

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 7, 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*.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

In reply to Mr. McANANEY (July 30).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The expected date for opening the section of the South-Eastern Freeway between Verdun and Mount Barker is December 4, 1974. However, use of this part of the freeway does not mean the termination of all the existing temporary arrangements for traffic in the Mount Barker area. Until the bridge on the Mount Barker interchange is completed as expected in April, 1975, the use of Childs Road must continue. The above programme is subject to any variation brought about by weather conditions, industrial problems, and availability of bridging materials.

TRANSPORT SURVEY

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (August 1).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A survey was carried out at Adelaide Airport on July 31, 1974. Its main purpose was to determine the destination of people leaving the airport and their reasons for having been there. This work was carried out as part of a wide-ranging study of airport alternatives for Adelaide that is being carried out by a committee established jointly by the Australian Minister for Transport and the State Minister of Transport. The work referred to by the honourable member was carried out by the Highways Department on behalf of the Director-General of Transport, who requested the information. Both the Department of Transport and the Highways Department are participating in this planning study. There is no satisfactory mechanical way of collecting the data obtained during this survey.

FOSTER ROAD LIGHTING

In reply to Mr. WELLS (August 1).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Foster Road is under the care and control of the city of Enfield, although Highways Department assistance was made available to reconstruct the section from the North-East Road to Folland Avenue. The remaining length from Folland Avenue past Hillcrest Hospital to Grand Junction Road has not been reconstructed and is not kerbed. The street lighting of Foster Road could certainly be improved, and the Highways Department will discuss this matter with the city of Enfield.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN INDUSTRY

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say whether he has initiated any investigation by members of his think tank and other industrial research officers to determine what effect the current rash of industrial stoppages and disputes is having on South Australia's ability to attract new industry and to encourage its existing industries to expand their operations here in preference to other places in Australia? In the past, South Australia has had certain advantages that have attracted industry to come here rather than go to the other States. Many of those attractions have been lost. If we are to have an industrial base for Monarto and a diversity and improvement in our general industrial base, it is important that we know something of the forward think-

ing or planning in this field. Therefore, I ask the Premier whether he has initiated an investigation along the lines I have suggested and, if he has not, whether he will do so.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I constantly have discussions on developments in South Australia with the Development Division, the Department of the Minister of Development and Mines and the economic intelligence unit of the Government. At present, the principal concern in these areas regarding the future of industry is not in relation to industrial disputes, as South Australia does not have more industrial disputes than the other States have.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Coumbe: What about Victoria?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If members opposite were able to get to Melbourne and also have a look generally at what is happening under Liberal Governments in the Eastern States, I can only say that they would regard South Australia as a haven of industrial peace.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The principal matter of concern of the economic intelligence unit of the Government and of the department is not a question of industrial unrest: it is the report of the Industries Assistance Commission on the motor car industry, and the position in our white goods industry as a result of alterations in the tariff and the economics of that industry. These are areas of major concern at the moment and, in each of these areas, studies are being undertaken. Constant consultation has taken place. There is a close watch on the effects on South Australian industry, and representation is to be made to the Commonwealth Government in consequence of these studies now taking place. Naturally, a close watch is being kept on industrial disputes, discussions having taken place with the unions, industry, and the Industrial Development Advisory Council on the present situation in South Australia.

Dr. Eastick: Will this help the market?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know what the Leader wants to have studied at present. If he is talking about the strike involving the Transport Workers Union, I can tell him that the transport workers are returning to work.

Mr. Gunn: What about the steel at Port Adelaide?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The steel dispute has been the subject of a series of conferences, including a conference called in my office on Monday by the Deputy President of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. In consequence of that conference, representations have been made to the parties concerned by the Australian Council of Trade Unions, the Deputy President, and me.

Dr. Eastick: What about coming back to the question of future industry?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What about ceasing to interject?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot promise the Leader that I will set up a special study on the effects of industrial disputes in South Australia as compared to the position of other States in this respect. Frankly, we are (thank goodness) rather better off here than the other States.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members are fully aware of what is required of each and every one of them during Question Time.

GARDEN SUBURB

Mr. PAYNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that Opposition members have calmed down, I will try to ask my question. Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the Government intends to implement the recommendation in the first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas regarding the Garden Suburb of Colonel Light Gardens? On page 40 of its first report, the Commission states:

We recommend that the Garden Suburb of Colonel Light Gardens be amalgamated with the city of Mitcham. We do so after carefully considering the submissions and evidence of the city of Mitcham, the provisions of the Garden Suburb Act, 1919-1960, and the reports of the various committees of inquiry that have considered the future of the municipality.

I consider that that explanation of my question is sufficient and, if the Government intends to implement the recommendation, I should like the Minister to state the likely procedure that will be followed.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Royal Commission report made abundantly clear that the return of Colonel Light Gardens to the Corporation of the City of Mitcham was highly desirable. I think most members (certainly, the member for Mitchell and the member for Mitcham, as the two members involved in the area) will recall that originally Colonel Light Gardens was part and parcel of what was then the Mitcham District Council and was constituted as an area unto itself for a certain purpose. The Garden Suburb Act provides for a proclamation to be issued (and I am speaking from memory about the number) when there are more than 300 residents in the area. Of course, there have been more than 300 residents in the area since the early 1920's, when I had the privilege of becoming one of them, as have also the present member for Unley and other distinguished people. The Government now intends to exercise the powers in the provisions of that Act and have a proclamation issued soon so that Colonel Light Gardens will again become part of the Mitcham council area. In addition to the proclamation that will be issued, I have reason to believe that a petition will be received seeking to amend the boundaries of the adjacent wards so that the existing Garden Suburb will become part of each of the two adjacent wards of the Mitcham council. I hope that this will be achieved within a few weeks.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister say whether any payment will be made to the Mitcham council in connection with the incorporation into it of the Garden Suburb? In view of the recommendations of the Royal Commission, the announcement made by the Minister in reply to the member for Mitchell came as no surprise. Indeed, for many years it has been expected that this would eventually happen. The burning question, and one that has held up the incorporation of the Garden Suburb into the Mitcham council area for five years or more in my experience, has been whether any payment would be made to the Mitcham council as compensation for the works it expects to have to carry out in the Garden Suburb, works which successive Garden Suburb Commissioners have simply not been able to undertake. Therefore, in some respects the standards of service in the Garden Suburb have fallen below those in the Mitcham council area. Sums of \$300 000 and even up to \$1 000 000 have been suggested to me as appropriate payment as recompense to the Mitcham council for having to undertake the responsibility for these works. I noticed that, in his earlier reply, the Minister was entirely silent on this point, which is the crux of the whole problem. Therefore, I put my question to him because, unless there is to be

some payment, there will be much upset and trouble. In addition, I was rather perturbed, in the light of what has been said to me by several residents of the Garden Suburb, to hear the suggestion that the Garden Suburb should be split up between two wards of the Mitcham council. What the people want is that they should go into the Mitcham council as an extra ward.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Unfortunately, the honourable member fits into the category shared by many other people who have criticized the report of the Royal Commission. As soon as they criticize it, they show clearly that they have not taken the trouble even to read it. If the honourable member cares to turn to page 40 of the report, he will see contained there the reply to his question, as follows:

On consideration of all these matters, we reject the concept of any monetary compensation.

That is the policy that the Government has adopted.

COUNCIL ROADWORKS

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Transport give the House further information about funds available for roadworks to be undertaken by the councils, following the statement last Monday by the Commonwealth Minister for Urban and Regional Development (Mr. Uren)? It was reported on Monday that the Commonwealth Minister had announced a grant of \$30 000 000 over the next three years to improve roads in the residential areas of major cities in Australia. As the grant is for the whole of Australia what allocation will South Australia receive and where is it likely to be spent? In addition, is the grant to be supplementary to the normal grants received under the old formula, or is this sum expected to be deducted from the allocation normally available?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I cannot say how much will be available to local government, because the total funds available for roadworks, including funds available to local government for roadworks, come from the Highways Fund (which is provided in several ways—about half of it coming from the Commonwealth Government). The Australian Parliament has not yet passed the three Bills introduced by the Government. Although the Bills have been passed by the House of Representatives, they have not yet been passed by the Senate. If the Bills are passed, South Australia will in this financial year receive a total allocation of \$31 000 000.

Mr. Coumbe: The same as last year?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Exactly the same as last year. However, at this stage it appears that certain forces within the Opposition in Canberra are bent on amending the Bills. The Australian Government has, through the Minister for Transport, made clear that the allocations to the States are not negotiable in Parliament. They have been subject to submissions from State Ministers. Until the three Bills are finally passed by the Commonwealth Parliament (and I do not know when that will be), the matter remains in the hands of the Senate. I am therefore unable to give the honourable member the information he seeks. Perhaps he might care to use his good offices (as he calls on us to do so often) with his colleagues in the Senate to ensure the passage of the necessary legislation.

COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Mr. WRIGHT: Will the Minister of Local Government indicate what action can be taken by councils that dissent from the findings of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas? An article in this morning's *Advertiser* refers to certain dissenting councils, one of which is the Thebarton council in my district. I should like to be

able to tell the officers of that council what procedures are laid down to enable councils to object to the findings of the Commission.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have discussed with the Chairman of the Commission (as I explained previously) the procedures to be followed in relation to the implementation of the Commission's report. Legislation will be introduced in the Parliament and, subject to its being passed, the Government would then require the Royal Commission to give effect to its recommendations. The legislation would contain provisions to enable the Governor to issue proclamations from time to time to give effect to the recommendations of the Commission. I am conscious at this stage that some councils have expressed opposition to the recommendations of the Commission. I will not canvass the points that have been raised or the basis of the criticisms those councils have used, other than simply to repeat that I believe that the Royal Commission has done a commendable job in the interests of all councils in the State. However, if there are submissions dissenting councils have regarding the report's recommendations, I believe that it would be in the best interests of all concerned if they were considered fully. Accordingly, after discussions with Judge Ward this morning, I can now say that the Commission is willing to receive written submissions from councils dissatisfied with the recommendations contained in the Commission's report, but such submissions should not take the form of a rehash of what has already taken place in the hearings the Commission has conducted over many months.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the Walkerville council?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If councils such as the Walkerville council wish to submit that the Commission's boundary recommendations should not be given effect to, the Commission is willing to reconsider or review any decision in the light of any written submission from those councils. I give no assurance that there will be changes, nor will I say that the Commission will not seriously review certain matters: it will review seriously any matter raised but, in the interests of local government as a whole (and this must be made plain), it is absolutely essential that this matter be resolved soon. It would be a retrograde step if negotiations, once commenced, delayed over a lengthy period the decision on whether the Commission's report be accepted or rejected. With that thought in mind, I can say that my office is currently preparing a circular to be sent to all councils telling them that, if they wish to make written submissions, they may do so, provided that they are received no later than Friday, August 30.

This will give councils between five and six weeks during which to consider and determine their attitude on this matter. If they wish to make submissions, the submissions will be properly considered by the Commission, which will report, as it has done in the past. I hope that, as a result, some of the fears previously expressed will be dissipated and that we can take the necessary action to ensure that local government is restored to its proper viable position in the community.

Mr. McANANEY: In view of the uncertainty amongst council staff and ratepayers about the planned redistribution of council boundaries, can the Minister of Local Government give a time table for the various stages of redistribution? Does he hope the changes will be completed in six months, 12 months, or two years?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This will vary from location to location, depending on what is involved. In some cases, the recommendations of the Royal Commission appear to

be relatively simple. For instance, in a case where two councils are being amalgamated completely into one council, the task is fairly simple. I hope that such a change will become effective early in 1975. In more complicated cases, where the existing council area is to be divided amongst three or four areas and there is also the problem of dividing assets and liabilities, obviously the time involved in the change will be longer. However, I hope that changes in such cases can be effected no later than late 1975. Although the honourable member did not refer to this specifically in his question, what has a distinct bearing on the matter is the passage of necessary legislation through this Parliament. Of course, nothing can be done until Parliament has indicated that it will support this legislation. I hope that this will be done within a couple of months; then the Royal Commission will be required to give effect to that legislation. Perhaps the Commission will be able to draw up a better programme than I can give the honourable member now.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Works say whether it is true that Engineering and Water Supply Department workmen employed on the Blackwood sewerage scheme are required to report for work but cannot work because of industrial problems and whether, as a consequence, at least two departmental employees have been digging trenches under private contract during normal working hours and have been using a departmental vehicle to proceed to that work? I ask this question reluctantly. I told the Minister that I intended to ask it, because I believed other workmen could be doing the same thing and thereby putting their jobs in jeopardy. It appears that, finding it difficult to sit around doing nothing, they took on private contracts near their depot in the Blackwood area and used the vehicle only to travel the short distance to the job. They have been digging a trench under a private contract because they were bored with sitting around doing nothing. Are the facts as told to me correct?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am aware of the incident referred to by the honourable member: the Engineer-in-Chief rang me at lunch time and told me that the honourable member had been in touch with his department about it. It is not correct to say that the men engaged in sewer reticulation in that area are required to report for work when there is nothing to do. The two men referred to are foremen who are required to check lights and installations. They were doing so, so they were at least partly employed. True, they were evidently engaged on private work at weekends for people who had requested it. It was foolish of them to decide to catch up on a backlog of private work in departmental time and to use a departmental truck to convey them to the site of this work. Both these foremen, I believe, are good foremen but they will be disciplined to the extent that their foolish action this morning will be indeed costly. I very much regret that this has happened and I hope it will serve as a lesson to other people who may think they can get away with this sort of thing. Let them be warned that the department will not be lenient at all with people employed by it who take full foolhardy action similar to that taken by the two men referred to.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: My question relates to trade unions. On practical grounds, I think I should direct it to the Minister of Transport, as apparently he is the Minister with the backing of the trade unions at present, although I think that theoretically the question should be asked of the Premier. In view of the critical industrial

situation now existing in South Australia and the complete lack of respect the trade union movement has for the Government, I ask what action the Government is willing to take to restore industrial order and the respect of the trade union movement for the Government. The industrial disputes and strikes that are currently affecting this State are well known, but I consider that the true picture comes out when we examine the statistics. Therefore, I have taken statistics issued by the Australian Bureau of Statistics regarding the average annual estimated loss in wages. I will give three figures, the first being for the period when the Liberals were in Government, the second being the average for the first four years of this Labor Government, and the third being 1974 projections based on figures already available. The estimated loss in wages was \$1 030 000 a year when the Liberals were in Government. The loss was \$1 400 000 a year during the first four years of office of this Government, and the figure for this year is \$7 700 000—an increase of 770 per cent.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport is now quoting statistics in explanation of the question, and that is bordering on debate rather than explanation. The honourable member must explain the question and do so as briefly as possible, rather than debate the subject matter of the question asked.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have only three more figures that I should like to quote, as I believe—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I accept your ruling fully, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The other figures were in regard to actual days lost, stated on an annual basis. They show that the annual loss was 90 000 days a year when the Liberal Government was in office, compared to 99 000 days a year in the first four years of this Labor Government and 466 000 days for 1974. The figure for 1974 is an increase of 420 per cent. Therefore, I ask the question of the Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member, of course, was trying to make a few political points and he started with the favourite nonsense of the Liberal Party, being put around in that Party's publications and by its officers, that in fact I have no relationship with the trade union movement and that the only member of the Government who has such a relationship is the Minister of Transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That's utter rubbish.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is. The point is that the Liberal Party in South Australia is so hopelessly divided and so bereft of the respect of the people that inevitably it must try to fix on some fantasy about there being some division within the Government and between the Government and the trade union movement.

Mr. Dean Brown: They are facts and figures.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They have nothing to do with the honourable member's statement that the Minister of Transport had the confidence of the trade union movement whereas I did not have it. It was I, on behalf of this Government, who spoke to the Trades and Labor Council yesterday, with the complete confidence of the Government and of the Trades and Labor Council executive. As to the history of disputes in South Australia, there has been an increase in the overall number in recent months, but most of them have been of national origin. However, if the honourable member looks at the history of disputes in States under Liberal Governments in that period, he will not find any statistics that give him joy.

Mr. Dean Brown: A Liberal Government was in power—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Liberal Governments in other States are trying to cope with the present situation, and right now the Transport Workers Union is staying out in New South Wales and Victoria, but not here. I realize that the honourable member does not like these facts, but he must face them.

WHYALLA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Works obtain the latest information about the provision of water to residents of Eight Mile Creek in my district? Much co-operation was sought by the Engineering and Water Supply Department from the people in the area, and I understand that that co-operation was given. Under those circumstances I am eager for a water supply to be provided as soon as possible.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain a report for the honourable member. As I do not know the latest development in the situation, I will bring down a report as soon as possible.

PORT LINCOLN HARBOR

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Marine say when he expects that work on the berthing facilities at Port Lincoln will be completed? This project appears to be taking a little longer to complete than was originally expected. Will the facilities be available in time for the coming grain harvest.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report from the Director of Marine and Harbors, but I know that work is not proceeding as quickly as was expected. I am not sure of the expected completion date but I will find out and let the honourable member know, probably tomorrow.

FAIRVIEW PARK BUS SERVICE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport consider, in reviewing the whole system of bus operations, extending either the Tea Tree Gully or Fairview Park bus service, operated by the Municipal Tramways Trust, to serve a newly developed subdivision at Fairview Park that is partly bordered by Hamilton and Yatala Vale Roads, and the hills face zone? This service, which was formerly operated by Bowmans Bus Service Proprietary Limited, was taken over by the Tramways Trust in February this year. Residents of the area desire the service to be extended in the way I have outlined. In his reply, will the Minister also say when the review of the whole system will be finalized?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As the whole of this problem is currently under review, I shall get up-to-date information for the honourable member and let her have it.

HOSPITAL CHARGES

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Treasurer examine the present situation applying to deductions for board made from the pensions of patients at Glenside Hospital and other hospitals, particularly in view of the imminent increase in hospital charges? I have received from 52 patients at Glenside Hospital a letter drawing to my attention the relationship between the value of sickness benefits and the amount remaining for the patient after deductions for board have been made. They point out that in a typical case at present the sickness benefit payable is \$26 a week. After the deduction is made, the patient receives only \$7.50; or about 29 per cent. In 1962, the sum payable was \$16 a week, from which the patient received \$7.50, or almost half. They point out that this

comparison shows no allowance has been made for inflation. The recently announced pension increase is \$5, but the increase in charges to be made is, I understand, from \$24.50 to \$35 a day for psychiatric hospitals. Therefore, in spite of the increase in the pension that they have received, the patients are concerned that they will be left with even less for spending than they received before.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

KANGAROO ISLAND AIRPORT

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Premier support Kangaroo Island residents in their long-standing appeal to the Australian Minister for Transport (Mr. Jones) to have funds provided for sealing the Kangaroo Island Airport runways? Last session, I directed a similar question to the Premier. Although I have received an apology from a member of his staff, I am still awaiting a reply. As the position is even more urgent now than it was when I raised the matter first in this place, I now ask the Premier this question in the interests of those who are being isolated. There are several reasons for this. The Governor's Speech sets out how the State Government should protect the interests of its people against fiscal policies that may apply in the programme of the Commonwealth Government. When this matter was raised previously in this House, I got into much trouble for making what were claimed to be unreasonable blackmail allegations. However, I find that a report in the local Kangaroo Island newspaper can be referred to on the matter. In that report, the writer states that recent correspondence from the Australian Minister virtually states, "Take over the airport and guarantee our investment, and we will spend the money; otherwise, go without an essential service when it rains." The community on Kangaroo Island is disturbed about the attitude that has been taken towards them in that regard. Another part of the report states:

The attitude of the department is that of a dictating monster. The local government authority is being forced into an untenable position.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now adverting to something not connected with the explanation of his question. He must come back to the explanation and must do so briefly.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I respect your remarks in that regard, Mr. Speaker, and will keep the explanation brief. However, the explanation is vital in dealing, in this place, with a matter that ordinarily would be one for the Commonwealth Government. That Government's extreme standover attitude shows that Kangaroo Island people are being treated like dogs on a chain.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member desires to continue in that vein, I will withdraw leave to make the explanation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I regret that I do not remember the honourable member's previous question, I will inquire about that. I will try to get a reply for him, but I point out that the Commonwealth Government, in the course of the most recent Premiers' Conference, made clear that one of the areas in which it would reduce public expenditure concerned installations for air services. Consequently, it may be extremely difficult to get the Commonwealth Government to increase expenditure when it has markedly reduced previous estimates of expenditure for airways establishments. I do not hold out to the honourable member much hope that we can do that when the Commonwealth Government is reducing its

expenditure deliberately in several areas, for economic reasons. However, I will try to get a reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

FISHING REGULATIONS

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Fisheries say whether the fishing regulations controlling the catching of yabbies have been revised, consequent on the dissatisfaction expressed at a public meeting in Renmark last year? As the Minister probably recalls, last year's high flow in the Murray River brought an abundance of yabbies into the Murray River system in South Australia, and many schoolchildren and adults took the opportunity to catch the yabbies, which are a delicacy. The fisheries regulations require that yabby nets be registered and that the person using the net have a licence. Further, one problem that the people concerned encountered was that, when they applied for a licence, often two or three months passed before the licence was received. That was because of the number of persons applying. I ask the Minister whether the Fisheries Department has reconsidered the regulations, because I understand that, following the public meeting at Renmark, representations were made to the Minister and to the Director.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: We are considering the representations that have been made from the honourable member's district. The only new aspect that he has raised in his question concerns the delay in replying to applications for licences. As that matter has not been brought to my attention previously, I will certainly have it examined, together with the general proposal.

REDCLIFF PROJECT

Mr. BOUNDY: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation give an undertaking that the studies of the impact of the Redcliff petro-chemical project on the environment will be completed and made public in time for public comment before the introduction of the foreshadowed indenture Bill? My question is a consequence of a reply given yesterday to a Question on Notice asked by the member for Mitcham. The Minister said that the consortium was responsible for preparing these studies. As the purpose of the studies is to help make a decision on this project, they will be wasted unless they are available before Parliament considers the indenture Bill.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In reply to the member for Mitcham—

Mr. Millhouse: That's not so.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: —I point out that the honourable member seems to fail to understand that studies associated with this project will continue not only between now and when the indenture Bill is introduced but also over several years, in order to ensure that, as the programme develops, the environment will be considered adequately. Several studies have been completed and are available, but I do not know whether the honourable member has received information about them. If he has not, and if he requires them and approaches me, I shall be pleased to obtain them for him.

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education indicate under what Parliamentary authority and appropriation has the Council of Educational Planning and Research been established and appointments made to its staff?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member checks the Estimates for 1973-74, he will see that under

the line "Minister of Education, Miscellaneous" the sum of \$25 000 was voted by this Parliament to the South Australian Council of Educational Planning and Research.

MOTOR VEHICLES DEPARTMENT

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the Government intends to acquire a building situated on the corner of Gawler Place and Wakefield Street to be used to house the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and his department? If that building is not to be acquired, can the Minister say whether investigations are being made to rehouse the Motor Vehicles Department in a location more convenient to the motoring public than is the present location?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member cared to read reports placed before him, he would have seen a report of the Public Works Committee (chaired by my good friend the member for Ross Smith), which has investigated the erection of a new building for the Registrar of Motor Vehicles in Wakefield Street, east of Gawler Place. The Minister of Works, who is responsible for the Public Buildings Department, now has this matter in hand and, from a report I received as recently as yesterday afternoon, I understand that the project is progressing satisfactorily.

PLANNING OFFICES

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the State Planning Office is to be transferred ultimately to Monarto, and whether, when the re-arrangement of local government boundaries comes into effect, regional planning offices will be located in the new local government areas? At a conference I attended recently it was suggested that it would be desirable that regional planning offices should be established because, at present, councils are not constituted so as to have the expertise for this work.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is intended to establish the Environment and Conservation Department generally in the new Monarto area, and the State Planning Office is a division of that department. However, what the honourable member has said is true: at present councils find it difficult to provide the planning expertise needed in local government, and I should have thought that this was one reason why the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas had recommended that the size of council areas be reduced: to provide more efficient local government and to enable councils to employ the sort of planning experts needed to undertake this work. At present this expertise is not available in most areas.

SOMERTON HOME

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health whether he has replies to two questions I asked last year? I asked one about this time last year, and then I asked a supplementary question (because I had not received a reply) at the end of the session in March. My questions related to the future of the Somerton Crippled Children's Home. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the children are to be moved from this home to another at Regency Park, and their present building will become available at its location on the Esplanade, Somerton. I pointed out to the Minister that the building would be ideally suitable for a geriatric home or a day-care centre, because it is a completely equipped hospital, with beds, lifts, and a heated swimming pool. Many aged people live in my district, as well as in other south-western suburbs, and this type of accommodation is needed. I asked the Minister whether he would consider seriously

my suggestion, and in his last reply the Minister said he would obtain a report for me. That was in March of this year.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The position remains the same: I will get a report from my colleague.

PREMIER'S OVERSEA VISITS

Dr. TONKIN: Does the member for Peake (Mr. Simmons), as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, intend to initiate an inquiry into the total costs of the Premier's recent oversea visits?

Mr. SIMMONS: The matters dealt with by the Public Accounts Committee are decided by all its members. At this stage no matter that has been raised by any member of the committee (whether he be a Government or Opposition member) has been refused a hearing.

Mr. Millhouse: You're not trying to cover anything up, are you?

Mr. SIMMONS: The committee has to consider its priorities. It is currently investigating two matters that will keep it going for some months.

MEMBERS' DRESS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier indicate the type of dress that honourable members should wear tomorrow—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You could be a streaker, if you like.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —when the Address in Reply is presented to His Excellency the Governor? There is no need for me to canvass the painful episode that occurred yesterday and was brought to a head as the result of the dress worn by some members of another place. I understand that the Premier discussed certain matters with His Excellency following the incident yesterday, and no doubt this matter was also discussed. I ask the Premier this question for the guidance of all members of this House.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I point out to the honourable member that there is resolution of this House as to the dress of members.

Mr. Millhouse: That doesn't help us.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They are the rules of the House and I cannot go beyond them. I can only say that, if the honourable member wishes to give pleasure in other quarters, he should be a little less scruffy than he is today.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 6. Page 297.)

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I am gratified to see the looks of delight on the faces of members opposite as they see me on my feet again. When I concluded my remarks last evening I was about to deal with the importance of physical fitness in the community and to say why I believed the Government had a responsibility to encourage such activity. Before expressing my views at any length I should like to quote what Willy Daume (President of the National Olympic Committee for Germany, which organized the recent Olympic Games) said:

There is a natural law to which man, as a being, is unavoidably subjected: normal use maintains a function, greater use improves it, too little causes it to waste away, and too much destroys it.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: How true.

Mr. KENEALLY: I understand from research carried out in West Germany that early disability in people has assumed such enormous proportions there that over 40

per cent of the workforce must retire before the retirement age (65 for men and 60 for women) is reached, and that such people receive a pension. Members would realize that the economic burden resulting from this would be enormous. In fact, in Germany the burden amounts to billions of dollars a year. A thorough investigation was undertaken to determine what ailments were caused by lack of exercise. The research was conducted by the Medical Institute for Physical Fitness at the Free University of Berlin, where it was calculated that these ailments mainly involved damage to the heart and circulatory system and cost the community about \$4 000 000 000 annually.

In individual terms that means that every person in Germany pays \$200 a year to help meet the expenses caused by these ailments. The lack of exercise within the community can be so harmful that no nation can afford the bill. To illustrate my point, an American research scientist named Badley disclosed that in professions involving little physical exercise, which include the professions of business managers, judges, lawyers, and doctors, the premature death rate was 5.7 times higher than for farmers, miners, and construction workers. Morries, when conducting studies on personnel on London buses, discovered that the incidence of heart attacks for bus drivers (people who had little exercise) was eight times greater than for conductors who climbed up and down the stairs of double-decker buses.

Finnish doctor Karwonen reported that long-distance skiers in Finland lived about seven years longer than the population as a whole. A team, headed by Professor Murarov, at the Russian University of Kiev has submitted some illuminating figures that show that 100 years ago human muscle accounted for 90 per cent of the total energy expended by people but that today it has been reduced to 1 per cent. In addition, it has been ascertained that the generation living in the industrial countries today will spend about 150 000 hours of their lives sitting down. For these reasons, in the more affluent societies around the world we find that the physical condition of people has deteriorated alarmingly to such an extent that an enormous financial burden must be borne by the community and everyone who lives in it.

I have raised this matter in my various contributions to this debate because I intend within my own district (in which I will include Whyalla and Port Pirie, with the good graces of the members for those areas) to convene a seminar to discuss the whole range of leisure and recreation activities. As members know, finance is available from the Australian and State Governments towards providing recreation facilities in the community. However, I would much prefer that interested people in the area in the north of Spencer Gulf would meet and develop their own priorities and tell Governments of their requirements in the area, instead of having Government officials come in and tell the people there what they need. The facilities required in that area can be ascertained only by a study in the area so that there would be a grass-roots contribution toward our future needs, instead of having them imposed on us by an outside body. This is not a radical suggestion, because I believe that this is what various departments would wish to have take place.

I have been heartened by the support I have received from the departments to which I have referred and by private industries, in the three cities, which have indicated their willingness to contribute financially toward the seminar I hope to convene at Port Augusta, the most central point. I hope that leading Australian authorities

on this subject will speak. The people in my district and in the two cities near it are aware of the expansion that will take place and of the problems that will occur if the expansion in population is not matched with an equal expansion in facilities that should be available for recreation and leisure. One can well imagine the social problems that might arise in having, in the first instance, workmen on site with little to do in their leisure time and of people coming to the area who, once again, would not have the necessary facilities for creative use of their leisure time.

Regarding the inquiries that have been made and the reservations that have been expressed by the Opposition regarding development at Red Cliff Point, particularly from the ecological aspect, people in my area appreciate the Opposition's interest and that of members of the public generally throughout the State. Members of the public do not necessarily share the view of those Opposition members who have doubts about what the Government is doing to protect the ecology and environment of the area. Numerous committees are engaged in many research exercises in the Port Augusta area, and people there have the chance to express their concern regarding the development.

The Town Clerk of Port Augusta (Mr. Harry Richards) is a member of various Government committees that carry out work at Red Cliff Point. So, the opportunity is given to people in the area to express their personal concern. I take this opportunity to compliment Mr. Richards on the work he is doing and on the way he is keeping the people of Port Augusta informed about the work the Government is doing. The Minister has pointed out, in replies to questions, that research into the ecology is not just a one-time process but that it will be a continuing process. As the development at Red Cliff Point goes through its various stages, various impact statements will be required. From a pragmatic point of view, the Government and the consortium have good reasons, apart from those already mentioned by the Opposition, to ensure that the development will not be an ecological disaster.

From the Government's point of view, we like being on the Treasury benches, and it would certainly be a great setback to our chances of being returned to office if we allowed to occur a disaster of the magnitude Opposition members have suggested might occur in the area. That is a good reason, other than the correct reasons. What chance would the consortium itself have of being able to secure a contract to build a petro-chemical complex elsewhere in the world if it became known that it had participated in an ecological disaster in South Australia? Of course, it would never be able to build a complex elsewhere.

I compliment the people who continually raise the problems that could occur and the people we refer to as "greenies". We need a radical, militant, environmental lobbying group in the State, and the Government has the responsibility at all times to justify what it is doing as the area develops. We must not develop merely for development's sake. It is the more radical and militant people who put situations that we, as a Government, believe would never occur and who force people in positions of authority to justify what they are doing. I assure such people and the Opposition that the people in my district, although not agreeing with the premises some members put forward, nevertheless appreciate their interest in ensuring that the Redcliff development will not cause any problems to the environment (whether air, water or noise) or any real problems in the community generally. I support the motion.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I, too, support the motion. His Excellency's Speech was poorly prepared by the various Government Ministers but, fortunately, it was well read by him. South Australians are indeed fortunate in having the services of this distinguished scholar, and I wholeheartedly support his rebuff in respect of the dress of some members. As the first member to wear shorts in this Chamber, I assure members that I would not wear them to Government House: I believe in neat comfortable dress for members, and I hope that some members will not try to upstage Parliament further by going from the sublime to the ridiculous. Such dress as our diplomats are required to wear is ridiculous and appears to me to be another action by the Commonwealth Government to smash the protocol and tradition of which our forefathers were proud and which all citizens respect on such occasions. I have said at times that the general atmosphere of Government members in manner, dress, and hatred of the Opposition reminds one of a union meeting at Trades Hall. That is in no way a reflection on you, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker; it is the atmosphere in this place.

The Speech refers to the work of the Coast Protection Board. Members will recall that, during the time I have been in Parliament, I have emphasized the need for urgent restoration work to be carried out along the foreshore, particularly in my district. I am grateful for the guidance and help that have been provided, and many of my constituents have put forward suggestions for schemes that would preserve the foreshore, particularly in the Glenelg North area. Had action not been taken when it was taken, part of the road would have collapsed into the sea and the Government might have had to acquire properties along the foreshore. Any money spent on restoration work was well spent. I am grateful for the guidance and help of many of my constituents in this regard, particularly the efforts of the late Hugh Ellerton, a retired Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization scientist. For many years he tried to have Governments of the day adopt his scheme for the type of construction that now exists along the foreshore, namely, building up of a foundation of stone and rubble, packed hard with sand alongside it. However, this will need constant attention and the sand will have to be replaced from time to time. In the long term we will regain a considerable amount of beach that we will be able to hand over proudly to our descendants.

The work along the foreshore from the Patawalonga boat haven to the Torrens outlet (which, of course, is the western boundary of my district) has been completed except for one or two minor areas which need final attention, but in which the work has not been completed, because of high tides and adverse seasonal conditions. The Coast Protection Board has spent about \$425 000 which I think is well worth while. The board, for whose establishment I was pleased to be able to move initially, has, since its inception, spent \$1 020 000, most of which has been spent on work within the metropolitan area, but some money has been spent in country areas. Indeed, in future, there will be a general upgrading of some of our more popular country beach resorts. When we consider the length of our coastline and the damage along the major part of it caused by winter storms and high seas the Government certainly has a task ahead of it, and the Coast Protection Board should be given every encouragement in this regard. No-one can estimate how much money will eventually be needed to preserve all our beaches; \$7 000 000 has been mentioned, and whilst perhaps many other works of greater priority

should be carried out, we must remember that this money will be spent over a considerable period.

I, like many conservationists, was horrified to learn that the Coast Protection Board had approved the destruction of part of the last sand dune remaining at West Beach. The sand dune was levelled to provide a car park for visitors to the area. After all these years of permitting people to build so close to the foreshore (we are ensuring that no building can be located at the back of the frontal sand dune at West Lakes), within the last 18 months a Government board has destroyed what I consider to be the last part of our natural heritage along this foreshore. The area to which I am referring is under the control and management of the West Beach Recreation Reserve Trust, and it will be the largest recreational area still awaiting full development in the metropolitan area.

Just before the 1973 election it was announced in the press that a million-dollar playground for young and old, with the emphasis being put on a family recreational area and picnic ground consisting of 20 hectares, was to be created in the area. The area was to be developed to encourage the establishment of riding clubs, and to include an extension to the golf course and facilities for rowing and for small craft sailing. The scheme was intended to attract the whole family to spend time in the outdoor activities accommodated within the West Beach trust area. I was alarmed to hear the rumour of a project that could spoil the area, and I refer to the construction of a motel. As the West Beach caravan park area, which at present can accommodate more than 500 caravans, can be extended, I cannot see the need for a motel in such an area, especially when the emphasis is being placed on family recreation. We need all the area we can find to provide ovals, parks and picnic grounds for families to enjoy. There are few such areas in the metropolitan area.

It is hoped that a women's basketball stadium will be included in the plan. I understand the Environment and Conservation Department is considering the establishment of a nursery but how that would fit in with the scheme I do not know. Also, I believe the State Planning Office is looking at the development of the area. We do not want to lose any area for a development that will spoil what has already been established over many years by the West Beach trust committee, which comprises representatives of the West Torrens and Glenelg councils working on a voluntary basis. They have created a unique area, and we must do everything we can to ensure that the general plan and beauty of it is retained. Representations have been made to me for the establishment of a model railway to be incorporated in the area, and I imagine that if this railway ran around the upper reaches of the Patawalonga lake it would be an added recreational facility for young people.

I believe that a bicycle track should be provided in the area. In the *Australian* today it is stated that Renault (Australia) Proprietary Limited is preparing for a \$10 000 000 annual sale boom in bicycles. This is seen as being related to the current interest being shown in cycling as an aid to physical fitness. A bicycle track would ensure that people could ride about in safety. We may well have to go one step backward in our planning and look at our roads system in relation to the bicycle. For example, we may have to consider tearing up the median strip on Anzac Highway and putting back the bicycle tracks. Economics could very well dictate this because of the price of petrol and the cost of running the family motor car. With more time being made

available to people for leisure and recreation I believe many will turn back to using a bicycle. The Renault company is preparing to market about 100 000 cycles a year in Australia, and that is big business. A sales and promotion programme will be launched to ensure the success of the scheme, and if we follow trends in other western countries we will have to rethink our transport planning policy.

In addition to this, we will also have to consider our road engineering policy. This summer we will see a great increase in the number of people riding bicycles for pleasure. As about 160 hectares of land will be developed at West Beach for family recreation areas, we must consider establishing a bicycle track there. It looks as though I will have to get the old Malvern Star out of the shed and cycle my way back to fitness. The Opposition will consider ways and means of protecting cyclists on our roads. During the recent petrol strike, having ridden from Glenelg to the city, I can assure honourable members that it is a fairly dangerous ride, considering the way motorists pay such little heed to cyclists. In this regard, some rethinking of our laws may be necessary.

The Governor's Speech also states that the State Planning Authority is proceeding with its work in relation to redevelopment of various schemes, one of which is at Moseley Square, Glenelg. People present when the Speech was delivered were probably not greatly impressed by this announcement, but it means quite a bit to the people of Glenelg. For the past two years a committee known as the Premier's working party has been investigating redevelopment of Moseley Square. The outcome to date has been a promise by the State Government to transfer certain land it owns in Moseley Square to the Glenelg council. I understand the Commonwealth Government is considering transferring the post office site to the council as well. If this happens, it would enable the council to fully develop the considerable block bounded by Colley Terrace on the east, the foreshore on the north, Moseley Square on the south, and Colley Reserve on the west.

Properties in the area include the Glenelg Town Hall, the courthouse, the police station, a hamburger shop, and the post office. Any redevelopment would be of great advantage to Glenelg. However, these facilities would have to be incorporated in that redevelopment. Most of all, a good hall is needed, with a suitable standard of office accommodation for the council staff. A convention centre is also needed. At present, we are trying to organize for August, 1975, a convention at Glenelg to be attended by 300 or 400 delegates from other States, but we are having difficulty in finding a location large enough. The boast is that, through the Tourist Bureau, everything is being done to establish Adelaide as the convention city. However, suburbs such as Glenelg, being tourist conscious, are also trying to get part of the very profitable convention trade. Unfortunately, Glenelg does not appear to have the facilities to hold the people.

A problem involved in redeveloping Moseley Square is the need to preserve the clock tower and facade of the Glenelg Town Hall. I could not imagine a photograph of Glenelg that did not show the town hall tower and the facade of the building. I believe that residents would be upset at the thought of demolishing the tower and facade. The National Trust has listed (it no longer has classifications) this part of the town hall. The accommodation in the town hall leaves much to be desired, the hall being not ideally suitable for any type of function. It could be argued that the tower is not in a very safe condition. However, over the years, nothing

has been done to repaint, restore, or repair the tower or facade, let alone improve the facilities of the building. As the Glenelg Town Hall has quite a history, I believe it would be a tragedy if it were demolished.

Mr. Rodda: The town hall?

Mr. BECKER: There is a threat that it will be demolished as part of the redevelopment.

Mr. Goldsworthy: If the work is undertaken as quickly as work on redevelopment at Hackney, nothing will be done for some time.

Mr. BECKER: True, but the matter has been under consideration for some years. I think that honourable members will be interested to hear some of the history of the town hall; if it is not recorded here, it will never be recorded. In June, 1866, the council considered steps to be taken for erecting a town hall, and eight years later a committee meeting was held. As the councillors were not particularly interested, an institute committee was formed. Just over 100 years ago, on May 28, 1874, a public meeting, under the chairmanship of the Mayor, formed a committee for the purpose of raising subscriptions to erect an institute building. The Government of the day gave the committee the site now occupied by the town hall and promised a Parliamentary grant of \$2 000. Now, 100 years later, the Government will give further land to redevelop that area. It will be interesting to see whether the present Government will give a cash grant. In 1874, the grant of \$2 000 was a considerable sum. At that time, the Government also agreed to supplement any subscriptions raised. Although I cannot imagine the present Government agreeing to such a proposal, it will be interesting to see whether it does.

Many fund-raising functions were held. The Glenelg council contributed \$1 083.74, being the proceeds of sale of land on the corner of Jetty Road and Gordon Street that had been paid by the South Australian Land Company as part of the compensation for the closing of Diagonal Road. At this stage the committee called for competitive designs for the building, and plans. Edmund Wright's plans were chosen. Tenders were then called and these varied between \$9 800 and \$11 340. The lowest tender was accepted, but it was found necessary to make several additions to the contract, the total cost reaching \$12 000.

On December 11, 1875, the foundation stone was laid by Sir Henry Ayers. The original design was Italian and built of Glen Osmond stone. Unfortunately, many alterations and additions have been made to the original building and the only resemblance to the original building is the tower and facade. Before the Glenelg council acquired the building, the institute committee experienced considerable financial difficulty. Initially, to augment Government grants and fund raising, a mortgage of \$3 000 at 6 per cent was raised; five months after the institute was opened, a second mortgage of \$1 000 was entered into. In 1878 the two mortgages were discharged and replaced by a new mortgage of \$5 200 at 7 per cent. Later this sum was increased to \$6 000.

The high rate of interest, working expenses, and a small membership caused the trustees considerable financial embarrassment, with the result that in 1886 the trust was unable to meet its commitments. In September of that year, writs were issued on the trustees of the institute for the sum of \$6 216, being the amount of principal and interest accrued on the mortgage. On December 9, 1886, the council met and resolved to acquire the institute for the sum of \$6 000, plus interest and charges accrued. In those days it was recorded that the council could not save the town and the trustees from disgrace or save the

trustees from the threat of imprisonment. To mark the acquisition by the council, a tablet was laid in place of the foundation stone. The inscription on that tablet states: "Glenelg Town Hall, 1887, W. F. Stock, Mayor." This action resulted in much condemnation of the council, and an extract from the satirical sub-leader in the *Register* of June 14, 1887, states:

The Glenelg council, having acquired the institute as their town hall, has determined to destroy the inscription on the foundation stone and to substitute for it "Glenelg Town Hall, 1887, W. F. Stock, Mayor". It only remains for them to issue an order that the foundation stone shall be undermined, and the records removed, which were deposited under the stone when the building was commenced, and the act of vandalism will be complete. Then perhaps it would be as well for the corporation to remove the unsightly log which is supposed to commemorate the reading of the proclamation at the founding of South Australia.

This and other press comments upset the Mayor and the council, and at the next council meeting action was taken to rectify an obvious mistake. Hence, today there are two marble tablets on the Moseley Square side of the Glenelg Town Hall building. The act of vandalism, cynically referred to in 1887, is still a threat to this building, which is a memorial to our pioneers and part of the heritage of Glenelg and South Australia. We in Glenelg are proud that that was the birthplace of the State.

Regardless of whatever plans are considered for the redevelopment of Moseley Square, I make a plea to the Government not to let the town hall tower and facade be destroyed. Those who are opposed to the building in its present state of decay will paint a gloomy picture about its lack of structural safety, and what they say cannot be denied. I understand that the tower has a 10 cm lean and that periodically masonry has fallen from it. The caretaker has a collection of pieces of stone that have fallen from the building. He puts them up in the hall and claims that they will be used in 1984 for the new town hall. The Tower is unsightly and its present condition is a disgrace.

It is also interesting to note that the town hall clock was a gift to the institute from the then Mayor (Thomas King), who was a member of this House for the Sturt District from 1876 to 1885, as well as being Minister of Education for three years during that period. He also was a former proprietor of the *Advertiser*. The clock has a chime all of its own, and I cannot accept its loss to Glenelg. Glenelg residents already have taken action to save it by forming a branch of the National Trust and appealing to the trust for help to preserve this part of the town hall.

In the transfer of land by the Government to the Glenelg council, it should be stipulated that the tower and facade of the town hall must be retained. If the Government does not do that, it will stand condemned for contributing to the wilful destruction of that building. Of course, this Government has contributed much to the destruction of our way of life in the past four years. South Australia is faced with the highest cost of living in Australia and the highest inflation rate; indeed; this State Government has much to answer for.

Although this is the only State that has price control, this system has not helped the position or achieved the true advantage contemplated by that great South Australian Premier, Sir Thomas Playford. He did much for the worker and his family, but the present Premier has not been able to achieve that. Amidst industrial anarchy, greater poverty than ever previously, and failure to recognize the real priorities of elder citizens in

our community, the Government says time and time again that it is waiting for the Commonwealth Government to help it out of the mess it has created.

I fear that Commonwealth aid may not be so generous and that history is about to repeat itself. It was of considerable concern to the people of South Australia to read a statement made by the Prime Minister (reported in the *News* of August 5) when opening the conference of the Building Workers Industrial Union. That is one of the most militant unions in Australia, being led by Mr. Jack Munday (President of the Communist Party of Australia). The report of the Prime Minister's opening speech states:

At the same time, he warned that the Opposition would impose harsh measures against trade unions if it came to office. These would include massive unemployment, soaring prices, and the whole sinister apparatus of penal clauses and anti-union propaganda would be in full stride, intimidating the worker and threatening the unions with penalties and restraints. Mr. Whitlam said the Government expected unions to cut back substantially in their wage demands in return for wage indexation. The Australian worker is better off now under a Labor Government than he has ever been.

It was ironical that the Prime Minister should make that statement on August 5, 1974, when on September 18, 1972, he had said:

There will be less industrial disputes under us. I am sure of that.

How could the Prime Minister of a country make that statement before the 1972 Commonwealth election and then, less than 18 months later, appeal to the most militant trade union group in this country to use restraint? The Prime Minister is using alarmist tactics by saying that, if the Labor Government fails to control industrial anarchy in this country, it will lose office. He is using the fear tactic that we have come to know so well from our Labor opponents.

Dr. Tonkin: It won't do him any good though, will it?

Mr. BECKER: I do not think so. One would think that, if a Commonwealth election was held tomorrow, the Whitlam Government would be defeated. However, for some unknown reason, the people vote for the Labor Party. Of course, we know some of the tactics that that Party uses in an election campaign and inside the polling booth. We also know the tactics used by trade unions and at stop-work meetings.

The Prime Minister has much to answer for. He is asking for wage restraint, and the Deputy Prime Minister, who is standing in the wings waiting to take over when Mr. Whitlam falls, is urging that the workers should ask for their increases. In the past 18 months, we have seen the rise of the Australian worker. I would not deny him the right to improve his lot.

Mr. Wright: But you deny him the right to strike?

Mr. BECKER: I do not, because I believe in the right to strike. If any man is victimized, he must have the right to strike. I would never take that right away from him. However, the worker has received a reasonable amount of just reward but the white-collar worker has been left behind, and we wait to see how he will deal with the situation. I hope that white collar workers will use common sense and negotiate first, then use arbitration.

Mr. Simmons: How about the banks?

Mr. BECKER: Under the Bills of Exchange Act it is illegal for strikes to be held in banks, but this provision has never been tested, and I hope that it will not have to be tested. However, I fear that white collar workers may be left behind in the race for increased wages. If a wage freeze is introduced, some groups may miss out,

and one of them may be the white collar workers. I could be incorrect, but I believe that the problem in this country is that awards are controlled by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission and the State Industrial Commission. Victoria does not have a State court, but has a Commonwealth court, whereas in South Australia and in other States both a State court and a Commonwealth court operate.

In some cases the Commonwealth award contains better conditions for the worker than the State awards, and this situation causes a conflict. Perhaps there should be one Industrial Commission throughout Australia, as this might simplify the system so that unions would not have to resort to industrial action. I am not convinced that trade unionists always wish to take industrial action, except in extreme circumstances of victimization. Also, an argument has been advanced that we have too many trade unions that have become fragmented, so that the system has become something of a shemuzzle. Whatever system is introduced, the industrial scene must be reviewed, and something done to ensure that the worker is treated fairly and reasonably in this country.

Price control in this State has been disappointing. In reply to a question I asked the Premier on July 23 whether price control was working in South Australia and what applications for price increases were being considered by the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs, the Premier said that under the terms of the Prices Act he could not give me those details. The Leader of the Opposition and I prepared a series of questions concerning prices, and revealing information was elicited as to certain goods that had increased in price following the Commonwealth election on May 18. I was surprised at the length of time taken from the lodging of the application to the announcement of the result. After perusing the information obtained by the Leader of the Opposition in reply to a Question on Notice on July 30 about prices, I am convinced that some price increases were deliberately delayed until after the Commonwealth election.

Mr. Coumbe: There was no announcement about them before the election.

Mr. BECKER: Nor was there any indication that they were to be introduced: perhaps in this way the Prices Act is failing in this State. When an application is lodged with the Commissioner, an immediate public announcement should be made, people should be able to give evidence, and the application should be closely scrutinized. Obviously, it is unreasonable to grant increases to an inefficient industry. Although we may have a situation in which the worker is receiving a fair and reasonable return for his labour, at the same time irresponsible employers increase the price of articles, so that the process starts again. Some people may consider it strange for a Liberal Party member to make that statement, particularly as it is considered that we support big business. However, if big business is irresponsible it cannot expect any sympathy from people in the community.

The slogan used by the Labor Party in the 1970 election was "Live better with Labor". It is interesting to note some of the price increases that have occurred since then, all of which have affected the average family that must bear the increased costs. It is a pity that people in the community did not heed the warning of the Leader of the Liberal Party of Australia (Bill Snedden).

In June 1970, the price of a .6 litre bottle of milk was 10c, but it is now 13c. The price of a .6 litre carton of milk was 11c, but it is now 15c. A .9 kg unsliced loaf of

bread cost 20c in June 1970, whereas it now costs 32c; a .9 kg sliced loaf of bread then cost 23c, whereas it now costs 35c. In 1970, the cost of .45 kg of butter was 56c, but it is now 61c, and there will be a 3c increase in the wholesale price soon, taking the cost to 64c. In 1970, 1 dozen medium size eggs cost 62c to 66c, but the same number now costs 86c to 90c.

In 1970, there were small, medium, and large grade eggs, but now an additional extra large grade has been added. It seems that fowls have become more efficient and can produce an extra large egg. In 1971, .45 kg of unwashed No. 1 potatoes cost 4c, whereas today the cost is 14c. It seems that the only commodity that has not shown a large increase in price (although the company may have reduced the size of the package) was 2 kg of sugar, which cost 42c in 1970 and now costs 44c. One of the biggest slugs to hit the working man is that 4.5 l of super grade petrol has risen from 43c to 56.1c; cigarette prices have increased generally by about 20c a packet (a popular brand, Benson and Hedges, has risen in price from 41c to 61c for a packet of 20); a 738.8 ml bottle of beer has risen in price from 40c to 48c; the price of a schooner of beer (the average man's drink) has gone from 18c to 25c; and the price of a 738.8 ml bottle of brandy has risen from \$2.82 to \$4.26. Much has been said by my colleagues on this side about the lack of efficiency of the South Australian Meat Corporation, and much will probably be said in the months to come.

Mr. Allen: I wonder what is going on out there today?

Mr. BECKER: I do not know, but wholesalers are buying cattle in South Australia, sending them to Victorian abattoirs, and then bringing them back to South Australia and undercutting the South Australian market price by several cents a kg. In 1970 .45 kg of lamb chops cost 49c, today 89c (that is a rough estimate because it is difficult to find the actual price as it varies from shop to shop, depending on the wholesaler); .45 kg of beef sausages in 1970 cost 25c, today 59c; a side of lamb, costing 20c for .45 kg in 1970, today costs 45c; .45 kg of chuck steak cost 56c in 1970, whereas today it costs 85c; a luxury cut of meat, blade steak, cost 50c for .45 kg in 1970, but today it costs at least 80c.

These are the price increases over the last four years that are being faced by the average person in the community today, under a Government that said that life would be better with Labor. When one considers the abattoir, the sums that have been spent on development there and the need for the new board to look at previous operations to try to convert to a viable business, one wonders what is going on. This morning it has been reported that cattle have been standing in mud in the abattoir holding paddocks for over a fortnight: the paddocks are in such condition that the quality of the cattle destined for the local market could be affected. A company sent 1 700 lambs to the abattoir last week, but only 282 were slaughtered. Another company sent 600 lambs at the same time, yet only 132 were slaughtered—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Where did you get that information?

Mr. BECKER: —which indicates that there is trouble at Gepps Cross. Three wellknown companies have been blackballed (Thomas Borthwick and Sons, William Angliss and Company and Metro Meat Limited) since this morning. I believe this may have something to do with the shipment of lambs to Kuwait.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Where did you get that information?

Mr. BECKER: From my colleague the member for Frome, who informs me that the blackballing of these companies could be a result of a decision to ship 25 000 wethers to Kuwait. This is a serious situation. It is a shame that there cannot be a more efficient operation at the abattoir. It is also a shame that the South Australian housewife, particularly when residing in the metropolitan area, cannot benefit from an organization which is controlled by the Government and which should provide her family with a cheap and staple meat diet. If this state of affairs continues, a shortage of meat will occur and, if the condition of the paddocks at the abattoir is allowed to remain, the cattle standing in mud will deteriorate, as will the quality of the meat available to the housewife.

Since Labor came to power in this State, the take-home pay of the average married wage-earner with two children, after allowing for many of the price increases I have mentioned, has fallen. During 1973, food and housing prices increased by over 20 per cent, and interest rates rose to their highest level this century. I believe it could even be to the highest level in the history of this country: interest rates are higher than they were during the bank crash of the 1880's and 1890's. It is not surprising to hear alarmist statements from Commonwealth Ministers attacking bank policy. Nor is it surprising to hear the alarmist bush accountant, Mr. Crean, attacking the banking institutions. However, the banking industry is well insulated today and its liquid funds ratio, which it must retain with the Reserve Bank, means that the community need not panic in that regard.

Personal income tax has increased by an average of over \$200 for each Australian taxpayer and, at the present rate of inflation, taxation will double in the next five years and the value of savings will be halved. Last year, a savings bank nest egg of \$1 000 had its purchasing power reduced by \$94.50 (an inflation rate of 13.2 per cent less normal savings bank interest of 3½ per cent). With inflation expected to be higher than that, the real value of people's savings is being whittled away at a fast rate. A retired person on a fixed income of, say, \$50 a week (if he is lucky), has seen the real value of that income, as a result of price increases, fall by \$6.14 in 1973.

Little help is being given to the retired person (say, a public servant or a former employee of private enterprise) who at the time of his retirement considered that he was covered by a reasonable superannuation scheme. Today he is finding, with the higher increase in inflation (the member for Davenport has experienced the same problem in his district as I have experienced), that with the increases in water and sewerage rates, council rates, and land tax, and if he owns his own house and receives a small superannuation pension, he must try to get a spare-time job. For all the years he worked and contributed to a superannuation scheme, he now finds that only two or three years after his retirement his efforts during his whole working life were not worth while.

Consideration should be given to a national superannuation scheme (personally I favour such a scheme) and we should look at a method of automatically increasing pensions and superannuation payments proportionately to rises in the cost of living. If ever there was an area that should come under a central or nationalized scheme, it is superannuation. A man who works all his life, who goes without and who saves to provide money for his retirement should not suffer as a result of the incompetence of any Government, whatever its political complexion.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you suggesting that the present Government is incompetent?

Mr. BECKER: Yes. If we had had a Liberal Government after May 18, these problems would have been ironed out. Inflation would not have been curbed within six months, but steps would have been taken to reduce the rate of inflation. We have gone through these periods in the past. The greatest danger has been that the Commonwealth Treasury has turned the tap off too suddenly and has created an economic position which, although the Government has tried to control inflation, has sent many companies and private citizens to the wall. The Commonwealth Government must not over-react to inflation, because such over-reaction is a major danger. The Commonwealth Government would be well advised to get rid of Dr. Coombs, its economic adviser, who, I believe, has not contributed much and whose economic theories should be dumped.

Mr. Dean Brown: Why not get rid of Caucus?

Mr. BECKER: That cannot be done without an election.

Mr. Coumbe: Don't you think Caucus should dissolve itself?

Mr. BECKER: That is unlikely, unless Dr. Cairns takes over. The tragic aspect of inflation is that it takes from the poor, the old and the frugal, and enriches the wealthy and the speculator. I recall the occasion when the Premier sent a letter to unionists in which he said he had tried to tax the tall poppies in the community, but it did not work: now he will have to tax the average man in the street. It will always go on record that the extremely wealthy (only a small percentage of the so-called upper crust) can never be hit by increased taxes. So, we witness periods such as we are going through now: the average income-earner is the one who really suffers. He is the one who is pushed down and denied opportunity. He is not encouraged to save or to do anything for the future of Australia.

When we reach a situation such as the present one, in which most people are oppressed, Governments become more dictatorial. We have reached a situation in which this Government has had to come cap in hand to this Chamber to seek certain legislation on emergency powers. I recall the Prime Minister's statement on September 18, 1972: "There will be less industrial disputes under us. I am sure of that." If there is any statement a Prime Minister should be held to and asked to resign over, it is that one. No wonder the shadow Prime Minister (Jim Cairns) is waiting in the wings. I have seen the structure of the new Australian Labor Party emerging for some time now. It started in Victoria, and it has now spread to South Australia.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You must have had a real problem with this speech. You must have had to find some way of padding it out.

Mr. Coumbe: What about Clyde Cameron?

Mr. BECKER: He lives in a Housing Trust flat at Brooklyn Park, while many average income-earners are desperately trying to find rental accommodation.

Mr. McAnaney: He's a fat cat, isn't he!

Mr. BECKER: Yes, the greatest of all time, and the biggest opportunist. He believes in, "Don't do as I do; do as I say."

Mr. Mathwin: Is he living in a trust flat?

Mr. BECKER: Yes. There are those opportunists in the Commonwealth Government who are waiting for Jim Cairns to take over or at least to see which way the ball will bounce. We have a similar situation regarding this

Government, whereby its members have their gentle digs. We have a situation in the A.L.P. in South Australia identical to that on the Canberra scene. The Minister of Transport is waiting to pounce on the Premiership and to take over from the Premier: that day is not long distant. To solve the problems within the Government Party, its members become snide and cynical in their attacks on us, but we are a strong, determined and united Liberal Party. I support the motion.

Mr. WRIGHT (Adelaide): I, too, support the motion. Unlike some Opposition members, I believe that the Governor's Opening Speech is an informative document setting out the pattern the Government intends to follow. Needless to say, not everything contained in the Speech will be implemented, because that would be impossible. The Speech refers to the many matters with which the Government intends to deal this session. I pay my respects to the Governor, whom I have always admired, particularly for the way in which he presented his Speech. I thought he did justice to his high position.

On this occasion, the mover of the motion was my bench mate the member for Gilles, whom I formally congratulate on the way he made his speech and on its content. He prepared his speech extremely well and gave it in a most efficient manner. I also congratulate my old friend the member for Salisbury, the seconder. I know that he was pleased to be the seconder on this occasion. He has been a member for about four years and, because of circumstances beyond his control, such as new members coming into the House, he has been unable to second the motion previously. To him, I also tender my congratulations on the magnificent job he did. I was interested to hear during his speech how concerned he was over the Duke of Gloucester, and I join with him in expressing my sympathy to those members of the Royal Family who mourn the passing of His Royal Highness.

I also express sympathy to the families of Edgar Dawes and Ernie Edwards. Although I did not know much about Ernie Edwards, there has been much talk about him in the House from time to time, and I understand that he represented his constituents extremely well. The late Edgar Dawes was well known within the Labor Party. It has been said he was one of the best of the former Leaders of the Party. Certainly, he was one of the best read men in the Labor Party and, as a consequence, he was certainly one of our best leaders through a bad period. I express my deepest sympathy to his family.

I congratulate the new member who was successful in holding Goyder for the Liberal Movement at the recent by-election. I think it was quite a thing to be able to take that seat away from the L.C.L. after so many years. That was no mean feat and it speaks volumes for the calibre of the new member. He has—

Mr. Chapman: That sort of remark should be directed to your Party and not to the individual.

Mr. WRIGHT: If the honourable member wishes, I will also extend congratulations to the Party. I think that the election of the new member is proof of how totally ineffective the Opposition has been and how totally effective the Liberal Movement is in telling the people how ineffective the Opposition is. That might quieten the honourable member for some time.

Mr. Chapman: It won't, because I'm satisfied to hear the expression of feeling from the honourable member. Now we all know where we stand.

Mr. WRIGHT: The honourable member knows that I am more apt to praise someone who progresses than someone who does not and the honourable member is one of

those who does not. The same remark applies to most members of the Liberal Party. If the honourable member persists in interjecting while I am speaking, he will not deter me from extending my sincere congratulations to the new member for Goyder on his performance in this House. The honourable member for Goyder has performed extremely well. Everyone knows how difficult it is in this place to make any speech, let alone a maiden speech. Paragraph 7 of the Governor's Speech states:

A new feature of the work of the South Australian Housing Trust relates to activity within the city of Adelaide.

The city of Adelaide is within my district and I am having great difficulty trying to rehouse people in and around the city, because it is an old established area where people have been living for many years. As a consequence of the difficulties we are having at present, avaricious landlords in that area have been buying up as much property as they can and evicting those elderly tenants who have been there for many years. An article in the *News* of April 10, 1974, is headed "Hundred in homes shock. Premier checks on eviction row." Although I have not been involved in all the evictions, I have been involved in many of them and I know that the avaricious landlords have shown no regard for humanity. Many elderly people who have been disturbed could not be provided immediately with Housing Trust accommodation. Indeed, they had not applied for it, thinking they would be living in the same house for years to come; but that was not to be.

The Housing Trust has taken a major step in overcoming this sort of disturbance to people by buying up or competing with the avaricious landlords before they can get their tentacles on the properties. I congratulate the trust on this policy, which is working well. I am not familiar with what is happening in other districts, but I know what is happening in my own district, and all in all the trust's policy is working well. More money must be poured into housing to overcome the housing problem, but in the meantime the new policy is helping solve some of the problems in my district.

Dr. Eastick: Are they individual landlords, or is it a group of people that is evicting the tenants?

Mr. WRIGHT: Several groups of real estate agents are doing it. They are renovating the houses and increasing the rent by as much as 200 per cent or more. Mr. O'Reilly an officer of the Housing Trust, has given me examples of rents being increased from \$13 to \$26, from \$17 to \$30, from \$22 to \$38, and from \$25 to \$45. Some landlords are individuals, but most are real estate proprietors with much money to invest, and they have taken the opportunity to evict people living in my district. I believe people of this age should not have any worries at all and should be well provided for.

The other major problem in my district concerns the Hilton bridge. I know that the Minister of Transport has this matter in hand for the future and no doubt in due course it will be dealt with.

Mr. Coumbe: The former member for Adelaide brought this up many times.

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not blame him for that, although I did not realize he had raised the matter. This problem is probably one left over from the Playford and Hall Governments, who should have been aware of it. I know the reconstruction of the bridge is included in the City of Adelaide Development Plan which is now held up, but I urge the Government and the Minister to consider this

matter urgently. Almost every day I receive complaints from people travelling over the bridge. As it is the main road to the West Beach Airport, it is used frequently. I use the road myself occasionally to come to work. Although I use it only infrequently in the afternoon, I have seen the road blocked as far back as West Terrace between 4.30 and 5.30 p.m. This bridge is a disgrace to our road system and its condition should be improved as soon as possible.

I am pleased to see in the Chamber the two members opposite who are most outspoken on union matters. I refer to the members for Eyre and Davenport, because they are particularly vocal on the need for secret ballots. I should have been disappointed if either of them had not been in the Chamber while I was speaking, because they might learn something by being here. If they are tolerant enough and are willing to sit here, they may learn something about the trade union movement, as I am sure they know nothing about it.

Mr. Slater: Or about anything.

Mr. WRIGHT: I thank the honourable member for that remark. I can see that I have already stirred up the member for Eyre, because he is moving back into his own seat, ready to interject. I hope he does so, because I want to deal with what he has said about union activities in this State. Some members opposite are more sensible than others.

Mr. Payne: Which ones?

Mr. WRIGHT: In most cases, the member for Torrens usually takes a constructive point of view, probably because he has had the advantage of experience as Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He showed intelligence before that.

Mr. WRIGHT: I agree that he is intelligent, but there is no teacher like experience. Regarding the management of industrial affairs—

Mr. Gunn: Tell us about the Premier!

Mr. WRIGHT: As the Premier said this afternoon, industrial relationships in this State are the best in Australia. These relationships are on a sound basis, as they always have been and always will be. Whenever there is a strike in this State, whether minor or major, members opposite always criticize the Government and trade union officials. Members opposite who have spoken in this debate recently have referred to trade union officials by name. When he spoke earlier, the Leader referred to Barry Cavanagh's being offered, as a buy-off, a position on the Industrial Commission.

Mr. Mathwin: I think it was as a bailiff.

Mr. WRIGHT: Members can check, but I think "buy-off" was the term used. I have talked to Barry Cavanagh about this, and there is no question of a buy-off. He was asked by the press whether he would like to go on the arbitration bench. He has never been asked by the Government whether he would like such a position; he denies that, and so does the Premier.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the future?

Mr. WRIGHT: I will not answer hypothetical questions; I will tell facts and no lies. I should think that, at this stage, Mr. Cavanagh would not have any idea of nominating for such a position even if it were vacant, because he and most union officials in the State are not very happy about the Industrial Commission.

Mr. Coumbe: Would he make a good Commissioner?

Mr. WRIGHT: I am not willing to answer that, but the 8 000 or 10 000 members of his union would say he would. If one looks at the results of the activities of the Miscellaneous Workers Union over the last two to 2½ years, one can see that there is reason for strong satisfaction with his leadership. In fact, except when he was first elected, his position has been uncontested at every ballot. Members of the union have expressed complete and utter satisfaction in his leadership, yet members opposite have the audacity to criticize him without saying anything constructive. I have never heard an Opposition member condemn large profits made. Members opposite always condemn the trade union movement for seeking higher wages, when it is forced into that position in its efforts to look after its members. No member opposite has ever suggested that profits should be examined.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They say that they are not controlled from outside.

Mr. WRIGHT: I do not know who controls them; they say that no-one does. However, all their criticism is one-sided. They pretend to represent the whole community, but I believe they represent only big business, and their actions prove that. I believe that there will always be conflicts between labour and capital; that is obvious. What we must do is seek easy solutions to these problems. No trade union official or trade unionist likes to go on strike, and that is the first thing that should penetrate the minds of members opposite. No-one likes to go on strike, to make sacrifices and not be able to feed the kids, pay the rent, and so on. From the criticism emanating from Opposition members, one would think that workers carefully arranged a plan to go on strike. However, they go on strike only to get something that they must have, something which is denied them by the Industrial Commission and which is not forthcoming from negotiations with private employers. The last thing a worker wants to do is go on strike. Strikes do not originate with union officials: they come from pressures caused by higher prices and the consequent erosion of wage values. With prices increasing at the present rate, there is no way union officials can or should hold the lid on the rising pressures until each national wage case is concluded.

Opposition members say that there should be no strikes at all and that workers should put up with price increases and the erosion of wages. Like the member for Florey, I think they are anti-union and anti-labour. I am convinced about that because I have never heard them say that a strike is in order. Although they may nod their heads on occasion, they have never supported workers in a dispute; they have always condemned the workers and the Government. Yet they know that if they were in office they could do nothing about such matters. Although I do not encourage strikes, I certainly try to understand them by finding out what has caused them. If everyone in our society took the trouble to find out what caused strikes, I am sure we would have a better society and fewer strikes. If the Commonwealth Liberal and Country Parties had not opposed the industrial reform legislation of the Commonwealth Minister for Labour and Immigration (Mr. Cameron), many of the problems would have been solved already.

One problem facing us at present is that there are too many unions in this country. The Australian Government proposed that the amalgamation of trade unions should be made easy. However, this was opposed by the colleagues of members opposite. They will continue to oppose it because they do not want industrial peace; their attitude at all times is to stir up industrial conflict. They do not

want to make union amalgamations easy, helping to settle disputes. If unions could amalgamate, we would not have one union increasing in size more rapidly than another, and we would not have disputes such as that in progress at Port Adelaide at present. If all unions representing transport workers were amalgamated, that amalgamation would include the Waterside Workers Federation, which includes transport workers, just as they are included in the Transport Workers Union.

I am not saying that it would be possible for all these organizations to amalgamate, because there are so many differences amongst them. However, there ought to be much easier provision for amalgamation. It may interest members to know that at present 154 unions are registered under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act and that those unions represent 1 984 179 members, or 81 per cent of the total trade union membership in Australia. Of the total of 303 unions, 112 have fewer than 500 members.

No-one can support that arrangement, because it leads to inefficiency and to officers not being able to properly attend to the members, because of a lack of finance. In this State, probably only four or five of the unions registered with the Industrial Commission can afford to pay their own industrial officer. If the amalgamations took place (as I consider they ought to), the organization could be centralized so as to operate from one point, resulting in total efficiency, proper service to everyone, and proper research being carried out. Dealing with industrial disputes, every time a strike occurs, the member for Davenport and the member for Eyre, either by interjection or in debate, scream out that they want a secret ballot to be held. I do not know what they hope to achieve by a secret ballot but it is obvious to me that neither of them has done any research on the matter. I suppose that the member for Davenport has been too busy doing research on his water problem at Burnside, but I do not know what excuse can be made for the member for Eyre.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I do!

Mr. WRIGHT: I refer now to a report that probably neither of those honourable members has heard about. It is the only available report on trade union affairs in England.

Mr. Dean Brown: Will you give us a copy?

Mr. WRIGHT: No, the honourable member can get his own copy. I am not looking after him: he can go to the Parliamentary Library.

Mr. Mathwin: You're not going to refer to the Donovan report, are you?

Mr. WRIGHT: Yes, I am referring to the Donovan report. It is good that the member for Glenelg knows of that report, because he has some trade union background. He has stated here that he is a member of the painters union, and I hope that he agrees with some of the things I have said today. I also hope that he agrees with what I shall read from this report, namely:

Compulsory strike ballots. A number of witnesses have suggested to us that a secret ballot should be required before a strike can lawfully take place. This proposal is based on the belief that workers are likely to be less militant than their leaders and that, given the opportunity of such a ballot, they would often be likely to vote against strike action. It is clear that the scope of any legislation to this end, if it were to be effective, would have to be confined to major official strikes. A law forbidding strike action before the holding of a secret ballot could not be enforced in the case of small-scale unofficial stoppages, which make up the overwhelming majority of the total number of strikes. There is little

justification in the available evidence for the view that workers are less likely to vote for strike action than their leaders; and findings from our workshop relations survey, already cited, confirm this. Experience in the United States of America has been that strike ballots are overwhelmingly likely to go in favour of strike action.

Surely members opposite ought to accept what is stated in the only official document on the examination of the trade union movement. The report also states:

This is also the experience of Canada, where strike ballots are compulsory in the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia. Two instances of ballots held in recent years in this country where the vote went against strike action are sometimes quoted in support of the case for compulsory secret ballots. One was held in connection with an industry-wide wage claim in engineering in 1962, and one in connection with action to secure the reinstatement of certain employees dismissed by the Ford Motor Company in 1963. But these ballots were held on the initiative of the unions concerned. They do not provide reliable evidence of what the outcome would be if ballots were held in quite different circumstances, and under the compulsion of the law.

That is the key to the whole proposition. Members opposite, including the member for Alexandra, who would have the workers starved to death and belted into submission if they were on strike, want not only secret ballots but secret ballots controlled by law. They want the affairs of trade unions taken out of the hands of the unions and placed in the hands of a foreign body. They want the courts to control the secret ballot. The report also states:

There are other objections to such ballots. Once a vote has been taken and has gone in favour of strike action, the resulting stoppage may delay a settlement by restricting union leaders' freedom of action. Moreover, how is the question on which the vote is to be taken to be framed? If the vote is, for instance, about whether to accept the employer's latest offer, its result can be stultified if the employer subsequently makes a slightly improved offer.

How do members opposite account for that set of circumstances? If the conduct of a secret ballot is in the hands of an outside foreign body and then a better offer is made, the union members are asked to vote on the lower offer. I suppose that that would suit members opposite.

Members interjecting:

Mr. WRIGHT: I ask whether members opposite do not want to listen to the recommendations in this report, because they have heard enough already. Obviously, they do not understand the report. If I may continue without interruption from the rude and arrogant member for Alexandra, I will quote the next part of the report:

We do not recommend that it should be compulsory by law, either generally or in certain defined cases, to hold a ballot of the employees affected upon the question whether strike action should be taken. We think it preferable that trade union leaders should bear, and be seen to bear, the responsibility of deciding when to call a strike and when to call it off. Occasions may of course arise when union leaders would themselves wish to hold such a ballot or are required to do so by their rules. The decision on such a matter should continue to rest with the unions.

That is the key to this proposition. The control ought to remain within the unions the same as control of the companies that members opposite represent remains within the companies. I do not hear Opposition members clamouring for managers and executives to have secret ballots to decide what dividends shareholders will receive. There is no interference in that regard. I have said enough to convince at least some Opposition members: I know that I have no hope of convincing all of them, but what I have said will give them something to think about, and we may find a changed attitude evident.

I now deal with the comment of the member for Hanson that I thought was an example of sinking into the gutter, when he said (referring to the Hon. Clyde Cameron, a Minister in the Australian Government), "Yes, that is all right about Clydie boy living in Brooklyn Park in a Housing Trust flat." It is not the concern of anyone where the Minister lives, and that is about the lowest comment I have heard. The member for Hanson should know that Mr. Cameron is required to live in Canberra for nine months of the year and, therefore, would pay rent for the flat without using it. Also, he had been living in this flat before he became a Minister.

Mr. Mathwin: He should let it go now.

Mr. WRIGHT: This Government has no dictatorial policy about telling people where they should live. Provided that they are willing to pay rent, the Housing Trust should accept it and should have no authority to eject them. No doubt many people whose income has changed dramatically still live in trust houses and, if they were removed, there might be some difficulty in filling the vacancies. When the standard of debate reaches the stage of that adopted by the member for Hanson, we should stop and think about it.

I now refer to Parliamentary salaries, but I cannot make strong comment on this matter as a result of what has happened in the Australian Government. I do not think the restraint should start with Parliamentarians: we should not be the only minority group whose wages are not increased. I believe that the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal should have finished our case last year and, if our interim award had been settled, I probably would have nothing to complain about. I believe my wages are not high enough for the hours I work, although these conditions may not apply to Opposition members. I know only five members on the other side who do not have second incomes, and perhaps they find no difficulty in existing today.

Mr. McAnaney: Who are they?

Mr. WRIGHT: I will name them if the honourable member wishes.

Mr. Dean Brown: Who are they?

Mr. WRIGHT: The member for Davenport, the member for Hanson, the member for Glenelg (I am not sure about him, but I name him), the member for Murray—that is four.

Members interjecting:

Mr. WRIGHT: I suppose the member for Heysen could be placed in this category, because he has told us that he has sold his farm and moved to a house.

Mr. Chapman: What about—

Mr. WRIGHT: The honourable member has a property, and he is a shearing contractor, which is the lowest profession in which anyone can engage. That is what I think about them. Let us consider what the member for Mitcham said the other evening.

Mr. McAnaney: He has three jobs going!

Mr. WRIGHT: The member for Mitcham said that it would be irresponsible for the Government to move on Parliamentary salaries, but what he forgot to say was that he was receiving, first, his Parliamentary salary, and secondly, on Wednesday evenings he acts as a Colonel or Lieutenant-Colonel at the Army barracks, and I understand that for each appearance he receives \$38 tax free. If he attended about 50 meetings a year he would earn about \$2 000, and the Army has special camps for three or four weeks a year. One cannot assess his income in

detail, but it seems that the honourable member would be earning in this capacity \$3 000 to \$3 500 more than any Labor back-bencher, and that is tax free.

Mr. Chapman: It's no business of yours, anyway.

Mr. WRIGHT: Perhaps it is not, but the member for Mitcham also has an income as a lawyer. I asked five lawyers for a conservative estimate of what he would earn as a part-time lawyer and a part-time politician, and their replies indicate that the honourable member would probably earn between \$10 000 and \$12 000.

Mr. Chapman: That's about the same as the member for Playford.

Mr. WRIGHT: The member for Playford has not had the impudence to say that Parliamentary salaries should not be reviewed, and that is why I am dealing with the member for Mitcham. The member for Playford is one of the first to realize how difficult it is to live on wages at present, and he would not criticize any action by this Government. I support the motion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): It is with great regret that we heard of the death of His Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester, and we appreciate his services to the Commonwealth of Australia. Also, I extend my condolences to the relatives of the late Mr. Dawes and the late Mr. Edwards. I did not know either of these gentlemen, but other members have made favourable comments about them. Four issues of the Governor's Speech should be considered. The first is Monarto, the town that never will be, I believe. The second issue is about prices people are paying for water in the Burnside area—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot display a document or an article in a debate in this House. The raising of that article is out of order, because it cannot be displayed.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not refer to the glass of water I have here. The third topic to which I will refer is the Callaghan report dealing with the future of the Agriculture Department, and the fourth topic refers to the transport drivers strike. The new town concept of Monarto is an exciting and challenging one. Urban planners and sociologists seldom have the opportunity of conceiving, gestating and giving birth to an entirely new town. Colonel Light is still a household name today, having successfully created Adelaide 138 years ago. His statue proudly points towards the city of parks and gardens. In 100 years time, will the children of Monarto be proudly standing beneath a granite bust of the (by then) late Hon. D. A. Dunstan, looking out over Utopia?

The cities of Sydney and Melbourne have shown us that it is important to stop Adelaide from developing into a typical urban sprawl. For this reason, I congratulate the South Australian Government on the concept of a new city to slow Adelaide's growth rate. In 1972, when the Premier introduced the Murray New Town (Land Acquisition) Bill, it was predicted that Adelaide would have a population of 1 384 000 by 1991 and of 1 500 000 by the turn of the century. These predictions were based on an annual growth rate of 3 per cent. In the second reading debate on that Bill in 1972, the Premier stated:

The Government is determined that the future city dwellers of this State should not be condemned to living in a metropolitan area characterized by congestion, noise and smog, with the tiring long journeys to and from work and those other evils that are so readily apparent in large cities throughout the world.

The Premier then offered the choice between purgatory and Utopia. He said that Adelaide, without a new town, would have twice as many cars, twice as many factories polluting the air, and twice as many people crowding our parks, beaches and sports grounds. He continued:—and I could have painted a much blacker picture very easily.

The alternative he presented was "a fine new city near the Murray, the most exciting Australian city development since Canberra's start in the 1920's". All members would agree that these two alternatives put forward by the Premier were extreme. The question to be asked is whether these are realistic alternatives, and whether Monarto may not be purgatory rather than Utopia. From the rather glib and euphoric statements of the Premier and his advisers it is apparent that they have become so obsessed with Monarto that they have lost perspective of the many deficiencies. I believe that these deficiencies and problems are now of such a magnitude that further development of Monarto should be stopped until an independent body has examined the present situation and advised on a suitable course of action. The remainder of this speech will outline the magnitude of these problems and the uncertainty of Monarto.

The initial selection of a site confining the new town to within 30 kilometres of Murray Bridge now appears to be an absolute error, although this was the most important factor in selecting the site. This selection was made by a group of senior public servants, under the chairmanship of the Minister Assisting the Premier. Although this was the most important decision of all, no reports are available on the feasibility studies presumably carried out, although my information is that no such investigations were carried out. Subsequent examination of the sites available within the designated area suggests that this initial decision was wrong. On March 29, 1972, the Premier explained in the second reading debate on the Bill to which I have referred the reasons for selecting the Murray Bridge area, and listed the following points:

- (a) the proximity of an assured water supply;
- (b) the ability to treat sewage effluent by normal methods and use the treated effluent for irrigation purposes;
- (c) the proximity of road and rail transport to Melbourne;
- (d) the proximity of the area to Adelaide; and
- (e) the nature of the intervening country between Murray Bridge and the Adelaide metropolitan area.

Recent studies have shown that the Bremer Valley is not suitable for irrigation with effluent water because of the type of soil and high salt content of the effluent water. Only two weeks ago the Minister of Development and Mines conceded that no decision had been made for the disposal of effluent water. I see in the Governor's Speech that the Engineering and Water Supply Department is still looking for a means of disposing of this effluent water. Monarto has been planned as a city with service industries which can export its technological knowledge to other parts of Australia. This is why a third university and a science centre have been proposed. Therefore, the proximity of the city to road and rail transport to Melbourne is probably not as important as the proximity of the city to a large airport to transport the technocrats. That is the first reason why the site is unsuitable.

Further, the proximity of the new city to Adelaide may prove to be its greatest weakness, rather than a strength. A study carried out at the University of Minnesota shows that a new city must be at least 90 minutes road travelling time from other cities for the new city to develop as an independent entity; otherwise the new area simply becomes

an outer suburb of the old city. This appears to be a point the planners overlooked. Monarto is only 45 minutes travelling time from Adelaide, not 90 minutes as the report suggests it should be. Monarto has been planned on the basis that 80 per cent of its work force will live there, but I have been informed by an international urban planner that in reality this will be only 50 per cent at Monarto.

In his explanation the Premier referred to preventing "tiring long journeys to and from work". However, instead of preventing such journeys, Monarto will exaggerate the need for such journeys. Monarto will become an outer suburb of Adelaide. Longer journeys to and from work will be encouraged, and the location of Monarto and the transport requirements involved may destroy the advantage of the nature of the intervening country between Murray Bridge and Adelaide.

Certainly, I know that the member for Fisher is concerned about the gradual subdivision of many areas into 4 hectares or even smaller blocks, allowing city dwellers to build on them. The reasons put forward by the Premier for selecting an area within 30 km of Murray Bridge have in reality become the weaknesses associated with the new town. Other deficiencies in the site also exist. The soil type is not ideal for a residential area. As the bedrock is close to the surface, the installation of underground services will be expensive and may require blasting. The thin soil layer is generally a sodic clay, which has a low water permeability and which is susceptible to water and wind erosion. I have already said that the bedrock is close to the surface; the depth varies from zero to 5 metres but, for between 30 per cent and 40 per cent of the proposed area, the depth is less than 1 metre. This emphasizes the magnitude of the problem. Dust storms would be a common occurrence during summer and autumn, as the area is prone to strong winds from the south and north-west. Studies have shown that serious wind erosion occurred in the area only two years ago. Furthermore, I point out that the Engineering and Water Supply Department currently has a report before it which shows that the soil in the area has a high corrosive effect on its new sewerage pipes; this is yet another reason why the area is unsuitable for Monarto. The Premier has boasted that "the area is pleasant, with warm summers and cool winters".

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, I draw to your attention Erskine May, who, at page 404, states:

A member is not permitted to read his speech, but may refresh his memory by a reference to notes. The reading of written speeches, which has been allowed in other deliberative assemblies, has never been recognized in either House of Parliament. A member may read extracts from documents, but his own language must be delivered *bona fide* in the form of an unwritten composition.

As none of our Standing Orders covers this matter, it is the practice of the House that the rules of the House of Commons, in the absence of our own Standing Orders, are followed.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Crimes): Is the member for Davenport reading his entire speech?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: No, Sir. I am using copious notes, as the Minister knows, and I have been making numerous comments regarding the Premier's own statements. I need my notes to build up the case if I am to destroy an investment of about \$150 000 000 that the Government is making on a frivolous project. I am surprised that the Minister is so thin-skinned that he—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! As the honourable member assures me that he is using copious notes necessarily, I accept his statement, and rule that he is in order. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have successfully made the point that Monarto has far greater extremes of temperature than Adelaide, despite the Premier's claim that it has a pleasant and mild climate. Because of the unique geography of the area of Monarto, it is common for a temperature inversion to occur there. Such a temperature inversion, as the Minister knows, will create a smog above the city. This problem will be even greater, because the industrial area has been located on the southern side of the town. As I have already said, the prevailing winds tend to come from the south. The obvious conclusion is that they will blow the smoke, soot and muck from the industrial area across the town, where there is a temperature inversion. Therefore, instead of escaping from smog, as the Premier has suggested, Monarto will become a town of smog.

There are other deficiencies regarding the site. I am reminded of a report in the *Advertiser* of November 22, 1973, written by Mr. Greg Kelton, who referred to the three man-made problems at the Monarto site: first, the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main; secondly, the Monarto-Sedan railway line; and thirdly, the Electricity Trust high-tension power lines between Adelaide and Murray Bridge. For all the reasons I have enumerated, the whole site of the town, within 30 km of Murray Bridge, should be reassessed immediately.

I hope that the Minister of Education, having taken a point of order somewhat rudely, is now listening to me, because I think that what I am saying is important to the Government's future actions. The second important reason why development at Monarto should cease is that the concept of a new city was based, according to the Premier, on an assumption that Adelaide would continue to grow at an annual growth rate of 3 per cent; this is clearly indicated in the Premier's second reading explanation. Public awareness of population control, and a reduced immigration intake, have already reduced the growth rate of the Adelaide metropolitan area, and further reductions can be expected in the future. The annual growth rate of Adelaide has dropped from 3 per cent to 1.5 per cent, in other words, to an increase of only 13 000 people a year, based on 1973-74 statistics. This reduced rate of increase has been a trend since 1970 and, if the trend continues (and every indication is that it will), the growth rate of Adelaide could become insignificant, certainly insufficient to maintain a growing city at Monarto.

It is expected that Monarto will have a growth rate of 9 000 people a year. Therefore, the growth rate of Adelaide will be slow, quite possibly zero, because a potential growth rate in Adelaide of only 13 000 people could drop further, whereas Monarto has an expected growth rate of 9 000 people. An economist who examined the possibility of a near static growth rate for Adelaide said that the effects on the industrial viability and economic growth of Adelaide could be disastrous. While Monarto struggles to expand, Adelaide could become the industrial backwater of Australia and, if this happened, the whole State could become a backwater; that is the second major reason why Monarto should not proceed.

The third reason is the effect on Adelaide of developing Monarto. The effect will be far more than just economic. Mr. Dean Lambert, Assistant Planning Officer of the Housing Trust, implied in a recent paper that suitable

planning and development of the outer suburbs of Adelaide were being sacrificed at the expense of Monarto. I am surprised that the Minister has looked up in horror. I suggest that he read Mr. Lambert's paper.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I'd be glad if you wouldn't ascribe to me views that I don't hold.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Mr. Lambert said that planning for the outer suburbs of Adelaide should be considered, instead of abandoning them in favour of Monarto. Adelaide currently faces a critical housing shortage, as we all know. The Housing Trust presently has before it 18 200 applications for housing. It is currently receiving applications at the rate of 350 a week but is building houses at the rate of 28 a week, so the gap between the number of applications and the number of houses being built is continually widening. Despite the Premier's refusal last week to supply information in answer to a question on notice, I understand that Monarto will require \$30 000 000 a year for the next five years if its planned development is to be achieved. This money would be used to finance the infrastructure for Monarto.

If plans for Monarto are shelved, much of this money can be used to supply urgently needed housing in the outer suburbs of Adelaide where the infrastructure is already largely established. That is an important point, because housing in the outer suburbs of Adelaide can be supplied far more cheaply than it can at Monarto. It would appear that the Government would rather supply housing at Monarto for public servants who have been forcibly moved than meet the urgent housing needs of the general community in Adelaide. Many of the public utilities at Monarto will be an unnecessary duplication of public utilities already available in Adelaide. As it is expected that younger people will tend to live at Monarto, this will create an imbalance in the age distribution of the population. New schools will be required and built at Monarto while existing schools in Adelaide will be only partially utilized.

In addition, the South Australian Government is currently increasing its rates and taxes so as to maintain the administrative and planning bureaucracy of Monarto. The Minister of Development and Mines last week, in answer to a question I had asked, indicated that as at July 29, 1974, there were 37 persons employed by the Monarto Development Commission at an annual salary commitment of \$466 000. On my calculations, that is an average annual salary of \$12 600 a person—and let us not forget that many of them would be telephonists and stenographers. Eight persons were employed by P. G. Pak-Poy and Associates at an annual cost of \$210 000, which, on my calculations, works out at an average annual salary and expense allowance of \$26 300 a person; and seven persons were employed by Kazanski and Associates at an annual cost of \$270 000, which means an average annual salary and expense allowance of \$38 000 a person. During a period of rapid inflation (about 16 per cent a year) the additional Government expenditure on the proposed new city will encourage further inflation. South Australia already has the highest inflation rate of any State of Australia.

The fourth reason why Monarto should not proceed is probably by far the most important; it is certainly the most practical—finance. Probably the most important reason why further planning and development of Monarto should be halted is the complete uncertainty of available finance with which to build or develop Monarto. The Minister of Development and Mines last week was unable to give the expected annual expenditure on Monarto and

the Monarto Development Commission for the next five years, as it is presently (and this was his reason) subject to negotiation with the Australian Government. The South Australian Government is also expecting a major part of the cost of the consultancies, currently \$480 000 a year, to be met by the Australian Government.

It is known that the Australian Government has been asked to contribute \$14 500 000 over five years, beginning in the 1973-74 financial year. The amount to be spent is as follows: \$4 000 000 on land acquisition, \$2 000 000 on accommodation for workers, \$1 300 000 on an express bus fleet and station, \$2 000 000 on tree planting, \$600 000 on an underground power demonstration scheme, \$2 000 000 on highways to Adelaide, \$1 000 000 on social facilities, \$200 000 on authority offices, and \$1 400 000 on professional fees and charges, all of which makes a total of \$14 500 000.

In the first year of this five-year period, when the State Government would hope to get this money, the year when most of the land was to be purchased, the Australian Government made a grant of only \$1 250 000. If we multiply that by five, it comes to only \$6 250 000; yet the South Australian Government still hopes to get \$14 500 000 from the Australian Government. In addition, I understand that \$30 000 000 a year for the next five years, from July, 1974, will need to be spent if the planned schedule for Monarto is to be maintained. A large portion of this money must come from the Australian Government as the South Australian Government's financial resources would be insufficient, as we all realize.

There must be serious doubt whether the Australian Government will be willing or able to make its expected financial contribution to Monarto. The Australian Government has already postponed other financial commitments with far higher priorities than Monarto. These commitments include child-care centres and the further easing of the means test for age pensioners. The Australian Government is also more definitely committed to the Albury-Wodonga and Bathurst-Orange growth centres. Of course, those are much closer to its voting strength. Until now, the planning and development of these growth centres has been slow by comparison with Monarto. This is because the South Australian Government has deliberately rushed and made short cuts in the planning for Monarto. The Minister scoffs, but Dr. Callaghan said in his recent report on the Agriculture Department that that department was given only five weeks in which to report on the suitability of land for the development of Monarto. It is in his report; the Minister can look it up for himself. I have also been informed (and this is even more astounding) that a group of ecologists was asked to carry out a survey of the ecology of the area of Monarto before the bulldozers moved in.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What they were given—a fortnight?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: They were given six weeks. The ecologists said they had no hope of doing such a survey in six weeks. The bulldozers moved in without such an ecological survey being carried out. That is an absolute shame. However, now that the Albury-Wodonga growth centre is a viable proposition, the likelihood of Monarto receiving sufficient finance is greatly diminished. The South Australian Government has financial commitments to other major development projects within the State. If and when the indenture Bill for the petro-chemical plant at Red Cliff Point is passed, the South Australian Government will be committed to an expenditure for that project of about \$180 000 000 on the infrastructure. If the uranium enrichment plant at Port Pirie proceeds, again the

South Australian Government will have a large financial commitment. Surely these development projects, which will have a committed industrial development, must have priority over Monarto, where no industrial development has yet been finalized. The South Australian Government has to defer capital works because of the limited loans and grants from the Australian Government for the current financial year. We have all heard what the Premier would like to do to the Prime Minister in connection with that matter. The Premier has already wept before the South Australian public in connection with the lack of finance, and he has said that he will unfortunately have to increase rates and taxes; indeed, he has gone ahead and done that. Will the Premier now tax the public even further to ensure that his expensive dream of becoming another Colonel Light will come true?

From the evidence I have given it is apparent that the further development of Monarto should cease immediately until the necessary guarantee of adequate finance for the town is given by the Australian Government. The worst possible thing that could happen would be for Monarto to go ahead in bits and pieces because of insufficient finance.

The fifth major reason why Monarto should not proceed is related to social aspects. The initial population will consist largely of 2 000 disgruntled public servants and their families. I say they are "disgruntled" because they will have been forced to move there against their will. A majority of them has already expressed opposition to the move to Monarto. A recent survey by the Australian Institute of Agricultural Science revealed that 66 per cent of the respondents from the Agriculture Department did not approve of the Government's decision to relocate the department at Monarto. Further, 62 per cent of the respondents did not think that the Agriculture Department could function equally well in Monarto as in Adelaide. I believe that a similar attitude prevails among employees of other Government departments that will be relocated at Monarto. This is evident from the six most hostile demands put to the Premier by the Public Service Association on July 24, 1974. I asked a question on this matter only yesterday.

It is widely recognized that new towns face greater social problems than do established towns. The report on the social planning for Monarto has only just been released by the Government. The report was marked "Confidential—only for members' use"; that classification has only recently been crossed out.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in exhibiting the report to the House.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have a copy of the report, and I shall be happy to make it available to members, despite the fact that the Government has not been willing to do so up to the present. The report states:

Social problems have often been endemic in new towns. These social problems will be exaggerated at Monarto because there is not even a nucleus of a stable existing community and because the new residents of Monarto will have been moved there against their will. The community of Monarto will be grossly imbalanced, as a majority of the new residents will be public servants and their families. This imbalance will create the same problems that Canberra has continually faced, as a city of public servants. I am sure that South Australian public servants at Monarto will be no happier than their Commonwealth counterparts. The report on the social planning of Monarto outlines other social problems that are likely to occur. A programme of incentives will be necessary because—

for some time at least, Monarto is expected to have inherent disadvantages as a place in which to live, compared with alternative residential areas in metropolitan Adelaide. The report also states:

A high rate of population turnover would be especially due to a general deficiency in the establishment and integration of basic community patterns and structure, facilities, and services.

These are only some of the basic social problems. Others will emerge unless the Government has the courage and meekness to admit that the development of Monarto will not be in the best interests of any of the potential residents. The evidence presented shows the extent to which the South Australian Government has become obsessed with Monarto and has failed to perceive the many deficiencies that exist. These deficiencies are major. The present siting of Monarto is condemned to such an extent that the initial advantages have become its greatest weaknesses.

The rate of growth of the population of Adelaide has decreased to the point where the necessity for a new town like Monarto has been largely circumvented. The industrial, economic and housing costs to Adelaide if Monarto is continued are likely to be so great that the residents of Adelaide should insist that further development of Monarto be stopped immediately. I hope that all citizens of South Australia will make such a demand. During a period of great economic uncertainty, the evidence presented indicates that insufficient finance will be granted by the Australian Government for the planned development of Monarto. Monarto will therefore suffer further shortcomings and/or the public of South Australia will be taxed to the limit to supply the necessary finance. As the final nail in the coffin, Monarto will face grave social imbalance and discontent.

The case presented is by no means complete. I have a massive folder, and I could go on speaking for many hours. A new town is being created, but no industrial development has yet been established or promised at that new town. The case against Monarto can go on and on: it never seems to end, and the case is supported by outside authorities. Professor Jensen, the town planning authority, has described Monarto as "a fundamental blunder of the first order". Professor Scott, Professor of Geography at the University of Tasmania and a Commonwealth Government adviser on urban and regional development, made some damning statements about Monarto. And let us not forget that it is Professor Scott who will be advising the Commonwealth Government on whether money should be made available for Monarto. Professor Scott has made the following separate statements:

The Monarto site and terrain do not seem suitable. Monarto will not be viable in the short term. There are other areas which could have been considered more seriously than Monarto. A very big question mark hangs over Monarto.

Yet the obsessed South Australian Government seems oblivious to such fundamental criticisms. The time has come when the South Australian Government must answer these criticisms with facts. Until it does so, further development of Monarto should cease and the South Australian Government must stand condemned for its blatant misuse of public funds. By the year 2000, perhaps the reality of Monarto will be a granite bust of the late Hon. D. A. Dunstan pointing across the bare fields of Monarto—the town that never was.

I now turn to the subject of water and sewerage rates and the extravagant sum the residents of the Burnside council area have to pay for the supply of water and sewerage facilities. I will also refer to other matters

associated with the rating system. The quality of water received through household taps in the Burnside area can be regarded as nothing but diluted mud. I have here a glass of that water that I would not drink.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. The Speaker has already ruled with regard to the honourable member's either exhibiting himself or any object in the House, and the honourable member is now proceeding to defy the ruling of the Speaker. I suggest that he is completely out of order in doing so.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in exhibiting any object or documents in the House.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I was not exhibiting anything. Despite the quality of water in the Burnside area, residents there cannot be assured of filtration, under the present plan, for another 10 to 12 years, yet they are paying more for their water than is anyone else in Adelaide or South Australia. The increases in their rates have been incredible. For many people, the increase in the rate for the July quarter over the rate for the April quarter has been about 100 per cent to 120 per cent. I can give cases of greater increases than that. In one case, the increase was 316 per cent; a woman had her rates increased by 370 per cent; and another lady telephoned to say that her increase was 613 per cent. The Government would damn any private enterprise that came out with that sort of increase. It would insist that, before any company could apply any price increase, it go to the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs, or even to the Prices Justification Tribunal. Yet that two-faced bunch of men opposite who govern this State—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, I refer to Standing Orders 153 and 154.

Mr. Dean Brown: I will withdraw the remark.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! A point of order has been raised.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Standing Order 153 states: No member shall use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to any member of the House. Standing Order 154 states:

No member shall digress from the subject matter on any question under discussion; and all imputations of improper motives, and all personal reflections on members shall be considered highly disorderly.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Although I do not consider that the words used by the honourable member were unparliamentary, I ask him whether he will withdraw them.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am happy to withdraw them, despite the behaviour of other members at times; I withdraw them and apologize. I was trying to refer to the two-faced attitude of the Government. Recently, as Acting Minister of Works, the Minister of Education made certain claims. First, he said that it must be remembered that the increases would be discounted over five years. I can give the Minister a list of names of people who have had three or four assessments within the past five years; they will certainly not take his word that there will not be further reassessments or revaluations of property in the next five years. As the Minister well knows, the legislation requires that there must be one revaluation at least every five years. Furthermore, the Minister tried to imply that I was advocating across-the-board charging for water on a usage basis. He knows that I have never made such a statement. I said that the charge should be on a usage

basis for private homes. The percentage presently paid by commercial premises should be maintained, so that householders would not need to pay an increase in rates for water, if the charge were on a usage basis. Next, the Minister threatened to restrict the water supplies to properties of people who had not paid their account in full. Under the Act, the Minister has power to do that, as I fully appreciate. I asked the Minister whether he would discriminate against the people of Burnside—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: —and, in particular, me, because I know his attitude towards me on this subject. As we left a television studio, he made certain statements about me.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But you're going to pay your account and obey the law, so you have no worries.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister still threatened me. The interesting point is that the Minister has now said that he will restrict the water in seven weeks time. I could refer to specific cases of people who have refused at other times to pay their water account, and it has taken eight months before the department has restricted their water supply.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not normal procedure.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have information relating to other cases to the effect that the department has said it would be 12 to 18 months before the water supply was restricted. Yet, because the people of the Burnside area stood up for their principles and against the Government, the Minister has threatened them by saying that their water will be cut off within seven weeks.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's untrue. I asked the department what was normal procedure, and the time table I gave was of the normal procedure followed.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Previous practice does not show that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's what you say is previous practice.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Therefore, the Minister is simply trying to intimidate the people of Burnside into paying their accounts.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not true.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will give a brief summary of what is wrong with the present system of water rating. First, it is related to property values. The increases in the costs of supplying water bear no relationship whatever to the increases in property values. Secondly, the water and sewerage rates of those poor people in Burnside are based on a highly inflated property value assessed at the peak of the land boom. As I have already said, no Government that is fair and just or that has reasonable standards would ever impose the sort of sudden increases on these people, particularly pensioners and people receiving fixed incomes, that have been imposed by the present Government. Despite the increases in rates, the Government has not even increased the amount of deductions granted to pensioners with a medical entitlement card; the maximum amount has remained at \$20. Many of the pensioners in Davenport are now rated at well over that \$20 limit.

Mr. Goldsworthy: A quarter.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes, a quarter. These pensioners, who previously received an adequate coverage, receive it no longer. Surely one of the most important criticisms of the present system is that it is based on quotas, as it must be if such a ridiculous scheme of charging for water and

sewerage is adopted. If, as is said, water is a precious and limited commodity, it is important to encourage people to preserve as much water as possible, yet the quota system encourages them to waste it. I could continue and find other issues to raise. For instance, the Sangster report has not been tabled. Why has it not been tabled? I am pleased to say that a Liberal Government commissioned the preparation of that report.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You have seen the report, haven't you?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: No.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you want to?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I should like to see it tabled in the House. I think it should be tabled.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If you want to see it, you can, but it has to go to the printer.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is interesting to see that a \$3 600 000 profit was made from supplying water to the metropolitan area, and that a profit of \$2 600 000 was made on the provision of metropolitan sewerage services. The State Government is therefore bleeding \$6 200 000 from the people of South Australia each year.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But what were the losses in country areas? Do you want country charges to be increased?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am not suggesting that for a moment.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What were the losses incurred in the country? Consider them.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Who is making this speech, anyway?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What do you think—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The people are therefore giving the Government this \$6 200 000 profit.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's a lie. Why don't you tell the truth? The country losses are greater than that.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: For these reasons, the people of Burnside are insisting that the present system be replaced with a fairer and more equitable one. They are sick and tired, just because they live in that area, of paying more than anyone else in Adelaide has to pay for water. I bet that if it was the Premier's district he would do something about it.

I now turn to the third topic with which I wish to deal: the Callaghan report. In this respect, I should like to comment on the actions of the Minister of Agriculture, who, on Monday, July 22, released to certain press representatives copies of the report to which I have referred. However, that report was not tabled in either House until a week later. Furthermore, in two television interviews the Minister said that the Callaghan report justified the movement from Adelaide to Monarto of the head office of the Agriculture Department.

I was fortunate enough to see a copy of the Callaghan report before the Minister released it, and it contained no reference to any movement of the Agriculture Department head office from Adelaide to Monarto. Having made this statement, the Minister was asked by the *Stock Journal* why he had deliberately twisted the facts. The Minister told me, "Look, I am sorry, a mistake has been made. My press secretary, who prepared the statement, misunderstood what the report said." Of course, that was wrong. The

Minister had said on television that this recommendation was contained in the report, which the Minister had surely read. But then that poor press secretary was asked to telephone me and apologize for the mistake that he, not the Minister, had made. It is absolutely despicable for the Minister to act in such a manner. The Minister is not willing to stand behind his own mistakes but makes his poor press secretary (Mr. John Lamb) shoulder his blunders. The Minister's action is despicable, and he should resign.

Mr. Payne: Who would you get?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I do not know. You cannot have a guy like that. I should like now to deal briefly with some of the aspects of the report, at the beginning of which four terms of reference are outlined. However, it contains no reference to shifting the Agriculture Department from Adelaide to Monarto, despite that being the most significant move the department has made in the past 50 years. What is the point of getting a report on the future of the Agriculture Department if that report does not mention a current policy change? The report refers to the low morale within the department, a matter to which I have already referred and which I will not therefore repeat now. This aspect is outlined on pages 13, 14, 16, 22 and 23 of the report, which says such things as that the department is not carrying out its role, that the Government has failed to perceive what its role should be, and that morale within the department is low. This is therefore a significant report, on the excellent quality of which I compliment Sir Allan Callaghan. The report makes three fundamental suggestions: first, the regionalization of the Agriculture Department; secondly, the establishment of an information and public relations centre; and, thirdly, that new emphasis must be placed on marketing techniques of agricultural products. The big question hanging over the report is whether the Government will adopt its recommendations. The Government has been remarkably silent since the report was tabled. However, members look to the Government to adopt its recommendations as quickly as possible.

Finally, I refer to the present transport drivers' strike. Unfortunately, few people realize what was the cause of this strike. Indeed, I understand that even some Ministers have failed to realize this. The Federal Transport Workers' Union works under two awards: the 1972 award, and the transport union general award. On July 8, members of the Road Transport Association agreed, on a voluntary basis, to a \$25.40 increase in salary for members of the T.W.U.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It was done by consent.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: That is correct. I am coming to that. Under the general award, these people in Melbourne were granted an increase of only \$15.40.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's right.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: One must therefore place much of the blame for the present strike on the shoulders of the executive of the Road Transport Association, who irresponsibly accepted or agreed to such a massive increase in wages.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They didn't accept it: they gave it.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. SIMMONS (Peake): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply so ably moved by the member for Gilles. I believe His Excellency's Speech

set out a fine record of achievement in the first year of this Forty-first Parliament. More importantly, it foreshadowed a generous measure of legislation that I am sure will benefit the people of South Australia. His Excellency also referred to the death of His Royal Highness, Henry Duke of Gloucester, and paid a tribute to the public service that he had rendered in the difficult post-war period.

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

Mr. SIMMONS: I remember the term of His Royal Highness as Governor-General quite well, because two weeks before the end of the war in the Pacific I had returned from overseas with a Royal Australian Air Force contingent, and we had been greeted with a speech of welcome signed in the traditional way with the word "Henry". The next day we were at the Melbourne Cricket Ground, having travelled overnight, and to our surprise the same speech was read to us again from "Henry". The following day when we arrived at the R.A.A.F. disembarkation depot on Dawes Road, we were regaled once again by a speech from the Royal "Henry".

By that time I could almost recite it and was almost on first-name terms with the Governor-General. However, I suppose this was another indication of the thoroughness with which he did his job as Governor-General, and it is typical of the Royal Family. I join with other members in paying a tribute to the memory of the late Mr. E. R. Dawes, who included a period in this House in a lifetime of public service. The Premier has spoken adequately of Mr. Dawes's contribution to public life in this country and of the contribution he made to the Australian Labor Party, to the State of South Australia and, indeed, to the Commonwealth of Australia. We of a later generation can only look at the record of his achievements and take them as a measure of the man. Mr. Edwards had left this Chamber before I became a member but, as I had the pleasure of meeting him two or three times, I am sure he was a worthy representative of his district.

One item of legislation foreshadowed in His Excellency's Speech appealed particularly to me: paragraph 13 refers to the establishment of a small claims court. This could be the means of providing speedy and inexpensive justice for litigants in small civil claims. The member for Playford has dealt at great length with the desirability of such legislation and, although I do not have his legal experience, I know from my experience as a member of Parliament how necessary a small claims court is, free from legal pomp and procedure, but providing quick and inexpensive solutions to small problems. On Monday afternoon between 4 p.m. and 7 p.m. I dealt with no fewer than four cases of constituents of mine in which such a court would have been of extreme value. I was frustrated that there was no way in which I could tell them how to obtain justice without incurring considerable delay and expense. Often, wealthy people take advantage of the fact that the less wealthy man cannot afford to obtain justice from our present system.

Also, I trust that the comments of the member for Playford on other aspects of law reform will commend themselves to the Government, and that the progress already made by this Parliament in this matter will continue at an even faster rate. Many of the Bills foreshadowed by His Excellency refer to the law, and I look forward to their introduction, passage through Parliament, and implementation, because I know that any legislation suggested by the Attorney-General concerning the law will be a reform. I am gratified with progress that has

been made in environmental matters, particularly by this Government in the previous four years, and I trust that this progress will be maintained by introducing laws relating to litter control and noise pollution.

As a result of my inquiries overseas recently, I am looking forward to participating in the debate on the Government's anti-litter legislation, because I am sure that the Government's policy in relation to this matter is sound and that the legislation will benefit the people of this State. I had the opportunity of seeing this type of law operating in Oregon, in Vermont, and in Washington State in the United States of America, as well as in British Columbia and Alberta, but the most effective legislation in those States was that operating in Oregon: this was the basis of the law we tried to introduce earlier this year. I look forward to that Bill eventually becoming law in this State, but I shall deal with that matter at greater length when the Bill is being debated. Legislation concerning noise pollution was foreshadowed in His Excellency's Speech, and this news is welcome. Noise is one of the most insidious forms of pollution confronting us, but many people (and particularly young people) do not realize that it exists. I think they are probably suffering a loss of hearing that long exposure to noise inevitably causes.

Mr. McAnaney: Do you advocate reducing the number of noisy bands?

Mr. SIMMONS: I would advocate a considerable reduction in the matter of noisy bands, noisy motor vehicles, and even noisy interjections. One of the most unfortunate aspects of modern life is that we are being assailed more and more by noise pollution. I hope that this legislation will not be long delayed. Other items of legislation are referred to by His Excellency but others must inevitably be added to the list: in fact, three additional Bills have already been passed, and another one passed this House last evening, and that legislation was not referred to in His Excellency's Speech.

Mr. McAnaney: Why was that?

Mr. SIMMONS: Emergencies probably tend to happen after a speech has been prepared and, therefore, some matters cannot be foreseen when His Excellency's Speech is being prepared.

Mr. Gunn: It's a weak document.

Mr. SIMMONS: Before this session is finished the member for Eyre will have had more than enough because, apart from the specific legislation referred to by His Excellency, we will achieve much more. In case the honourable member is not aware of what His Excellency said, I now refer to it, as follows:

In addition to the measures already referred to, my Government intends to lay before you a substantial legislative programme for the forthcoming session, and included in this programme will be Bills relating to architects, boilers and pressure vessels, builders licensing, building societies, commercial arbitration, commercial and private agents, co-ordinate survey systems, the Constitution, control of advertisements, control of litter, country fire services, credit unions, Crown lands, . . .

If the honourable member is already overcome with the prospect of such a heavy work load in front of him, I need do no more than refer him to paragraph 17 of His Excellency's Speech so that he will see that it is not a weak document. I believe it is full of promising legislation.

Dr. Eastick: How much of it will be as ineffective as the legislation we saw yesterday?

Mr. SIMMONS: I do not intend to debate a Bill passed by this House yesterday.

Mr. Coumbe: What about computers?

Mr. SIMMONS: No doubt some reference will be made to computers during this session as they are such all-pervading giants. It is hard to imagine that during a six-month session nothing will be said about the monster. The legislative programme to which I have referred indicates clearly that all members will have to work harder this session than in the past four record-breaking years over which this Government has presided.

I now refer briefly to one or two matters which are not only of importance to this State and Australia generally but also of importance to the entire world. My first point concerns fitness and the associated problems of leisure. The member for Gilles, who moved this motion, and the member for Stuart have already dealt adequately with the need for an extensive rise in fitness standards of the Australian community. I refer specifically to the general fitness of Scandinavians, compared to whom Australians are generally most unfit.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Come off it!

Mr. SIMMONS: I was going to say that they were grossly unfit, and I do not believe that that is an overstatement of the position at all. For that reason, rather than bolstering one or two sports for the benefit of a few participants who are watched by many people, the Government would be much better advised to spend its money promoting activities aimed at increasing the level of fitness among members of the community generally. Even a modest rise in the level of fitness of the community will be of much greater social value than providing facilities for a few top-notch athletes.

Recently, I had the opportunity to inspect developments of this nature in oversea countries, and in due course I will present a report to Parliament on this matter. Several of the activities I saw could be introduced in Australia. In Helsinki I was taken by the head of the Helsinki City Council recreation section to visit pensioner exercise classes. One class was located in the stadium that was constructed for the 1952 Olympic games. There I saw a group of men and women pensioners, all over the age of 70 years, engaging in exercises which, I am sure, would have left most members puffing. Yet these people were doing these exercises with obvious ease and enjoyment.

After that, I visited a private gymnasium, which had been hired by the council for a certain number of hours a week for the use of pensioner classes. This gym also incorporated a heated swimming pool, and the pensioners I saw were obviously delighted to take advantage of the cheap admission fee (about 20c), which was a quarter of the normal fee and which was well within their financial means. In the climate prevailing in early April in Scandinavia these people were only too pleased to immerse themselves in warm water. I was also impressed by the obvious desire of the Helsinki City Council to ensure that these elderly citizens were encouraged to keep fit and active through attendance at these classes. I refer to the added companionship these people enjoyed, and I point out that such activity could be copied in South Australia where, unfortunately, we have a major problem with elderly people often being confined to their homes, lacking incentive to seek exercise which would improve the quality of their life (making them feel better) and which would also substantially reduce the cost to the State of maintaining them in infirmaries and other institutions.

In Stockholm I was taken to see a fitness centre run by the municipal council in a large city contiguous to Stockholm. Here, for the payment of about \$12 annually, residents could avail themselves of many facilities including

showers, saunas, table tennis and other similar facilities, as well as having the opportunity to exercise on exercise cycles. I refer also to the availability of regular medical checkups by weekly visits of physicians and nurses. Patients' records were kept at the centre and they could have regular medical checkups to evaluate their progress. The interesting thing about the centre, set in undulating woodland, was that it had several jogging tracks, laid out through the woods, of lengths varying from 2 km to 7 km, which were electrically lit because for many months of the year in Stockholm, by the time a person has left work and gone to the centre, it is dark. Therefore, it is necessary to illuminate the paths. The centre also had a big clock at the starting and finishing points so that members who were running could time themselves and see how they were progressing.

Mr. Duncan: Is it a nudist colony?

Mr. SIMMONS: No. In fact, a person would have to be hardy to cover the course even when dressed. I was most impressed by this centre, a similar one to which could be provided here. Such a centre, although it would not require much capital, would require land perhaps, say, in a national park. The centre is a good example of the use of municipal funds to provide facilities not for the benefit of only a few but for the benefit of the whole community. In Finland, I visited a training centre, about 130 km from Helsinki, which was most interesting. A great dome-shaped new building, which had an indoor tartan track of 190 m (which is more than we have in Adelaide), had just been completed. The training centre had tartan tennis courts, and I saw people there throwing the javelin, under cover because it was snowing outside.

Apart from this building, which cost the equivalent of about \$750 000, there were also heated swimming pools. A total of about 45 people could undergo a two-year course to be trained as physical fitness leaders to work in small communities. When I asked to what size communities the trainees would be sent to promote fitness, I was told that they would be communities of as few as 5 000 people. Obviously, the Finns have an outlook on the need for physical fitness and community participation in exercise completely different from our outlook.

Mr. Nankivell: Their seasons are different from ours.

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes. I suppose Finland has about the same number of hours of sunshine as we have because of its long summer evenings. Facilities are provided to cater not only for summer sports but also for considerable activity outside in the open during summer and, indeed, during winter. The Finns place considerable emphasis on winter sports, such as ski-ing and so forth. A major aspect is that much greater emphasis is placed on non-competitive participation in sport than is placed on it in Australia, where sport is all too often the preserve of the young and where, after the young have reached the stage when they cannot maintain their position in competitive sport, they tend to give it up and to put on weight fairly rapidly.

Mr. Goldsworthy: They go in for much cycling.

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes. In Ottawa, I was interested to see that they were building bicycle tracks in the city so that people could cycle. I would have expected that in Finland and Sweden, but I was somewhat surprised to see a renaissance of cycling in North American cities.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The Ottawa council sets aside about five hours on Sundays during which only bicycles are allowed on a freeway.

Mr. SIMMONS: That is something I did not see when I was there, but I saw cycle tracks in Ottawa. I know that this practice is growing. I point all this out to illustrate that people in some parts of the world are taking fairly inexpensive action to promote community fitness, and I believe that their example ought to be followed here. The member for Gilles, when moving the motion, referred to the activities of the Institute for Fitness Research and Training which, in a minor way, is providing some of these facilities here. I hope that it will be possible for the Government to subsidize the institute, similar to the way in which the Australian Government has recently done by making a \$5 000 grant for the purchase of equipment for the institute.

I hope also that the institute will interest the Further Education Department in running classes throughout the State (it is beyond the institute's capacity to do this in areas outside the inner metropolitan area). It should be possible for the department to provide these facilities and classes not only in outer metropolitan areas but also in some country areas. There is a reasonable chance that, at least on a pilot basis, the scheme will be in operation next year. I hope that the member for Stuart will not be too proud to accept the department's offer to provide these classes in his district. He made the point that it was necessary that local people have some say as to the types of facility to be provided in their areas. It is necessary that local people support the scheme and, for that reason, I hope that there will be co-operation between local people in the northern towns and the Further Education Department when the scheme gets under way.

Whatever money the State Government can put into this kind of community fitness activity would pay a worthwhile dividend because, not only would it raise the quality of life considerably for people who would become more fit as a result of these facilities, but it would also in the long run save the Government a considerable sum in health expenditure.

Another topic to which I wish to refer is one I dealt with at some length in the corresponding debate two years ago, but I do not apologize for referring once again to the global effects of the population explosion. We in Australia are living in a fool's paradise as far as the consequences of the world's population growth are concerned. There is a much greater awareness of this problem overseas, not only in places like India, Thailand, Singapore, and Hong Kong, which are desperately affected by the problem of population, but also in advanced countries like Sweden which, for many years, has provided unilateral aid in birth control to Sri Lanka. In the United States and Canada I saw many articles in the daily press relating to the pressure of population on resources, particularly on food.

Incidentally, I was most impressed on this trip by the provincial press in Canada and the United States. In 1966-67, I spent six months there and formed a very low opinion of the standard of the provincial press. On this occasion, apart from two days, I was only in the north-western part of the United States, and I thought the press was much better (in fact, considerably better) than our local press. Whether there has been a general improvement in the meantime or whether it has just happened that that part of the country is better than the rest of it, particularly in the west and the south, I do not know.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The north-east is all right.

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes. There was a lot about Watergate, but there were also many thoughtful articles about the

sort of problem I am dealing with now. However, whatever the reason, I thought the provincial press in States like Oregon, and so on, was much more informed and thoughtful than we have here. In this connection, I should like to support the strictures of the mover of this motion concerning the role of the press in reporting Parliament. From my observations, the people of Australia get more honest and conscientious effort from their politicians than do the people of, say, India, the United Kingdom and the United States, where there is general disenchantment among the public with the standard of the politicians representing them.

Mr. Mathwin: There are not many Indians in the British Parliament!

Mr. SIMMONS: In case the member for Glenelg misunderstood me (although it is hard to understand that he could be that dense), I was referring to the level of the political leaders in India, in the United Kingdom and in the United States. There was general disenchantment with the quality and performance of those politicians. I would be the last to claim that all politicians, even all Labor politicians, in this country are of the highest possible quality but, to read our local newspapers, one would assume they were all money-grubbing, selfish, lazy, or incompetent. Although I might be prepared to ascribe one or two of those adjectives to one or two people, I do not think it is a fair description of politicians in general. The unbalanced representation of Parliamentary and political activities by our press constitutes the greatest current menace to democracy. I heartily agree with Sir Paul Hasluck's conclusion, as quoted by the member for Gilles.

Returning to the world population problem for a moment, I should like to quote two short extracts from articles I read in North American newspapers. In Oregon, one correspondent, under a Washington dateline, said:

Lack of strong leadership bodes evil for starving. There are almost as many theories of how to solve the problem of feeding the world as there are mouths to feed, but the problem looms bigger and closer. Frustration is pandemic; hunger is close behind. All in the same week, these things happened: In Washington, a report to the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs urged the United States to take the lead in organizing a new international food reserve. But the committee also heard that neither more spending in agriculture nor even increased food productivity is an adequate answer to forthcoming world food shortages. At the United Nations, the Nobel Prize winner who developed new rice strains heralded as a "green revolution" declared that in Asia and Africa few nations are concerned about stepping up fertilizer production to make that revolution real.

When I was in India, there was an article in the *Statesman* at Delhi about the "retreat from the green revolution", and it seems obvious that, particularly as the result of the oil crisis and its effect on fertilizer production, the high hopes held for the green revolution are disappearing and that, in fact, the breathing space that the world got because of the green revolution looks like being wasted. In the article I was quoting from, the writer continued:

In New York, an international conference on population agreed without serious dissent that the world was *en route* to reproducing itself over the brink of starvation. In Tokyo, a spokesman for the Japanese fishing industry maintained that his countrymen must continue to eat whale meat, and so Japanese whalers must continue to kill whales even if it means the mammals' extinction.

Again, I heard in Tokyo the comment by the Japanese, which was probably fairly pertinent, that, as far as they were concerned, the whale was just a big fish to be eaten; it was all very well for the rest of us in the world who had

plenty of protein to protest against the killing of whales, but we had plenty of food.

Mr. Duncan: What was the solution of the Japanese to the situation that will occur when whales run out?

Mr. SIMMONS: Mankind is not very good at looking ahead, and that applies particularly in Australia. It is not good enough for us to criticize the Japanese, who happen to need these things rather more urgently than we do at present. The article went on to say that several other things have happened in the last week, and the writer said:

The economic imbalances, temporary price acrobatics, slaughtering of stock at the very time responsible authorities are urging record production—all these are sideshows. The inexorable main event was outlined 176 years ago by Thomas Malthus, who predicted that population would increase faster than food production, and that would define the future of man. Old-fashioned, scoffed at, his theory gains strength with time. The suggested ways to circumvent it vary from genocide to a return to breast-feeding to eliminate the pet-food industry to some that make sense on the grand scale necessary. All of those latter demand government commitment and leadership on a level above ethnic, geographic or religious politics.

The writer concluded by saying:

There is no sign that such leadership is forthcoming. The proof is copious that the showdown is hurrying near. In this context, I deplore the continued existence of quotas in the production of wheat. I believe that the representatives of the Commonwealth Government and the States who determine these things should be showing some of this leadership.

Mr. Gunn: Do you think there was any reason to introduce quotas in the first place?

Mr. SIMMONS: Yes, because there were serious short-term problems associated with the unlimited production of foodstuffs, but that time has now passed. An article I read recently said that a few months ago the world's grain stocks were down to 29 days supply. There was great satisfaction in the United States of America when I was there a month ago that that country was having a very big harvest. The harvest had been considerably affected by unfavourable weather and insects, etc., but it was still a good harvest. It was essential that there be a big harvest, because the big reserve that the world has had in the form of American stocks of grain has disappeared. There is now no reserve to meet any large-scale crop failure.

Mr. McAnaney: Why is the Commonwealth Government hindering primary production?

Mr. Gunn: You should be encouraging wheat production.

Mr. SIMMONS: I deplore the continued existence of wheat quotas, because it is too late for us to be failing to produce foodstuffs.

Mr. Gunn: You should avoid Socialist economic policies. Do you want grain production, or don't you want it? That is the question.

Mr. Duncan: It's not as simple as that, and you know it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Peake is speaking to the Address in Reply.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am well aware that there will be short-term problems associated with a large expansion in wheat production, but they are local problems.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Peake.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am very pleased that my comments have generated a little discussion, if not thought. A big increase in wheat production brings some local problems,

but such problems pale into insignificance compared to the starvation that faces tens of millions, if not hundreds of millions, of people in the world today. Related to over-population in under-developed countries is wasteful over-consumption by the advanced countries. The following is an extract from the leading article, headed "Will a profligate world act on the warnings?", in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, which claims to be Canada's national newspaper, of June 10:

There have been warnings enough, from the United Nations Stockholm Conference on the Environment, from the Club of Rome, from internationally known scientists and scholars of the stature of Arnold Toynbee. The society of mass consumption is coming perilously near to consuming the very planet on which it depends.

The affluent minority of the world's people is burning up irreplaceable resources at a rate that goes on increasing exponentially, living beyond the means of the whole human race. Already the hope that the under-developed world may one day catch up to the standard of living of the advanced industrial societies is doomed to disappointment. Warnings that industrial civilization faces certain catastrophe unless it makes a voluntary and drastic change in its pattern of consumption have become part of our conventional wisdom. But there is no evidence that any such change is getting under way, nor even that the advanced societies have any clear idea how the challenge should be confronted.

Not surprisingly, perhaps, democratic Governments seem to prefer to look the other way. In the affluent countries the way to win elections has been to exploit, and reinforce, the competing urges of all groups in society for a larger share of the pie, to feed the belief that there can be a never-ending increase in a so-called standard of living that is nothing but a standard of extravagant consumption. A politician who campaigned for office on a platform of decreased consumption would be a brave leader indeed.

Members might listen to the writer's conclusion and, for a little while at least, resolve to forget their tendency to make capital out of everything they can. The article concludes:

It is not good enough for our leaders to treat the problem philosophically in addresses to university convocations, only to put it out of their minds when they come asking us to elect them. It may not lend itself well to the making of seductive election promises; but it is, in the long view, the greatest political challenge we face.

It is urgently necessary that we, in this advanced country, face up to some of the facts of our present society. Politicians, public leaders and educators should try to do something to develop a climate of public opinion that will offset the greed of industrialists, who work on the principle that the only good society is one that involves an expansion in the rate of output. We have passed the stage when the world can afford to do that. In Australia we already have a high standard of living generally. I know that our affluence has to be spread more evenly but, by comparison with other countries, we really are living in a paradise.

Mr. McAnaney: We ought to be No. 1.

Mr. SIMMONS: I am not even sure that it is desirable that we should be No. 1, if being No. 1 means being like the United States, a tremendously wasteful country. Generally speaking, Americans have a very high standard of living (although 30 per cent of the people are pretty poor), largely at the expense of the rest of the world, because they are using up a disproportionate share of the world's resources, which will be greatly needed very soon. I tried to get this message across a couple of years ago but, like the writers of these articles, I see no sign of anyone taking any notice. In a few years time we will be faced with harsh realities when there is mass

starvation in countries such as India. That country had a population of 547 000 000 in 1971; the population had increased by 25 per cent in the previous decade. There will soon be mass starvation in India.

One incident typifies the whole Indian problem. On the Saturday while I was there I went by car to Agra to see the Taj Mahal. By the side of the road there were fairly large holes, the object of which was to collect water during the wet season so that the water could be sold to farmers. I travelled along the road in April, the beginning of the dry season. The countryside looked like the land north of Morgan, with a low rainfall. The average temperature was about 41° Celsius. In one of those holes we saw a man struggling; he had a cow or a buffalo bogged in the hole.

There was no water left in the hole. Despite the man's best efforts, it was obvious that he would not be able to drag the beast out. Sitting on a tree nearby was a flock of vultures. It seems to me that that is the shape of things to come in India. As soon as a monsoon fails to bring rain and there is a serious crop failure mass starvation will follow on a scale the world has never seen before. We may be able to isolate ourselves from that mentally, but it is hard to believe that medically, at any rate, we will be able to escape the consequences of the pestilence bound to accompany such a famine. It is urgently necessary that we face up to our responsibilities in the world. We should do something about moderating our demands, and see that our population does not add to the world's problems. On that note, I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I, too, support the motion and welcome the opportunity of replying to the address of the Governor at the opening of the Forty-first Parliament. I add my expressions of sympathy in line with the message directed to Her Majesty the Queen following the death of His Royal Highness, the Duke of Gloucester. I also respectfully extend my sympathies to the families of the late Messrs. Edgar Rowland Dawes, member for Sturt from 1930 to 1933, and Ernest Clifford Allan Edwards, member for Eyre from 1968 to 1970. The records show that traditionally Opposition members have commanded the Address in Reply debate, using the occasion to remind the Government of areas in which it has gone astray. Sometimes the Government is blamed for matters over which it has no control at all. However, the national economy and that of the State are areas of responsibility from which the Commonwealth and State Governments cannot escape. We do not have to be Rhodes Scholars to know how those Governments have miserably failed in these fields recently. In the past 12 months, the morale (as well as incentives) of the Australian people has been so damaged that it will take several years to repair, whichever Party is in Government.

This is no wonder, for the Australian Government has the same basic intent as its Labor predecessors in years past. It is not being unfair or unreasonably critical to say that its motives are, first, to disintegrate the free enterprise control of primary and secondary industry, and secondly, to erode State and local government powers and generally weaken the community under the master plan to monopolize and centralize control in Canberra. Whether or not it is intended, the effect of this action is to destroy the incentive of all people at all levels of industry. I held this opinion when I was in local government before coming into this place. Now I have personally witnessed in this Chamber the Labor Government acting as a puppet to the national Labor scheme. Adolph Hitler tried to monopolize control by dictatorship. He destroyed his

country by that same monopolizing and overbearing tactic. He crashed and he brought his country down in the process, but that is in the past.

The greatest contribution we can make in the interests of the Australian public is to occupy the Treasury benches both in Canberra and in this State. This is necessary if we are to save the country from total disaster and its people from bloodshed. I do not think I am being overdramatic in saying so. If a member had referred in this Chamber 12 months ago to the Communist element in the Australian trade union movement, he would have been branded as a right-wing reactionary, and called by all the other names used by members opposite. However, such a statement would not have been so unreal after all, because we find that the Leader of the Communist Party in Australia has blatantly and openly declared his influence and that of the Communist Party in all trade union affairs, and unions have an influence on the Labor Party generally:

Therefore, I am not reluctant to say that, considering the way the country is going and being managed, there will be bloodshed before much longer. In fact, the process that will lead to this has already begun. Without reading the newspapers or listening to the radio, citizens can still feel the effects of the process to which I have referred. In his Speech, the Governor refers often to "my Government". In paragraph 4, he began the part of the Speech that one would expect to deal with management of the State and other significant matters. However, what he said was as follows:

Throughout the State generally there has been an excellent opening to the current agricultural season with the sowing of all cereals well advanced, and pastures have made early and prolific growth in most districts.

How honourable of the Governor to begin such an important document with a matter over which neither he nor his Government has any control whatever.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should know by now that he may not take the name of the Governor in vain in the way he has just done. He may refer to His Excellency's Speech to Parliament, but he may not refer to the Governor as he has just referred to him.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The next reference in the Speech is to a primary product, dairy spread. This disclosure about a new dairy product is rather interesting. The Speech states:

A new dairy product "dairy spread", being a combination of butter and edible fats, which retains the flavour of butter but has some additional advantages in use, has been developed by the Agriculture Department and widely accepted in consumer trials. Legislation will be laid before you during this session to permit the manufacture and sale of this product.

We have been told about the legislation. A little later in my speech, I want to impress on members the importance of supporting those who make these products. The Governor's Speech then refers to the Coast Protection Board, as follows:

The close attention of the Coast Protection Board is being directed to the protection, restoration, and development of our coastline.

There is a serious need for further attention to be given to the sand bar which is known as the Spit and which is situated a few miles off the coast of Kingscote. This is an area of ecological significance. Other areas in the Alexandra District that require further attention are at Aldinga, Normanville, and on the coastline within the Port Elliot and Goolwa area.

The next and most important matter in His Excellency's Speech concerned State planning. On behalf of the Government, His Excellency referred to the State Planning

Authority's redevelopment, acquisition and expansion programme. The principle of planning is of paramount importance at every social, agricultural, industrial and even political level. No responsible person would deny that a degree of planning is necessary in every field. Sometimes people, councils and committees require technical, architectural or other expert advice to enable them to prepare maps and collate their ideas into documentary form. Sometimes, the criteria for regulations for guiding implementation of such plans require expert assistance.

It is desirable that officers of the State Planning Authority should be available when and where required to give such a service, especially when legislative standards are required, as under the State Planning and Development Act. Few laymen are equipped properly to make and document such final preparations. To this point, I agree with the principle of planning and, as well, with the departmental guidance that is or should be readily made available. Regarding their implementation thereafter, however, I am afraid I part company with the attitude of this State's planning officers.

I should like now to cite a few examples of where not only the Minister and his officers but also the Planning and Development Act have fallen down in respect of planning in certain outer metropolitan areas. The Minister has failed to realize the significance of and the need for salesmanship and product quality in this whole matter. The method adopted in selling controlled planning of development in some of the rural areas of this State has been disgraceful. Many responsible citizens have been disturbed by the overpowering attitude inflicted on them by certain departmental officers. Because of their isolation, Kangaroo Islanders have necessarily, and largely on their own initiative, had to plan and implement their island's development. I am a fifth generation descendant of the first settlers of this country, and I could go on for some time relating to the House the various stages of development carried out by these people to whom I have referred.

Mr. Nankivell: They came from Van Diemen's Land, didn't they?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I do not have sufficient time to reply to that interjection. Instead, I refer to what Mr. Raymond Steiner, from Louisiana, U.S., has said in this respect. I am citing this area, which has had unreasonable requirements inflicted on it. This area is representative of what has occurred throughout South Australia's country areas and particularly in the outer metropolitan planning area. Mr. Steiner said:

In our travels we have lived on islands which were not so different from Kangaroo Island: Ibiza (Spain), the Greek Islands, Okinawa (Japan), Bali (Indonesia). All these islands are or were physically beautiful, and the people had a peaceful way of life. They had a strong community and a tradition of helping each other and welcoming strangers.

He later continued:

Kangaroo Island is a very special place . . . We hope that Kangaroo Island remains a place where man and nature live in harmony.

Mr. Steiner has decided to reside in this area for a while. He continued:

We hope our children can grow up and live on this land. There are two things that the islanders will not wear, the first of which is an ignorant, militant union leader (and they have many times nominated Mr. Jim Dunford in this respect), and the second of which is the bulldozing bureaucrats who tell them how to run their own country and who lack regard for the plans of families and for the future of these people.

Mr. Rodda: Tell us what they don't like about Jim Dunford.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I may do that if the member for Adelaide re-enters the Chamber from wherever he may be nesting. It is not necessary to reiterate the history of the black ban or the events that followed Mr. Jim Dunford's actions. However, I think everyone will recall that, as a result of his actions, the Premier came out and spent the taxpayers' money in protecting that militant, arrogant animal.

Mr. Becker: Whose money?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Our money—money that belongs to the people of South Australia. Because of his actions, this man will be hated for the rest of the time that he stays in Australia. I now refer to what happened regarding the island's planning and the feeling that has until now built up regarding this matter. Although they recognized the need for proper planning and development, these people, like many others in the rural community in this State, set out to plan and document the development of their community. Indeed, they even called on the State Planning Authority for assistance in this matter. A plan was eventually produced, amended and accepted.

Regulations were prepared, again, I concede, with the co-operation of the learned gentlemen to whom I have referred. Unfortunately, the planning officers were not willing to consider the feelings of the local people, and the draft regulations were thrown out. The matter received the attention it deserved. Because they have an accepted plan but no regulations to implement it, this community has applied for, and has had granted to it by proclamation, interim development control. These people applied under section 41 of the Planning and Development Act for local powers to enable them to implement that control. However, their repeated applications have been rejected by the State Planning Authority.

In seeking interim development control during the period from January 1 to when amended and accepted regulations are adopted, district councils on the island have acted properly and responsibly. However, the control they have sought has not been vested in the local community where it belongs: it has been retained by the authority. We went to senior officers of the authority and to the Minister to find out what was behind the decision and why the community had been denied its reasonable rights. A senior officer and the Minister of Environment and Conservation stated that the controls must be held by the department: they saw Kangaroo Island as a place of significance in this State, but they did not see how elected local people were competent enough to carry out the responsibility. Among other things the department claimed that it did not have the time or staff to guide the councils in their efforts to plan and develop their communities within the plans.

I set out to clarify this confusing situation that had followed our correspondence and discussions with the department. On May 2 this year I asked the Minister whether planning officers would be available to these district councils to give guidance and assistance in planning matters, if and when they were needed in future. I understood him to say that, if the respective councils continued to seek and ultimately to gain interim development control on Kangaroo Island, future requests for guidance would be refused. In seeking confirmation of this attitude, I sent a letter on May 2, 1974, which included a comment in the form of a question: if the department had the time and staff to deal with Kangaroo Island's application for planning and development

in total, why were those services not available in an advisory way for that isolated case when needed? On July 24, I received a reply from the Minister containing the most conflicting remarks I have seen since becoming a member. Among many other irrelevant points, the Minister stated:

The State Planning Division has insufficient resources to provide expert planning advice to all councils at present operating under interim development control throughout the State.

In the early part of the letter the Minister admitted that the department did not have access to (or if it did, could not or would not supply) advice to particular councils that were under interim development control. What is a Government department all about? Is it there to provide expert advice to the community or councils where needed? The Minister's reply continued:

It is most undesirable for officers of the division to become too involved in providing informal advice to councils, and the possibility of giving formal advice under section 77 of the Planning and Development Act to all councils is out of the question with the present staff.

Is the Minister suggesting that the staff is there but is not competent, or that the department does not have enough staff? I can only assume that the Minister is suggesting that he has sufficient staff but that it does not have the brains or expertise to supply services that councils are seeking and need. Later, in the same letter the Minister became more specific and stated:

In the case of Kangaroo Island, Flinders Range, Salisbury stock paddocks, Monarto, and other areas of State significance, the State Planning Authority is retaining control and deals with every application.

I have not heard such conflicting statements: they are incredible. I am not sure whether the Minister of Environment and Conservation, when dealing with councils in particular, is forced to act under the Minister who ordinarily deals with local government affairs. We know the Minister to whom I refer and who has such a commanding control over the Australian Labor Party in South Australia, or over a section of that Party. I am not sure whether the Minister of Environment and Conservation, when dealing with matters concerning councils, is controlled by that "Virgoinian" Act. The Minister's reply continued:

I am sure that, on reflection, you will appreciate the difficult position in which staff of the State Planning Division would be placed if they were required to be at the beck and call of any council with planning problems.

What is the point if they are not there to advise taxpayers of this State? The Minister's letter continued:

Furthermore, it is not good policy for staff of Government departments to make a practice of providing professional advice to councils.

Incredible as it may seem, the Minister's letter continued:

Notwithstanding the above, staff of the State Planning Division are always available to give advice in general terms to councils on how to administer the Planning and Development Act and the regulations thereunder.

Perhaps my question may have been a double-barrelled one, but the Minister takes the prize for giving a more double-barrelled reply. I now refer to an article that I believe reflects not only on people of Kangaroo Island concerning this planning issue but also on people in a wide area and particularly on people living in rural districts in South Australia. The article states:

It may be that the present Planning and Development Act needs some legislative amendments to make these things possible. If this is so then steps should be taken as soon as possible. Meanwhile the councils and islanders generally should think long and hard before they take any action which could give the State effective and ultimate control over how they may live in the future.

One simple solution to this problem would be for the Government to adopt the practice of the New South

Wales Government. A Planning and Development Act was in force in New South Wales, and I do not know for how long that Government followed that planning programme, which clearly did not work. I refer to pages 2156 and 2157 of a New South Wales *Hansard* report of remarks by Sir Charles Cutler on the introduction of an Act to constitute the New South Wales Planning and Environment Commission, to define its powers, authorities, duties and functions, and at the same time to dissolve the State Planning Authority of New South Wales. Sir Charles Cutler stated:

It is the Government's experience that present planning procedures limit the powers of councils under planning ordinances and, as a result, too many matters are referred to the State Planning Authority. As a consequence, there are delays in reaching decisions. The Government proposes to give effect to its undertaking to confer the power to make local determinations concerned with planning and development applications on local authorities within guidelines, policies, and procedures laid down by the new Planning and Environment Commission.

The South Australian Planning and Development Act not only is undesirable in its present form but also it has caused much disturbance and disruption throughout our community. Before referring to the Fleurieu Peninsula, where the same sort of reaction has been witnessed, I refer to a report published in the *Chronicle* on July 5, 1974. David Parsons prepared a comprehensive and informative article headed "Fears on State Planning Authority Plans". I refer to one early incorrect paragraph of that report, as follows:

The authority was set up under the Planning and Development Act by the Hall Government in 1967.

I do not know who fed that information to the young writer, Mr. Parsons, but that Act was assented to in 1967 following the repeal of the Town Planning Act, 1929-63, and in 1967 the Dunstan Government was in power in South Australia. Concerning the Fleurieu Peninsula, in an outer metropolitan area planning document the State Planning Authority has stated that it intends to acquire considerable areas of rural land, some which has been developed and some which has not yet been cleared. People living in this area want to know whether their land is to be acquired and, if it is, when their land will be acquired. Doubtless, the Minister has plans for his own family and future, and farmers of the South Coast are entitled also to make their own plans. Although the Minister is absent at present, I seek his urgent attention to this matter with a view to giving this information to the people in this area.

I now refer to a similar matter in an attempt to erode the need for a whole heap of planning regulations applying to rural areas in South Australia. When the Planning and Development Act was prepared for the purpose of controlling the development of previously undeveloped areas, a great fear was held by this Government that the clearing of natural land was being carried on by people who had no real intention of developing land for agricultural purposes. In the Outer Metropolitan Area Plan, the following statement appears at page 110:

Clearing has not always taken place to bring land into agricultural production. Some may have been carried out solely for purposes of tax deduction. It is often followed by soil erosion, the spread of undesirable weeds and constitutes agricultural and ecological malpractice.

That statement was directed at the Rundle Street farmers and people who, or so the writer believed, were attempting to avoid taxation without having any real interest in farming.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Do you deny that?

Mr. CHAPMAN: There may have been some basis in this, and I believe that if there is any truth in it at all, it is reasonable that this statement should be made. However, much weight is placed on the statement, which is again referred to on page 111. One good reason for the Government's having control over the development of outer areas was the fear that people would clear and develop land as a means of obtaining a taxation deduction, but all that is now gone. The Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. Crean) fixed that last year when he removed concessions on moneys spent on developing land. Therefore, with the removal altogether of that factor, I wonder whether the Government will rethink and reconsider the position concerning its desperate need for control over development undertaken by every company, organization and individual in the outer areas. I hope that we are not continually bogged down with all this paraphernalia which belongs to the State Planning Office. I refer again to the Governor's Speech, which regarding Monarto states:

During the forthcoming year it is expected that plans for the new city of Monarto will be further developed.

In the absence of the member for Murray, I will make only a brief comment on this matter. I am concerned that the proposal to establish Murray New Town (as it was originally to be known) has occupied so little of Parliament's time and so much of the people's money thus far. The debate introduced by the Premier on March 29 was fairly shallow, and he had little to say. In turn, as a result of the shallow and uninformative nature of the Premier's second reading explanation of the land acquisition Bill, there was only little response from the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition took up the debate briefly and secured the adjournment. From *Hansard*, I see that the next time the subject was debated (and the only time it was really debated in Parliament) was when the Leader started debating it at midnight on April 4. Monarto was to be one of the greatest planned development steps proposed to be taken in South Australia, and this was the kind of attention the legislation was given.

The member for Murray spoke briefly, and I am unable to find much more debate on the proposed new town. I am not impressed by the concept of establishing a city at Monarto, although I favour decentralization at carefully selected multiple sites throughout the State. Rather than pursue the subject, I refer members to an alternative decentralizing report provided at that time, and my thoughts are in line with the ideas contained in the plan. It called for the establishment of cities where towns already existed in dispersed sites throughout the State, in line with the Victorian style of decentralization of its cities. The State has many country towns along the Murray River and at scenic spots along the coastline which are screaming out for development and which need some form of industry established and an injection of population. I believe that the Government should again look seriously into this question, because I have not heard three good reasons why there should be a Monarto at all. Great play is made in the Speech of the Government's extended plan for home builders, namely, an increase from \$12 000 to \$15 000. If this were not such a serious matter, it would be laughable.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Can you justify the development of Elizabeth compared to Monarto? Answer that.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Although I wish to cover certain other matters, I realize that my time is running out. The Speech states:

A Bill will be laid before you during the forthcoming session to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, providing, amongst other things, that industrial disputes will be dealt with by industrial tribunals, that civil

actions for damages will not be available in connection with industrial disputes, and for the removal of the penal provisions from that Act.

In no way in the world shall I or should any responsible person agree to legislation to exempt any person or any action caused by such persons against another dispensation or escape from a civil action in the ordinary course of the law. No-one should be able to escape the due process of law and order.

The First Report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas requires considerable attention. I understand that, later in the session, a Bill will be introduced to implement the recommendations contained in the report. However, we would be well advised to treat the report already at hand with the respect and caution it deserves. Considerable reference is made in the Speech to the Water Resources Branch, a new branch that has been formed within the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I sincerely hope that the American River water supply proposal is now near fruition. I have co-operated with the Minister in gathering information on this project for his department.

The desperate situation at American River, Kangaroo Island, still exists. Many appeals have been lodged by landholders who have received advice that their land will be acquired under the new land acquisition scheme within the department. Here again, these people cannot be expected merely to receive advice that their land is to be acquired at some time in the future. It is not fair or reasonable for landholders to be held on a string in this regard.

Education is given considerable coverage in the Speech. It is my understanding from reading *Hansard* and from listening to members in the House that contributions on this subject have adequately covered all the relevant points. Certainly the speech of the member for Kavel (our future Minister of Education) adequately covered the subject. The last subject on which I should like to comment is contained in the final paragraph of the Governor's Speech:

Accordingly, my Government will keep the effect of the Australian Government's fiscal policies on this State under the closest scrutiny and will not hesitate to point out to that Government any hardship that may arise for the people of this State . . .

What an amazing task the Premier and the Government have taken on. As a result of the attitude extended to the primary industry sector of our community in particular, the Government will have its work cut out looking after primary producers. The superphosphate bounty, the establishment of regional abattoirs, transport in the outer areas, the lack of adequate funds to local government, the neglect of tourism generally, and State taxation all deserve attention in this debate. However, I am running out of time, and I believe that all these topics should receive adequate and proper attention.

There is one matter that may be described as a personal matter but, when I refer to it, I hope it invites comment from those whom it may concern. I refer to electoral offices. Shortly after the last State election (in fact, in correspondence signed by the Minister of Works and dated March 26, 1973), I was informed that the Government had decided to provide office accommodation to all the then House of Assembly members. The document attached to that letter—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Did they consult the Opposition before drawing up the proposal?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I will come to that point in a moment. The document attached to the letter set out the proposals in some detail. It was not a document following a discussion

in this Parliament: it was not a document following consultation with the Opposition: it was a document prepared as a result of a decision by Cabinet.

Mr. Goldsworthy: And they do not know anything about country districts, either.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Following the opening paragraph, the letter states:

There will be a restriction on the choice of accommodation only to the extent that it will not be part of the member's own premises, that of a relative, Party executive or Government offices, and it is suggested that the following procedures be followed.

Let us look at that closely. Cabinet's decision not to allow such facilities in a member's own premises is quite understandable, and that applies also with respect to premises of a relative. I can also appreciate the wisdom of avoiding premises owned by Party executives. Now let us look at the last reference—"Government offices". On no account did I at the time, nor do I now, interpret this to mean Parliament House. If the Minister is fair, he will agree that the intent of Cabinet here was directed at Government department offices. Accepting that point, at precisely the same time as the member for Eyre and the member for Frome approached the Minister for the establishment of such offices in Parliament House, I sought appropriate accommodation, along with those members, in line with our respective district geographic situations.

Incidentally, the member for Goyder at that time (Mr. Hall) was accommodated under the new scheme with convenient offices and a private secretarial service in Parliament House. The Minister wanted time to consider the requests and before many weeks had passed, with interviews and correspondence, on April 9, 1974, the two members mentioned earlier were provided with facilities and secretarial services in Parliament House, and later with refrigerators and facilities that do and should apply to outside offices. Incidentally, an additional \$500 a year was offered to them—I repeat "offered". The member for Frome has kindly furnished me with some correspondence relevant to this point. He received a letter from the Deputy Premier on April 9, 1973, which stated, amongst other things:

Would you please advise me as soon as possible if these arrangements are satisfactory to you so that I can take steps to implement them?

Members should bear in mind that this was at exactly the same time as my application was with the Minister, but the situation in my case was a little different, apparently. The Minister told me to wait awhile as he was dealing with the situations of the member for Eyre and the member for Frome. In fact, he said, among other things, "Let it go for a while and I will fix you up, Chappie", or words to that effect. I left the matter in the capable hands of what I thought was a fair man, at least one who would stand by his word. In all fairness, he may still do so.

However, in the meantime, every reasonable effort has been made to find premises within my electoral district, in line with the findings of the Minister himself, at Victor Harbor, although Victor Harbor is a 640 kilometre round trip from my home, involving an aircraft fare, the use of two motor vehicles a minimum cost of \$45 to visit such an office and return on each occasion. I appreciate it is an important part of my electoral district. It is a developing area that has the greatest concentration of people, and deserves this service. In line with the Minister's demands, I was prepared to set out to make every effort to establish an office in that area, but this is what has happened. I have tried the good offices of

the local government authorities, and local land agents have tried. Even officers in the Public Buildings Department have in the meantime tried to find me premises in that area.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CHAPMAN: By specific request, I submitted my whole case in detail to the Minister on August 7, 1973, and later in August. With evidence from the corporation of Victor Harbor about the extreme shortage of rental premises, my Party unanimously supported my submission to the Minister in about September, 1973, but to no avail. He replied on October 15, 1973, implying the same contempt as previously.

The Leader of the Opposition took up the matter personally with the Minister early in December, 1973, but again to no avail. During the session early this year he did so again—with absolutely no result. On February 21, 1974, the member for Mallee and I lodged a joint submission with the Minister. Again he fobbed it off. The Public Buildings Department officer has lodged a report confirming the situation, and I have a copy of that report, to which I have widely referred. Now, after 16 months in Parliament House, I am still required to engage private secretarial assistance at my own expense to supplement the typing load involved in serving my district, and in particular to assist my wife in the typing load she has to bear as a result of the situation in Parliament House. This poor situation in Parliament House is shockingly inadequate. I have witnessed the Minister's agreement with that remark, and I can accept his personal description of the existing situation.

Generally, I am disappointed that grown men, and particularly Ministers of the State, have adopted such discriminatory practices. I am far from impressed with the attitude of the person who is responsible, during the whole deal, for the activities within this House. So, on my own behalf and on behalf of my wife, who has been run into the ground as a result of this work load, I look forward to a fair go in this matter in the future.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra has one minute to go.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Sir. When I referred to the person who had control of Parliament House and when I said that I was far from impressed by the attitude of that person, I meant the attitude that had been extended to me by the honourable Speaker, not by any other officer in this place.

The SPEAKER: Order! I seek information from the honourable member for Alexandra as to whether he made the statement that the person responsible for members' activities in this place did not give him a fair go. Is that the implication in the honourable member's statement?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Sir, there was nothing in any of my remarks that referred to the staff members in this place—nothing whatsoever.

The SPEAKER: The latter remark of the honourable member for Alexandra was that the implication was not applicable to any officer. Would the honourable member please explain whether the implication was thrown at the Speaker as the administrator of the House of Assembly?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Mr. Speaker, with every respect, I can understand your concern about the interpretation that you have placed on what I said. Quite seriously, I will set out to explain very briefly what was involved.

The SPEAKER: I am asking what was said, not what was involved.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Exactly what was said, Sir. As I sat down at the end of my address, someone said to me that he thought I was reflecting on an officer within this House. To clarify the position, I referred to the honourable Speaker, yourself in particular. What I said, leading up to that comment, was that generally, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that grown men and, in particular, Ministers of State have adopted such discriminatory practices in this regard, and I am far from impressed by the attitude of the person who is in charge of this House (you, Mr. Speaker) during this whole deal, during the period I have been seeking secretarial services. Do you, Sir, take that as a reflection?

The SPEAKER: I take it as a reflection, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw.

Mr. CHAPMAN: As I said earlier, Sir, if there was any part of my remarks that was regarded as a reflection, I would be happy to withdraw, and I certainly will do so.

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I support the motion and I am pleased to be able to rise in my place knowing, Mr. Speaker, that you have restored the confidence of the House in the honourable position that you hold here, after the comments made by the member for Alexandra.

The SPEAKER: Order! There can be no comments on a request to withdraw. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

Mr. DUNCAN: Thank you, Sir. I want to pass similar condolences and congratulations as have been passed by other members during this debate. Unfortunately, I was unable to be present to hear the Address in Reply debate in the first week of the session. However, I have since listened with interest to the speeches made in this debate. The reason for my absence during the first week of the session was that I was overseas, and I shall have a few words to say about that in a moment. I have read the speeches, so ably reported by the *Hansard* reporters, of the mover and seconder of the motion. The member for Gilles referred to the Institute for Fitness Research, a body with very noble aims. It is sad that more members do not go to the facilities provided by the institute.

Mr. Gunn: Where is it?

Mr. DUNCAN: It is at Adelaide College of Advanced Education in Kintore Avenue. The institute also has classes in the gymnasium at North Adelaide of the Adelaide University. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition could well lose as much weight as anyone; so, he could well take advantage of the institute's facilities. The Australian Labor Party team, ably led by the member for Gilles, soundly defeated the Liberal Party team in the *News* race to Glenelg last year. I point out that the member for Gilles received his training from the Institute for Fitness Research. Many members could usefully benefit from the institute's facilities, which are made available not only at a reasonable rate but also at a time convenient to members. Members can go to the institute during the dinner break to participate in an exercise programme. After hearing some contributions and after witnessing a lack of contribution from the Opposition, I think members should visit the institute in response to press comments about the inability of some members of Parliament to carry out their duties because of their poor state of physical health.

I congratulate the member for Goyder on being elected to this House. He has certainly shown that he is well able to contribute to the proceedings of the House and

that he will in the future show himself well able to represent his constituents. It is clear that the people of Goyder did not want Liberal Party representation in this House. The Governor's Speech has been well canvassed in this debate, and I do not want to bore the House as Opposition members have done over the past few days by repetition. I am extremely pleased to note that the Speech refers specifically to the appalling lack of medical services in the Para region. For the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition, I point out that that region includes the Elizabeth District. As most members know, the medical services in the Elizabeth area are, and have been for some years, absolutely appalling. They have gradually got worse. This situation cannot continue for much longer without leading to a serious breakdown in medical services in this area. I am pleased to see that the Speech refers to the fact that the Government has the matter well in mind and intends to take action to improve the situation soon.

The Speech also refers to the question of local government boundaries. Since I have been a member, this matter has been dear to my heart, as it greatly concerns many of my constituents who live in Elizabeth. The Elizabeth District covers basically two local government areas: those of the Munno Para council and of the Elizabeth council. The Royal Commission into Local Government Areas has recommended that the Munno Para council be dissolved and split up basically between the Elizabeth council, the Gawler council, and the Salisbury council. For the Para region (as I will call it) this will be a great step forward, because even the Munno Para council has recognized that the present situation is unworkable. Only last week, at a meeting following the report of the Royal Commission, the Munno Para council voted by a majority in favour of the report. This clearly indicates that the Opposition is misrepresenting the situation regarding council boundaries in this State. This council, which will be dissolved as a result of the Commission's report, has voted in favour of that report. The Munno Para council realizes that the Elizabeth area needs one council to control local government affairs.

Mr. Olson: That's a commonsense approach.

Mr. DUNCAN: Yes. I wish to refer to two matters that illustrate how completely ridiculous the past local government boundaries have been and how the recommendations will rationalize boundaries in the area to ensure that local government is placed on a sound footing. The Elizabeth council has been in control of the small area that surrounds the developed residential area of Elizabeth. The effect of that has been that the Munno Para council has controlled the foothills (the so-called hills face zone) overlooking Elizabeth. That council has been able to pass zoning regulations that have materially affected the quality of life of people living in Elizabeth, without the people of Elizabeth being able to have a say in those regulations. I hope that this situation will now be remedied, with the people of Elizabeth being able to control the natural environment surrounding their city, ensuring in future that that environment will be as pleasant as it is today.

Secondly, I refer to what is perhaps a trivial matter. Although the Elizabeth council area has been surrounded by a large space of open land that is suitable for the disposal of rubbish, the Elizabeth council has been unable to establish a rubbish tip. In the circumstances, this seems ludicrous. Although the Munno Para council has had a large tip, it has refused permission for the people

of Elizabeth to use it. Therefore, in these two cases to which I have referred the recommendations of the Royal Commission affecting the Elizabeth area will be of great benefit to people living there. It is appropriate that I should refer today to the matter to which I shall now refer, as on this day Mr. Justice Moore's industrial conference has got under way to try to sort out some of the problems arising in the Australian community.

Mr. McAnaney: Isn't that the Commonwealth Government's job?

Mr. DUNCAN: Certainly, but it affects everyone in the community. Notwithstanding the parochialism of the honourable member, I point out that there are 13 000 000 people in this country, including those who live in South Australia, who are affected by what happens at this conference. The immediate focus of the conference next week will be on discussing whether wages should be adjusted to prices. The basic question facing the country is whether there should be indexation. In my view, this should happen.

Mr. McAnaney: You want to repeat the failure of the fifties. They had to give it away and you want it again.

Mr. DUNCAN: It was not a question of giving it away; the Australian people were robbed of their right to indexation by the Menzies Government. I say that not only wages but also pensions and social service payments should be indexed to ensure that, regardless of inflation, ordinary people are protected. I am not one of those members, such as members opposite (and the member for Heysen is giving a good example of this at present), who constantly bash the unions, claiming that unions ask more for their members than they are entitled to claim. We know well that unions are only trying to maintain for their members the conditions and wages to which they have been accustomed. They have been simply protecting the purchasing power and rights of pay of their members.

Mr. McAnaney: The Commonwealth Government is responsible for the erosion that has taken place.

Mr. DUNCAN: We have heard many calls for restraint in wage claims and claims that wages should be pegged, unions muzzled, and that sort of thing. However, we have not heard a call for interest rates to be pegged, for a moratorium to be placed on bonds, and for dividends to be pegged for 12 months. We have not heard this suggested, especially by Opposition members. Opposition members have constantly carried on with their typical union bashing, regardless of the rest of the community, which includes people who obtain their income from dividends. I think that a moratorium on dividends could be one solution to the problem and might well temper the inflation rate more than has been the case in the past. We have heard all sorts of stories about how badly the share market is going and how low share prices have fallen. It has been said that this is an appalling situation. Let us have a moratorium on dividends on shares, as the share market, which is now at rock bottom, cannot fall further.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the Commonwealth Government's part in this? You are a disgrace to the university that didn't educate you.

Mr. DUNCAN: Opposition members constantly proclaim the need for increased productivity and other virtues of personal endeavour. No doubt, the member for Heysen, who is interjecting so vigorously, supports these statements. He supports the free enterprise system through and through. I believe that the logical extension of this is the right of everyone to work for himself, and to have

the workers run the factories. I put forward this proposition seriously. It seems to me that, if one listened at all to the theories and philosophies put forward by the Opposition, one would have to say that people who worked in industry and, by their endeavours, produced goods and services, should be able to have some control in industry and in their lives, in the same way as those who are involved in so-called private enterprise have this control.

Mr. McAnaney: What you're saying—

Mr. DUNCAN: I am pleased to see that the member for Heysen agrees with me. It is certainly pleasant to see that one Opposition member supports such a rational approach.

Mr. McAnaney: We're 20 years ahead of you.

Mr. DUNCAN: I am pleased to see that I am getting through to the honourable member. Although he is older than I am, I see that he is one older person with a clear and open mind on this subject. In the present situation, who could or would blame the union officials and their members for exercising what is their right in this so-called free enterprise system? In this dog-eat-dog system, they are merely protecting themselves by using the tactics that the Opposition cherishes and admires so much: the rugged sort of approach.

With the development of multi-national corporations and with fewer and fewer people being self-employed, the logical extension, if we want to have a free enterprise system, is workers' freedom. The Opposition would do well to listen to what I am saying, because, if one Opposition member can open his mind in this respect, surely we can win over yet another member who will see the reason and rationale of what I am saying tonight. I am advocating a free enterprise system that allows workers to control their work lives in a democratic situation and to have the resources in the hands of the people who produce them. They ought to have the control and the rights, not the people who happen to be shareholders or company directors. Those latter people ought not to have the control. The sort of system about which the member for Glenelg speaks is a freedom to exploit one's fellow human beings. It is the sort of freedom to exploit the world, the sort of thing that one sees in the capitalist countries of the world: the destruction of the resources of the people.

Mr. Mathwin: What about Russia? It takes eight years to get a car there.

Mr. DUNCAN: If the member for Glenelg wants to refer to what I saw overseas, I will oblige him. He advocates the sort of society that I saw in Beirut, where half the society drives Cadillacs around the streets and the other half begs. It is the sort of society where one is free to starve another in the gutter.

Mr. Mathwin: What about Russia?

Mr. DUNCAN: I have never been to Russia. This illustrates the sort of ignorance from which the member for Glenelg suffers. It is a pity that he does not make himself more aware of world affairs instead of worrying about the fortunes of the Glenelg Football Club, about which I will have more to say tomorrow. The sort of freedom he is seeking is that which will change the lifestyle of future generations to one that is far more primitive than that which we enjoy today. This will happen if we do not wake up to the destruction of resources that is occurring in today's society. It will then be too late to ensure that the next generation can enjoy at least the same standard of living as we enjoy now.

Mr. McAnaney: How will you put this into practice?

Mr. DUNCAN: I am pleased that the member for Heysen has raised this matter, because he is—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Heysen is out of order.

Mr. DUNCAN: He is not only out of order but he is also following my speech carefully, as the next matter to which I wished to refer was the solution to these problems.

Mr. McAnaney: I want a coat like you have.

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members know what they can and cannot do under Standing Orders. Interjections have always been a part of Parliamentary procedure, but interjections made by honourable members who are out of their seats will not be tolerated. If the honourable member for Heysen disregards Standing Orders, I shall have no hesitation in dealing with him.

Mr. DUNCAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One thing is certainly becoming clear in the debate: the member for Heysen observes far more out of his seat than he does from his seat.

The SPEAKER: Order! I gave instructions in accordance with Standing Orders, and honourable members cannot comment on remarks made by the Chair regarding Standing Orders.

Mr. DUNCAN: I certainly did not intend to reflect on the Chair, Sir. We will never solve any of the problems to which I have referred until society is willing to change its attitude in relation to the dog-eat-dog approach which obtains at present and which is not conducive to society's prospering and living harmoniously. The doctrine of the survival of the fittest is not one on which society can be based. Although the Opposition subscribes to it, society cannot live in harmony and thrive in that way. Until the Opposition and many people in our society change their attitude and believe that the motive for a lifetime's work and opportunities should be the betterment of the whole society, the situation will not improve. Until the Opposition and many others in society have that attitude, we will not get the sort of just society that we are seeking. It is a grave pity that Opposition members do not spend some time researching philosophy and questions about where society is going and how it will get there, because these are real questions that are holding up the progress of society that we seek today. That is the fundamental problem with the Opposition: its members find it completely impossible to progress in any direction. They continue to mark time, and it seems to me that they are incapable of anything else.

Mr. McAnaney: How much progress have we made in the past 18 months?

Mr. DUNCAN: Australia has made much progress. While I was overseas, I found that the Australian community was well known in the countries I visited for the new approaches that it had made regarding foreign affairs in the past 18 months. This indicates clearly the sort of progress that Australia has made in that time.

The member for Spence, in his contribution to the debate, referred to the threat to democracy. I believe there is a serious threat to democracy, and I wholeheartedly support his remarks. If the sort of approach that has been taken by the Liberal Party in the Commonwealth sphere is continued, a real threat could exist. Notwithstanding that it forced a double dissolution, the Commonwealth Liberal Party thereafter said that it would not support the Health Bill and the other Bills that had

previously been rejected. However, the people endorsed the Australian Labor Party in the House of Representatives, which is the only House of Parliament in which the Australian Government is either made or unmade and which has the support of the Australian people.

We still find that the Liberal Party is using the Senate as an obstructing force. Indeed, even when a joint sitting was to be held, it had the audacity to go to the High Court to try to further frustrate the democratic process. If this attitude is continued to be taken by the Liberal Party of Australia, I have grave doubts about the continuation of democracy in this country. Whilst the Liberal Party is frustrating the will of the people in this manner, and using every devious trick in the book to try to frustrate the will of the people, democracy may prove to be too inefficient and too much of a luxury to work in our society. If people have a will and express it at the ballot box in a democratic election the Liberal Party of Australia should accept the democratic will of the people, and in the House of Parliament also accept that will and vote for Bills that have been submitted in the way of a referendum to the people of Australia. On a true Party preference vote the Labor Party received 50 per cent of the votes in the recent Commonwealth election.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What percentage of the total vote in Australia did you get?

Mr. DUNCAN: We got about 48 per cent for the Party, and on second preferences we received over 50 per cent. Although Opposition members, in trying to hide their deficiencies by the way they have been frustrating the democratic process in this country, are now jesting and joking about the situation, I believe that after 700 years of Westminster type Parliamentary democracy the institution of Parliament seems to have lost much of its efficiency and much of its respect from the people of Australia. Many more people in the community now view Parliament with disrespect than did so a few years ago. This statement in no way reflects on Parliament or officers of Parliament, but I think many people are viewing Parliament with greater disrespect than was the case a few years ago. I think they now no longer look, as they did, to members of Parliament for protection from Executive acts, and I believe people are more likely to write to Government departments or to Ministers than seek the assistance of members of Parliament. I think the reasons for this attitude are manifold.

Mr. McAnaney: You must be a poor member if you do not receive letters and complaints.

Mr. DUNCAN: I did not say that. I said that more people seem to be inclined to seek the assistance of Ministers or administrators in the Government rather than the assistance of members of Parliament. The member for Heysen would be well advised to consider this aspect because it reflects an attitude that he may have recognized if he had been more astute. People are less inclined to look to Parliament than they were previously in order to have their grievances considered. I think this attitude is regrettable because the Parliamentary system has been operating for 700 years, but this unfortunate development is occurring. In this regard the representative function has also been reduced: people do not look to members of Parliament with the same regard as they used to look to them and, therefore, the representative function of Parliament has been reduced.

There may be several reasons for this, but the principal reason in South Australia has been the gerrymander.

Many people have been stuck with members of Parliament with whom they have no affinity; they have been voting against them for years without having any real ability to change the situation, and that has had a material effect on the standard of the South Australian Parliament. Through the years of the Playford Administration people could not elect the Government they wanted. What is needed is a system that can be applied as a consequence of the success of the conference called by Mr. Justice Moore. That conference has my best wishes for success. What we should be aiming for in this country is a situation in which the highest paid person in the country receives no more than four times the basic wage of the lowest paid wage-earner.

With that system we would find that many more people would consider themselves as part of the country and would not feel alienated as they do in the present situation. If the highest wage-earner and the lowest wage-earner were brought closer together, there would be a real possibility of establishing a democratic system in which people considered that they belonged and were receiving a reasonable share of the cake. Of course, there would still be the problem of people receiving unearned income from dividends, but this problem would have to be dealt with by the Arbitration Commission conference. I hope it is dealt with in the way I suggested earlier, because it seems to me that those people receiving dividend incomes could stand a reduction of those incomes for 12 months during which the inflation situation could be overcome.

Mr. McAnaney: What about my Chrysler shares? I don't get much now.

Mr. DUNCAN: As one who does not own shares, I do not depreciate the honourable member's point. I realize that the Leader of the Opposition and other Opposition members in their statements in this House do not really support the system they try to prop up. They do not support a free enterprise and dog-eat-dog society—the type of society that so often seems to be promoted from the Opposition side, particularly by the member for Alexandra. It seems to me that they cannot realize that they are being used as the pawns and tools of big business. When they speak they promote ideas which, when purely and simply put, are the ideas that would come from the board room of companies in Detroit and New York. It is a pity that Opposition members do not realize that Australia is an independent country with great strength and wealth. It is a pity that Opposition members do not see things as independent Australians and start thinking about the welfare of all Australians in this society, which also includes trade unions (a comment made for the benefit of the member for Alexandra), and not put the narrow point of view that they espouse in favour of big business, monopoly capitalism, and the like.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the motion. I realize that it is almost 10 p.m., and that recent practice has been to wind up the business of the day between 10.30 p.m. and 11 p.m. However, there is only one opportunity to speak in the Address in Reply debate in which a member may speak about matters concerning his district or on any specific matter not covered by proposed Government legislation. He may speak about private members' legislation, and he may also take the opportunity to speak for some time on motion. In that case, we shall be here until after midnight.

I express my sympathy to the families of the late Mr. Dawes and Mr. Edwards. Although I did not know Mr. Dawes, I did know Ern Edwards. I knew

him to be an honest and sincere man who worked hard for his district. He had strong beliefs and a philosophy to which he rigidly adhered. For all Parliamentarians who enter this House with that attitude, the people who elect them understand the path their members follow, and Ern Edwards was in that category.

I appreciate the way the Governor delivered his Speech, which was prepared by the Government of the day. The Governor's address is a stated programme for the Government of the day; it is the stated policy of the Government of the day; and, in particular, it is a publicity stunt for the Government of the day, the Australian Labor Party, which governs this State. South Australia is governed by an A.L.P. Socialist Government, holding the same philosophy as the current Commonwealth Government.

I do not condemn the people who hold that philosophy, nor do I condemn those persons who supported that philosophy. I can understand the motives of persons who have recently voted for that philosophy. For over 23 years Australia was governed by a Government holding a Liberal philosophy, and in South Australia we have had over 30 years of Government holding that philosophy. It is understandable that persons throughout the community hoped that the grass would be greener on the other side of the fence, and that it was worth seeing what an alternative Government was like. I refer to the situation in Russia where the masses are uprising, even though they do not have the same democratic opportunities as do Australians. In Russia the people are stood over with machine guns.

Members interjecting:

Mr. EVANS: Members may laugh, but the member for Frome has been to Russia and knows that officers in charge of the law there do carry machine guns, and that situation does not apply in Australia. People in Australia have the opportunity to change their Government by a democratic process. I do not blame electors for believing that the grass would be greener on the other side of the fence. Especially as it is known that within our teaching professions, whether in our universities, schools, or other institutions of learning, many people in the period 1960-70 promoted openly a Socialist philosophy, and everyone could see it happening.

Many people educated in that era believed that it was the Establishment, big business, or the word "profit" which was the ruination of the country, at least according to Socialist thinking. I do not condemn them for accepting that belief, as it was pushed down their throats on a continuing basis. Fortunately for Australia in general, and South Australia in particular, the community has experienced four years of an A.L.P. Government in this State and nearly two years of a Commonwealth Labor Government. Already some people who were the tutors of that philosophy, and others who were students and the recipients of the teaching of the tutors, have realized that it is not really the rosy garden they expected it to be.

I believe it is better for a person to learn by his mistakes and experiences rather than having only to listen to someone who believes that one must accept a little more responsibility and fend for oneself. Both the Commonwealth and State A.L.P. Governments have discouraged thrift. They have discouraged initiative and productivity. The Minister of Education has recently admitted that Australia stands on the brink of a depression that could be as disastrous as the great depression of the 1930's. Yet it took

less than two years of Commonwealth Labor Government and four years of State Labor Government to put our economy in jeopardy. This is what has happened.

Our democracy is being plundered. We all know that. There are even members of the State A.L.P. team who are worried, and I praise them for having the conscience to understand that even their own thoughts and philosophies when put into practice have placed Australia in a situation that could not have been foreseen by any Australian holding even the mildest political beliefs. I say this sincerely—

Mr. Keneally: No you don't—you don't say anything sincerely.

Mr. EVANS: If the member for Stuart has the decency to be quiet for a moment I will tell him what I predict will happen before Christmas.

Mr. Langley: Will you retract it if you're wrong?

Mr. EVANS: The member for Unley can speak later if he wishes. Before Christmas we will have more unemployment in South Australia than we have seen in a decade and the number of housing applications will reflect a 60 per cent downturn in the private sector. That situation will occur because there is no way of stopping it from occurring. People are afraid; it is in the pipeline. The member for Elizabeth said that democracy was in danger because, although members of the House of Representatives were democratically elected, Senators were not. Yet I say that Senators are elected on a State-wide basis. Members opposite hold the philosophy and say that they support one vote of equal value in electoral districts, yet nothing comes nearer equality than electing Senators.

Mr. Keneally: That's incorrect.

Mr. EVANS: We have virtually a balanced Senate, with 30 Senators supporting the Liberal side, and 30 Senators supporting the A.L.P. side.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What about the 300 000 voters holding—

Mr. EVANS: The Deputy Premier knows that Australia is a Federation of States and that the Senate is a States' House. Despite the Minister's belief in centralism and all the power being based in Canberra, he forgets that the founding fathers brought six States together to create a Federation.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Is the Senate a States' House?

Mr. EVANS: We have learnt one lesson from our short experience of Socialist Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: That lesson is that the human being basically takes the easy road home. There are few human beings, be they in a tribal state or in a civilized community, who do not take the easy road home. I believe that the greater the benefits for not working (and I am talking not about a decade but about a generation) and the greater the opportunity in the long term of obtaining a living without working, the fewer the number of people who will be working. We would create, as I said about two years ago, a parasites' paradise. I was condemned at the time by the Labor members, but I notice that the Commonwealth Minister for Labor and Immigration has said that his Government has created an opportunity for the bludger to loaf on the genuine worker. The Minister made that statement himself. He said that we must make the work test more stringent than it had been in the past, because people were living off society.

I look to the future with fear and with grave doubts, particularly in the housing area. High costs are frightening many young people away from the ideal of owning their own house. The Minister in charge of housing (Hon. Don Hopgood) agrees with me in this respect. He said on television that he believed that the old ideal of owning one's house was fast running away from us and was lost to our young people. He did not make the statement before a Labor Government took over the Commonwealth Government and this State's Government, but, as a responsible Minister in a Labor Government, he said that the ideal for the average young person to own his own house had gone by the board.

It has reached the stage where the weekly increase in the cost of housing during the past year has exceeded the average weekly earnings of the average person. What a situation we face! Between January 1, 1971, and April 1, 1974, the labour content of the cost of a house escalated in awards and costs by 108 per cent, and material costs rose by 43 per cent. The overall cost to the average house owner showed a rise of 71 per cent between January 1, 1971, and April 1, 1974.

Mr. Keneally: But wages have risen.

Mr. EVANS: If the average man could afford to buy his own house in 1971, and if, despite higher wages, he now finds that he has no chance of owning a house, how can he be better off?

Mr. Keneally: He would be better off.

Mr. EVANS: No, he would be worse off today than he was before. During the period from May 29, 1973, to May 23, 1974, the awards in this State have affected housing costs considerably; so, too, has Government legislation. A house consisting of 14 squares was worth, on average, \$15 400 on May 29, 1973.

Mr. Payne: Is that right?

Mr. EVANS: Yes. On May 23, 1974 (only six days short of a year later), the cost of such a house was \$21 200. That figure represents a rise of \$5 800 within about a year—slightly less than a 40 per cent increase. The increase in cost of \$5 800 over a year was made up in the following way: increase in wages, \$3 436; materials, \$1 288; and Government legislation, \$1 076.

Mr. Keneally: That's incorrect.

Mr. EVANS: They are the figures on which the building industry is working. With such figures operating, more builders will become insolvent between now and next June than became insolvent within the last five years. If Government members say that the builders are making a profit, there is the lie to their argument. The building industry is in real jeopardy. If the member for Stuart had listened to the speech of the member for Gilles, who moved the motion, he would have heard his colleague admit that the Commonwealth grant of an extra \$5 000 000 (out of the \$2 500 000 000 increase in taxation) made available for low-cost housing will in no way make up the effect of inflation on the average man who wants to own his own house. That is how serious the situation is in the housing field.

Let us be honest: if we continue along the stupid path we are following today, a 14-square house, costing \$17 000 on October 10, 1973, taking into account, say, a 40 per cent inflation rate in the building trade over the next 10 years to October 10, 1983 (and I have in mind my own 15-year-old son who will be interested in owning his own house at about that time) will cost about \$500 000. Any young person who wishes to buy his own house at that

time, and who must raise a 10 per cent deposit, will need \$50 000. If he borrows over 30 years at 11 per cent, he will pay about \$1 500 000.

I ask any Government member whether his political philosophy is really worth such a sum, unless he wishes to blame the country's economy so that we will have nothing but State housing and so that we all live in the same kind of house and get back virtually to the same salary, regardless of the initiative or energy used, a policy espoused by the member for Elizabeth this evening.

We have had an example of Government members referring to rents and saying how people have been exploited, how the under-privileged could not obtain homes, and how many problems they face. I will keep plugging the argument I have been plugging for a long while, and I will refer to several reports. The first is in the *Sunday Mail* of August 4, under the heading "Battlers Hit by \$30 Rent", and is as follows:

Rapidly rising rents, especially in the Bowden-Brompton area, are causing great hardship among low-income families.

The article explains how people had been forced into this position of having to obtain shelter.

Mr. Keneally: They must go to the private sector to get housing.

Mr. EVANS: I am glad to hear the member for Stuart make the point that they must go to the private sector to obtain a home at any rental at all. Admittedly, rents are sometimes exorbitant. If the member for Stuart will keep quiet, I will tell him how to solve this problem.

Mr. Keneally: You're getting personal.

Mr. EVANS: I am not: I am being straightforward. The Housing Trust has 16 per cent of these people renting houses at \$6 or less a week; it has 8.8 per cent renting at under \$7, 23 per cent at under \$8, 13.4 per cent at under \$9, and 9.5 per cent at under \$10. So 71 per cent of its houses are rented to people at under \$10 a week.

Mr. Keneally: That is the Housing Trust?

Mr. EVANS: Yes; I am glad the honourable member asks that because it shows that he does not understand that within the Housing Trust area the trust is concerned, as is the Premier of this State, that people are living in Housing Trust houses who could well afford to pay the normal rent in the community or buy their own houses. Those people are denying the under-privileged the opportunity to live in these houses. I am not going to refer to a certain individual, as was done earlier.

Mr. Payne: Then why refer to him at all if you do not intend to say anything about him?

Mr. EVANS: Because two personal friends of mine are paying over \$6 000 a year in income tax and living in a Housing Trust house for practically no rent. When a person earns almost \$30 000 a year and talks about helping the under-privileged people, what hypocrisy that is, and members know it! I give credit to those people in the Housing Trust area who find themselves in a better position and buy a house for themselves. They deserve credit, but the other people, the parasites, do not. In this State we are short of money and housing, and people are living like parasites on the genuine workers in the community by denying the people who really need a house to live in. I do not say they should be kicked out of their houses or should not be given the opportunity to buy them, but they should pay the normal rent in the community if they are earning a good salary or their position improves in some other way. Indeed, they could be given the opportunity to buy the house, because

often they have carried out much work on it to make it a better place in which to live. They deserve credit for that. If they cannot accept either of those two alternatives, some form of alternative accommodation should be offered them, taking into consideration their general circumstances.

Mr. Keneally: I believe you would support the industry being socialized!

Mr. EVANS: The members of the Liberal Party started the programme and more houses were built each year under that programme than have been built each year by the Socialist Party in the four years I have been in this place. The honourable member should look at the Housing Trust figures before he starts talking about that.

Members interjecting:

Mr. EVANS: For the last 20 years of the Liberal Government (from 1948 onwards) the Housing Trust built each year a bigger percentage of the total number of dwellinghouses or units in the State than the socialistic Labor Government has. In fact, during the worst year on record (1972-73) 1 618 houses were built in this State by the Housing Trust out of a total of 15 000. That is the worst year on record, yet the so-called Government, which claims it is interested in the person in the low-income group, has the gall to try to justify itself. This year's figures will be little better. In fact, the department says that the Minister has not yet released the figures. If the figures had been good, the Minister would have said, "All right; give them to me." The honourable member and other members opposite know that this year's figures will be just as bad. I should like now to refer to a little town that we hope to see in the future—Monarto.

Mr. Dean Brown: We shall not see it.

Mr. EVANS: Possibly, but there is still the old council chamber, and the Government may turn that into a museum. I said at the outset that this was the wrong place for a new town. In 1972, the member for Bragg and I were impressing on our Party that much research should go into the new town. About the same time, whether or not news of that move leaked from our Party room, the Premier made a great announcement about Monarto, the place where it would be. The site was never considered satisfactory by this Party. What do we find now? An investigation is being carried out into the project to ascertain whether or not the area is suitable, what the soil types are, and information on all the other matters. The announcement about Monarto was made without any significant research, even though the first thing we should do in this day and age is to carry out an environmental impact study of any area or venture we are moving into for the first time. The Government denied that area this opportunity. For that act alone, this Government stands condemned. We now find that a study has been made, and there are several things I could refer to in the *Social Planning of Monarto* report, dated November, 1973. It has never been published or made available to the public, even though Monarto is a major project in the State and the people's money was spent on producing that report. At page 25, we find the following:

The very need to consider the question of incentives shows that, for some time at least, Monarto is expected to have inherent disadvantages as a place in which to live, compared with alternative residential areas in metropolitan Adelaide.

The Government's aims are to spend money on Monarto, get people out of Adelaide, and move them on, because I know it is not acceptable to most people. Not only do we find that but also a questionnaire about Monarto is being posted to some people in the community, with a

stamped addressed envelope with it, so we should get some rude remarks back as well as some good ones. The questionnaire asks whether people would like to live at Monarto. It refers to development planning and the working draft concept plan. All this promotional stuff is designed to get people to go to Monarto. It shows a picture of an old farm home and the old council chambers. In other words, the Government realizes that the situation is serious and that it has made a mistake but, come hell or high water, it will try to make it go. Yet, when one writes to the Minister of Works, who is away, and gets a reply from the Minister of Education acting as the Minister of Works, one finds that Adelaide will not be restricted to the numbers suggested by the Premier and the Minister of Planning and Development—about 1 300 000. A reply dated July 2, 1974, from the Minister of Education states:

The most popular prediction at present is that the city will double in size in this time.

That means that the population will double by the end of this century. The population of metropolitan Adelaide will be close to 2 000 000, yet the Premier claims that it will be kept at 1 300 000. Who is kidding whom?

Mr. Keneally: He never said that.

Mr. EVANS: I give the member for Stuart credit for being present in the Chamber for long periods, but if he looks at the Premier's statement he will find that the Premier said when the Land Commission was established that the population of Adelaide would be kept at 1 300 000. The honourable member can consult *Hansard*, where the statement is recorded. The report on the social planning of Monarto, dated November, 1973, states:

- (a) The provision of Housing Trust accommodation for lower-income groups so that it is more readily and/or cheaply available than in the Adelaide metropolitan area.
- (b) Subsidy of private enterprise housing (on land of a type of tenure acceptable to the free-enterprise buyer).

That statement does not refer to the freehold title system; it refers to a "type of tenure acceptable to the free-enterprise buyer". Actually, it will be the leasehold system, with all the catches attached to it. I object to it, as do most Australians, who have always had the ideal of owning their own home; unfortunately, that is not achievable today. Perhaps that was part of the overall plan.

Mr. Payne: The most important word in your vocabulary is "profit".

Mr. EVANS: I have heard several members opposite say that it is important for people to make more effective use of their leisure time and to become more physically fit; that is a sound suggestion. I have heard the member for Elizabeth, in particular, attack the word "profit". If there is one thing that this country needs now it is a national dedication to productivity, which means more work by each and everyone of us. If we are to have a bigger cake to share amongst the under-privileged, there is only one way in which we can get it—by producing more.

Let us remember the time when a man worked 56 hours a week; in those days he raised a family that was, on the average, double the size of the average family today, yet many men in those days achieved the objective of owning their own home under a system that I believe exploited the worker. When a 48-hour week applied, people still achieved the same objective with a slightly smaller family and a slightly better standard of living. When a 44-hour week applied, people found that they could not live on

their wages, so they worked a little overtime. When a 40-hour week applied, not only did the men work overtime but also their wives took part-time jobs. We are now working a 35-hour week (if we are lucky) and men now work much more overtime, and their wives have jobs, too. Yet their families are half the size of the families of years ago, and they are working more than 80 hours a week to achieve the same objective.

What is needed is for Premiers, business men, politicians and union leaders to say, "Let us knuckle down. The boss will not play golf during the week: he will stay in the office. Everyone will take an interest in his job and produce a better quality article." If that attitude was taken, Australia would prosper and not be in the dire straits it is in today. There is nothing wrong with a return on investment that is somewhere near the Commonwealth bond rate, but many business people are not receiving that return today from their investment in business enterprises. The Premier and the member for Elizabeth know full well that the Commonwealth Government set the bond rate; so, it is that Government which put the young people in jeopardy as regards buying houses. Yet the Premier said that he supported the Superannuation Fund interest rate being 11 per cent on housing loans; he said that there was nothing that he could do about it. Let us remember that 11 per cent is being applied by an organization that has a guaranteed clientele to contribute and also a guaranteed clientele to borrow; Commonwealth and State politicians know this. Sir Winston Churchill said:

We must beware of trying to build a society in which nobody counts for anything except a politician or an official, a society where enterprise gains no reward and thrift no privileges.

President Roosevelt warned about pursuing "the easy road of centralization of authority, lest some day we discover, too late, that our liberties have disappeared". The people have now realized that it is not such a glorious way of life under a Labor Government. When I was a member of the Select Committee investigating the North Haven project, involving the Government and the Australian Mutual Provident Society, I heard that housing allotment prices were to be kept to an average of \$4 000 to \$5 000. However, we have recently seen allotments advertised at \$9 000 to \$10 000. What sort of a swindle was it? Actually, it was not a con job (I will admit that): what happened was that the Government did not realize what its policies were doing; it pushed up inflation at such a rate that it was not possible to create an allotment in this State at under \$4 500. Of course, if electricity cables are put underground for aesthetic reasons, we reach a figure of about \$5 000. The following is a letter that I wrote to the Minister of Works (as he was away at the time, the Minister of Education replied to it):

I would appreciate receiving answers to the following questions *re* the Electricity Trust of South Australia. These questions resulted from a statement on the heat pollution in the north arm of the Port River, due to the waste heat from the Torrens Island power station, as well as remarks regarding the high voltage transmission lines and large substations in the Adelaide Hills:

1. Does the Electricity Trust plan for a constant or nearly constant rate of compound growth in power demand until the end of the century—only 25 years off?
2. If so, where does the Electricity Trust intend to build the additional 4 to 6 power stations of the size of Torrens Island, Osborne, and Port Augusta combined, required to meet this demand; where will it get the fuel and where will it put the spider web of high voltage transmission lines and substations to distribute the energy?
3. If not so, what measures does the Electricity Trust intend to take to curtail the power demand so that it will stay within the capability of available power stations at any time without major interruptions of supply?

4. And, what guarantees have we that any such curtailment will occur on an equitable basis, and not prefer industrial consumers like Holden's and Chrysler's at the cost of domestic customers?

The reply from the Minister (and the trust) states:

I refer to your letter of May 28, 1974, regarding the Electricity Trust of South Australia. The position is that the trust does not make firm plans and commitments for major plant any further ahead than the time needed to procure and install it. New generating plant, for example, takes five to six years to manufacture and erect so the trust is only now reaching the stage of making final decisions about the location and other features of generating units needed around 1980 to follow plant now under construction at Torrens Island.

No great difficulties can be foreseen in meeting Adelaide's demands to the end of the century. The most popular prediction at present is that the city will double in size in this time. Even then it will not be very large by world standards and will still be smaller than the present size of Melbourne and Sydney and many other cities where so far electricity demands have been supplied satisfactorily.

The General Manager of the trust has informed me that fuel is not expected to present any great problem. Australia is relatively well endowed with coal and adequate supplies should be available.

In April, 1970, transmission lines were put through the Hills to conduct power and now, four years later, they are being duplicated. What sort of planning do we have by the trust, when these great monstrosities of pylons, with spider webs of conducting wires, spread through the Hills? The Government has introduced legislation in an effort to protect the Hills area, yet it allows one of its semi-government instrumentalities to carry out this work. At present, from Torrens Island to Para there are two 275 kilovolt lines. In addition, there is a feeder from Port Augusta to that power station. From Para to Magill there is a 275 kV line, and from there it goes to Cherry Gardens and thence to Happy Valley. In addition, from Para there is one 275 kV line (and these are single circuit lines) to Cherry Gardens and Happy Valley direct, without going to Magill. From Para to Tailem Bend there is a 275 kV line. From Tailem Bend there are two 132 kV lines, one from Keith to Mount Gambier and one direct from Tailem Bend to Snuggery. There are some other 132 kV lines to which I will not refer.

Now, two new transmission lines are to be put through the Hills from Para to Cherry Gardens and then to Happy Valley, and they are to be double circuit. What is the Electricity Trust doing to the Adelaide Hills? Why is it not possible to install a marine line under water for gas from Torrens Island to Port Stanvac and farther south, with a power station south of Adelaide? By 1991, it is said that 150 000 people will live in the area south of Adelaide. Why should all the power lines be taken around the back, through the Hills? We are told that it is not desired to put them on the one set of pylons, because security of supply is sought. If there is a failure in one area, power can be conducted through the other. The trust seems to be concerned only with the minimizing of cost.

No cost benefit ratio is carried out by the trust. No real consideration is given to the environment that is likely to be affected. We know that the Government places a burden on the trust by increasing charges. However, the power lines through the Hills and those planned are objected to by the people and are a blight on the Hills. Any Government that stands aside and allows the trust to do this stands condemned for its inaction. It is important that the trust should start to plan for the future, considering the whole environment and not just cost minimizing.

In the long term, it must have a power station in the southern area, so the time to think about that is now.

I wish to refer now to one or two local matters that will be old hat to many members, but there are not many other opportunities to refer to them. First, I wish to refer to the lack of a good public transport system in the Mitcham Hills area. In the main, private enterprise bus services have ended up in the Government's lap, because they were placed in a situation in which it was uneconomical for them to operate. They could not compete against the modern motor car. The Municipal Tramways Trust has been subsidized, but private operators have not been. We now find that public transport in the Coromandel Valley and Bellevue Heights areas of the Hills (and this is an urban part of South Australia) is virtually non-existent. In the Coromandel Valley area there is one service in the morning and one in the evening.

I also wish to refer to the matter of water supply. Recently, the Ombudsman stated that individual applications for water supply should be considered on their merits. The Government says it will not extend a water main to supply a reticulated water service to people who have properties in the water catchment area. Does the Government or the Engineering and Water Supply Department believe that a person who owns a block of land will not build a house on it and that, having done so, he will not put in a rain water tank and buy water from the local Emergency Fire Services branch or other contractors if his supply is low in summer? Of course he will. In addition, he automatically puts in a septic tank, and all the usual problems arise that would arise if he were given a reticulated service, except that then he would have the added benefit of being able to offer fire protection for his own house and for the immediate surroundings. With a rainwater system, he would not have the capacity and, very often, the pressure to do that. Therefore, I support the Ombudsman's attitude of considering each application on its merits. Regulations affecting people who own land in the water catchment area are promulgated to protect most water users, who live in the metropolitan area. Why should people who own land in the Hills be further penalized?

I point out that Flinders University had some problems. It was willing to put roads through its property into an urban environment to encourage people to travel through a residential area, and it did this without considering the local community. I praise the community for the report it compiled in 10 days; it then convinced the State Planning Authority to reject the application by the university, an institution that should really show a sense of responsibility to the neighbouring environment. All these people are in my district, but I believe that the hierarchy of the university should consider that it is worth a little inconvenience to protect the way of life of other people. I hope that in future this type of consideration is given. Not only in the Hills but also throughout country areas the Emergency Fire Services provide a valuable service to the community, receiving no financial assistance other than the contributions made from council rates which relate only to plant and equipment and not to labour costs. Mr. Overall of the fire-fighters' union would like to see all fire-fighting organizations come under one authority so that all fire-fighters will be professionals belonging to only the one union. The South Australian Fire Brigade, a service that has union control and protection, will cost \$7 000 000 to run this year, 75 per cent of which, because of the legislation that was passed I think last year, is to be met by insurance companies. The companies have decided

that, if the Government is going to force them to meet the costs involved, the people who want to receive this sort of protection will have to pay a 30 per cent increase in their premiums this year. This is yet another burden that is being imposed on the community. Persons like Mr. Overall want to place this burden on the country people, when the E.F.S. already does this work successfully.

Mr. Simmons: Who do you think should cover the cost of fire protection?

Mr. EVANS: The property holder in the city has to meet the cost of fire protection facilities, and that is only right and proper. In the country, some are property holders and others are workers. However, they all believe in community effort, which is something that many A.L.P. members do not support, particularly when it relates to cleaning up garbage around the city that is a health hazard to the whole community.

Another matter to which I must refer relates to those people in our community who about 20 years ago left their homeland to come to this country, many others having done so more recently. In this respect, I refer to the people who came from Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania, which form part of the captive nations group. The Commonwealth Government has shown sympathy to countries which have used oppressive tactics and which, in many cases, have resorted to murder to gain control of certain small countries, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is no exception. There was no need for the Commonwealth Government to say that the three countries I have named should be regarded as forming a part of Russia. Why should it have done so?

Mr. Simmons: They have been for years.

Mr. EVANS: If the member for Peake believes that these people ever wanted their countries to be States of Russia, he is wrong, because that has never been the case. Women were raped and families were shot. There are even people in our community today living under assumed names because they are frightened to use their real names. The daughter of the Treasurer of Estonia lives here, as does the son of a Minister of Agriculture. The latter lives here under an assumed name because he is afraid, even living in this country. If people believe that no real fear exists here, they should sit up and take notice of what I am saying, because the Prime Minister is saying that the Government will accept this philosophy of murder and plunder that has been committed to take control of these countries. He is admitting that, in the eyes of this country, they are States of Russia. However, the Prime Minister did not submit this matter to the people before the election. One should also examine the statements made by the President of the Communist Party of Australia, Mr. Jack Mundey, who said, when talking about national strike action, that he had strong support. He was reported in the *Advertiser* on Monday, August 5, as having said:

You have people such as Laurie Carmichael, of the metalworkers, nationally; John Halpenny, Secretary of the metalworkers in Victoria; Keith Wilson, who's Secretary of the Labor Council in Newcastle, and Merv Nixon, Labor Council in Wollongong and, in fact, in most of the cities, the leading Communists on the industrial committee. All those people are out to disrupt this country. I realize that I probably will not see the day when the worst of it comes (at any rate, not actively as a politician); however, I predict that what is happening in this country today will be chicken feed to what our sons and daughters will see. Members may sit here and say that I am not being sincere but, if I am wrong and I am still alive, I shall be pleased to apologize. The Commonwealth Government and anyone who supports its actions in this regard stand condemned

in my eyes. It is no wonder that some people who came here hoping that they would live in a democratic country are afraid. In their own countries they lost their properties, in some cases their families, their health and freedom, and their opportunities to choose for themselves. Only now in Russia are certain intellectuals starting to realize that the people have lost their rights and freedoms, and are thinking that there should be an uprising, which they are attempting to bring about. I hope we do not see that sort of bloodshed here in Australia.

We in Australia have experienced a great era. After the Second World War, our people worked industriously to rehouse themselves. Productivity and industry had to be built up. But now we face sad times, a fact that no-one, not even the most optimistic of A.L.P. members, would deny. We are certainly facing sad times and, once the ball starts to roll, we are not sure whether we will have the power to stop it rolling and to save Australia from a real catastrophe.

Members have been told that they have 150-odd Bills with which to deal this session. However, most members know that it will be a physical impossibility to give all those Bills the necessary consideration. The A.L.P. is hell bent on breaking Australia's democracy and on having centralism: it believes that all power should be centralized in Canberra, and none of its members is willing to deny that. The Minister of Transport and the Premier are concerned about the Commonwealth Government's attitude to road grants. The Commonwealth has apparently said, "We will give you a road grant but, if you do not spend it as we direct, you will not receive it."

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I did not hear His Excellency's Speech, because I was absent on account of ill health, but I read it. I extend my condolences to families and relatives of the late Mr. E. R. Dawes, a previous member for Sturt, and the late Mr. E. C. A. Edwards, a previous member for Eyre. I did not know these gentlemen, but I am sure that they did their best for their constituents, and no doubt believed that the principles by which they worked were to the advantage of everyone. I did not hear the maiden speech of the member for Goyder, who has been absent frequently since I returned, but I read it and congratulate him on his contribution to the debate and on his election as a member of this Parliament. He became a member with the help of the Labor Party and the Country Party: in other words, three organizations helping each other to combat one Party.

Since the last session of this Parliament there has been a Commonwealth election, which could be described as the greatest sham (or, more pointedly, the greatest confidence trick) of all time. The Attorney-General, with his legislation concerning unfair advertising, would have done well, because some advertising during the election, encouraging people to vote for the Socialist Party, or the Whitlam Party, indicated that, at that time (and even after the election) no problems existed. The Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. Crean) did not realize for many weeks that the country was facing a credit squeeze. We had the situation in which the Premier of this State, who was absent on expensive business in Europe (visiting such places as Scandinavia where he did the job for the Minister of Labour and Industry of studying worker participation problems), found it so intriguing that, realizing he had to return to sign papers, he broke his sojourn

in Europe to return and help in the Commonwealth election. No doubt he was happy when his Party was returned to office. The Premier then went back to Europe to finish his business, and returned home for the second time. However, on speaking to his Commonwealth friends he was teasy about the whole situation. An article in the *Sunday Mail* of June 9 states:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) still seething over the treatment he received in Canberra, returned to Adelaide yesterday hinting that Mr. Snedden was better to deal with than Mr. Whitlam. Mr. Dunstan said Mr. Whitlam's anti-inflation policies, outlined at the Premiers' Conference, were "an over-reaction" and "ill-judged."

Also, an article in the *Advertiser* of June 19 states:

The Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) denied yesterday he made decisions which conflicted with Labor Party policy. Mr. Whitlam defended himself over a strong attack made by the South Australian Premier (Mr. Dunstan) at the weekend. Mr. Whitlam said at his weekly news conference: "I don't agree with him. Of course I don't. I don't depart from Labor policy in any respect. I carry it out."

Mr. Whitlam had been asked whether he agreed with Mr. Dunstan's statements that the statements and economical policies of Mr. Whitlam were contrary to Labor Party policy. It seemed that the two gentlemen were at loggerheads, despite the work that the Premier had done to assist the Prime Minister. In my absence a debate on inflation was introduced in this House. When reading the speeches, I noticed that the Minister of Development and Mines had said that we should live with inflation, because Japan had an inflation rate of 30 per cent. It is all right for the fat cat Minister to speak like that, but what about people most affected by inflation, such as pensioners, superannuants, and those on fixed incomes?

These people are suffering from inflation, which they find impossible to counteract, and have no future. It is impossible for them to do anything for themselves, and they rely on friends or families and, of course, the Government. The member for Fisher referred to the recognition by the Commonwealth Government of Soviet rule over the Baltic States. No Government member has referred to this matter, and it is ironical that two years ago several Government members demanded that all members of Parliament march in a Vietnam moratorium. In the present situation the Commonwealth Government is recognizing Russia's rule over the Baltic States, yet no Government member has objected. I cannot believe that they have had no contact with these people and that they do not understand the situation.

Mr. Max Brown: What about recognizing China?

Mr. MATHWIN: I cannot believe that these people are not known by Government members. I remember about 12 years ago when a lady came to me at a naturalization ceremony to ask if there was any way I could help her determine the whereabouts of her mother, who had been taken from her home on the same night that 4 000 people were transported from Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania to Siberia and were never seen again. I contacted Red Cross and after some months was told that that organization could find out nothing at all about this lady, who was an intellectual, a doctor, who had done nothing wrong at all, yet whom the Russians for no reason had taken away. The lady who approached me has not heard from her mother since. She does not know whether her mother is dead, or living in Siberia. This person is never likely to hear from her mother again, yet all she wanted was some information about her mother. This is only one case of many hundreds that could be revealed. Thousands of people have disappeared from the Baltic States.

Mr. Olson: What about the Americans at My Lai?

Mr. MATHWIN: Anyone who has served in a war would know of the horrors that have been committed on both sides, be they the English and Australians or the Germans. If the member for Semaphore were there (and I do not know if he was) and ever saw action, he would know that in war-time these things happened on both sides. Let us not become sidetracked. My son was in Vietnam, and I can certainly retell stories of what happened when the North Vietnamese attacked villages in South Vietnam. Certainly, I am willing to discuss the wide issue, especially the Soviet's record relating to the Baltic States. All members should be ashamed that the Australian Government has seen fit to recognize the rule of Soviet Russia over the Baltic States but, if members opposite agree with that action, they should show their support and say so.

Earlier, the member for Elizabeth referred to the good things and the bad things in the world, but he refrained from referring to the downtrodden workers of Soviet Russia (the workers' paradise supported by members opposite) who work for eight or nine years and still have insufficient money to buy a car.

Mr. Olson: Have you ever been to the Soviet Union?

Mr. MATHWIN: My colleague the member for Frome has been there, and I am willing to believe what he has told me.

Mr. Simmons: In what year would you be willing to recognize Soviet rule over the Baltic States?

Mr. MATHWIN: I would never do that unless I was going to kowtow to the Reds, or get my country involved in the Third World. Indeed, that is where Mr. Whitlam is leading us. He is washing his hands of all our allies. He is playing Judas to every ally we had, rejecting all the people who supported us in the last war. He is willing to wash his hands of those people and to look to the Third World of the Russians and the Chinese. He spent much time in China, and the only reason he is not spending more time there is that he is frightened to leave Australia and go there in case of a take-over bid by his Deputy.

I refer to the problems of older people in our community. Through no fault of their own, these people are now faced with untold worry and anxiety. Having laboured all their working lives, they have been good citizens, and many of them have helped in many voluntary organizations over the years. Some of these people have gone to great expense to help the community and extended themselves to the limit, and I draw the attention of all members to the hardship they face. I refer to the State Labor Party policy speech prepared for the State election in March, 1973. Perhaps the member for Fisher would have liked to refer to this speech which states:

A State that cares and works for the sick, the lonely—

Mr. Groth: Everyone has had a go at it.

Mr. MATHWIN: This is the A.L.P. policy speech made at the last State election. All the member for Salisbury referred to in his Address in Reply speech was a lady reclining in a polling booth. On February 19, at Norwood Town Hall, the Premier stated:

A State that cares and works for the sick, the lonely, the dispossessed . . .

Old people are suffering great hardship at a time of life when they should be able to sit back and enjoy life and reminisce with their families about their past life and achievements. What has happened? I pay tribute to the many nursing homes now caring for many of these people as inmates.

Mr. Payne: Not all of them.

Mr. MATHWIN: No. These people often use their total pension and a large part of their life savings, as well as some of their children's savings if they are lucky enough to have any left. They do this when they are ill in nursing homes. The cost spiral is the cause—what is now called the push-cost inflation we now face. As we all know the reasons for this, I will not go any further into this matter. All States receive a different allocation of benefits. Until 1971, the Government fee allowed was \$2 a day, and a home had to provide a nurse for three hours a week for each patient. For a person in an intensive care unit, the Government allowance was \$3 a day, and the home had to provide a sister for six hours a week for each patient. In December, 1972, the allowance was pegged at \$3.50 a day.

In January, 1973, \$14 a week extra was granted to each patient: the allowance was \$5.50 a day for the ordinary patient and \$8.50 a day for the intensive care patient. The charges were \$13.40 a day for a ward patient, making a total of \$93.80 a week. There was a public outcry about the situation and, no doubt, members will recall reading the letters to the press in support of these people and their position. The nursing homes could no longer carry these people. At one time, they were able to make the richer pay for the poorer, but some pensioners could not pay or did not qualify, with their pension and allowance. Some nursing homes were able to carry some of these people but, as a result of the spiralling cost increases, they were unable to carry any extra patients.

The Commonwealth Government said that it would grant an increase of \$26.95 a week, to \$65.45, from August 1. I was pleased to see this move, because it will help the patients, but it will not help the nursing homes. More money must be allowed. If the Commonwealth Government cannot provide more finance, it is imperative that this State Government find some way of providing finance to help solve this problem. These people should not have to worry and upset themselves about their future. Nothing is worse than seeing an aged person who has saved a little and who believes that he has some security in later life but who finds that such security no longer exists. He finds that he must rely on other people to keep him in a home; if he is receiving intensive care, he must find other people to provide the finance. They worry about what will happen when the money runs out and about where they will be placed. I cite the case of a home in my district which proved to the Commonwealth Government that it was suffering \$2.45 a day loss each patient but which received only \$1.62 extra for each patient, so it is still suffering a loss. It cannot continue to operate much longer. The home's wages bill on June 15, 1974, was \$7 590.63, whereas by next pay day the wages bill had increased to \$9 643.92. The home cannot remain in existence without assistance.

I cite the case of a pensioner who lives in my district and who has a sister who lives in Kilburn. She said that her mother was in a hospital intensive-care unit. The hospital has told her that she must find an extra \$23 a week. She is a pensioner herself, and her sister is a pensioner and has an invalid husband receiving intensive care. The two pensioners, if they are to keep their aged mother in intensive care, will have to find an extra \$23 a week somewhere. The situation is impossible, and something must be done for and help must be given to these people. It disturbs any member to have to face up to such cases of hardship only to find that it is almost impossible to obtain any relief. The Magill home for the aged and infirm,

Northfield home for the frail, the Helping Hand Centre, and the Aged Cottage Homes at St. Bernards Road, Magill, are full to capacity; so it is difficult to find accommodation for people in these circumstances.

I now touch on another matter which has been referred to in the press recently and about which much has been said on television. I refer to a report in the *Advertiser* of July 9, under the heading "Male Housewives Fight 'Discrimination'." I do not approve of the *Advertiser* referring to them as "male housewives". They are in a difficult situation: their wives have left them or have died. I can speak with authority, because I was placed in a similar situation when my first wife died and I was left with two teenage boys, a 14-year-old daughter, and two young children. At times, it was almost impossible for me to keep going. So, I understand the situation these men face, particularly Mr. Churchill, who has four small children to care for. He would find it difficult, unless he was self-employed, to do his job and keep the family together. He must find either a housekeeper or a temporary help who would come in when the children came home from school, prepare a meal and perhaps feed the youngsters. That would enable him to go to work. But, of course, these people are hard to find. If a person wants a permanent housekeeper, she is hard to find and is expensive. It would be difficult to get a temporary housekeeper now, anyway. I think these people have a genuine grouch and should receive assistance from the Commonwealth Government.

We talk about sex discrimination and the like, yet what is the real difference between a widower and a widow left with a young family, and what is the difference between a deserted husband and a deserted wife? The situation is exactly the same: they all have the same responsibilities, but the widow or deserted wife gets all the assistance in the world (to which, of course, she is entitled) and the poor widower or deserted husband gets no assistance. I would support any assistance given to that section of the community.

I have referred previously to the problem of aged people, but another need of the aged and infirm is either hostel care or day care centres. On two occasions previously, and again today, I have asked the Minister representing the Minister of Health about the Crippled Children's Home, which is in my district and is to be vacated reasonably soon by the crippled children, who are moving to other accommodation. The set-up there would be ideal for a day care centre. I envisage as such a centre a place that would be open not five days but seven days a week. If we are to encourage people to keep their elderly mothers and fathers at home or encourage the elderly people to stay in their own homes, we should provide relief to the young people so that they can give their own families their time (the best time being at the weekends). So, these day care centres should be available at weekends so that elderly people can be taken there by voluntary organizations or their families. These people can then go to day care centres not only on week days but also at weekends. That is an important point.

I repeat that the Crippled Children's Home in my area is well situated for this work. It is a building that is now a hospital; it has kitchens that would no doubt need to be renovated; it has lifts and also a heated swimming pool provided by the Adelaide Rotary Club some five or six years ago. So the place would be ideal for these people; it is in an ideal situation, right on the Esplanade and the beach. Although the Minister of Health has not replied to the two questions I have asked—one last year and one

early this year—I hope he may be able to give me a reply to my question whether the Government would deem it possible for this hospital to become a day care centre or a geriatric hospital; I do not mind which. There is a great need for one, especially in my area where there are so many aged people.

The building industry is mentioned in the Governor's Speech. The member for Fisher spoke at great length of the building situation, and I fully support all that he said about it. Anyone closely connected with the building industry realizes it is in a terrible state at the moment. The *Advertiser* of August 1, under the heading "Builders fear depression", states:

Trade unions appeared to be bent on a course which would bring about a depression in Australia, the executive director of the Master Builders Association (Mr. K. C. West) said yesterday. He said the depression would start with the building industry. Mr. West was commenting on a decision by a meeting of about 1 200 building workers in the Trades Hall yesterday morning to begin a three-day strike immediately. More than 9 000 building workers in South Australia, members of six unions, are involved in the strike which is the forerunner of further industrial action unless employers agree to a national paid rates award for Australia's 150 000 building tradesmen and labourers.

Later in the article we read of a meeting at Trades Hall about a strike and a statement by the State Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners (Mr. V. J. Martin). It is reported that 1 200 building workers were present at that meeting; I understand that the hall would not hold 1 200 people, so I cannot imagine there would be even 600 present. The local State Secretary was not allowed to talk at that meeting, but is reported to have said, in the newspaper, that "hundreds of members were ringing the union saying they were prepared to have a one-day stoppage but would not buy a three-day strike". We know that they had a three-day strike, which included the matters which were to be given to a deregistered union, the Builders Labourers Union. We see that the builders are in trouble, when in the *Advertiser* of August 5 we read:

More than 50 office employees have been laid off by Adelaide housebuilders in the past six weeks.

That is a large number of people to be laid off in one section—the office employees. The article continues:

This was revealed in a recent survey by the Housing Industry Association of South Australia. The 17 companies involved in the survey build more than 30 per cent of all private houses in South Australia. Last year they built 2 852 houses. This year they expected to start 1 914 houses—a drop of about 32 per cent. In the first half of the year they started building 1 065 houses, but orders for the second six months total only 849.

They are the only orders they have had; so that is the situation of the building industry in South Australia. When I was in the building trade (I have worked on many new housing projects and we always fulfilled a contract) the aim was that the house would be built within 12 weeks. That was the guarantee of one of the builders for whom I worked: from the laying of the foundations the house would be completed within 12 weeks. Compare that with the length of time needed now to build a house: one is lucky to move into a newly built house within eight months!

We are well on the way now to a 100 per cent increase in the cost of housing in four years. The Governor's Speech referred to the licensing of builders. A tradesman who wants to become a builder can apply for a provisional licence. All he can do if he wants to build a house is to build a "spec" house. What a farce! The number of builders who have gone out of business recently would be an all-time record. Paragraph 5 of the Speech states:

The close attention of the Coast Protection Board is being directed to the protection, restoration and development of our coastline, particularly in the metropolitan area, where a number of projects have been completed or are in progress. A plan is being developed for the future management of the natural and man-made assets, recreational facilities, areas of ecological significance, and similar aspects of the coast from Port Gawler to Sellick Beach.

The Minister of Environment and Conservation said that \$7 000 000 would be spent on upgrading beaches, shore-front reserves, and recreation areas. Exactly how and where will that sum be spent? No-one knows! There is a secret report on the matter, but it will not be released to members. I warned the Government last year about a section of beach at Somerton where there is no protection. A section between 23 metres and 46 metres long, near Rossall Road, is without any protection. Will the Government provide protection for that area? What priority has it? As member for the district, I ought to be told. I asked about the matter last year but I have not had a reply.

Last year the Government arranged for the supply of thousands of tonnes of sand which it had to get rid of from North Haven. The sand was sent to Glenelg, Henley Beach and Somerton. I would guess that 200 000 tonnes of sand was put there, and I would be more than surprised if half of it was left. The wind has taken most of it into Minda Home, and part of it is in the ceiling of the corner house. The rest of the sand has been whisked away by the wind.

One would have thought that the Premier could spare time during his jaunts to look at the beaches in Belgium and Holland, where there has been a very difficult erosion problem. The authorities in those countries have done what Minda Home has done here: they have planted spinifex grass to stop the erosion. Minda Home adopted this idea with amazing success, yet the Government shoots all the sand down a cliff to the beach. The Government has provided a three-strand fence which children climb over, but the Government has not done anything about keeping the sand in place. One would have expected to see a planting project to contain the expensive sand that has been brought from North Haven. I do not know about the situation further up the coast, but I am convinced that much more has to be done. It is a pity that the Minister of Environment and Conservation was not here earlier, but I hope that he and his committee will seriously consider providing beach protection in the area to which I have referred. I hope that, if they put another 100 000 t of sand there, they will plant something there to stop the erosion of the sand. Later in paragraph 5 of the Speech reference is made to the State Planning Authority and to Moseley Square, Glenelg, which involves the member for Hanson and me. We shake hands across the tramline at times, because it is our boundary. I hope that Moseley Square and Jetty Road will become a mall, and I hope that the plans do not take as long to implement as are the plans for the Rundle Street mall.

Mr. Payne: Are you talking about mal de mer?

Mr. MATHWIN: The Royal Family pronounce the word as I do. I hope that, when the mall is created, the Government will agree to a single-track tramline along Jetty Road. It would be ridiculous to close the road, make it a mall, and leave two tram tracks. There could be a single track from Brighton Road to the jetty; the Municipal Tramways Trust has objected to this idea because it says that it will not be safe. However, let us remember that, while the M.T.T. talks about safety, at the same time it agrees to the dark brown colour of its trams, which are very difficult to see at night. I suggest that the

people who chose these colours did so in the middle of the morning, and have never seen them in the dark, because their dullness is dangerous.

Mr. Coumbe: What about yellow and black?

Mr. MATHWIN: I would give those colours serious thought; I am pleased that the new taxi signs are in those colours. I hope that eventually something is done about the colour of the trams, because I believe that, being hard to see, they are dangerous, particularly for old people who find trams bearing down on them suddenly. Therefore, if the danger of trams is talked about, the first thing to be considered is their colour. Paragraph 10 of the Speech states:

The report of the Royal Commission into the boundaries of local government areas in this State will be presented to Parliament and, to the extent that legislation will be required to give effect to the report of the Commission, an appropriate Bill will be laid before you.

Members will know that recently I asked the Premier whether Government members would be allowed a free vote on this matter. I well remember the time of the referendum on shopping hours. In some districts, people left no doubt about what they wanted, yet the members representing those districts were tied to Party policy and the pledge and were unable to support their constituents. In fact, they told their constituents that they were unable to vote as the constituents wanted, because they were not permitted to go against Party policy. I sincerely hope that when the legislation dealing with local government boundaries is introduced members will have a free vote.

The Minister of Education, who is the member for Brighton, could be in a difficult position, because he knows as well as I do that the people of Brighton are very irate about the findings of the Commission. Brighton council easily met the qualification of the Commission that rate revenue should be more than \$500 000, as the rate revenue of that council is \$560 000. This is a viable council that has one of the cheapest rates in Adelaide (10·5c). There are only two unmade roads (one very short road and another in Marino) in the whole council area. I hope that a situation does not arise, as it arose in relation to the referendum on shopping hours, in which members will not be able to support the wishes of their constituents. I support the motion.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I, too, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech given at the opening of the third session of the Forty-first Parliament. First, I must apologize for being absent and not being able to hear His Excellency's Speech. As members know, I was away, representing the State at a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference in London. I thank all members for the support they gave me in selecting me to carry out that most important duty. I believe it was an honour to be selected to represent this Parliament. I assure honourable members that the trip will for a long time remain one of the great highlights of my life. During the conference, there were several memorable occasions. The first that comes to mind is the occasion on which we were invited to 10 Downing Street by the British Prime Minister (Mr. Harold Wilson) with whom we had a 50 minute informal conversation in the Cabinet room. I understand that this was the first occasion for about 15 years on which a delegation had been invited to the Cabinet room. That will remain one of the highlights of the trip.

We were also privileged to attend the Commonwealth Day observance service in Westminster Abbey, with Prince Charles representing the Royal Family. That was also a day to remember. In addition, we were fortunate to be

in London at the Trooping of the Colours. Through the efforts of our Agent-General in London, we were able to obtain tickets for the official dais on that occasion, which I will also remember with pleasure. We were taken on a trip to the north of England and to Scotland to visit certain industries, and we also attended a Scottish highland show. When members of the delegation were asked to say what line they wished to study, most of them listed something relating to primary produce and industry, so that we were shown as much industry and rural industry as possible. That was another highlight.

Of course, then there was the bomb episode at Westminster while we were there. On the Friday evening, we were in a room not far from where the bomb exploded. However, on the Monday morning when it exploded we had left for Scotland, so we were well clear at that time. We had five business sessions, with various discussions on different subjects. On each occasion, the relevant Minister from the British Parliament was present, so these discussions were most informative. Towards the end of the conference, another highlight was the dinner given by the Speaker of the House of Commons. Having a tight time table, we worked hard. We were shown many things and were fortunate to enjoy the occasions to which I have referred. Also, six of us were privileged to be in the House of Lords when Prince Charles made his maiden speech, and that was something to be remembered.

[Midnight]

After the conference, my wife and I toured Scandinavia and Russia, and came back through Germany. I was a day or two late getting back because the war in Cyprus meant that we were unable to come home through the Middle East; we had to fly home through America. As members know, when one comes home through America one crosses the international date line, which means that one loses one calendar day. It so happened that July 23 was the day on which we crossed the international date line; therefore, I missed July 23 altogether. I have heard of people going on a bender and missing a day, but I never thought that I would miss a day yet be sober. However, that actually happened, and it was the day that Parliament resumed its sittings.

His Excellency referred to the death in June of His Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester. My wife and I were present in London when he passed away. His Royal Highness was buried either the day before or perhaps on the morning of the Commonwealth Day observance service in Westminster Abbey. However, because the Queen was in mourning, she was unable to attend the ceremony and Prince Charles deputized for her. Two former members of this House have passed away since last year. Edgar Rowland Dawes was a member of this Parliament from 1930-1933. Those members who can recall the depression days will remember that the years from 1930 to 1933 were the worst of the depression. I do not envy him for having been a member at that time, as I am sure his task would have been difficult. I refer also to Ernest Clifford Allan Edwards, who was a member of this Parliament from 1968 to 1970. Although I did not know Mr. Edwards before I entered this House, he and I were elected to Parliament at the same time and shared the same room for two years. I am sure all members will agree that he was a dedicated supporter of his Party who did his best to represent his vast district on South Australia's West Coast. I extend my deepest sympathy to the relatives of these deceased persons.

I wonder sometimes what is the value of this Address in Reply debate. This is the seventh time I have taken part in the debate, and only once in those seven years has a Minister (and I refer to Sir Glen Pearson) come to me afterwards and asked me for further details relating to a matter to which I had referred. I think the Ministers' press secretaries could look harder at some of the matters to which members refer and raise those matters with their Ministers and the respective departments. This would certainly give members more encouragement to participate in the debate.

Primary production was placed high (indeed, in paragraph 4) in His Excellency's Speech. The Government realizes that in the excellent season that this State is at present experiencing the State's economy benefits in more ways than one. The Minister of Works announced a day or two ago that all metropolitan and country reservoirs would fill this year. This will, of course, save the Government much expense in relation to pumping. Also, when there is an excellent season, more taxation flows from the rural industries into the Treasury. I am sure, therefore, that the Government realizes the benefits that flow to the State generally as a result of an affluent rural economy. It is, however, ironical to see the State Government giving the rural industry a pat on the back and to see the Commonwealth Government at the same time giving it one good thump, with a clenched fist in the bargain, so much so that the rural industry has sagged at the knees. I am sure that, if Dr. Coombs' report is implemented to the letter, our rural industry will really sink to its knees.

I could continue for some time referring to the measures (such as the withdrawal of concessions, increases in taxation, and so on) implemented by the Commonwealth Government. However, I will not weary the House with those details, as they have already been well and truly covered in the debate. The latest issue that has been raised by the Commonwealth Government is the removal of the subsidy on the price of petrol in South Australia, which is a blow not only to the people that I represent in the outer areas of South Australia but also to people throughout Australia. I am concerned about a report in the *News* of Thursday, August 1, which referred to the withdrawal of the petrol subsidy, part of which report states:

Government Ministers in Federal Parliament today played down the effect of the abolition of petrol subsidies when the Opposition members attacked the Government for removing the petrol subsidy. The Transport Minister, Mr. Jones, in the House of Representatives, claimed few people would be affected.

In the Senate, the Leader of the Government, Senator Murphy, said senators and the community "would be astonished that the subsidy was operating in so few areas". . . . Abolition of the subsidy would have only a minimal effect on the people of Australia, Mr. Jones told a rowdy House.

I understand that more than \$20 000 000 is involved in the removal of this subsidy. If Mr. Jones is correct when stating that few people will be affected, I can only conclude that someone must be using large quantities of petrol. This matter affects my district, and particularly the Far North of the State, because people in those areas depend on the availability of petrol supplies. This enables them to maintain their stations, their services to the rail heads, the removal of stock, and so on. We have been told that petrol prices may increase by about 2c a litre. This will therefore impose another heavy burden for this industry to carry.

His Excellency also said in his Speech that a Bill would be laid before members this session to permit the manufacture and sale of a new product called dairy spread. I assure the House that it will take much dairy spread to cover up what the Commonwealth Government has done to this State's rural industries. At paragraph 6 of His Speech, His Excellency referred to Cooper Basin, which, as most members would realize, is in my district. It is now 15 years since gas was discovered in this area and, although a company was floated, its shareholders have not received a dividend, despite their having invested their money for 15 years. Although a main has been put through to Adelaide, which has used natural gas for 2½ years, and another main is being put through to Sydney, the profits made by this company have been ploughed back into further exploration. These people have therefore been waiting some time to receive a dividend, and, when a dividend was in sight, the Commonwealth Government's mineral policy, which resulted in the withdrawal of subsidies for mineral exploration in Australia, put a damper on further exploration and things came to a standstill. His Excellency also said:

A vigorous programme of exploration is in contemplation for this area during the next decade. . . .

That could be anything up to 10 years. If these people have to wait for this vigorous exploration programme to commence before they can receive any dividends, they will be waiting for a long time to receive any return on the money they have invested. I have always been confident that more gas, and possibly oil, will be found in this area, and that one day we may strike oil or gas in the Simpson Desert. Some drilling has been done in the desert in recent months, and I hope that the Commonwealth Government will give more encouragement to oil exploration so that these projects can proceed. Paragraph 9 of His Excellency's Speech states:

A greater priority for national highways and a somewhat reduced rate of spending on roads in the Adelaide metropolitan area are the predominating features of the Highways Department's programme of work in the immediate future. In keeping with this trend, work on three major national road links will be accelerated. These are the Byre Highway, the South-Eastern Freeway, and possibly the Stuart Highway.

When I was in London I saw an *Advertiser* in which Mr. Whitlam had announced, before the Commonwealth election, that \$22 000 000 would be made available to upgrade the Stuart Highway. I was pleased to read this announcement, because it would be of great benefit to people I represent in the Oodnadatta area. When roads from Marree northward are impassable, people are compelled to use the Stuart Highway, thus making a round trip of 1 440 kilometres on which they have to pay a road toll for an additional 400 km. His Excellency used the words "possibly the Stuart Highway", but Mr. Whitlam did not say "possibly". Apparently, that word has now crept in somehow.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He didn't say which year.

Mr. ALLEN: I think it was within five years. I hope that the project will be carried out, because people in the area have had a torrid time for several years. Roads have been unusable for much of the time, and many goods have not been transported to the area because of the condition of the roads. In the 1968-70 Parliament, of which I was a member, the Hon. Murray Hill was Minister of Roads. Early in his period of office he and I visited every council area in my district: namely, five district councils and three corporations. On his return he instigated the commencement of several road projects in my district, including the Hallett-Jamestown and Burra-

Spalding roads. It was agreed that about \$20 000 would be allocated each year to the four councils, which would upgrade the roads on a piece-meal basis and eventually seal the roads. The plan worked for several years but, because of inflation, the value of the \$20 000 received by councils has been eroded so much that little more than half the work is being done now compared to what was being done about five years ago. A letter from the present Minister of Transport dated February 22, 1972, in reply to a deputation I introduced, states:

I am now advised that the 34 kilometre section of this road from Spalding to Burra is at present in good condition with a traffic volume peak of 190 vehicles a day. Reconstruction and sealing of this section is programmed to commence in 1974, provided funds are available, and should be completed by mid-1977.

It is now 1974, and we are anxiously awaiting announcement of the roads grants for South Australia. Crushed metal is stacked on the side of the road to be used for upgrading, and the councils concerned are hoping that the project will proceed. I am sure that the township of Booborowie would be the only town in the Mid North without a sealed road out of the town: it does not have a sealed road within 16 km. This town has an assured rainfall, more lucerne seed would be produced in this area than in any other part of the State, and most leading Merino sheep studs are located in this area, but there is no sealed road within 16 km of the town. This is a disgraceful situation, because the town is only about 160 km from Adelaide, and it reflects on the present Parliament and previous Parliaments. I have taken out figures dealing with the allocation of money to various districts from the Highways Department.

Each year the Minister issues a proposed list of works for the coming year, and from a study of these details one realizes that the amount available to the Highways Department has steadily increased in the previous four years. The total amount has increased by about 50 per cent, and Commonwealth assistance has also increased to much the same degree. Vehicle registration fees have also been increased accordingly, but allocations to the Northern district have dropped by \$300 000 during this time, even though there has been a 50 per cent increase in total funds available to the department. I do not know whether this money is being used in administration or in other ways. Road maintenance tax contributions have increased by 33 per cent in the previous six years, but it would seem that the inflationary rate has eroded the value of money available. Paragraph 9 of His Excellency's Speech states:

However, a major task facing the department will be the restoration of roads damaged in the recent flood in the Far North of the State.

I agree that this is currently a problem. There are many hundreds of kilometres of road in the area and it is difficult to keep them in a state of good repair. I hope that, when the grants are soon made, sufficient funds will be allocated to maintain roads in the Far North. Last week in reply to the member for Eyre concerning council grants the Minister of Transport stated:

Unfortunately, I cannot give a full reply to the honourable member's question, other than to repeat that local government must stand on its own two feet.

The same statement (perhaps in different words) has been used by the Commissioner of Highways, and it is also contained in the report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, which states, in slightly different words:

On the whole of the evidence, we consider that it would be unwise to rely upon this income being supplied by way of grants from central government. No doubt some grants

will be available to local government, but there is a difference from receiving grants from time to time, even annually, on the one hand, and relying upon those grants in order to exist, on the other.

To use the Minister's words, councils should be expected to stand on their own two feet. In giving evidence to the Royal Commission, the Commissioner of Highways stated:

Councils should have sufficient financial resources available from their own collectable income to enable them to operate irrespective of the level of Government subsidies.

He too, said the same thing as the Minister: that local government must stand on its own two feet. How can local government stand on its own two feet without Government grants? Are the ratepayers and the people living in districts expected to maintain all their roads so that interstate traffic, road hauliers, stock contractors and all other road users can use them? Why should ratepayers be expected to maintain roads for through traffic? The Commonwealth Government collects about \$40 000 000 annually in petrol and diesel taxes from South Australia, but returns only about \$31 000 000 to the State, so it retains about a quarter of the taxes levied on fuel in this State.

The Highways Fund in South Australia is maintained by revenue from vehicle registration, drivers' licences and road tolls. All vehicles using district roads contribute to the Highways Fund, especially through petrol tax. Why should these funds not be returned to district councils for the maintenance of roads? I, for one, just cannot understand the thinking of these people who suggest that councils should stand on their own two feet. Councils should not have to do this. Money is provided from assorted vehicle taxes to pay for road maintenance, and the views that have been expressed are inexplicable. I look forward to a reply from the Minister on this matter. His Excellency, referring to coal mining at Leigh Creek, said:

New coal handling, rail loading and other facilities, needed for further development of the coalfield, are being constructed at Leigh Creek at a cost of \$4 000 000. This will ensure a continuing supply of coal for the power station at Port Augusta for many years.

This situation has been common knowledge in the area for three or four years. Because the present coal seam will be worked out in a year or two, it will be necessary to move the existing plant to a site south of Leigh Creek, and this will involve much work. It will also be necessary for the Government to pay more attention to the upgrading of the road from Hawker to Leigh Creek. In South Australia we hear the constant cry for decentralization. Leigh Creek has a coal industry maintaining a population of about 1 000, yet the road between Hawker and Leigh Creek is in such a poor condition that, during the winter, Leigh Creek residents cannot get out, because they are bogged down in their town. If this industry is to continue (and I understand that currently about 20 years coal is available with the prospects of finding more), it is up to the Government to upgrade the road so that these people have the opportunity to travel south. Leigh Creek is only about 480 km from Adelaide and, with any sort of reasonable road, residents could travel to Adelaide for the weekend, whereas currently that is hard to do.

His Excellency also referred to pollution, and I was pleased to hear what he said about it. He referred to water pollution in the Barossa Valley and the quality of water along the length of the Murray River. Australia is fortunate because its modern civilization is not as old as that existing in Europe, and we have not done as much

damage to our water resources and our coasts as has been done in oversea countries. We have been able to see the light before most of the damage has been done. I have read that the Thames River in London is in a much better condition than it used to be, and that the fish are returning to it. However, when I was in London I saw the Thames, and it did not look good at all, so it must have been in a shocking state a few years ago because it is certainly not in a good condition now.

I refer to the situation at Hamburg where, on leaving Hamburg by ferry for Harwich, England, it took over half an hour of travelling before we saw any clear water. I believe that the same pollution situation applies in several other European ports. By comparison, I can see how fortunate we are in South Australia in facing these problems before the worst damage is done.

I was interested to hear the contribution made by the member for Peake, who has just returned from an oversea study tour. His comments illustrate the wisdom of the Government in making study tours available for members to investigate what is happening elsewhere in the world. I believe a study tour is even more advantageous than the type of trip I undertook as a delegate to a conference, because a delegate is restricted in respect of advanced planning and conference requirements, whereas a member on a study tour has greater freedom to investigate current matters of interest.

The comments of the member for Peake illustrate the value of study tours, and I believe we should have more of them. For the price of the Premier's recent oversea visit (about \$59 000) we could send ten members on study tours, although I believe it is necessary for Ministers to undertake oversea trips. For the amount spent, I am sure that South Australia would benefit if every member could have a study tour. Although some electors may disagree with me on this, I know from having experienced the advantages myself that the State would benefit considerably. If every honourable member could be given an oversea study tour, and could obtain ideas, bring them back and see them implemented here, the State would be that much better off.

I was also interested in the remarks of the member for Glenelg regarding a mall at Glenelg. While in Copenhagen, I took special notice of the mall there; it is well worth seeing and so, too, is the mall in Stockholm. After seeing these two malls and the way in which they are used, I am convinced that not only should Rundle Street be turned into a mall, but so also should Hindley Street. I am sure that business people in that area would benefit from the thousands of people who would congregate there.

Mr. Coumbe: Yes, but how far along Hindley Street?

Mr. ALLEN: At least as far as the Morphett Street bridge. This would be a step in the right direction. If members could go overseas and see these things for themselves, it would benefit the State as a whole. With those few remarks, I support the motion.

Motion carried.

TRANSPLANTATION OF HUMAN TISSUE BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

EMERGENCY POWERS BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.33 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 8, at 2 p.m.