least. The fencing post situation is that some lines are still subject to six months delay. Only the stout stock from which the farmers are bred has kept them going. That and the cattle that the shadow Minister of Transport has been talking about have kept them afloat. I hope that the Government will heed what has been said in this debate and the earlier debate today on behalf of people on the land.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The SPEAKER: Under Standing Orders, a further motion that the debate be adjourned cannot be moved within 15 minutes of the moving of the previous similar motion. That time has not elapsed.

Mr. MATHWIN: I register my objection to this Government's idea of worker participation. It is no wonder that the Treasurer is going abroad! A report in the *Advertiser* of February 21 states:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) will lead a group of technical advisers and policy experts on an industrial tour of Europe in April . . . But his main interest is Sweden's approach to job enrichment and worker participation in plant management, a major objective in Labor policy. Sweden has pioneered unique production line methods and worker-management principles in her plants to boost work incentive and quality of production.

I am amazed that the Treasurer is not taking with him the Minister of Labour and Industry, who I would imagine would be the appropriate Minister to take in all the information, leaving the Treasurer to read all the books available from the Parliamentary Library and the State Library on North Terrace on worker participation in other countries. Why the Treasurer should devote all his attention to Sweden as the be-all and end-all of worker participation amazes me more. Anyone who knows anything about worker participation knows that, by an Act passed in 1921, Germany was the first country to introduce worker participation.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I'm going to Germany, too.

Mr. MATHWIN: The press report states:

The Premier will visit new towns and urban redevelopment sites in Britain and West Germany in particular, to study housing.

We take it that, when the Treasurer has had 2c worth in Sweden, he will be ready for another 5c worth in Germany about building new houses and towns. Germany, not Sweden, is fairly well advanced in worker participation and I suggest that the Treasurer examine the position there.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have every intention of doing so.

Mr. MATHWIN: I suggest that not one Government member knows what worker participation is.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Do you know what it is?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes. I should think for one thing it would be a system of giving information to employees about the running of certain factories. One imagines that the Minister of Labour and Industry, with his leanings and tendencies, would go to Yugoslavia, which has worker co-operatives. That is the other extreme in worker participation. Many different terms are used for worker participation, but they all mean the same thing. Terms used are participation, worker participation, industrial democracy, economic democracy, co-determination, co-partnership, co-ownership, worker-directors, as well as many others. It is not surprising that the Government does not know the first thing about worker participation.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Tell me what you know about it.

Mr. MATHWIN: I know that the Minister is sour and upset because he has not been included in the trip. Perhaps, if he is a good boy, he will be able to take a trip later to find out about this subject.

Mr. Coumbe: Do you mean a one-way trip?

Mr. MATHWIN: I think the Minister does his best here at Question Time when I ask him a question. Employee participation was introduced in Germany by Act of Parliament in 1921 and public companies were required to appoint employees to the supervisory boards of the companies that had more than 500 workers.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: What happened to that system?

Mr. MATHWIN: It is still in operation. The employees have a right to elect one-third of the supervisory board. This system has been working well in Germany for many years but, at some stage, there had been a take-over by the National Socialists who were akin to Government members here. It is difficult to define where it begins, but it seems to be all Socialism. Government members pride themselves on being Socialists, but they should be like other Socialists and display the hammer and sickle. However, Government members will not do this because they are afraid they may lose some ground. I should like a Government member to explain where they stand on this matter. I understand that the Premier is to visit Holland.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is wrong.

Mr. MATHWIN: From Germany, Holland is only about 23 kilometres, and the Premier should have no trouble entering that country. In Holland there is a two-tier system about which there is nothing new, but it is interesting to note some of the rules for election to a board, as follows:

- (i) The first supervisory directors are appointed by the general meeting of shareholders
- (ii) Thereafter, vacancies may be filled by co-optation by the remaining board members: however, the shareholders' meeting, the employee council, and the executive board all have the right to object to the person chosen; and each of these bodies can put forward its own nominees.

It seems that both parties can have nominees on the board, but people employed by a company or by a subsidiary in which the company has a 50 per cent or more ownership cannot be members of the supervisory board, nor can the officials or employees of any union that has dealings with the company or its subsidiaries. This is a significant point and the Government should take notice of it. It does not refer to representatives of the union but to representatives of unions connected with that industry. Today, I asked the Minister of Labour and Industry a question about the members of the new Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Board, and what qualifications they had. We know of Mr. Lindsay Bowes; Mr. David Flehr is a director of a painting and decorating firm, Mr. Patterson is attached to the Chamber of Commerce; Noel Sarah apparently is a builder; Barrymore Frederick James Cavanagh is Secretary of the Miscellaneous Workers Union; Mr. Royston Griffiths is Secretary of the Electrical Trades Union, and Mr. George Lean is Secretary of the Sheetmetal Workers Union.

I said last week that I was concerned about this matter, because I cannot understand why the Government should give jobs to the boys and why union secretaries or organizers should automatically be made members of such a board. People involved in industry and workers on the bench are good enough to be appointed to this sort of board, and they would do a good job. It is wrong that the Government should select union secretaries: there are three on this board, and two of these members are extremely militant, that is, Mr. Cavanagh and Mr. Lean. I agree with the principle of worker participation, because that is the correct way to do it.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: This is not a worker participation board.

Mr. MATHWIN: No, it is a job for which members are receiving a plum. Obviously, these people were given the job as a pay-out.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: It is bad enough to look stupid but when you open your mouth you remove all doubt.

Mr. MATHWIN: It takes one to know one. It seems that the pressure for this type of appointment is coming downward from the top and not upward from the workers. I am sure that the average person working on the bench would prefer to work overtime and receive more money than to be appointed as a member of such a board. However, other people in industry would be able to represent trade unions and workers and could do a far better job than some members who have been elected to boards.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Why not get a couple of non-unionists?

Mr. MATHWIN: I am not concerned about that: I am concerned with stopping hand-outs to trade union secretaries.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: They are selected not by the Government but by the Trades and Labor Council.

Mr. MATHWIN: I would be more than surprised if there had been a ballot to select members of this board.

Mr. Duncan: What if there were a ballot?

Mr. MATHWIN: It is amazing to realize that in other countries with these boards there is not a complete hand-out to trade union secretaries.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Give us some more.

Mr. MATHWIN: I know that the Minister wants more information on this matter, and I also know that he knows nothing about worker participation. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is refused. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: I take it that the Treasurer is still the Minister in charge of tourism. Tourism is now so low on the Government's list of priorities that it is not recognized as a separate portfolio.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It has not been a separate portfolio for four years.

Mr. MATHWIN: If it is not a separate portfolio, it ought to be. The Treasurer and the Government generally have failed miserably in connection with tourism. If any person should know how important tourism is to a country, it is the Treasurer. He should know that the first step in developing tourism is to build good hotels. He has been fiddling around with a block of land in Victoria Square ever since I have been a member of this House. One minute a Japanese hotel is to be built there, and the next minute it is to be some luxury hotel, but years have gone by and there is still nothing there. There is an empty block opposite Parliament House; a hotel was supposed to be built there for tourism. I suggest that, while the Treasurer is overseas on his study tour connected with new towns and worker participation, he should investigate tourism and ascertain why this State is missing out. He should see for himself that the basic thing is accommodation. Why does the Treasurer not get on with it instead of fiddling about with jiggy-pokery?

I am also worried about the regular six-monthly checks by the Government Motor Garage on buses. Buses that have been used on metropolitan services can be sent, without any further checks at all, on interstate trips; they are checked only once every six months. A bus travelling between here and Brisbane or Perth could well travel 50 000 miles (80 470 km) in six months. Surely mileage is a more important factor than time in connection with vehicle checks. Let us consider how the tests are made. An unladen bus is required to stop on a flat road from 30 m.p.h. (48 km/h) within 25ft. (7.6 m). What would be the result if the bus was tested with 50 passengers in it travelling down a hill with a gradient of one in eight at 40 m.p.h. (64 km/h)? There would be a considerable difference between the results of the two tests, yet the Government sees fit to test an unladen bus on a good road. This is ridiculous, and something must be done about it forthwith. It should be laid down that buses must work only in the zone for which they have been tested. The Government Motor Garage should be authorized to issue defect notices; it cannot do this at present. Further, the garage should be authorized to police the maintenance of passenger buses and trucks. It must be given teeth, so that it commands the respect of the trade. This is the only way in which we will get satisfaction and safety. Only recently there was a serious bus accident, involving the loss of many lives. It therefore behoves the Government to see that such an accident never happens again.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): A matter causing great concern in my district (and probably in others) is the lack of action by the Government to control the activities of

massage parlours, which are becoming a nuisance in certain suburbs in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Duncan: You have been reading the *Advertiser*.

Mr. BECKER: No doubt the honourable member supports the activities of these organizations. I voice the grievance of constituents of mine who live in a first-class residential area, in the middle of which is a massage parlour. Nothing can be done to control the activities of this establishment.

Mr. Duncan: The council can close it.

Mr. BECKER: The massage parlour is run by the owner of the house, who simply says that she is carrying on her normal home activities. The police are unable to take any action unless someone comes forward and complains.

Mr. Payne: With council consent it can be closed at any time.

Mr. BECKER: The council has considered the matter on numerous occasions.

Mr. Payne: I have had two cases of this.

Mr. BECKER: Where the person owns the house?

Mr. Payne: That doesn't matter.

Mr. BECKER: I have done my homework on this; I am repeating what the town clerk of the council has told me. I have been complaining for six months. I have asked the police to move in and do something, but they can do nothing. When they do go to the house, there is a greater disturbance than ever, the neighbours being worse off than they were before. As the town clerk has said, the only thing to do is place some sort of control on massage parlours. They should either be licensed or accepted as businesses, being located in commercial areas away from residential areas. Great inconvenience is caused to residents in this area. Cars stop at this house at all hours of the day and night. The callers are becoming annoyed by the complaints of the residents and by the calls of the police, with the result that they pull into driveways, sound their horns, and flash their lights. The police call at the house constantly. Unfortunately, the Government is not willing to do anything about this situation.

Mr. Payne: How many complaints have been made to the council?

Mr. BECKER: They have been constant over the last six months. Councillois and a health inspector have visited the place; every attempt has been made to do something. Action must be taken to stop the activities in this street and to preserve the normal peace and quiet of the area. The Government is not greatly worried about morals in this community, as can be seen from the Premier's accusation that the Leader of the Opposition has been playing porno-politics. Over 12 months ago, the matter of pornographic literature being sold in this State was raised not only by me but also by the member for Florey, who said that the pedlars of porn needed a swift punch. I think that all members, except the Premier, agree with that statement. The lack of Government action means that morals in the community are being downgraded. The Government is afraid to take any action. The Government talks about freedom; people must have their freedom protected. Nothing is being done about people passing on these so-called adult books to children in our schools.

Mr. Mathwin: They leave them lying around.

Mr. BECKER: This is done deliberately by these people to try to break down the moral standards of the community. It is all very well for the member for Goyder to say that this is the most arrogant Government we have had. Some of his irresponsible actions contributed towards this

Government's gaining office. Had he shown more responsibility in some areas, perhaps the present Government would not be in office. The morals of the community are being continually downgraded as a result of the Government's failure to grasp the nettle and control such activities as massage parlours. In today's newspaper there are 55 advertisements for massage parlours, that list having grown continually in the past 12 months. This problem must be solved for the benefit of the community. I say to the Government and the loud-mouths who are sitting opposite at present and who think this is a joke that it is high time that you acted responsibly.

Mr. Payne: You always descend to the gutter.

Mr. BECKER: I will play your tactics any day you like, and you do not enjoy that, as you have proved once before.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must refer to other honourable members by their district.

Mr. BECKER: Only recently the member for Mitchell, instead of speaking about legislation before the Chair, took the opportunity to abuse members on this side. As soon as an Opposition member stands up for his rights, he is accused of using gutter tactics.

Mr. Payne: You do.

Mr. BECKER: The honourable member uses gutter tactics and, if we throw back the same, he cannot take it. I will give him as good as he can give me, and better.

Mr. Payne: You should keep calmer.

Mr. BECKER: Members on this side will not be put off by Government inactivity; we will fight to uphold the moral standards of the community and the rights of individuals. The Government does not care about the future generations of the State. Although at one stage it intended to introduce legislation to control massage parlours, the Government dropped that legislation. Why did it not proceed with that Bill? Perhaps the Government's failure to legislate on this matter will contribute to the downfall of our community. If one believes in Socialism, this is the way one can demoralize the community. Indeed, that is what happened in Europe in the 1930's, and it is happening here now.

I refer now to the quandary in which the Government finds itself. Unfortunately, the Government has done little or nothing to protect this State's young people who are forced to rent flats. Young married couples must now wait up to four years to acquire a Housing Trust flat, as a result of which they are forced to obtain whatever alternative accommodation is available. If the Government did something to relieve the situation, these people would not be forced to pay the high rents that they must pay. However, the Government will again say that it is waiting for a hand-out from the Commonwealth Government.

The point that alarms me is that some landlords are capitalizing on the bonds that they are forcing young people to pay. I have a document which was issued by the proprietor of a large block of flats for the information of his tenants and of which the House should be made aware. One can see from this that one can pay either one or two weeks rent in advance as well as a \$28 deposit. Permanent rates are subject to a minimum tenancy of six months and, if the tenancy is for a lesser period, the deposit is forfeited. Prospective tenants must sign such a document if they want to obtain accommodation. This Parliament should examine the system to protect the young people who rent flats today.

One can see from the document to which I have referred that, if a property is damaged, the tenant must pay \$7 for cleaning, which is taken from the \$28 deposit.

For termination of the tenancy, two weeks notice is required. If less notice is given, the deposit is forfeited. Tenants allowing visitors to park cars on the premises will have their tenancy terminated, and visitors will be fined \$5. One car park is allowed for each flat. Pets are not allowed to be kept, unless authorized by the management. Laundry must be hung not from balconies but on the lines provided. Also, the management reserves the right to inspect the property at any time. Each tenant must provide his own rubbish bin, and it must be kept outside the flat door. Rubbish must be wrapped in newspaper and the bin kept in a sanitary condition. Any undue noise or misconduct will be sufficient cause for the management to terminate a tenancy and to forfeit all moneys held. Also, definitely no pets are allowed.

When one reads the conditions under which tenants must live, it makes one wonder what is happening. Also, overnight guests are not permitted, unless authorized by the management, and visitors must pay \$2 each extra a week or part thereof. If they stay only one night they must still pay \$2. Non-payment of rent on the due date will automatically terminate tenancy and all moneys held will be forfeited. Electricity charges are the responsibility of tenants.

Prospective tenants are forced to sign such a document and to accept its terms and conditions. Because people must obtain accommodation, they have to accept what they can get. Tenants of one of the flats to which I have referred were unable to pay their rent on the due date. Because the husband was paid two days late and could not pay his rent, he and his wife were told, when they arrived home at 6 o'clock one night, that they had to vacate their flat by 7.45 p.m.

If the Government wishes sincerely to help young people who are not fortunate enough to own their own house, it could set certain standards with which landlords would have to comply. True, it could be argued that some tenants pay a small deposit for a partly furnished flat, rent it for a week, and then take everything and move to another State. In other cases, however, bonds are often as high as \$90 and this makes it extremely difficult for young people, if they do not have reasonable financial resources, to obtain accommodation and, indeed, to live by the rules I have enumerated. The rules laid down for the group of flats to which I have referred are so restrictive that most of the tenants last barely six months in that accommodation.

Mr. Keneally: Would you support rent control?

Mr. BECKER: The bonding system needs to be controlled. Rent control is an entirely different matter and I am not at present arguing it. Tenants must be given as much protection as that given to landlords. Surely this is not being unreasonable, and no reasonable businessman would object to it. Although complaints are not received regarding most landlords, a few of them abuse the system. Because of the actions of this minority, the Government must consider introducing legislation regarding the bonds that are required to be paid by people who must rent flats from the types of landlord to whom I have referred.

Of course, the ultimate answer would be if we could provide sufficient accommodation through the Housing Trust but, with a four-year waiting list, it is a tremendous backlog to make up. However, the Government will have to pay greater heed to its priorities in future. If it is not prepared to do that, the situations I have instanced will increase: competition for flat accommodation will increase, and young people in particular, but anyone who cannot afford his own house, will be living in substandard accommodation. That is already happening in certain

areas of the city, but we hear nothing about it. It is rarely mentioned that people have to live in a one-bedroom flat, with shared facilities. Let us not kid ourselves that there is not an area of poverty in this community, and poor living standards to go with it. We in Parliament must face that fact.

The other issue that concerns me is the present road toll in the State. On the latest statistics available, there have been 77 fatalities on the road in 69 days. If that rate continues, the road toll for the whole year of 365 days will exceed 400. That should cause all members concern. According to the 1972-73 Annual Report of the Road Safety Council of South Australia, 306 people were killed in road crashes in that year. In 1971-72, 313 people died on our roads; in 1970-71, 299 died; and in 1969-70, 302 died. So, over the four-year period, the average road toll is 305. This is alarming but the present trend indicates that road fatalities could increase by one-third bringing the total for the year to well over 400. A concerted effort must be made to reduce the road toll. It will take money and personnel; it will take much co-operation from people in the community. We cannot rely on isolated instances of the occasional so-called road blitz. It is reaching the situation where a concerted effort will have to be made each weekend; we must look at ways and means of educating the motorists and other people in the community to drive a motor car today, with the congestion on our roads, with greater patience and care, and to realize that the damage done and the lives lost should not be tolerated.

We are placing a tremendous burden on the South Australian Police Force and its meagre resources but, as the Premier said earlier, if we want more patrol cars and a fleet of unmarked motor vehicles (which we should have on every road, with every colour range of motor car to use for policing traffic offenders) then somewhere the cost must be met. Whilst no-one likes advocating increased taxes or passing on taxes to the motorist, the people of South Australia will have to face the fact of life that, if they want protection on the road and honestly and sincerely want to reduce the road toll, they must realize that the taxpayers somewhere will have to contribute something, unless we can sort out our priorities and have moneys made available from other sources.

But again we have had little support from the Government in this area. Efforts have been made on specific occasions. The Minister of Transport has gone overseas twice in the last four years, and I have been waiting for an answer to a question I asked about August of last year on what he intends to do to reduce the road toll. I have not had a reply. I do not think the Minister knows what to do or how to tackle the problem, so Parliament must be ready to accept the responsibility. It is something we must face. It is also alarming that last year 11 825 road users suffered injuries. This was an increase of 1 097 on the previous year, or an increase of about 10 per cent. In 1970-71, 10 056 road users suffered injuries. That, too, is alarming.

If we want to tackle the road toll, we should be tackling the whole problem of the causes contributing to road accidents. It is in the area of injuries that the greatest expense can be incurred, when people are maimed for the rest of their lives and become either paraplegics or quadraplegics. It goes on and on and has many effects. Their cost to the community is tremendous, and there is also the impact on family life.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Alcohol probably contributes to 50 per cent of road accidents.

Mr. BECKER: Yes. We shall not really know what part alcohol plays in the road toll until we get the statistics from the compulsory blood tests now being taken of road accident victims. That was at least a step in the right direction. It is a privilege to drive a motor car in this country; it is a right that should not be abused. A motorist should have the welfare of and concern for his family and fellow human beings at heart, and it is high time he took more care and realized that people's lives are at stake when he drives a motor vehicle.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): First, I get no real enthusiasm or benefit from attempting to speak at this early hour of the morning in a grievance debate.

Mr. Goldsworthy: When would you have a chance at any other time the way they run this show?

Mr. EVANS: I accept that comment. What other chance do we have now in Opposition or if one happens to be a Government back-bencher? I should like to go back over the effects brought about by actions taken since I have been in this House, which have had a direct effect upon the effectiveness or otherwise of individual members, whether in Opposition or back-benchers in the Government team. When I first entered this Parliament there was no time limit on speeches. I had no real objection to limiting speeches at the time it was done, although I did express doubts. Some members of the present Government will remember the benefit they had before this Government was elected. Those members who were here in the Opposition Party before May 30, 1970, enjoyed the privilege of giving a lengthy explanation before asking a question, and often much of the explanation had no real bearing on the question. That privilege had been enjoyed by Oppositions in this Parliament for as far back as one would care to read *Hansard*.

Later that system was changed to a system whereby a member asked a question and then made an explanation, and the latitude allowed to a member has been decreased gradually until a stage has been reached where an Opposition member virtually has no real way to bring forward a complaint that he has received, except by moving a motion for the adjournment of the House in the early part of a day's sitting. That cannot be done every day, and some issues are not sufficiently important to warrant that, but yet are important enough to warrant their being mentioned in Parliament for the information of members generally and so that people may read them in *Hansard* if they are not published elsewhere. We went from that point to the reducing of Question Time from two hours to one hour, and the member for Torrens has said that a member is lucky if he is able to ask one question each day, especially if Ministers take the opportunity to give lengthy replies. Sometimes they debate the reply.

Dr. Eastick: That would be the Minister of Education, would it?

Mr. EVANS: I do not say that it has happened with only one Minister: we now have the present Minister of Development and Mines, who I consider is as big an offender in that field. Let us be honest and say that, when we debated the matter of reducing Question Time, no guarantees were given but it was stated that it was not intended to give lengthy explanations: they would be brief and Ministers at least would show responsibility in replying to questions. That has not occurred, as we all know. We know we are not allowed to comment in explaining a question but, again, that was not the practice in the past. Members commented, and any of us can go back through *Hansard* and find that the two worst offenders in that regard were the present Minister of Education and the present Minister of Transport.

Doubtless, the individual member has lost some rights and some opportunities to be effective and bring forward in this Parliament matters of complaint within the State. I know that it is easy for the Government to function on that basis. I give that background because the time is now 2 15 a.m. and Government members may say publicly or in this House that the Opposition has filibustered. Some points that have been raised perhaps could have been raised by Question on Notice, but I want to make the point in particular that, after three weeks of a lack of work in this Parliament, today we were given the task of passing two financial measures. Those measures have been the only opportunity that we have had for a grievance debate, and both are being dealt with on the same day. In addition, we are required to deal with the Superannuation Bill.

If the Government wants co-operation from the Opposition, it should show a sense of reasonableness. At least, the Government could have said that it wanted the financial measures, or one of them, and the Superannuation Bill dealt with at this sitting, and I am sure that the co-operation would have been given if that had been done. However, what Parliament in its right senses would set out to put those three measures through so that, even if the Opposition did not speak, the time would have been late before we dealt with the Superannuation Bill, which contains more than 130 clauses? That Bill is important to people in the Public Service, yet we are to debate it in the early hours of the morning. I do not mind that, but I make the point that, after doing virtually no work for three weeks, at the beginning of this week the Government has said, "This is it." I am pleased that the Opposition did not bow down, say nothing and go home, allowing the Superannuation Bill to pass. I am pleased that the Opposition did not adopt the attitude that it would be bad luck if there were any errors in the Superannuation Bill. That is all I will say about that matter. I consider that at this stage we would be wise to go home, and for that reason, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No.

Mr. EVANS: Earlier this evening I spoke, in another grievance debate, about the activities of the South Australian Film Corporation. I will not go back over any of the material I used then but, because I was running out of time in that debate, I will now make some points that I wanted to make then about the activities of that organization, and I want to support the claim of at least one group that it can produce a first-class film in this State. I consider that the expertise of that group has not been recognized by the South Australian Film Corporation, for reasons unknown to me, except, as I said earlier, that perhaps to get a job or a contract one must be a friend of friends who all go to the same party and mix in the same circles. As I have stated earlier, Arkaba Films Proprietary Limited produced the film *Time in Summer*. In 1969, Mr. Tim Burstall produced the film *2 000 Weeks* and he claimed that that was the first feature film produced in Australia for 10 years. I say that that statement was not completely accurate, because *Time in Summer* was produced in 1968 and that would mean that that film was the first feature film produced in Australia in nine years. It was produced not only in Australia but in South Australia, and by a South Australian company. I refer to a comment made by Dr. Bauer, Director of the Berlin Film Festival on June 2, 1968. In a letter to Arkaba Films, he stated:

The selection committee was very much impressed by the film and considers it a very fine production. I would be pleased to welcome you and the leading actors to our festival as guests of honour for the entire festival period.

That film was recognized as a first-class production and all criticisms praised it, whether appearing in the *Sunday Mail*, the *News*, the *Advertiser*, or from the Berlin Film Festival. The Australian flag, and particularly the South Australian flag, was being flown overseas in the film industry for the first time. However, Arkaba Films has not had one contract for the South Australian Film Corporation: it has been asked to tender for two films to the end of 1973 and for one since that date. Of the seven films put to tender before the end of 1973, three went to firms in other States and four to South Australian firms, except that one went to Film Makers Australia. In the case of this company, one person was encouraged to come to this State to form a company with a person in this State. In other words, this company did not exist before the corporation was formed. Most of the business has gone to other States, and the latest to which I have referred, the film being made for the Police Department, is also being produced by a firm from another State.

I should like to know, if the Premier has the ability to obtain the information, what percentage is added to a contract when it is passed to another department. If Film Makers Australia contracted to the corporation for a production, say for the Police Department, what percentage does the corporation add to the contract for overheads, or does it add nothing? If it adds anything for overheads, who judges whether it is a fair addition to the contract price? Because of the number of personnel employed by the corporation (and I understand they are like white ants now), are the overheads pushed up to such a high degree that the contract sounds unreasonable? In the case of the film for the Police Department (the contract for which was given to Bob Talbot Film Productions in St. Kilda, Victoria) a recommendation was made to the Police Department that it should accept the tender: on what basis was the recommendation made, and was consideration given to South Australian tenderers, as promised by the Premier when the corporation was formed when the Premier said that it would be advised to give preference to the South Australian industry? If this advice has been given, I believe that it has not been accepted.

South Australian producers are being left on a limb, and there is no doubt about that. I have not spoken to a representative of Mastersound Recording Studio. Although I tried to communicate with the proprietor at short notice, I was unable to do so, but I understand that he has been given no work in this State. He has been given the chance to tender on the production *Adelaide*, but has been given no work in the field of sound for film productions. The production by the corporation, *Staceys Gym*, is being hawked around the country now in an effort to sell it. The editing and dubbing for that production was sent to the Eastern States and no chance was given to the local industry to prove itself with that production.

I have made the point earlier that many of the personnel employed by the film corporation are from the Eastern States, and I suggest again that someone must be dealing with the friend of a friend of a friend. I refer to the production *Sunday Is Too Far Away* of one and a half hours duration, and I should like to know whence the money is coming to pay for it. Is half the cost being paid by the Australian Film Development Corporation, is it coming from moneys made available by this State to the film corporation, or is money being guaranteed by a loan from the Treasury? I believe the Treasury is able to guarantee up to \$300 000 to the film corporation for work it may undertake.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The Treasury is not required to guarantee it. Half the money is coming from the

Commonwealth Government and half from the corporation's funds.

Mr. EVANS: Well, at least we have the details. I realize that about \$400 000 was made available from Loan Estimates last year for the corporation. However, the corporation was not originally set up, as the Premier said, to make films. Basically, it was to promote the industry, help others in the industry, and to stimulate existing film companies. However, that has not occurred. Local film producers are disgusted and disappointed. In what I have said I do not challenge the expertise of anyone who may be employed by the corporation, except that I challenge the expertise of one person who was forced on a filmmaker in the case of one film produced. I do not doubt that *Staceys Gym* will be a good production and *Sunday To Far Away* will also be a good production.

However, we have not given the chance to people in this State to enter this field in order to see whether they can produce films. From the evidence I have received, at least three or possibly four companies have the expertise to do this. These companies are Production Centre, Bosisto Productions, Ray Beale Film Productions, and Arkaba Films: they are not in any order of priority but as I have written them on a piece of paper. Each company has the capacity to produce suitable films. If that statement is incorrect, let us tell them that they are finished and should get out of the industry because we do not need them. One could start a company with the proper expertise and produce a good film: all that is needed is a good manager. That statement is clarified by the terms and conditions of the contracts let by the corporation, but I challenge that statement because I do not believe that the corporation has honoured the obligation that Parliament expected from it when it passed the legislation.

Another matter of concern to me is Monarto, and I wish to speak about the connecting link to that town. Members have said that they doubt the wisdom of attempting to develop Monarto as a new city. I think I said when a new city was first proposed that the site was too close to Adelaide for it to be really a separate city. I thank the Minister of Transport for confirming this for me because, in reply to one of my questions, he said that the State needed another road through the Adelaide Hills from Crafrers to transport commuters from Monarto to Adelaide and from Adelaide to Monarto.

That is the very thing we set out not to have—a massive freeway system transporting people from one area to another that may be only 40 miles away. It is just a waste of fuel and resources, but that is the intention, and that will be the result. If the Minister sets out with the present proposals that the Highways Department has for road development in the Mitcham hills area, I believe his standards are double. He stood up in this House with tongue in cheek and accused the Liberal and Country League Government of bringing in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan; he said that he did not want massive freeways carving his district apart. He organized public meetings and gained much publicity. When he spoke in this House he had the opportunity of using a better method of asking questions and of obtaining more details. He had all those benefits, and he now has the cheek to say that it is all right if the Mitcham hills area is carved up for a massive road development, and it is all right if trees are removed in order to give us a main road from Adelaide through one of the most rugged, foggy and steep parts of the State to Goolwa.

What Minister with any common sense would accept a proposal to put a main road from Adelaide to Goolwa through Mitcham over Belair Hill, through Belair, Blackwood and Coromandel Valley into Kangarilla? It is utter stupidity. The Highways Department will remove many beautiful trees and interfere with properties. In one case 18ft. (5.5 m) is to be taken from a property, resulting in the house being virtually on a main road. Actually, the building was once a church, and it is more than 100 years old. The occupier is trying to keep it as a relic of the work of pioneers. Yet the same Minister in this place who condemned the M.A.T.S. plan because it interfered with the average man's house is setting out to establish several unnecessary roads through a residential area. If we are to connect Monarto to the city by a road, the place to build the road is from Hackham over the hill, over the Onkaparinga River (about where the new wall will go for the Baker Gully dam), through Kangarilla, Meadows, Macclesfield, Gemmells and Woodchester, and then back on to the main road near Callington.

This route is not steep, and the road will have to be built in the future, anyway; and then the main Goolwa road presents no problem. Some of the traffic on the South Road will be removed when the railway is extended to Christies Beach; if traffic is not removed in that way, it will mean that the railway is a failure. The Mitcham hills will be carved to pieces if the Upper Sturt and Hawthorndene roads are widened, together with Sheoak Road, Old Belair Road, and the main Coromandel Valley road. This is a disgrace. I hope the Minister will have the courage of his convictions and be honest with the people in my district; I hope he will say that their way of life is just as important as the way of life of people in his district. There is no place for politicians who have double standards, but the Minister will be showing that he has double standards if he goes ahead with the proposals.

The Stirling District Council was criticized throughout the State by the news media for the zoning plans and regulations that it introduced about two years ago. As a result, the plans were withdrawn and the State Planning Authority was given the responsibility of drawing up supplementary plans and regulations, but to this day they are still not available. The State Planning Authority was given this task in April or May of last year. Permission has been given for a house in the main street of Stirling, which was used as a residence up to 18 months ago, to be converted into a land agent's office. However, permission was refused for a butcher's shop (about 100yds. (91 m) away), which had been used as such for many years, to be converted into a land agent's office. I hope that a current application for this shop to be used as an art and craft shop will not be rejected. On the opposite side of the street, a house was converted into another type of business premises. In other words, the decisions of the State Planning Authority have not been consistent, but the community is asking for consistency. I hope that the plans are brought in for public perusal very soon.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Chapman (teller), Coumbe, Eastick, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, McAnaney, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (20)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, Burdon, Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Dean Brown, Evans, Gunn, and Nankivell. Noes—Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Langley, McRae, and Wells.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am disappointed that the Government has chosen to have us continue this debate at the ungodly hour of 2.45 a.m.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Your filibustering is the reason we are here.

Dr. Eastick: We aren't.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Some members have just talked their time out.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Whatever comments Opposition members have made, I believe those members have acted responsibly on behalf of the State. Late yesterday I spoke about the Kangaroo Island part of my district. I now wish to refer to the Fleurieu Peninsula part of my district. The Willunga council has been, still is, and will be for a long time a most responsible body. Among other things, over the years the council has made a desperate attempt to preserve the environment and generally enhance the district. In 1962, it refused to adopt a plan prepared for it by the relevant State department. It then set about preparing a supplementary plan that it believed would continue to enhance the area. That plan was gazetted on July 12, 1973. As the plan was gazetted, presumably it was acceptable. As a result of that gazettal, until the plan is finally approved by the State Planning Authority, the council has been denied continuity of control in the district under its own by-laws.

This interim period has become a serious embarrassment to the district. I seek the co-operation of the Minister of Environment and Conservation and his department in dealing with this urgent and serious matter. The actions of this council exemplify the responsible efforts of councils throughout the State. Recently, I believe that adequate recognition has not been given to councils. The present Government appears to ignore continually the true and valuable function of councils. During this important debate, when Opposition members have tried to bring before the House matters of importance not only to their own districts but also to the State generally, the Premier has seen fit for the last two hours to read a book about Frost and/or Whitlam, or vice versa. The Attorney-General has for the same period during the debate perused a book on Watergate. This illustrates how the Ministers of this State act at a time when they ought to be paying attention to the conditions pertaining within the State.

When referring previously to a council in my district, I spoke of State Planning Authority involvement. The authority has been involved in many proposed development plans, only two of which I have seen and both of which related to my district. Having perused those documents, I consider that they were non-development plans: in no way could they be described as positive development plans. If these are an example of the plans that are to apply across South Australia, it is about time we had some positive planning in regard to future development proposals. These plans are negative and restrictive statements that are the responsibility of that bureaucratic band.

I now refer to Kangaroo Island and to some of the charges that are incurred in relation to the m.v. *Troubridge*. However, before doing so I will refer briefly to some of the comments which the Minister of Transport so proudly made and which were reported in the *Islander* newspaper of January 16 last, as follows:

The Government began operating the *Troubridge* on July 1, 1972. "In the financial year 1971-72 about 6 820

passengers were carried on the *Troubridge*; however, under Government control the number of passengers rose dramatically to 14 484 in 1972-73. And in the first five months of 1973-74, 7 971 passengers travelled on the *Troubridge*, which indicates to me that by the end of the financial year the vessel will have carried many more passengers than in 1972-73. I would think the 1973-74 figure would exceed 16 000," the Minister said.

If the Minister's estimate is somewhere near accurate (and I have no reason to doubt that it is) the figures for 1973-74 will be nearly triple those of the year prior to the Government's taking over the vessel. Many reasons could have brought this about, one of which could have been tourist promotion of this attractive island. We then have a different picture. A little over a year after the Government assumed ownership of the *Troubridge*, the Minister, on March 9, 1974, announced increases in the rates to apply to the *Troubridge*. When comparing those figures with those of other forms of transport to which I have referred, one should not overlook that this is the only form of transport on which one can take one's vehicle from the island to the mainland and vice versa. In other words, it is the only form of vehicular transport from the island to the mainland. It can be seen from the latest announcement that the Minister intends to increase the fares and charges on the *Troubridge* by about 20 per cent. For example, he intends to increase the adult fare to \$11.50 each way. That sum, when compared to the mainland form of State-owned transport, is outrageous. One can compare the distance involved in this journey with that included on the mainland between, say, Merriton, a town near Crystal Brook, and Adelaide. The fare on the Government-owned transport system for that journey involving a distance of 118 miles (190 km) is only \$3.50. For less than that distance, the fare between Adelaide and Kingscote is \$11.50. Worse than that, I should like to cite another example of how outrageous are the charges that are being inflicted on the community by the Minister, through his department. A passenger who wishes to travel between Adelaide and Kingscote in the middle of the week has two choices: he can travel on the *Troubridge* for a single fare of \$11.50, or fly with Airlines of South Australia for a single fare of \$11. This point was raised earlier today, and I defy any honourable member to cite another example in Australia where any form of Government-owned transport is dearer than airline transport. Considering the difference in charges that apply to the services provided, the Minister must think that the people are out of their minds.

Probably an even more significant factor in this respect is that we have the two forms of public transport to which I have referred: the railways system on the mainland and the *Troubridge* that runs between the mainland and Kingscote. It is expected that the volume of trade and operating costs of both these services will increase in the next 12 months. However, no public announcement has been made regarding increased railway charges, despite Kangaroo Island residents being faced with a 20 per cent increase for travel on the *Troubridge*. I mentioned previously that this is an outrageous situation, and I say that again.

I believe it is another case of gross discrimination against a community that has no other effective means of transport for passengers travelling with their vehicles, for growers wishing to market or take delivery of stock, or to freight goods to or from Kangaroo Island. It is a situation where one cannot get in his car and drive; he cannot engage another carrier. He has no other choice when involved in shifting freight: he has to use the *Troubridge*, that big hulk of a vessel, which, like this A.L.P. Government, is too big, too slow, and too expensive.

He has no alternative, and on that basis I claim the Government is taking advantage of the situation in which that community is placed. In no way do I apologize for having referred over and over again to that community, which I believe in many respects for a long time has been denied a fair go.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) introduced a Bill for an Act to apply, out of the General Revenue, the sum \$100 000 000 to the Public Service for the year ending June 30, 1975. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for the appropriation of \$100 000 000 to enable the Public Service of the State to be carried on during the early part of the next financial year. In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no Parliamentary authority for appropriations required between the commencement of the new financial year and the date, usually in October, on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill. It is customary to present two Supply Bills each year, the first covering estimated expenditure during July and August and the second covering the remainder of the period prior to the Appropriation Bill becoming law.

This Bill is for a lower amount than the first Supply Bill for 1973-74. The possibility of an unusual delay in passing the second Bill, against which it was deemed prudent to provide, made it necessary to include an amount of \$110 000 000, estimated to be sufficient to cover the three months to September rather than the two months to August. It is proposed this year to return to the more

before the House is considerably higher than half of the usual practice. However, the amount of the Bill now total amount provided by both Supply Bills last year. This is, of course, a result of rising salary and wage rates and other costs, together with a steady expansion in the services provided by the Government.

The absence in the Bill of any detail relating to the purposes for which the \$100 000 000 is to be made available does not give the Government or individual departments a free hand in spending during the early months of 1974-75. Clause 3 of the Bill ensures that, until the main Appropriation Bill becomes law, the amounts made available by Supply Acts may be used only within the limits of the individual lines set out in the original and Supplementary Estimates approved by Parliament for 1973-74. In accordance with normal procedures, members will have the opportunity to debate the 1974-75 expenditure proposals fully when the Budget is presented.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. It is an unusual time (about 3 a.m.) for a Bill to be introduced. The attempt by the Treasurer to introduce it earlier was defeated because the Opposition exercised its right to discuss the many deficiencies in the present Government's administration. The situation is quite clear: it is normal to accept a measure in these terms. A check of the details provided by the Treasurer indicates that no unusual circumstances surround the Bill. Therefore, I support it and trust it will receive a speedy passage.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.9 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 13, at 2 p.m.