

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 12, 1975.

The SPEAKER (Hon. E. Connelly) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

## HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

## PETITION: EDEN HILLS SEWERAGE

MR. EVANS presented a petition signed by 18 citizens of Eden Hills praying that the House would bring to the notice of the Minister of Works the need for immediate consideration of, and a statement of a definite completion date for, installation of mains sewerage capable of serving every street in Eden Hills.

Petition received.

## QUESTIONS

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

## TRAMWAYS TRUST BUSES

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Has the commencement of delivery of the Volvo bus chassis for the Municipal Tramways Trust been delayed from August, 1975, until 1976?

2. What has been the cause of this delay in delivery?

3. Is the Australian Government now investigating the suitability of these bus chassis?

4. Will there be a shortage of buses within the metropolitan area until these new buses are in service?

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

1. The latest advice received from Volvo indicated that delivery of the chassis to Adelaide would commence in January or February, 1976.

2. To enable improved features to be incorporated in the chassis.

3. The trust is unaware of any such investigation.

4. Yes.

## MORIALTA CHILDREN'S HOME

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Has the South Australian Government considered purchasing the property currently owned by the Morialta Children's Home Incorporated, and if not, why not?

2. If the Government has considered the matter, has a decision been made to purchase the property and, if not, why not?

3. If the property will be purchased, for what purposes will it be used after purchase?

4. If the property will not be purchased, what are the reasons?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The decision is not to purchase the property at this stage.

3. See 2 above.

4. Purchase of the Morialta Children's Home property does not receive priority in present Government capital expenditure proposals.

## CELLULOSE DEPOSITS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What developments have taken place in proving cellulose deposits in St. Vincent and Spencer Gulfs since the reply to the Hon. C. R. Story, M.L.C., on March 11, 1975?

2. When does the Minister expect that the viability or otherwise of commercial exploitation of these deposits will be established?

3. Does the Minister believe that the deposits could be worth up to \$800 000 000 to South Australia?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. A survey of marine fibre deposits in the St. Vincent and Spencer Gulfs was completed and submitted to the Government by Lithominerals Pty. Ltd. in September, 1974. The survey was made by Environmental Resources of Australia Proprietary Limited for lithominerals and confirmed substantial deposits of the marine fibre *Posidonia Australia* in the two gulfs.

2. Within the two-year period commencing October, 1974, and ending October, 1976, the viability of commercial exploitation of these deposits must be demonstrated to the Government by Lithominerals Pty. Ltd. The viability of the project includes environment and economic aspects, and during the two-year period it is required that Lithominerals Proprietary Limited:

(1) will inform the Government of the situation of those specific deposits of marine fibre for which it will require a licence;

(2) shall inform the Government what minimum quantity of fibre must be mined to ensure that the operation of marine fibre production will be viable, and over what period of time;

(3) shall provide evidence satisfactory to the Government that the marine fibre, when recovered from these deposits, has a profitable market;

(4) will undertake to carry out proposals acceptable to the Government for mining the deposits and enter into such agreements as the Government may reasonably require with respect thereto;

(5) shall not obtain or remove marine fibre for any commercial purpose or for any purposes other than for the investigation of the extent and nature of fibre deposits and shall obtain or remove marine fibre only to such extent as may reasonably be necessary for that purpose.

During the two-year period the company is required to comply with all regulations under the Fisheries and other Acts. Liaison with the Environment and Conservation and Fisheries Departments is also required. There is no undertaking to issue licences at the end of the two-year period. If licences were to be issued, then such licences would be for limited areas only.

3. Over a period of 100 years such a value is conceivable.

## POPULATION

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Has the Premier or any Minister or officers of the Government carried out an assessment of the Borrie report in respect of population predictions and, if so, does any such appreciation either accept or reject the predictions contained within the report relative to South Australia?

2. If no such assessment has been carried out, is it the intention of the Government to initiate such a study and, if so, when?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The answer to the first part of the question from the member for Light is "Yes": officers of the Premier's Department have carried out an assessment of the Borrie report in respect of its population projections. That report, "*Population and Australia: A Demographic Analysis and Projection*", was examined and assessed immediately following its release on February 25, 1975. The assessment made was that, although the projections for the whole of Australia appeared reasonable, there were serious deficiencies in some of the assumptions used in projecting the populations of individual States. In particular there were two main criticisms of the method used in determining the future distribution of population.

First, the pattern of population distribution and the proportion of the total population that was identified as moving between States was assumed to remain constant over the whole projection period according to the pattern and level experienced between 1966 and 1971. This five-year period was, except for the financial year 1969-70, a relatively adverse time for South Australia. Early in that period there was a large population drain away from this State due to the coincidence of a mining boom in Western Australia and the high unemployment in this State, caused by a concurrent down-turn in both the building and automotive industries. Consequently, it was considered that this period was inappropriate as a basis for projecting future net interstate outflow from South Australia. The years since June, 1971, have confirmed this judgment. Secondly, the Borrie report, after estimating the size of the future interstate movement occurring within Australia, then assessed the net migration in each State and Territory by applying the proportionate distribution of net migration observed over the 1966-71 period. This meant that a State's net migration was always linked not with the State's own population but with that proportion of the whole Australian population that was migratory in the earlier, 1966-71, period.

To the extent that a State's population as a proportion of the Australian population changes over time, then the gross inflows and outflows and hence the net result will also change as a proportion of the State's population. Therefore, in South Australia's case, the Borrie assumption implicitly meant that the net outflow from South Australia to the rest of Australia would be an increasing proportion of this State's population over time. There is little justification for such an assumption. It was assessed that these deficiencies alone in the Borrie projections meant an understatement of South Australia's population in 2001 by at least 50 000 persons. Another major factor which reduced unduly South Australia's population projection was the Borrie assumption that all Australian States had the same mortality rates. In fact this State has a markedly lower-than-average death rate in key age groups.

Because of these major deficiencies the population projections of the Borrie report needed to be modified to arrive at more reliable estimates for Government planning in this State. Since the beginning of this year officers of the Premier's Department have been closely examining population trends with a view to providing the State Government with such projections for South Australia. The projections were prepared on assumptions established by officers of the department in consultation with demographers of the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Full account was taken of the analysis and methodology of the Borrie report and the bureau, using a computer model, calculated the anticipated population for each year of the

period 1975 to 2001, and also provided a breakdown of each year's population by age and sex.

These projections have now been made available to appropriate Government departments and statutory authorities for planning purposes. The population of this State in 2001 is now forecast to be 1 492 000, a figure 122 400 greater than the most likely population projected in the Borrie report, but well below earlier projections made in the 1960's in an era of higher birth rates and higher net migration from overseas. The Government is well aware that circumstances can change and it is therefore intended that the population projections for the State will be reviewed annually as new information on birth rates, death rates and net migration becomes available. The projections from present trends could markedly alter with new industrial arrangements such as those forecast for the car industry in requiring some renewed increase in migration. For the information of the honourable member and other members I am attaching a set of projected annual figures for the State and for the metropolitan population, for mid years 1975 to 2001.

2. The second part of the question needs no answer in the light of my reply to the first.

#### South Australian Population Projections 1975-2001

Year (at June 30)	S.A. population estimate—whole State. (To the nearest hundred)	Adelaide Statistical Division plus Monarto population estimate. (To the nearest hundred)
1975	1 240 900	903 200
1976	1 252 300	913 500
1977	1 263 800	923 800
1978	1 275 200	934 100
1979	1 286 600	944 400
1980	1 298 100	954 700
1981	1 309 500	965 000
1982	1 321 000	975 300
1983	1 332 400	985 600
1984	1 343 700	995 800
1985	1 355 000	1 005 900
1986	1 366 100	1 015 900
1987	1 377 000	1 025 700
1988	1 387 600	1 035 200
1989	1 397 800	1 044 500
1990	1 407 800	1 053 400
1991	1 417 300	1 062 000
1992	1 426 500	1 070 300
1993	1 435 400	1 078 200
1994	1 443 800	1 085 800
1995	1 451 700	1 092 900
1996	1 459 200	1 099 700
1997	1 466 300	1 106 100
1998	1 473 100	1 112 200
1999	1 479 600	1 118 000
2000	1 485 700	1 123 600
2001	1 491 500	1 128 800

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What is the expected population of the new town of Monarto for the year 2000?

2. Does the Government expect that Adelaide's population will grow to about 1 300 000 by the year 2000 as forecast on page 5 of the 1974 report of the Monarto Development Commission and, if not, what does the Government now estimate the population of Adelaide (including Monarto) will be by the year 2000?

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

1. Monarto has been planned to accommodate an eventual population of between 180 000 and 200 000. Initial indications were that this figure might be achieved early next century. However, this was in the context of an Adelaide region population of at least 1 300 000 at that time. State population projections recently endorsed by Cabinet indicate that the Adelaide region, including Monarto, will contain

at least 1 100 000 persons by the year 2000. The initial development proposals for Monarto are being re-examined in the light of this reduced scale of regional population growth.

2. See 1 above.

#### PUBLICITY SERVICES

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What is the purpose of considering the appointment of a Publicity Services Manager for the Premier's Department as advertised in the *Australian* on April 9, 1975?

2. What specific qualifications are required of applicants?

3. How many applications were received?

4. Has an appointment been made and, if not, when is it expected it will be made?

5. Is it intended that the appointee will take over any of the workload of any existing position and, if so, what action is contemplated to gainfully employ any current employee?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The appointment of a Manager, Publicity Services was recommended following an investigation by the Public Service Board of publicity services in government departments. The objectives of the recommendation was to increase the efficiency of the existing machinery for publicity, and to improve the overall quality of Government publications by the establishment of a corporate image.

2. No specific academic qualifications have been specified although proven experience in journalism, advertising and public relations is considered essential. In addition, the successful appointee will be expected to possess administrative and organising ability of a high order.

3. A total of 27 applications was received, of which one was subsequently withdrawn.

4. An appointment has not been made. The position has been readvertised in the national press and recirculated throughout the Public Service. Applications close on August 13, and when an appointment will be made can only be forecast when the applications have been assessed.

5. The investigation conducted by the Public Service Board proposes a total reorganisation of publicity services throughout Government departments and some reallocation of duties and responsibilities will occur. All existing officers will be gainfully employed.

#### FESTIVAL THEATRE PLAZA

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. What is the estimated cost of the present work proceeding on the completion of the plaza between the Festival Theatre and Parliament House, including car parking facilities?

2. When is it planned that this project will be completed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The estimated cost of the completion of the plaza, including the car parking facilities, is \$4 917 000, which includes the provision for site allowance, rise and fall, and consultants' fees.

2. Completion is planned for early in October, 1976.

#### NORTH ADELAIDE TRAFFIC

Mr. COUMBE (on notice): Is it still proposed to declare Melbourne Street, North Adelaide, a clearway or are alternative traffic plans being considered for this area, and when can a decision be expected?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Adelaide City Council is currently investigating a proposal to declare Melbourne Street a clearway. Any alternative plans could be only in the long term and would have no effect on the current proposal.

#### HILLS SCENIC ROUTE

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What sections of the hills scenic route have been decided?

2. When will the complete scenic route be opened and sign-posted for public use?

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

1. The Hills scenic route is defined in the 1962 metropolitan area of Adelaide development plan, as modified from time to time, as being from Gawler to Sellick Hill, and traversing the Mount Lofty Range.

2. As the route has been defined, regulations have been promulgated under the Planning and Development Act to protect the scenic value. Much of the route follows roads that are not yet developed or are local roads unsuitable for through traffic. There are no current proposals to upgrade or signpost those sections of the route that have not yet been developed.

#### MONARTO

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What amount of finance has been requested from the Australian Government for the Monarto Development Commission for the 1975-76 financial year?

2. What construction work is planned for the new town of Monarto during the 1975-76 financial year provided that the finance requested is available?

3. How many persons were employed by the Monarto Development Commission as at July 1, 1975?

4. What is the expected amount of finance necessary for wages and salaries for the Monarto Development Commission during 1975-76?

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

1. An amount of \$9 200 000 of an estimated net expenditure of \$10 100 000.

2. On the basis of a \$10 100 000 programme, it was planned to commence construction of roads and water and sewerage facilities, major drainage system, outdoor recreation facilities, as well as continuing with the tree planting programme. However, a revised programme is under consideration which will involve an expenditure of between \$4 000 000 and \$5 000 000 for 1975-76. This is based on the assumption that the amount requested of the Australian Government will not be received.

3. There were 65 persons employed by the Monarto Development Commission as at July 1, 1975.

4. The estimated amount of finance necessary for wages and salaries for the Monarto Development Commission during 1975-76 is \$920 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What salary, wage, expenses, or sitting fee is paid to Mr. John Mant for being a Commissioner on the Monarto Development Commission?

2. What other State or Commonwealth Government positions are currently held by Mr. Mant?

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

1. Mr. John Mant does not receive any remuneration or a commission for the Monarto Development Commission. Travel and expenses related to attendance at commission meetings are reimbursed to Mr. Mant.

2. Mr. Mant is on the Australian Government Public Service Board unattached list as an Assistant Secretary with

the Department of Urban and Regional Development. He is currently acting as Principal Private Secretary to the Prime Minister.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How much money has now been spent in establishing the new city of Monarto?
2. How much of this money has been contributed:
  - (a) by the State Government; and
  - (b) by the Commonwealth Government?

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

1. The total net expenditure on Monarto to June 30, 1975, is \$12 600 000. The major item is the acquisition of land and improvements, which represents 63 per cent of total expenditure.
2. Contributions to this expenditure are as follows:
  - (a) State Government \$2 600 000 (21 per cent);
  - (b) Australian Government \$10 000 000 (79 per cent).

UNLEY TRAFFIC

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Minister of Transport given an undertaking that Wattle Street at some point between Unley Road and Glen Osmond Road will be closed to through traffic?
2. If an undertaking has been given:
  - (a) to whom, and
  - (b) when?
3. Is Wattle Street to be so closed and if so:
  - (a) when;
  - (b) for how long; and
  - (c) why?

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

1. Yes.
2. (a) Wattle Street Residents Association, (b) June 12, 1975.
3. Yes.
  - (a) August 29, 1975.
  - (b) Six months.
  - (c) After being requested by residents of the area, it was considered to be desirable as part of the evaluation of the study.

SCHOOL TRAVEL CONCESSIONS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it proposed to answer my letter to the Minister of Transport of May 12 concerning concessions on public transport for schoolchildren and, if so, when?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, as soon as possible.

PEDLAR CREEK BRIDGE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Who built the bridge over Pedlar Creek on the Main South Road?
2. What was the total cost of this bridge?
3. Was the damage to a structural element arising from malfunction of expansion joints due to negligence and if so:
  - (a) whose negligence; and
  - (b) is it proposed to take legal proceedings and against whom?
4. Who is carrying out the repairs to the bridge?
5. When is it now expected that the repairs will be completed?
6. What is now the estimated cost of such repairs?

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

1. L. M. Robertson Construction Company.
2. \$190 283.
3. No.
4. McMillan Industries Pty. Ltd.

5. It is expected to be opened on August 25, 1975.

6. Modifications to the abutments are being effected concurrently with the repairs and the total cost of the work is estimated to be \$70 000.

ATHELSTONE SEWERAGE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Did the Minister of Works in January, 1973, advise the then member for Coles that:

- (a) it was proposed to provide sewerage facilities for the whole of the Athelstone area during the financial year 1973-74;
- (b) there would be no increased costs to property owners for this service; and
- (c) such work should commence late in 1973 or early in 1974?

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

- (a) Yes.
- (b) Mr. King was advised that there would be no increased costs for this service above normal charges.
- (c) Yes.

STATE LIBRARY

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Does the State Library now close at 5.30 p.m. on Saturdays and, if so, from what date has it closed at this time?
2. How many complaints, if any, have been received about this?
3. What is the estimated number of people using the State Library during the later part of Saturday afternoons?

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

1. Yes, from May 24, 1975.
2. Written objections on prior notice of closing—2. Written complaints after closing—4.
3. The number of persons leaving the State Library between 5 and 5.30 p.m. on the dates shown was:
 

June 28, 1975 . . . . .	203
July 5, 1975 . . . . .	119
August 2, 1975 . . . . .	314

On July 5 the question "At what time would you have left the Library were it to remain open until 9.30 p.m.?" was asked of each person leaving between 5 and 5.30 p.m. The answers were as follows:

Between 5 and 6 p.m. . . . .	67
Between 6 and 7 p.m. . . . .	13
Between 7 and 8 p.m. . . . .	13
Between 8 and 9.30 p.m. . . . .	26

PARKHOLME LAND

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Has the Government any plans for the use of land at the junction of Oakland Road and Marion Road, Parkholme, and if so, what are they?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Any land surplus to requirements at this location will be disposed of in accordance with Government policy. In pursuit of this, Cabinet yesterday authorised the Commissioner of Highways to dispose of .009 hectares.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What is the policy of the Government on water pollution control in relation to reservoir reserves and other waterworks installations used for the collection and distribution of water supplies?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government's policy with regard to water pollution control in relation to reservoir reserves is that the public will continue to be excluded from reservoir reserves except at defined lookout points.

- (a) Water mains and pipelines: all new mains and pipelines are sterilised prior to being commissioned and after major repairs have been carried out.
- (b) Storage tanks: the metropolitan storage tanks and the majority of country tanks are roofed and all tanks are periodically cleaned and disinfected.
- (c) Monitoring of water supplies: daily monitoring of all domestic water supplies is carried out to ensure the safety and acceptability of water supplied to the consumer.
- (d) Chlorination: in order to ensure a satisfactory degree of safety Adelaide's water supplies are all continuously chlorinated.

#### HOSPITAL PARKING

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What further provision, if any, of car parking facilities for staff nurses, including student nurses, at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, is it proposed to make?
2. Is it proposed to make such provision during the next three months and, if so, when?
3. If such provision is not to be made, why not?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. The hospital's car parking problem has been discussed and investigated by its joint consultative council, as it is a problem not confined to nursing staff but affecting all staff and hospital services. The council has made proposals for reorganisation of existing car parking space and reallocation of permits. This should improve the situation as far as nurses are concerned but not to the extent they are seeking. The total requirement can only be met by the acquisition of off-campus parking space in respect of which suggestions have also been made.
2. It is hoped that any on-site improvements in facilities will be achieved within three months, but the acquisition of areas outside the hospital will depend on decisions to be made by organisations over which the hospital has no influence.

3. See 1 and 2.

#### PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What has been the total State Government expenditure on the Redcliff petro-chemical complex project, including the salaries and other costs of production for departmental reports?
2. What departmental reports and other governmental reports have been produced in relation to the Redcliff petro-chemical complex?
3. What does the Government intend to do with the 7 149 acres it has acquired at Redcliff?

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

1. Please refer to Question on Notice No. 17 of February 25, 1975.
2. The following Government reports were published:  
SADEC 1—Redcliff Petro-chemical Development—Plan for Environmental Study.  
SADEC 2—Redcliff Petro-chemical Development—Project Report.

In addition, a Supplementary Flinders Range Development Plan was progressed to the draft stage and a number of interdepartmental reports and papers were produced as part of the planning effort. Some of these were:

Planning our police services and facilities in relation to the Redcliff petro-chemical project.

Report on passenger transport requirements in the Port Augusta area.

Port Augusta educational development plan.

Interim report on air pollution control for Redcliff project.

Preliminary assessment of the impact of the Redcliff petro-chemical complex on the health services of Port Augusta and adjacent areas.

3. A joint Commonwealth-State study of the Cooper Basin liquids resource is currently being undertaken. Until that study is completed no decision on the future use of Redcliff can be made.

#### BUILDERS' LICENCES

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What number of general builders' licences and restricted builders' licences, respectively, is currently valid?
2. How many licences in each category have been cancelled or suspended since the commencement of licensing, and for what reasons?
3. Have any licences not been renewed at respective due dates and has there been any delay or other difficulty in subsequent renewal of these overdue licences?
4. If there have been delays or renewal difficulties, or confusion in responsibility to renew, what measures have been taken or are contemplated to overcome the difficulty?

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

1. The latest figures available are as at June 30, 1975:

Valid licences	Total	Provisional		
		General	General	Restricted
7 962	3 259	100	4 703	
Licences not validated by payment ..	925	272	19	634
Total licences issued .. ..	8 887	3 431	119	5 337

2. Two general licences were cancelled since the commencement of licensing:

(a) On May 25, 1972, following a board of inquiry, pursuant to section 18 (5) of the Builders Licensing Act, for inadequate supervision of building work undertaken and a lack of knowledge of commonly understood principles of building construction.

(b) On February 17, 1975, following a board of inquiry pursuant to section 18 (5) of the Builders Licensing Act, for negligence and incompetence in performance of building work undertaken.

3. A number of licences were not renewed on the due dates. All licences expired on April 30, 1975, and were renewable as from March 1, 1975. The board accepted late renewals up to May 31, 1975. No renewals were accepted after this date and licence holders were advised to reapply. All licence holders were sent renewal forms on or about January 15, 1975. It is administratively impossible to issue all renewals on May 1 and this was recognised in 1971 when the Act was amended by the addition of section 14 (3a), which provides that, where the application for the renewal of a licence has been made and the application has not been determined at the date of the expiration of the licence, the licences shall continue in operation until the application is determined.

4. The Builders Licensing Board is of the opinion that there has been no difficulty or confusion in responsibility to renew licences. The renewal notices sent out on January 15, 1975 clearly stated that the expiry date of licences was April 30, 1975. As already stated delayed renewals were accepted up to May 31, 1975.

#### STATE'S FINANCES

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say what are the details of the letter he received recently from the Commonwealth Government advising him that Commonwealth funds may not now be available for planned and promised State projects and what effects this will have on the level of unemployment in South Australia and on the welfare generally of South Australians? I understand that the Premier, as well as other State Premiers, has been informed that he cannot depend on Commonwealth funds for such matters as education, national parks acquisition, and for long-standing election promises such as the Christie Downs railway electrification, and sewerage and water filtration projects, even though the Commonwealth had previously indicated that these proposals were acceptable. Various State Ministers have indicated that they expect cuts in expenditure, and it becomes obvious that there is little that they can do to prevent these cuts now that the State Government has allowed itself to become so completely in the financial grasp and control of the Commonwealth Government. It is becoming increasingly apparent, too, that the Premier was well aware of this impending money squeeze on the States and that it was for this reason that he seized on the railways transfer issue as an excuse for an early election before these matters became generally known.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That was today's funny story. I have received a letter from the Prime Minister which is in similar terms to that written to all other Premiers saying that, for this year's finance, the States should be cautious about committing money in areas where Commonwealth funding would be required for the commitment. That is what has been said. I have received no letter from the Prime Minister which relates to national parks, electrification of railways or any of the other matters referred to by the Leader. It was a brief letter which said no more than what I had detailed to the Leader. I did not receive that letter before the State election, nor did any other Premier, and the honourable member's politicking in this House is absurd.

#### BROOKWAY PARK

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say how many inmates are now at Brookway Park, Campbelltown, and whether security arrangements are adequate to cope with the situation following the closure of Windana Home?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I hesitate to try to give an off-the-cuff reply to such a question, especially in relation to the number of inmates at Brookway Park. I have been there since becoming Minister and have been shown around by the Superintendent, Mr. Holmes. It was indicated to me that fewer people were there than in the recent past but, in order to clarify that point for the honourable member, I will certainly get a report giving the actual details. As regards security at Brookway Park following the closure of Windana, this matter is in hand; indeed, from what I saw there the security would be considered to be at least as adequate as was previously the case at Windana.

#### DRUGS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say what is the Government's policy on the Commonwealth Government's proposal to introduce legislation that overrides existing State laws in relation to drug offences? It has always been the province of the States to make their own laws in relation to this type of criminal offence, and what is being proposed is an obvious incursion on those rights. I would like to quote briefly from today's edition of the *Australian*, in which the situation is explained, as follows:

Legislation has been drafted under the sponsorship of Doctor Everingham, the Attorney-General (Mr. Enderby), and the Minister for Police and Customs (Senator Cavanagh). It is based on two international conventions dealing with drug trafficking and drug users and the Government is relying on its constitutional power over foreign affairs to try to override the existing State laws.

The report continues at some length to explain that the penalties proposed for some offences will be considerably diminished and others will, in fact, be increased. I think it is pertinent to ask the Premier what is the Government's attitude to these continuing attempts by the Commonwealth Government to erode State authority.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no information on this matter. I was asked today to comment on what is a newspaper story and nothing more. To my knowledge, there has been no release on this subject by the Commonwealth Minister and, until there is any authoritative statement that the Commonwealth Government intends to move in this way, I do not intend to comment. I will certainly not get into the area of newspaper speculation to which the honourable member refers.

#### BOATING TRAGEDY

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Marine report on the recent boating tragedy at Semaphore and say whether the boat hired by the occupants was fitted with any safety equipment?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have called for a report on this incident through the Director of Marine and Harbors. That report has not yet been finalised, because we have not been able to contact one of the people involved in the incident. There may have been contact made this morning, but there had not been up until last night. It is important, of course, that we contact this person before any report is finalised. I cannot say whether or not any safety equipment was carried on the boat, although indications are that no such equipment was carried. I am not able to confirm that. The unfortunate incident that occurred at the weekend confirms the Government's policy in this matter and the action it took during the previous session of Parliament to see that all seaworthy craft were registered. One of the problems in this incident was to identify the owner of the boat, as there were no identifying marks at all on the vessel involved. Until I receive a report, I will not be able to comment further on the matter.

#### DUKES HIGHWAY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Is the Minister of Transport aware of the deteriorating condition of the Dukes Highway between Tailem Bend and the Victorian border, especially between Ki Ki and the railway overpass south of Tintinara? Also, is he aware that no funds will be provided for the reconstruction of any section of this highway during the 1975-76 financial year, although I understand that \$247 000 is being supplied for maintenance work? As Dukes Highway is an approved national highway, can the Minister say when it is intended that reconstruction on this highway (National

Highway No. 8) will be recommended to the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Mr. Jones), and what the order of priorities is likely to be for these projects? Recorded in the minutes of the Coonalpyn Downs District Council is the following reply received by the council from the Commonwealth Minister for Transport:

I have recently approved a program of national high-ways projects for 1974-75 submitted by the South Australian Government. This program, while not including any construction proposals for the Dukes Highway between Tailem Bend and the Victorian border, proposes the expenditure of \$247 000 for road maintenance in the current year.

That is my authority for the sum to which I referred earlier. The reply continues:

Construction proposals for forthcoming years are to be nominated initially by the South Australian Government, and at this stage I am not aware of their intentions. I suggest therefore that your representation on this matter might be profitably directed to the State authorities. For my part I will bear in mind your comments when examining future programs of projects submitted to me for approval. I therefore hope that I am directing this question profitably to the Minister.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know whether or not it is profitable to direct such a question to me; that can be judged later by the honourable member. I will direct his question to the attention of the Commissioner of Highways and try to get the information. I should make it plain that the Australian Government is now assuming full responsibility for the national highways system. Fortunately, Dukes Highway constitutes part of that system, although Sturt Highway, which connects Adelaide to Sydney, does not. The Australian Government is providing the South Australian Government with, from memory, about 45 per cent of the total sum involved for this purpose, the majority of which will be used on National Highway No. 1, including the Swanport bridge. Therefore, that section of South Australia is certainly receiving much financial support from the Australian Government and, of course, from the South Australian Government, too. Although the Australian Government is assuming full responsibility for national highways, South Australia is still spending money from its own sources, because the sums made available by the Australian Government are insufficient for the purpose.

#### RIDGEHAVEN HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education say what are the Education Department's present and future plans for the land facing Golden Grove, Ridgehaven, that was previously earmarked as a site for a high school? What are the department's present or future plans for the site?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will get the information for the honourable member.

#### MANNUM PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Education obtain for me the likely construction date for a new primary school at Mannum? When a new school was approved about three or four years ago, it was expected to be built quickly. Obviously, construction has been postponed, and I should be pleased to know when it is likely to take place, having regard to the building programme of the department.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will get the information the honourable member requires.

#### BUILDING COSTS

Mr. COUMBE: In view of the decision of the Government to expend this financial year all its current capital funds from Loan accounts, as stated in His Excellency's

Speech, can the Treasurer say what escalation in costs is presently being encountered by the Government in building public works, particularly schools and hospitals, as a result of inflationary trends being experienced in the building industry? In addition, what is the percentage monthly increase, to use the normal commercial phrase?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I certainly could not give the member a reply off the cuff, because the tendering climate has altered. We are certainly not in as difficult a tendering climate as we were in even 12 months ago. At the Premiers' Conference held in the middle of last year, the Commonwealth Treasurer pointed out to me that in one year the cost of some of our schools had escalated (according to the report of the Co-ordinator-General of Works) by 40 per cent. More recently, we have received competitive tenders. Although it is very difficult to give the honourable member an overall picture, I will ask the Minister of Works whether he can get some more adequate information than the reply I have so far given to the honourable member.

#### TIMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. ALLISON: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether it is expected that the intended South Australian Woods and Forests Department and New Zealand modular homes construction will be commenced under licence in the current financial year, and whether other local enterprises will be invited to join in the venture with the supply of chipboard for ceilings, floors and cupboards? The State mill does not manufacture chipboard. In view of the depressed state of the South-East timber industry and the laying-off of staff, it would appear that all possible co-operation should be considered in an effort to revitalise the industry, especially since markets in the Eastern States are increasingly hard to enter because of rapidly increasing freight rates and competition from softwood forests in these States.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to refer the question to my colleague. I was rather surprised to hear the honourable member talking of the depressed state of the timber industry in the South-East. Talk of laying off staff and things of that nature is news to me.

#### Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I point out that I am still in touch with this area. If the honourable member could be more specific I, and the Government, would be interested to learn what is this depressed state of the industry at the moment and where the laying off of staff has occurred. I will refer the specific questions to my colleague. If the honourable member was alluding to the fact that there was a strike at one of the mills, and that some of those responsible for felling timber were laid off, that is a different question. However, I did not know that the industry was depressed.

#### MANNAHILL TRAFFIC

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Transport say when I can expect a reply to the letter I wrote him on May 23 regarding the speed of motor vehicles through the township of Mannahill? When I visited this township during May, several people pointed out that the maximum speed limit through this town was 80 km/h. It was stated that schoolchildren met their buses in the main street, that interstate transport vehicles usually travelled through the town at the maximum speed permitted, and that an accident was expected at the time. Last weekend I received a telephone call from Mannahill stating that the inevitable had happened and that there had been an

accident in the main street involving a transport vehicle and a car driven by a mother and three children. Although the car was extensively damaged, fortunately the occupants were not seriously injured. I have been asked again to approach the Minister to see whether he could expedite action in this case. It has been pointed out that many small towns in the State similar to Mannahill have a 60 km/h speed limit, whereas Mannahill has an 80 km/h speed limit.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will have the matter investigated.

#### COUNCIL GRANTS

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Transport say whether all money made available by the Commonwealth Government for road grants will be distributed to the country councils in South Australia? A news release dated July 31, 1975, of the Australian Minister for Transport (Mr. Jones) states:

Under the Roads Grants Act the Australian Government was providing \$160 000 000 for rural local roads throughout Australia over the three years 1974-75 to 1976-77. Of this, South Australia would receive \$13 590 000, with \$4 500 000 being allocated for 1975-76. Mr Jones pointed out that the Australian Government had accepted full financial responsibility for national roads throughout Australia. Based on patterns of expenditure over recent years it was estimated that the State Government would save \$12 000 000 in 1975-76 as a result of the Australian Government's decision to fully finance national highways. "I would expect the State Government to allocate an amount equal to this saving towards roads which are primarily the concern of State and local governments," Mr. Jones said. "These include rural arterial and local roads and urban arterial and local roads. I hope that a fair proportion of that money will be made available to councils for rural local roads," he said.

It seems that \$4 500 000 has been allocated for 1975-76. Will this full sum be distributed to councils?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think that the honourable member said that the press statement by Mr. Jones concluded by saying that Mr. Jones hoped that a fair proportion of the money would be distributed to councils. Indeed, this is what we have done, but we certainly have not, and we will not distribute all of the money, which has been provided by the Australian Government to South Australia, to councils. After all, the Highways Department has a fairly large work force performing an important task in providing roads, street safety devices, and many other things, all of which must be financed from that source and from the other source of the Highway Fund, namely, the registration of vehicles, licence fees, and funds from the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act. Therefore, it would be irresponsible for us to distribute all the money, which is provided by the Australian Government, to councils. Unfortunately, much misconception arises with regard to the distribution of road moneys in South Australia and, indeed, in every other State. It seems that, merely because approvals are given, in accordance with the legislation, from time to time on an annual basis, each time that approval is given a new announcement is made, and people such as the member for Gouger and others seem to think that that is another slice of money coming to South Australia. It is not; it is exactly the same slice that is covered by the legislation, which has a three-year life. The position is merely that an approval is required in each of three years. Because of this, people seem to be getting the idea that additional funds are coming to South Australia. Indeed, the same argument has been advanced regarding the other States, but these are only the approvals required in accordance with the legislation.

The remaining point that needs to be made on this matter is that the Highways Department is facing extreme

financial difficulties in the current financial year. It has done its budgeting on the basis that the Commonwealth Budget to be introduced next week will provide additional funds for roads. On that score, allocations have been made to councils. For the benefit of the honourable member, I repeat the statement that I have made previously that it is extremely unlikely that there will be any possibility of increasing those amounts that have been allocated already, unless funds are forthcoming next Tuesday in addition to those we expect. If the amount received is less than we expect, we will be in an extremely difficult financial position.

#### HOUSING COMPANY

Mr. RODDA: Will the Attorney-General bring down to the House a report on the activities of the company known as Bimbadeen Development Proprietary Limited, house providers? Some of my constituents have, with much sadness, entered into contracts with the company known as Bisley Homes (Distributors) South Australia and with Bimbadeen Development Proprietary Limited, the proprietors. I understand that the company entered into a contract to supply house kits and that, basically, the terms were payment of 10 per cent on the signing of the contract and then certain payments as the building of the house progressed. It seems now that there are some extremely sad people throughout the whole of South Australia; indeed, some of these people are in the District of Victoria. My constituents, like all these other good people, have acted in good faith, and at meetings of creditors it has become abundantly clear to some people who have interviewed me that, in the opinion of those people, the company has no show at all of meeting the terms of the contract. As I understand that this matter has been investigated, I ask the Attorney-General whether he will bring down to the House a report of the activities of this company.

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

#### PRESS COUNCIL

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier say whether he supports the establishment of a Commonwealth or State press council and/or the licensing of newspapers, and if he does support these matters, will he say on what basis he does so?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not seen in detail the proposals for discussions concerning the press council. The only advocacy of a press council in South Australia of which I know came from a member of the Liberal Party.

#### SITTINGS OF HOUSE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say whether the Government hopes to get Parliament up by the end of October? I understand that there is to be a week of festivities in Penang, planned for some time in November (I think for the middle of November), and that about 300 South Australians, including the entire front bench of this Government, have been invited to go over there. This could be idle gossip that might not be accurate, but the Premier will have an opportunity to say whether what I have said is correct. I do not know at whose expense these people will go, but I should like to know that. That is the reason that has been put forward for the anxiety of the Government to get up at that time, and doubtless that is the reason that it would stick to, but in addition I point out that a Government that is on a knife edge in the House is not anxious to sit too often, in case of accident, and I know that feeling quite well. Finally, I



remind the Premier (and this may change the jocularity of the front bench) that Mr. David Combe has stated much the same thing about the sittings of Parliaments in his report of the abysmal failure of the Australian Labor Party in the Bass by-election. I thought that would change the visages of the front bench if I added that one.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Have you read the report?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have read the report in the *National Times*. It was good bedtime reading for me on Sunday evening, as a matter of fact.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must stick to the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was provoked by the Minister, Sir. Therefore, I put to the Premier the simple question whether it is intended to get Parliament up by the end of October.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is certainly intended to get the House up as soon as we have completed the legislative programme outlined in the Governor's Speech, and we intend to proceed with those measures with all due speed. We seek the assistance and co-operation of honourable members in dealing with the business expeditiously.

Dr. Tonkin: And carefully, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that it should be done carefully; I have always hoped that it would be. I just suggest to honourable members that it should not be done with verbosity. However, there is no intention of having the Adelaide Week in Penang, which has already been announced publicly and which is a joint undertaking by the city of Adelaide, the State Government, and several commercial ventures in South Australia, including the *Adelaide News*, in November. The week in Penang will take place in the first week in December. I can assure the honourable member that, unfortunately, I cannot issue invitations to the whole of the front bench, and I regret that, whilst the Leader of the Opposition will be invited, the invitations will not extend to the member for Mitcham. However, if that honourable member is keen to attend, as many other citizens in South Australia already have indicated they are, I assure him that he will find the trip extremely rewarding and that it will be available at a reasonable figure.

Dr. Tonkin: How much?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It would be \$350 return, and we could make bookings in Penang for the honourable member if he wished to stay. I assure the honourable member that in no event is the question of Adelaide Week in Penang exercising the Government's mind regarding the date on which the House will rise. The honourable member has said that he has experienced a knife-edge in the past, and he has regretted it ever since; however, it is not a situation in which the Government finds itself. He has referred to various other matters in relation to which he seems to have an advantage over me if he has read Mr. Combe's report; I have not done so.

#### WAIKERIE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. ARNOLD: On June 17, I asked the Minister of Mines and Energy, as acting Minister of Education, whether he could state a commencing date for work on the upgrading of the senior section of the Waikerie Primary School. My question continued:

The work on upgrading the infants block is presently proceeding. In a reply that I received from the Minister of Education on November 28, 1974, it was stated that a comprehensive plan had been prepared for the upgrading

of the upper primary section of the school. The plan included provision for added administration unit, an activity hall, a Commonwealth standard library unit and 11 teaching spaces.

My present concern is to know when the planned alterations will be made. The Minister in reply stated that he would inquire and bring down a reply. I am not sure whether my question has been referred to the department, but I would appreciate consideration being given to it.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: This matter would have been referred to the department, because this happens automatically in my office whenever questions are asked in the House. The honourable member will appreciate that several little matters have occurred between the time he asked his question and now, and this could have meant that the matter had lapsed into some sort of limbo. However, I will obtain the information for him.

#### NEW ZEALAND DEVALUATION

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Premier say what action the State Government will take to compensate for the probable loss of demand of goods from South Australian industries because of the 15 per cent devaluation of New Zealand's currency? The export of goods from South Australia to New Zealand is likely to decrease because of increased competition from local New Zealand manufacturers. During the 1972-73 financial year, South Australia exported \$33 400 000 worth of goods to New Zealand, and no doubt exports have increased substantially since then. I realise that about one-half of these goods were motor vehicles and that New Zealand has no local manufacturer of vehicles. However, that does not affect two areas: first, the likely decreased demand in New Zealand because motor vehicles will now be more expensive, and secondly, the increased competition within Australia that our manufacturers will have to meet because of the likely increased imports from New Zealand manufacturers. The latter will directly offset South Australian manufacturers. Last year, New Zealand exported to Australia about \$40 000 000 worth of domestic appliances, which would directly have affected that industry in this State. I refer specifically to the Kelvinator and Simpson-Pope companies, the two large manufacturers in this State of domestic appliances, which will now suffer unfair competition from New Zealand manufacturers. In an article appearing in yesterday's *Australian Financial Review* it is stated that the Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. Hayden) admits that a problem now faces Australian manufacturers because of the New Zealand devaluation. However, the same article quotes him as saying that he will take no action to protect Australian industries. It seems that the Commonwealth Treasurer has no or little concern for South Australian industries.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that he must not debate his question. This is Question Time.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am simply quoting a fact, Mr. Speaker (and I thank you for pulling me up), which appears in a publication to the effect that Mr. Hayden will take no action. That is why I am asking the Premier what action he will take. Mr. Cairns once said on television that the 25 per cent tariff cut across the board was a risk worth taking, and I think that the statement I have quoted shows a complete lack of concern for this State by the Commonwealth Treasurer.

Mr. Harrison: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: My Government consults with the white goods industry and is willing to have discussions with it regarding assistance that is within the competence of a State Government. If the honourable member suggests that there is some action which a State Government has the power to take in a situation of this kind, it would be interesting for him to advance it.

Mr. Dean Brown: I thought that, when Dunstan fought, he won!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When I fight, it happens to be about something that is winnable. It is utterly irresponsible for the honourable member to suggest that any State Government can act as Mandrake the Magician and produce a result which in no way accords with its constitutional, legislative or economic power. If honourable members want to be constructive, it is no use their getting up here and asking, "What action does the Government propose to take?" If there is a course of action they believe can be taken, it is up to them to put it forward constructively. The Government is willing, as it always has been, to discuss with the white goods industry or any other industry in South Australia action which a State Government could take that would be of assistance to the industry. However, I point out that the white goods industry in this State has received assistance from this State Government which it has not had from any other State anywhere else in Australia under Liberal Governments, and that is acknowledged by the industry. Not only has the industry had financial support but it has also had this Government's support in representations to the Industries Assistance Commission and, before that, to the Tariff Board. No Liberal Government in Australia has ever given such assistance to the industry.

Mr. Dean Brown: They're facing a crisis now.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that the industry has had a series of crises. The Government has been discussing with the white goods industry how it may diversify its markets. Indeed, the honourable member for Mitcham earlier today asked me about a project in relation to Penang. The Government is developing with the white goods industry a series of projects in which the industry has been involved in studies with the Government for diversifying its markets in Malaysia and the countries serviced by the Malaysian markets directly to assist the industry to maintain a sufficient diversity of its markets in order to maintain its employment levels. If the honourable member proposes some course of action, he should do it specifically, but it is not much good his getting up and asking, "Whatever is it that the Government is proposing to do," unless he has some course of action on which he believes the Government can embark.

#### CONSTITUTION CONVENTION

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to continue its support of all facets of the Commonwealth Constitution Convention? The Premier will be aware that Committee A and the executive of the organisation are meeting in Canberra tomorrow and that there is no knowledge yet that South Australia will be represented. A new meeting of the convention is to be held in Melbourne between September 24 and 26, but there is no indication whether South Australian members will be present at that meeting. If we are going to make progress in this vital field, it is important that not only the Commonwealth Government but also all State Governments and local government play their full part. I suggest

that if the answer to my question is that South Australia does not intend to continue its support, it is an act of sabotage by the Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am inquiring whether there is a series of recommendations to come to any proposed general meeting of the Constitution Convention which would, in fact, lead to any conclusions. If there is no indication that any reasonable conclusions could be arrived at by a meeting of the Constitution Convention, I consider that the legislative programme of this House is more important. However, I have not got the answers on that. When I have, I will give them to the honourable member.

#### COOMA BUS ACCIDENT

Mr. MATHWIN: Is it possible for the Premier to speed up the hearing for damages set down for March, 1976, for the victims of the Cooma bus crash, which occurred in 1973? In a press report in the *Advertiser* of August 1, it was stated that the hearing set down regarding the accident would depend on the availability of a Supreme Court judge and that even then might not be possible until March next year. Even if the hearing was in March next year, it would not be completed until September, 1976, three years or so after the accident. I am sure the Premier will know that this is causing great hardship and worry to most of these victims, who are now over 70 years of age. It has cost them many thousands of dollars out of their own pockets, and many fear they will die leaving the debts behind them because of their inability to pay the final accounts.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It seems very difficult to expedite hearings, particularly as in many of these cases the initial proceedings have not yet been taken. It is not possible, given the requirements of legal procedure, that we would get an earlier hearing in this matter. However, I can tell the honourable member I have had representations from two Commonwealth members, Dr. Gun and Mr. Jacobi. The State Government is the co-defendant in some of these writs with several others, but in our opinion, on the advice given to us, the State Government can in no way be found liable in this matter. However, we are concerned about the situation which is facing the victims of this disaster, and moves have been initiated by the State Government which may (I do not know whether it will) lead to some earlier settlement.

Mr. Mathwin: You will have to appoint another judge.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not a question of appointing another judge: it is an action of another kind. I have, however, taken action in this matter and, if I am able to reach an earlier conclusion, I will let the honourable member know.

#### FIRE-FIGHTING SERVICES

Mr. GUNN: I ask a question of the Minister representing the Minister responsible for fire-fighting services in South Australia. Can the Minister say what plans the South Australian Government has to reorganise fire-fighting services in South Australia? It has been brought to my attention by several people that the South Australian Government may intend to set up a single fire authority in South Australia and thus do away with the voluntary fire-fighting services which now operate, namely, the Emergency Fire Services, which have a fine record in protecting the property of people in country areas and people close to the metropolitan area. They are concerned that representatives of the South Australian Fire Brigade may be stationed in each area. The cost would be tremendous—

Mr. Venning: Astronomical!

Mr. GUNN:—not only in wages, but also there would be an increase in the fire protection insurance policies which landholders and other people have to take out to cover themselves. I should be pleased if the Government would clearly state the position and not succumb to the dictates of Mr. Overall and his union.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will refer the question to the Chief Secretary.

#### HOTEL LICENSING FEES

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say what action the Government intends to take to amend the Licensing Act to prevent licensees from cancelling their licences and not paying the licence fees due within the relevant licensing period? I understand that the licence fee payable by a hotel is calculated to the end of the financial year, and that licence fees calculated to June 30, 1974, would be payable by March 31, 1975. I understand that the proprietor of the Rose Inn recently gave up his licence early in June. As I understand it, he will now not be liable to pay any licence fee from July 1, 1974, until the date of relinquishing that licence. I am led to understand that during that period that hotel engaged in price discounting of beer, and it is reported to have amassed a considerable sum of money. It has been rumoured that about \$140 000 would have been the licence fee, but I cannot confirm that. In this instance, it seems that there is a loophole in the Act. I am wondering whether the Government is investigating the Act with the suggestion that, when a licence is relinquished, the person holding the licence would pay the fee due on relinquishing that licence. I ask the Premier whether a repetition of what has occurred could be prevented.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The legislation has been investigated. Draft legislation has already been prepared, and it will be introduced during this session.

#### MORIALTA CHILDREN'S HOME

Mr. VENNING: Can the Premier say whether the Government will urgently consider the purchase of the Morialta Children's Home for the purpose of carrying on its present activity of caring for under-privileged children from the metropolitan and country areas of the State? I believe that this building is owned by the Baptist Church and that it is to be auctioned, probably next month. I have had an approach from my constituents, particularly in the Laura area, requesting that the Government be asked to purchase this building so that the organisation will be able to continue doing the work it is doing at present. I ask the Premier whether he has any thoughts about it and whether he will consider the situation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter has been under investigation, and I will be writing to Mr. O'Shea later this week concerning the Government's decision.

#### EDUCATION EXPENDITURE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Is the Minister of Education aware that dramatic cuts are being forecast for education in the forthcoming Commonwealth Budget? If so, can he say what are the possible implications of such cuts on educational institutions in South Australia? In today's *News* it is stated that everyone seems to know almost to the last dollar how much has been cut from the allocation of Commonwealth Ministers such as the Minister for Education, Mr. Beasley. I am sure that, if that is public knowledge, the Minister must have some knowledge of what is intended for South Australia.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Thanks to the generosity of the honourable member's Party in granting me a pair last Thursday, I had discussions in Canberra with Mr. Beasley about the current situation. I am not at liberty to share with the House the information that Mr. Beasley gave me, nor for that matter was he in a position to give me closely detailed information. I can say, however, that much of what I have seen in the press, not so much locally but in the Eastern States, varies somewhat from what I was led to believe, as a result of my interview with the Commonwealth Minister, would be the outcome. The short answer is that, in the event of drastic cuts occurring in the Commonwealth Budget in the education area, there would be most serious implications on the education system in South Australia. Much of what we are hoping to do in our State Budget is predicated against certain assumptions about Commonwealth funding, which was all the more reason for my trying to get more detailed information from my Commonwealth colleague about the Commonwealth Government's intentions. What Mr. Beasley had to say to me was somewhat reassuring: I do not believe I am breaking any confidence in saying that. Beyond that, however, we can only wait for Mr. Hayden to bring down his Budget.

#### COURT COSTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to try again with a question, but this time I address it to the Minister of Labour and Industry. Now that Mr. J. E. Dunford has become a member of the Legislative Council—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The Hon. J. E. Dunford.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Wait! Does the Government intend to recover from him the \$9 985 paid by it on behalf of the now honourable gentleman to satisfy the costs in the Supreme Court action of *Woolley v. Dunford*? It is now almost two years to the day since the Government paid out that sum. It was said at the time it would be about \$7 000, but in the Auditor-General's report for the following year the figure was the one I mentioned. The Government paid out of public funds that sum rather than allow Mr. Dunford (who was personally liable as Secretary of the Australian Workers Union) to go to gaol in default of payment. At the time that was regarded as a scandalous action. Even in the *Australian* it was described as being politically unwise and morally unsound. Now that Mr. Dunford has succeeded, through the Party to which the Minister belongs, in becoming a member of the Legislative Council, and is therefore paid from the public purse, it would be possible to recoup that sum from him. I suggest to the Government that, in all honesty and honour, that should be done so that the public is not at a loss because of Mr. Dunford's defiance of a court judgment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Millhouse: The Premier gets up on this one, does he?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As the honourable member should know from his time in this House—

Mr. Millhouse: It's too important for Jack Wright, is it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —it is the prerogative of the Leader of the Government to reply on matters of policy.

Mr. Millhouse: Oh, I see!

Mr. Chapman: Is it the Government's policy to pay fines when people default?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier must be given an opportunity to reply to the question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government does not intend to recover moneys from Mr. Dunford any more than the Liberal Government in Canberra recovered moneys from those A.W.U. members for whom it paid costs in matters that went before the Industrial Court, or any more than the Liberal Government that the honourable member supported in this House recovered damages and costs in the case of the cook at Government House for whom it paid out money.

Mr. Millhouse: I think you're very much on the defensive.

The SPEAKER: Order!

#### WATER FILTRATION

Dr. TONKIN: Does the Minister of Works expect the sewerage and water filtration programmes recently announced and promised in two elections to proceed as originally planned and, if he does not, what is the reason and for how long will the programmes be delayed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If South Australia receives from the Australian Government the funds it expects, the programme will proceed as announced.

#### CHRISTIE DOWNS RAILWAY

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Transport say whether any modification has been made to the proposed time table for the electrification of the Christie Downs railway and, if it has, for what reason has the modification been made? It is perfectly obvious that the Premier and the Deputy Premier are hedging in the replies they are giving to questions about this matter. It is absurd for the Premier to assert in this House that he has no knowledge of what is proposed in the Commonwealth Budget. I therefore ask the Minister of Transport whether he has any knowledge of this matter and whether there is any proposal to modify the time table.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am afraid that I am not privy to discussions held by Commonwealth Cabinet Ministers when the Budget or other matters are being discussed. The time table for the Christie Downs line will depend entirely on the availability of Commonwealth funds so, like the honourable member, I will await next Tuesday evening with interest.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: TIMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. ALLISON: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. ALLISON: Briefly, one very large company in Mount Gambier has retained staff until it has stockpiled coreboards and its warehouses can no longer hold any more.

The SPEAKER: Order! Such a statement is out of order. It must be of a personal nature.

Mr. ALLISON: Well, Sir, the Minister seemed to be misrepresenting my integrity.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think the honourable member is trying to make a personal explanation (the first such explanation he has made to this House) and you, Sir, would be only too aware how difficult that can be. He was leading to the position of saying he had been misrepresented and wished to make a personal explanation to clear the air. He then tried to do that, Sir, but was put off.

The SPEAKER: That could be so, but at this juncture we are out of time; we have gone beyond Question Time.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Mount Gambier rose to make a personal explanation during the remaining minute of Question Time, which means he was perfectly in order in doing so. Once a question or a personal explanation has been started during Question Time, it is normal practice for that question or explanation to be completed. The honourable member had embarked on his personal explanation when you said that you were not clear about the nature of the personal explanation. Standing Orders provide for a member, having sought and gained the leave of the House, to make a personal explanation and for that explanation to be completed. With respect, Sir, I think the honourable member has not had the opportunity to complete his personal explanation; in fact, he was within the prescribed limit for undertaking his personal explanation.

The SPEAKER: In the circumstances I will allow the honourable member to make his personal explanation briefly.

Mr. ALLISON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believed there was a personal reflection on my integrity. I have facts available, but I will not name the companies involved. Since July 11 this year staff have been stood down, stock has been filling warehouses, shifts have been reduced, several firms can no longer run four shifts, and log hauliers are on reduced time throughout the South-East. Bearing in mind that "depressed" means a downward trend, no other construction is possible on the present situation in the South-East.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 7. Page 107.)

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to your high position in this House; I am sure you will fulfil your duties with distinction. I add my condolences to the relatives of the late Sir Norman Jude, and Mr. Leslie Densley, whom I did not know. I knew Sir Norman well; I admired and respected him as a fine person. I wish to congratulate new members to this House, wishing them well in their endeavours on behalf of the Parties they represent. I commiserate with our colleague Allan Burdon who was most unfortunate in being defeated in Mount Gambier. We will miss his contributions to proceedings and his other activities, particularly as Chairman of Committees. I support his contention that, like MacArthur he will return.

I also wish to congratulate members of the Labor Party Cabinet on their election to their high offices. I am certain that, as in the past, they will perform their duties in a way that will receive the plaudits of everyone concerned. The veracity of their statements will not be questioned, nor will their endeavours on behalf of the people of this State. I also congratulate the new Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy, who have been elected by their Party to lead the Opposition in this House. That is no business of members on this side, but we can have thoughts about the changes in position that have occurred because I think it must be realised by everyone that the Labor Party is a united solid Party.

Mr. Goldsworthy: How's Harradine going, Charlie?

Mr. WELLS: Mr. Harradine is not in this House, and he is not on this side of the Speaker.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He's in the Labor Party.

Mr. WELLS: So are a lot of other people. We are a united Party in this House, and Government members stand squarely behind their Leader. It is shocking to realise that once again we have a rag-tag Opposition, comprising members of the Liberal Party and the Country Party (some Parties have been referred to lately that I do not think I would recognise). Once again we have, blowing strongly down the necks of the Liberal Party, the Liberal Movement, under the leadership of the member for Mitcham. This does not constitute an effective Opposition to our Government. It is disgraceful that such a thing should occur when the people of South Australia are entitled to a united Opposition that will be of some value in this Chamber. At the moment, that is not the position.

I was astounded to see the changes that took place in the Liberal Party leadership. The member for Light has been a victim of the long knives; he now reposes on the back benches, from whence I believe he will play an active role in the proceedings of this Chamber. I believe he was a good Leader, but the people who had the say thought otherwise. The previous Opposition spokesman on industrial affairs was the only man (possibly with the exception of the member for Glenelg) on the other side who had the slightest inkling of what makes the trade union movement in this State tick; he, too, has been relegated to the back benches. That is good from our point of view, but I fail to see the reasoning behind the moves that took place. I believe the Liberal Party will rue the day it made such changes.

I believe it is the responsibility of every candidate, whether successful or defeated, to attend the declaration of the poll. I know that candidates from both sides of the House have at times failed to do this. I believe it is a discourtesy to the returning officer when such a thing occurs. I have had personal experience of two Liberal Party candidates in this regard. The Liberal Party candidates for Florey are phantoms; I have never seen or heard either of them. They certainly have not appeared at the declaration of the poll, or submitted apologies to the returning officer. The Liberal Movement candidate—

Mr. Dean Brown: The same as the Labor Party candidate.

Mr. WELLS: It happens on both sides and I am equally angry when candidates from both Parties do not attend and show courtesy to the returning officer. The Liberal Movement candidate appeared at the declaration of the Florey poll. In a brief speech, he lauded his Leader and said that it would be only a short time before the member for Mitcham would lead the Government in the House of Assembly in South Australia. I do not agree, but at least he was loyal to his Party. He attended the declaration and had his say, even though perhaps he had his tongue in his cheek. I now want to talk briefly about the veracity of some of the statements made during the campaign and the accusations made against the Labor Party by members opposite. They were very vocal about this. I want to draw the House's attention to a deliberate falsehood that appeared in the Liberal Party pamphlet, which I believe was a general pamphlet. The one I have is merely headed "The Liberal Party of Australia (South Australian division)". It bears the printed name of Mr. J. Morgan, Liberal candidate for Florey and his phone number, and no doubt he has slid back into the obscurity from which he arose. This pamphlet does contain falsehoods, and I want to draw the House's attention to the deliberate lies when the pamphlet states:

Wastage of public money in South Australia by Dunstan's Government: \$59 000 Premier's overseas trip, including return for federal election; \$32 000 for costs included in opening festival playhouse; \$210 000 in renting buildings which are not used; media monitoring service; Monarto; and 11 press secretaries for the Government, on salaries between \$13 000 and \$18 000—

Jack is worthy of his hire, of course. The following is the crux of the matter I want to elucidate:

\$200 000 "gift" to Trades Hall; \$200 000 "gift" to an employer organisation if they qualify by Government standards.

An absolute falsehood, but it was circulated right throughout the State, and it is time somebody denied these statements, which appeared in the pamphlet authorised by Mr. John M. Vial, of North Terrace.

Mr. Dean Brown: They didn't go into my area.

Mr. WELLS: I would not imagine they would have got into the honourable member's area, because this was probably a pamphlet designed for the more general run of elector rather than the blue-noses. This is a rather general pamphlet. Now, I refer to the magnificent programme which has been set out and which we will be pursuing during this session.

Dr. Tonkin: Don't strain credibility too far.

Mr. WELLS: The Leader says it stretches credibility a little too far, so let us hear about it. When the railways transfer Bill was passed in this House (and I hope I am not out of order in referring to it), the Opposition jumped up and down like wax dolls attempting to frustrate what is the will of the people of this State, as demonstrated by the return of this Government to the Treasury benches.

Mr. Venning: Not in the country.

Mr. WELLS: The honourable member says that, but country people will benefit greatly. The Opposition stated that it wanted a Select Committee: that is absolute rubbish. Opposition members wanted no Select Committee for its finding; they wanted it to delay the measure. Praise has to be bestowed on the Liberal Movement members in this House (a very small minority): they had sought the Select Committee, which was desired by the Liberal Party, but, as a matter of principle, they recognised that a mandate had been created and bestowed on this Government to pass the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Bill, and they were courageous and honest enough to say, to the chagrin of the Liberal Party, that we had a mandate, and they would vote with us. The sooner members of the Liberal Party learn to face facts and to acknowledge that mandate is a mandate and stop their ridiculous opposition, the sooner that Party will gain the confidence of the people. I also believe that we will have the support of the Liberal Movement for an electoral Bill that will provide for one vote one value voting. This is something the electors of South Australia are screaming for.

Mr. Mathwin: Can you tell us what it means?

Mr. WELLS: Do not argue with me about it, because I would say you would be—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Florey must not use the word "you", but should use the words "honourable member".

Mr. WELLS: We will also provide for elections for the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council to coincide. Never again will we get to a situation where people can sit in the Legislative Council for a period of years, which are cumulative in the event of an election taking place, and maintaining that they can adequately represent the people they are supposed to represent because they were

elected to that situation. That situation will go. A further Bill will provide for optional preferential voting, something the electors of this State want very badly, so there should be no talk about stretching credibility. We will also provide for the appointment of another Minister. This will be very good too, because when one considers the ability of the members gracing the front bench in this Chamber one realises that it is no wonder that the State Government is making such headway, because of the confidence bestowed upon it as a result of the sheer ability of the members of the Government front bench.

Mr. Venning: Do you think you will make it?

Mr. WELLS: I do not know whether I will make it or not, but when I look around I see the member for Gilles, the member for Playford, the member for Salisbury, and the member for Tea Tree Gully, any of whom would make an ideal Minister, and possess qualities that could not be matched by Opposition members. This Government has a wealth of ability, and soon there will be another member on the front bench, and he or possibly she will show that the quality of the work performed will not deteriorate in any way. Of course, primary producers are and always have been of great concern to the Labor Party in this State, and we have subsidised them to the hilt. We have assisted them in every way, and this session will see further benefits flowing to the rural industry.

Mr. Venning: Things have never been worse.

Mr. WELLS: I refer now to the statement in the Governor's Opening Speech, as follows:

My Government will press on with its plans to improve the quality of the State's livestock by proceeding with the campaign for the eradication of the cattle diseases, bovine tuberculosis and brucellosis. Plans have been prepared for a rapid expansion of the programme should further funds be made available by the Australian Government following its consideration of the report and recommendations of the Industries Assistance Commission on this subject. Appropriate legislation will be laid before you in due course to facilitate the conduct of this campaign.

Opposition members should, if they are country members, or have the welfare of the country at heart (as we have on this side), applaud that legislation and the fact that it is to be introduced. Also, we will reintroduce the Beverage Container Bill. This time the Government's activities, intentions and desires will not be frustrated by the conservative hostile majority in another place, because the picture has changed drastically and this time the Beverage Container Bill will go through despite the efforts by big business and their representatives here and in another place to prevent it. We will see justice prevail once again.

Mr. Evans: How much unemployment will you create?

Mr. WELLS: No unemployment: full employment is our policy. Having looked after big business and the rural industry, let us come back to the workers.

Mr. Evans: At the abattoirs?

Mr. WELLS: Workers anywhere are workers to me: they are the salt of the earth. For decades there has been in this State's industrial Acts an anomaly that has prevented long service leave from being given to members of the building industry. I complained about this many years ago and, as a matter of fact, spoke of it in this House.

Mr. Mathwin: It's covered in the award.

Mr. WELLS: I withdraw my comment that you may have some knowledge of industrial affairs.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must refer to another member as "the honourable member", not "you".

Mr. WELLS: I referred to the member for Glenelg. At last building workers will be accorded their just rights. They will be paid long service leave when they accumulate a sufficient period of service to qualify, and how long overdue this is! For decades a building worker may have been on a building for two years and, when that building was completed, he may have gone to another employer and worked for him for six months, and then gone to another employer and worked for him for four years (in fact, that building worker may have spent a lifetime in the industry), without receiving long service leave. That has gone by the board and now building workers, not before time, will get their just deserts.

We will introduce amendments to the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act to ensure that no longer will profit-hungry employers be permitted to exploit workers at the risk of their health and safety. These provisions will be policed to the full extent by our new Minister of Labour and Industry, who already has proved that he will be a Minister of renown in this portfolio. He will see that his department polices it thoroughly, and under this legislation workers will be happier and safer than they ever have been previously. I refer now to the Leader's speech, which was the weakest speech by a Leader that I have heard since I have been in this House.

Mr. Becker: Stop watching the Minister—

Mr. WELLS: The honourable member got his nut chopped off, so he should be careful. The Leader said nothing that could indicate that he had any policies for this State. He confined his remarks almost entirely to abuse and criticism of the Australian Government.

Mr. Gunn: He was quite justified.

Mr. WELLS: Whether he was justified is a matter of personal opinion, but he is, or is supposed to be, the Leader of the Opposition in this House, and he should be expected to bring forward policies that would be an alternative to the policies of this fine Government.

Mr. Evans: Do you think the Commonwealth Government is a good Government?

Mr. WELLS: I was inclined to look at Commonwealth *Hansard*, because I thought the Leader's speech was lifted directly from a speech that Fraser had made in the previous few weeks. I should not be surprised if Fraser wrote the Leader's speech. I thought it was a disgusting effort, and the only time he said anything in respect of the State was when he abused the workers of South Australia and told us that they were bludgers and loafers (perhaps not in those words, by certainly by implication). The Leader stated:

The welfare state taxes people at a higher rate if they earn more by working harder. Therefore some people say, "Why bother to work harder?" Indeed, as we know, some people say, "Why bother to work at all?"

That was a fairly strong statement. The Leader also said:

Under the present system, living collectively, they do very well living on the welfare state. This is another facet of human nature coming to the fore, and human nature is something that, by and large, Socialist Governments do not take into account. The acceptance of this situation, where the welfare state takes more and more responsibility for individual well-being and frequently decides for all individuals what is best for them, results in the gradual loss on the part of individuals of any sense of gratitude or responsibility, in return, to the State.

What rubbish that is! The Leader also stated:

The idea of giving a fair day's work for a fair day's pay as part of the total community responsibility, so that the state may prosper, seems to be almost completely lost in many sectors. The benefits handed out by the

welfare state are no longer seen as benefits or concessions; rather, they are regarded as rights that cannot be taken away.

I say, "My oath they are rights!" Unfortunately, they could be taken away by rescission if ever a Liberal Government came to office. That is certainly what such a Government would do. Social welfare is the right of every person in this country, whether he is a capitalist or a worker, but in particular it is the right of a worker to have a welfare situation that will see to it that he and his wife and family are fed and looked after in adversity. As the Leader has said, members opposite think it is a privilege, not a right, but I should like someone to tell me why it is not a right. The Leader also stated:

I am pleased to see mention in His Excellency's Speech of measures to improve the workmen's compensation legislation, which is a significant area in which there needs to be much improvement. There are many instances that bear out the point previously made by the member for Davenport and me that people who suffer injury at work frequently take considerably longer, clinically, to recover than do people suffering the same sort of injury on the sporting field.

The Leader and the member for Davenport are saying that workers are bludgers and that, when they suffer an injury at work, they take a long time to recover and will not return, as they are being paid compensation, but if they were injured on the football field or the marble ground they get nothing: if the member for What's-the-name is injured, he would get nothing.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no member for "What's-the-name".

Mr. Coumbe: The member for Fisher.

Mr. WELLS: Yes. The Leader also stated:

I make clear that I do not refer to people who are consciously malingering: I refer to a state of mind that comes about. It is a well-known clinical entity called "compensation neurosis".

What bloody rubbish: compensation neurosis! This man is not an eye doctor: apparently he is a psychiatrist. He also stated:

There is no doubt that workmen's compensation should be tied to effective rehabilitation programmes. There should be a package deal whereby compensation is payable, provided the patient himself takes every step to recover and rehabilitate.

What does the Leader think a worker does? Does he think he puts his leg in a mincer to give it another jag or that he falls over a gutter to get a broken leg if he is on compensation? The Leader also stated:

That can be done, and I believe it should be done. The present situation, where we are paying average weekly earnings to disabled people, is doing nothing more than encourage them psychologically to remain disabled and we should not be surprised when that happens.

I say that the Leader has offered to his own fraternity, the medical fraternity, an insufferable insult, because no worker can go to a doctor and say, "I am ill", or "I am injured, and I do not want to go to work."

Mr. Gunn: What about a bad back?

Mr. WELLS: It is a doctor's responsibility to assess a bad back, and that can be done. If a worker is at home on compensation longer than he should be, only one person is responsible, namely, the medical officer who wrote the medical certificate. It is not the worker's fault. The Leader offers an insult to his medical colleagues when he says things of that kind, because it does not matter how much a worker would like to remain at home. However much he may say he is ill, if a doctor says, "You are fit to go to work," he goes to work or he is off pay. If a doctor writes a certificate to the effect that the

person is injured or unfit for work, who can query it? Only the boss or an insurance officer who wants to drive him to work can do that. What a terrible thing it is that workers should receive their average weekly pay when on compensation! They expend their sweat and blood for the employer, and sometimes suffer serious injury or death. Perhaps the worker has worked a year, without a break, during weekends and on overtime, increasing the employer's profit, and may take home \$150 a week with his overtime, etc., added. If he has a serious accident, say, breaks a leg, he may be home from work for six months. If an award wage is \$90 a week, that is all his employer pays him. If, because of an accident that occurred in the employer's time, and under the employer's instructions, an employee suffers serious injury or any injury at all, the Leader says that he should not receive his average weekly wage, but only 85 per cent of it. No doubt, Opposition members have deduced that I disagree with the Leader.

I will now raise another matter which, again, relates to the attitude of Opposition members one to the other or, as I call it, a rag-tag Opposition. I think that the Deputy Leader will do a good job. As I have said before, it is not my business but that of the Opposition, which is telling people about it. It is placed on record and, if the Leader had his way, I am sure that, after reading an article such as the one I will read, he would agree with licensing of the press. The article from which I will quote was written by Rex Jory, a prominent writer for the *News*, which published the article. Rex Jory has disclosed the fact that, already, the knives have been sharpened again, more mayhem is on the way, and someone will lose his head. Mr. Jory pointed out that great discontent was seething within the Liberal Party both here and in the other place. Mr. Jory's article states:

Murmurs of discontent are being heard in the ranks of the reshaped Parliamentary Liberal Party. More than one Liberal back-bencher has privately expressed dissatisfaction at decisions being made by the Party leadership. The new Opposition Leader, Dr. David Tonkin, cannot hope to win the support and loyalty of all members of his Party at all times.

If he were an Australian Labor Party leader he would win the support and loyalty of all members of his Party, but he admits that he cannot hope to win all the time. The article continues:

But dissension can quickly spread unless it is quelled either by straight talking or direct disciplinary action.

Out come the knives again! The article continues:

Dr. David Tonkin, who won clear Party room support when he defeated Dr. Bruce Eastick in the leadership ballot, had made a good first impression as the Opposition Leader.

I do not agree with that. The article continues:

The selection of a city-based member with a progressive image was a recognition that the Liberals must attract the swinging metropolitan voter if they hope to win Government.

How? With 27 per cent of the vote? The article continues:

Dr. Tonkin's Party room supporters must have been happy with the relaxed and authoritative way he handled the early days in his new position.

That must have been in the Party room. The article continues:

But away from the public arena some members, including Legislative Councillors, are bitter they missed being included in the reshuffled Tonkin shadow Cabinet.

They all want to be in it. The article continues:

Others believe the eight rural members of the 12-man Cabinet have given it a heavy country bias which again suggests—at least to the casual observer—that the Party is in the control of country members.

They are all cockies; they are all in it, and these are the people who say they will win metropolitan seats. The article continues:

Dr. Tonkin's early attack on the Government's proposed electoral boundary redistribution proposals won general Party support, but some Assembly members privately claim the Government's mandate should be recognised. The selection of all four city shadow Cabinet members—Dr. Tonkin, Mr. Dean Brown, Mr. Stan Evans and Mr. Murray Hill from the eastern or south-eastern suburbs is another grouch being held by certain members. The handling of the Liberal Movement, and whether it should be wooed—as Dr. Tonkin is doing—attacked or ignored, is another area of disquiet in both Party rooms. Dr. Tonkin knew only too well when he won the leadership that certain country and "conservative" elements in the Party had grave reservations about the appointment.

I am right with them, and I suppose we can expect to see even more shuffles about the place. I think that the member for Kavel will remain but that the member for Light will be down on the front bench again. I believe that we will again see the tail wagging the dog. The member for Mitcham and the member for Goyder play a big role. As I have said before, we saw this so often when, on the voices, the Opposition supported the Government but, when the Leader of the Liberal Movement called for a division, like little puppies they whipped across the floor to vote with him because he said, "Will you tell your electors that you voted with the Government on this issue?" Mr. Speaker, no doubt you will have understood from my remarks that I support the motion.

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate you on your election to the House and to the high office you now hold. I also refer to the passing of Sir Norman Jude, formerly a member of another place, who was a resident of a near neighbouring town of mine, Naracoorte, and who served the State very well. I refer also to the passing of Mr. Leslie Densley, who had been a member of Parliament for 23 years. I offer my congratulations to my colleagues, the member for Mount Gambier and the member for Heysen, and other new members on the other side of this House, on their election to this House. I pay a tribute to former representatives of the Millicent electorate, the first being the late Mr. Jim Corcoran, who served the district with great distinction, and secondly, the past member, the present Deputy Premier, who will be well remembered for his efforts in his home area.

In speaking for the first time in this House I cannot help but feel a great depth of responsibility. I now represent a section of the South Australian people in this House, which operates under a Parliamentary system the history of which goes back many years. I understand that part of the procedure used during the opening of this session comes from the days of Charles I. I have not made a lengthy study of the history of the procedures we use, but the mention of Charles I indicates to us all that we still have a very great respect for many old customs. Many of us think that we retain too many of these customs, but, as with much of the change that is demanded today, the new system proposed is very often not as solid or time proven as the old.

Much of what I have seen and heard in this House has reinforced the deep sense of responsibility I felt when I first climbed the steps to enter this building. There is possibly some procedure that could be modernised, but when I feel the atmosphere here under these old customs, an atmosphere of responsibility, honesty and integrity, I ask why we should change. The effect is the correct one. If anything, the public would say it is still not

strong or lasting enough. I hope honourable members have not gained the wrong impression, for I do like to see change, but not change just for the sake of change or because some minor group is not satisfied, though such groups must be given consideration. We cannot object to change or we would not progress in this scientific world, and progress is fundamental to our system. Of course, when proposing progress or change, we should do our best to ensure that changes will benefit our society in the long term, not just the short term. If we are to improve our society we must accept change, for change benefits all to some degree. Perhaps it was because past civilisations would not accept change and became apathetic that they were destroyed. Even so, they reached very high standards in their art and culture, but somewhere there must have been some fault or weakness: there may have been several, but we cannot be certain. These civilisations have gone, having been conquered or destroyed in a great many cases by nations intent on expansion. Apathy and corruption with a breakdown in moral standards played a large part in the destruction of these ancient civilisations. They had developed as a unit within a much larger volume of people. These people on the fringes eventually took control. Are we in a similar situation today, with many people on the fringe of our society looking at us with envious eyes?

Given these circumstances, our situation at the moment is very vulnerable, and we must consider how much of the easy life we can afford. If we do not take positive action to correct the breakdown, we will soon find ourselves heading for the same self-destruction that befell the earlier civilisations. To keep our community progressing we must all be given an incentive to pull our weight. In the very primitive society it was easy to enforce this principle. It was simply a case of, if a person did not work, that is, if he did not go out and hunt for food, he did not eat. Only in cases of sickness did a member of the tribe receive support.

I could go on for a long time talking about basic rules of survival that governed the way of life of many primitive people. It is also true that many of the basic rules still apply today. Those fit and able should pull their weight in the community and contribute to those in need.

Many of these basic rules still apply but there has developed a feeling of apathy, a lack of the desire to work, and many people, knowing that the welfare State will look after them, take the easy way out. Many young people seem to be satisfied to sit in the sun and do nothing, have a few dollars of dole money in the pocket, and adopt the "I'm all right Jack" attitude. On the other hand, we have a section of people who are willing to work but who cannot obtain it, and they are very frustrated. Thus we have apathy and frustration becoming prevalent in our community, a situation that can be easily exploited by radical groups perhaps wishing to change our society for their own ends or to change it for something virtually unknown.

This situation also generates an anti-social group willing to live by means beyond our laws. Burglaries and robberies become a way of life and violence a form of amusement. To beat frustration, drug use becomes prevalent. This only increases the problem we have, creating tension in the community. The drug pedlar then makes his money from the frustrations of those unfortunate enough not to be able to cope with problems we have created. I feel we can compare this situation with the situation that existed in the old civilisations hundreds of years ago. It could happen here. Do



not let us believe it could not. Nothing is impossible. The lesson to be learnt here is that over the period of the development of the people of the planet earth, civilisations were born but they also died. Generally succeeding civilisations reached greater heights of achievement than those before. They learnt by the mistakes of their predecessors, but in the end broke down for very similar reasons. They were civilisations developed within the whole of the people: they had too much and their neighbours became jealous and destroyed them. I feel we have too much apathy at this time, and we must develop a desire of achievement and creation before apathy takes control. Mr. Speaker, with these thoughts in mind I say again that I feel a great load of responsibility has been placed on us all at this time.

Now may I say something of the moral issues in our community. This may seem to be a subject virtually outside the field of thought of a bachelor. I do not intend to speak of the problem of marriage, but I would like to say something of the effect on our community of the approval taken to the bearing of children out of wedlock. There is in our community a feeling of approval for this, and the welfare state is now providing assistance for people so involved. There will always be some children born out of wedlock, and I will not condemn the people involved, because it has always occurred and always will. I have great feeling for those involved, and I think we should assist them in their difficulties. The situation I would like to speak of is that where people consider that whole families can be had without the institution of marriage, and that this situation is quite acceptable for the whole of the community. This concept I must reject completely, not on conservative old-fashioned ideas but on sound factual evidence of what will happen to the community if this were to become an acceptable ideology.

If we are to condone the bearing of children outside the institution of marriage by people who can afford to care for them (such as women on high salaries), we must accept that everyone can do the same. I do not believe that people generally will accept that only those receiving a large salary can do so. Human nature being what it is would not make it possible to have an elite group bearing children without a husband and wife relationship and without many young people saying, "We can be in this, too." If such were the case there would be a complete breakdown in our present family-unit system on which society is based. One could well ask what could happen if that situation developed. Perhaps nothing would develop in the short term. However, I cannot imagine that all children born to one mother would be born as a result of a relationship with one partner. Thus, the children of one parent would have a different parental history, and many of them would be only a half-brother or a half-sister to the other children. Such children would have half-brothers or half-sisters in other family units in other parts of town.

Each individual would have a complete breakdown of his genetical history; the tracing of the family tree would be impossible. Many people would ask, "Who wants to trace the family tree, anyway?" That question is fair enough, because not many people do want to trace their family tree. However, the ability to trace it is a by-product of a system of genetical control that has been part of our society for centuries. When using the phrase "genetical control", I do not mean to say that in future society will have a genetical control system—heaven forbid! The

present Christian family-unit system does provide a record of the family tree, so that we know who are our blood relations.

It has been generally known for some time that, to produce children from partners with a close blood relationship, is dangerous and can cause severe emotional problems when abnormal children are born as a result of the close blood relationship of the partners. Geneticists must be concerned about the modern trend in society. I am surprised that we have not heard them speaking out about the subject. People from the farming community know something about animal breeding and the science of genetics, a difficult and complicated subject about which I would not claim to have a great knowledge. However, being a farmer I believe I understand a few basic essentials. To run the risk of the acceptability (as we could do in future) of a system of raising children of different parental history who would not know their half-brother or half-sister, is extremely dangerous and could lead to the complete breakdown of our society. We should take positive steps to educate our children in the field of genetics. It is a difficult subject, but some schools have been teaching it for years, and other schools should take the lead that has been given.

So much for the problems of this State as a whole. I will now be somewhat parochial and speak of my own District of Millicent, an area consisting of rural and industrial people which will increase its productivity greatly in the coming years. The pine forests of the South-East are perhaps the area's greatest asset. I place them ahead of the farming community in that respect because a tree takes many years to mature: it is a long-term programme to create an industry from tree growing. By way of explanation, I ask members to consider what happens in the case of a fire disaster, which can easily send an individual farmer into the bankruptcy court in a matter of minutes. That is a heart-breaking situation, but in a few months the grass on a farmer's property will grow again and production will once more be under way. However, if a pine forest is destroyed it is many years before production resumes and the loss involved is astronomical.

It was with great foresight that a previous Government saw fit to commence the planting of man-made forests in the South-East. I confess that I do not know the political persuasions of the Government concerned, but it was most certainly one of the most far-sighted actions taken by any Government in South Australia. Succeeding Governments have seen fit to carry on the good work. It is unnecessary to give a full description of the timber industry in the Millicent District. Suffice it to say that it provides products ranging from jetty piles to fence posts and from construction timber to paper tissues. While dealing with paper tissues, I must refer to the pollution problems occurring as a result of the production of paper. Action has been taken to remove the solid waste matter from the effluent emitted from this process, but chemical effluent is still a problem. It appears that it is as much a problem of economics as it is of science.

Effluent is useful in other industrial processes, but the cost of transport prohibits such use. A process of fermentation that uses the sugars contained in the effluent produces food for animals and humans, but the process is at present uneconomical. However, as this is a process to produce food in a world still unable to feed sufficiently all its people, society will be able to use this effluent in future, at the same time overcoming the pollution problem, because the fermentation process makes the effluent innocuous. The timber industry in the South-East will certainly grow in the years

to come, continuing to provide the basis of the industrial complex in the South-East. This industry is an example of how true decentralisation can take place, with the local commodity providing the raw material for processing and the manufacture of goods.

The local product is the essential item in building an industrial complex to provide work opportunities for our growing population. Industry will grow in future in the South-East, but reliance must be placed on local products. The greatest potential lies in the processing of vegetables. The Millicent area has not realised its potential for producing vegetables, and I predict it will become the great food bowl of South Australia. The black soil plains at Millicent and Tantanoola, with the Kalangadoo, Penola and Naracoorte area adjacent, could become one of the greatest vegetable-growing areas in Australia. With underground water at a shallow depth, the potential for vegetable growing is tremendous and, provided the incentive is given by way of a fair price for produce, the industry will develop in years to come.

The rest of my district provides excellent grazing and mixed-farming land, much of which has been brought into production over the past 30 years. The trace element story is well known to all, but the present factor limiting higher production is the high cost of phosphorous, which is an essential element in our soil. If farmers must continue to bear this tremendous cost, without a marked increase taking place in the price of meat and wool, I am sure production from these areas will fall. The meat and wool industries of the area are at a crisis point, with most farmers looking to other forms of production in an attempt to maintain income. At present other forms do not offer long-term relief, as most of the alternative products have a limited demand which, if production increases too much, will mean that the market is over-supplied.

I call on the Government for more positive leadership and financial assistance to tide over the farming community in one of its most critical periods since the Depression of the 1930's. Farmers have provided the greater part of Australia's export income in the past and believe that some of what they have contributed to Government revenue could now be used to see them through a difficult period. In the new lands of my district live many fine people who have a great pioneering spirit. Let us not destroy their incentive or break their hearts when they call for assistance, because they are first-class citizens. We also have in the district a group of hard-working devil-may-care people in our fishing industry, people who built up an American dollar-earning export industry at a time when we needed American dollars. These people face risks each working day, and at the present moment face an uncertain future. The lobster has proved difficult to catch in the past season, but hopes are high for the coming season, for the catch at the moment appears to be improving.

This industry has reached major proportions in the past 30 years, with about \$15 000 000 export income. It has a great capacity for expansion and will expand, if given the incentive. New fish species are to be explored commercially and they will, I am certain, provide room for expansion of the industry. Again, they need some assistance and direction for, if individuals spend time and money on research and discovery, their findings are not their own; they cannot lay claim to any area for themselves alone. To explain this situation more fully, I will compare the fishing industry with the mining industry. If we give a licence to a mining company to explore a certain area, we also give it certain mining rights in the area so that it has a chance to recoup its original investment.

If a bonanza is discovered, other companies are not allowed to jump in and claim a share. This is not so in the fishing industry, which is a free-for-all; it could not be otherwise. In these circumstances, Government-sponsored development is the only fair method that can be applied. If it can be proved that the fish are there and that the end product has a market, the fishermen will do the rest. The opportunity to diversify is also one of the Millicent District's greatest assets. It is pastoral, agricultural, industrial and horticultural, and also offers attractions to tourists. Our coastline provides recreation areas for large numbers of people from all over Australia. Tourism is big business in the South-East, providing coastal towns with a large part of their livelihood. The extra business also enables local businessmen to provide improved services to local residents.

Before concluding, I should like to refer to a magnificent project that is nearing completion in my home town of Kingston. This project, the erection of the old Cape Jaffa lighthouse on the foreshore at Kingston, is almost complete. The local National Trust branch has done a colossal job in having this lighthouse brought to the town. I believe this is the only lighthouse of its type left in one piece in the world. The National Trust branch has received tremendous assistance from the State and Commonwealth Governments, and I wish to thank them for that assistance. In addition, as our local team has done a marvellous job, I should like to pay a tribute to their efforts. The lighthouse is about 35 m high. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it is an outstanding landmark in the town of Kingston, which is at the entrance to the Millicent District.

Mr. ALLISON: (Mount Gambier): I am pleased to support this motion. It was a great pleasure and an honor to attend the official opening and to observe the quiet dignity and decorum that His Excellency brought to such a ceremonial occasion. I found it most reassuring to be a part of that dignified ceremony, which reaffirms the stability and, I hope, the continuity of our democratic Parliamentary system. I pay a public tribute to the unending support given to me over the past few weeks by my wife and family and a host of supporters whose work paid me a tremendous compliment: I am very grateful.

I must also pay tribute to the previous member for Mount Gambier, Mr. Allan Burdon, who represented the district for over 12 years in a sincere and honest manner. He has given solid down-to-earth representation to hundreds of Mount Gambier people at a close personal level, and I only hope I can do as well. While congratulating the members for Spence and Price, in the Government ranks, and the members for Heysen and Millicent on this side of the House for the quality and the sincerity of their maiden speeches, I thank all members for their courtesy in listening to my maiden speech in this House, despite the fact that such a contentious issue as that on which I spoke must have raised many dissenting thoughts amongst Government members. I assume that, having been sworn in last week, I am now open to be sworn at. However, I hope that, by vigorous debate, I can present a fresh view of the city of Mount Gambier and its problems.

We do appreciate the fact that a lot of good Government money has been spent in Mount Gambier by a succession of Governments. The State's sawmills, the electricity power station, the large modern hospital, and the new high school, were all built under Liberal Governments. More recently, the extensions to the facilities of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, nurses' accommodation,

a new courthouse, and buildings for secondary and further education were built under a Labor Government. Of course, we appreciate this.

Mr. Keneally: What about Fletcher Jones?

Mr. ALLISON: That brings up an interesting point. The manager of Fletcher Jones recalls that, originally, when he suggested building in Mount Gambier a member of the South Australian Government suggested that Adelaide would indeed be a better place to construct this factory. So much for decentralisation. I am pleased to see that common sense prevailed and Fletcher Jones' new factory was in fact built in Mount Gambier.

I believe that a regional city such as Mount Gambier should not have to go cap in hand for its share of public funds, public funds that have been amassed as a result of an incredible flow of funds into the Treasuries because of galloping inflation, and public spending has not revitalised the private sector, which pays these taxes. One has only to examine the record number of bankruptcies in South Australia last year to realise this. I do not think that we in Mount Gambier are looking for hand-outs. Admittedly, we are a little incensed at not being made a declared area for unlimited Regional Employment Development scheme grants earlier this year, despite having at that time the second highest unemployment rate in the State. We were not too happy, either, to have Mount Gambier qualify for \$100 000 in assistance while, for example, metropolitan Walkerville, of similar area and population, received \$300 000 as its initial grant. There seemed to be no stated criteria by the Commonwealth Government for allocation of the funds; it was a random affair.

We realise this was not essentially the fault of the State Government; it was not its neglect. After all, in spite of having a South Australian Commonwealth Minister for Labor and Immigration we were negotiating at that time not through Adelaide but to Canberra via Melbourne. Perhaps the Commonwealth did not really think our State Government was competent to handle the grants effectively. Was Mount Gambier also neglected in the normal Grants Commission allocation because the seat was then regarded as safe? The year 1974-75 saw the State grant reduced to almost zero, until the council took the then unprecedented step of refusing to pay its hospital bill in an attempt to gain State assistance. Perhaps even this neglect was a direct compliment to the Mount Gambier council, which has administered its own finances in an exemplary fashion.

Mount Gambier has a certain pride of achievement, too. For example, the Mount Gambier folk built their own swimming pool 20 years ago with local voluntary labour, and even more recently the Young Men's Christian Association building was constructed with a \$100 000 public subscription and no outside help in its own foundation. It is at present the largest in Australia, and this is a far cry from the Y.M.C.A. leisure centre to be erected at Elizabeth with \$586 000 of Commonwealth and State grants. I am not saying that we are ungrateful. The Y.M.C.A. in Mt. Gambier has in fact recently received a \$4 000 once-only Commonwealth grant on salary allowance that was about half the subsidy requested. Mount Gambier council has also been farsighted enough to acquire land both inside and outside the city council boundary to provide sporting and swimming pool sites for the entire district population for use over the next few decades, and we look forward to continued subsidies being made available for their development as the city grows.

The growth of the city leads us to contentious matters. The city is at present too tightly restrained by its existing boundaries. In spite of the Minister of Local Government's then unbounded enthusiasm for boundary revision, nothing definite or constructive resulted from the Royal Commission into Local Government areas. Mount Gambier still has two local government authorities responsible for administering a growing city, and the district council itself has a loss of revenue problem because of the non-ratable nature of the Government pine plantations, about 121 000 hectares of them.

In 1969, the South-East planning development plan was published, and was extremely sketchy compared to the Monarto plans. In fact, there is no real comparison between that South-East plan and the Monarto documents, which are much more detailed and much more positive in direction. In 1974, the *South Australian Year Book* stated, "Where it is necessary to redevelop country or metropolitan areas, a supplementary development plan will be brought forward", and a supplementary development plan is certainly needed for Mount Gambier and district. For Monarto, the report places a high priority on quality of life and diversity of housing design by the South Australian Housing Trust, with trust subdivided areas being shared between low and high-density developments, and with private developers also sharing in constructions. It is interesting to note that Monarto will be developed and planned flexibly, and tied to Adelaide's growth. In this case, I am certain that Monarto will grow very slowly.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics figures on South Australia's population growth are interesting. The projected growth rate for South Australia in 1970 showed a growth rate of 2.04 per cent a year. The actual growth rate from 1971 to 1974 was 1.25 per cent a year. Mount Gambier's projected growth rate from 1970 was 1.81 per cent, but the actual growth rate was much less, declining to 0.41 per cent between 1970 and 1974. With these declining population growth rates in mind, may we earnestly suggest that there is less urgency for the Monarto scheme to be rushed forward, and that several of those highly skilled town planning personnel working on Monarto should be at once redirected towards those urgent planning matters at present piling up in the State Planning Office. It is tragic that an 18-month delay (which is not uncommon with subdivision) can increase the cost of a house by \$8 000 to \$10 000. I am assured that in Mount Gambier the present rate is an increase of \$145 a week for a 14 square house. This places young people in an impossible position. In 18 months one might expect to pay an additional \$1 200 in interest alone. We would very much like to see more of the State's planning skills devoted to the development of existing cities and towns.

Despite the Government's spending in Mount Gambier, the population is not increasing, but there is a housing problem. The baby boom of the post-war years that led to South Australia's educational crisis in the period between the 1950's and the 1970's is now creating a desperate housing crisis, which must leave young people in despair now that we have fewer jobs, astronomical land and house prices, and a shortage of finance in general. The drastic reduction of growth rate points to another crisis in the next 20 or 30 years. There will not be a sufficiently large work force (that is a productive work force, let me emphasise) to meet the mushrooming sums of money needed to meet the vastly higher pensions at present being provided for, especially under South Australian legislation. I appeal to the Government to take a more conservative

approach to its superannuation, long service, and workmen's compensation legislation. It need not necessarily be highly restricted, but at least it should be more conservative, not only for the sake of today's workers and employers but even more so for the sake of our children (that diminishing body) who will have to meet the increasing bill somehow in the next few decades.

This is not an idle claim on an emotional level; it is already recognised as an immediate threat by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Harold Wilson. The desperate shortage of cheaper houses in our State (and in Mount Gambier in particular) brings to my attention the construction of the extension of the nurses' home in Mount Gambier. We are pleased that the use of our hospital as a training hospital is to be extended. However, I am aware that nurses' homes generally are not being fully occupied and such a state of affairs is undesirable in any city today. In reading the July 25, 1975, issue of the *Medical Journal of Australia*, I noted that Dr. Trevor C. Beard of the Australian Department of Health in Canberra expressed the thought that discipline might be needlessly aggressive in our hospitals, perhaps even archaic and destructive. I take the liberty of extending Dr. Beard's thoughts into the administration of nurses' homes constructed within hospital precincts, although this does not imply that Mount Gambier Hospital nurses are in any way oppressed; on the contrary, to my knowledge they are a bright, ebullient group of young ladies, with the administrative and working staff there being well adjusted and co-operative. I have had recent personal knowledge of and respect for their dedication to nursing.

However, we can ill afford the luxury of empty rooms. The reason why the nurses prefer to live in city flats rather than in the nurses' homes should bear close investigation. After all, those rooms cannot be used by any section of the community other than the nursing fraternity. The question of housing must inevitably lead to reference to sewerage. Mount Gambier sewage is at present discharged raw into the sea off the South-East coast, and there is increasing complaint that our city is despoiling the beaches for residents and holiday makers. Excreta and other insanitary solids are increasingly drifting back to the beaches with the prevailing currents, and families find it unhealthy and embarrassing in the extreme. I hope that the Government, so keenly dedicated as it is to environmental preservation and pollution control, will take immediate action to install at least some form of filtration and settlement on the Mount Gambier discharge line, possibly adjacent to the coast, in order to minimise possible pollution of the underground water supply.

Primary producers in my district are of great concern to both the Labor and the Liberal Parties, as the honourable member for Florey assured us. However, there seems to be no solution in sight to the massive problem of how to maintain farm produce at reasonable prices; at present they are falling to rock bottom. Farmers are falling behind faster week by week because of inflation and rising costs of fuel, higher taxes and transport charges, the increasing cost of labour, and subsidies being removed.

Mr. Langley: Tell us how to stop it.

Mr. ALLISON: I am astounded to find that there is an adverse comment from the Government benches because, while I can understand other countries throughout the world having this problem, Australia with its fine work force and probably the greatest resources, physical and personal, of any country in the world, should have no excuse for falling into the state in which it is now. Quality

of produce will have to fall, and we need high quality products for home and export markets: ask any housewife. Make no mistake: unless there is a strong move to maintain markets and productivity, the cost of meat and dairy products will skyrocket during the next 12 months. The country areas cannot afford to subsidise our food forever.

In conclusion, I say that I am proud to represent the District of Mount Gambier. I make no apologies to the member for Florey for not being a cocky but for being merely a city dweller for 45 years, an old schoolteacher, and a union man of relatively long standing. I make no apologies for being a union man. My union was, after all, more interested in running itself than in running the country, and I should like to think that the responsibility for running this country and this State will long remain in the hands of democratically-thinking free men and women.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I must begin with a slight confession, and that is that the recent general election came upon me relatively unexpectedly. There had been talk of it, but I for one was rather surprised with it when it came.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You had your candidates—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, they were all ready. I am pleased to say that the Liberal Movement was, as always, prepared, for the election and it had no trouble getting its organisation into top gear. However, I do not think that I was the only member of this House who, on that evening, was surprised when the Attorney-General had the debate on some piffing Bill (a Bill on bank cards) adjourned to get further information and the Leader of the House then secured the adjournment of the House and we were to have an election. At the very least, that saved us (and I say this with respect to you, Mr. Speaker, and all other members of the House) the tedious hypocrisy that we normally experience at the end of every Parliament of praising those members who are retiring and thanking them for their contributions in this place, regardless of whether we believe what we say. This time those members just went, some of them with less expectation than I had at the election and others because they had announced their retirement.

One member who was present that evening but is no longer here was the former Attorney-General (Hon. L. J. King), the member for (I cannot remember where he came from)—the member for Coles. His translation to the bench at the time of the election was not, in all the circumstances, unexpected. Indeed, it was quite foreseeable, because the Government had taken the necessary action to see that this could come about. First, the fixing of the upper limit on the number of Supreme Court judges had been taken out of the Supreme Court Act some time previously so that, at will, the Government could make further appointments to the Bench. Then, as all of us in the profession knew, a new set of judges' chambers was prepared at the Supreme Court but left vacant. The only thing not ready at the time of the election was furniture, I understand that His Honour had nowhere to sit in the chambers that he had caused to have made ready for him. All this happened after I had asked a question in the House about the Government's intentions on the appointment of a tenth judge and had had what I could describe only as a negative answer.

Mr. Max Brown: Are you disappointed, or jealous?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am neither disappointed nor jealous but, as I said at the time of His Honour's appointment, I did not think it was a proper appointment or an appropriate time to make it.

Mr. Duncan: You'd be the only one in the profession to think that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. The aspiring Attorney-General, the member for Elizabeth, is under a misapprehension if he thinks that. Many members of the profession did not agree with the timing of the appointment.

Mr. Duncan: You couldn't name any.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: All I say is that, whilst certainly I do not begrudge His Honour the preferment he received, it was ill-timed and against constitutional practice.

Mr. Duncan: Oh?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It most certainly was. Had I had any voice in the choice of the next judge, he would not have been the former Attorney-General.

Mr. Duncan: We're not surprised to hear that you wouldn't support him.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I remind the member for Elizabeth that the last occasion when these circumstances arose was in 1962, when it was necessary (and I stress that word, because it was in contrast with this occasion) to appoint a Supreme Court judge. His Honour Mr. Justice Travers was appointed after consultation with both sides of the House, because it was acknowledged that, with a general election approaching, there could be a change of Government and an appointment of this kind should be made, if made at all, not only with the consent of the Government but also with the consent of the possible alternative Government. I say no more about that matter.

I congratulate the new members of this House on their election. I have not had the opportunity to meet them all yet, either all those in the Labor Party or all those in the Liberal Party, but that probably stems from my rather isolated position still in this Chamber. I should like to say something about the changed fortunes of the four Parties represented in this place, and I hope I will be pardoned for dealing first with my own Party, the Liberal Movement. As all other members will be only too well aware, even if they do not like to admit it, the Liberal Movement polled more than 18 per cent of the vote at this election, and we were able to have one additional member of Parliament elected. I do not conceal my disappointment that we were not successful in getting in many more members than we did get. I had hoped we would get them, and we did not. Nevertheless, the result for the Liberal Movement was excellent, and as the latest edition of the *Liberal Movement News* states:

This is a clear indication that people are really looking for a political Party occupying the middle ground. We—that is, the Liberal Movement—are such a Party, and the massive swing in our favour is proof of the increasing confidence in and support for the L.M.

It is with some amusement that I see the efforts, particularly of the Government, to avoid recognising the L.M.'s existence as a Party, but I venture to say that soon the Government will have to bow to the inevitable, because the L.M. will go on getting stronger and stronger. I was encouraged to read the comments in this regard of Mr. Max Harris in the *Australian* last Saturday.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Education (and I congratulate him, too, on his preferment and on the assumption of his doctorate) laughs a little too loudly not to betray his discomfort when I refer to Mr. Harris.

Mr. Langley: You must be joking!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I am not. I will quote some of the things that Mr. Harris said about us in his newspaper report last Saturday. Mr. Harris stated:

For the Liberal Movement's astonishing total vote, despite the paucity of seats it acquired, came from that growing army of people from all previous political persuasions who are disillusioned with Party-machine politicians and with Party-machine politics as such . . . In short, the L.M. phenomenon very possibly expresses a national psychological shift, and at this moment has little to do with personal issues within the local Liberal Party which gave it original regional life.

It now must be seen as the prototype of a short middle-ground educated movement which could well spread in national terms all over Australia; by no means to be confused with the premature and confused identity of the lamented Australia Party. The recipe of the Liberal Movement pudding has been well and truly proved in the eating, as a puzzled Don Dunstan must be the first to admit. The historical change that altered the voting behaviour of one in six South Australians has been to do with moral distaste. He ended the article as follows:

If the Liberal Movement experience in South Australia is a valid indicator, and I think it is, it may well be realistic rather than starry-eyed to envisage a new political force occupying the middle ground—massively!

Of course, that is what we believe will happen. May I, therefore, leave the Liberal Movement for a moment and speak to that Party to which my friend the member for Flinders belongs, namely, the Country Party. I congratulate him on his re-election to this place, but I was disappointed with the showing of his Party, because it was (and I hope that he will not take it amiss if I say it) quite a failure in the total support it got in the rural areas of South Australia, and it makes difficult the strategy which I have often mentioned and which I have always had in mind of a Country Party strong in the rural areas of this State. What the future will be we cannot tell, but certainly the Country Party did not poll as well as it should have done.

Let me now say something about the Liberal Party, the members of which I see in front of me. It obtained the lowest vote it has ever had in this State. One result has been a change of leadership in the Party, and it is ironic that the former Leader of the Opposition had only just returned from his holiday abroad, which cost the taxpayers of the State about \$16 000. What value we will get out of that I do not know. Anyway, he has gone, and he has been replaced by another. I will not say much about the new Leader except to express disappointment about one thing he said within a few days of his appointment to that position, namely, that the concept of one vote one value was meaningless. I just cannot understand how the honourable gentleman could say such a thing, and I find it hard to think that he really believes it.

Perhaps (although it is not entirely on the point) I could remind him of something he wrote in a letter to a newspaper in October, 1968, at a time when electoral matters were before this place. He dealt mainly with the question of the Legislative Council franchise, but he ended his letter, after referring to Mr. Hall (then the Premier, but now Senator Hall), as follows:

His actions on electoral reform stamp him as a Leader whose primary concern is with the welfare of the State. I believe his present stand will win widespread support.

That is rather different in tone from the things he is saying now about electoral reform. However, we shall have a better opportunity later in this session to see just what his real thoughts are about it.

I come now to the remaining Party in this place, namely, the Australian Labor Party, and I am sure that I shall be pardoned by its members if I say that at least its leaders went into this election thinking that it would be a breeze, that they would be easily returned to office, that the railways issue was a good one to precipitate an election, that it was an election winner, and that the Party would come back at least as strong as it was when the election was called. But that did not happen. There was a rather stark change in the situation during the election campaign. The Labor Government is now on a knife edge, relying on you, Mr. Speaker, who were, I understand, expelled from the A.L.P. because you dared (and good on you for doing it) to stand against an endorsed A.L.P. candidate for the seat of Pirie. The A.L.P. is now relying on your support as Speaker, and I have no doubt that, whether it likes it or not (and I suspect that it does not like it), it will have to have you back in the Party (if you will go back) in due course.

I congratulate you on the way in which so far you have carried out your duties here, but I wonder sometimes whether you realised what a task you were being invited to take on. As one who has not been here before, you probably could have had no idea of the size of the job. I can only say to you, as I did when I congratulated you on your appointment, that, so long as we in the L.M. get a fair go in this place (by that I mean in debate, when you have to rule on matters, and in the order of speaking and asking questions), we shall do nothing to embarrass you in the discharge of your duties. But, as I also said during Question Time today, I know the feeling the Government must be experiencing, because I was a member of a Government that was in a similar situation for a little over two years, depending on an Independent as Speaker and not having a majority in the House.

While it was noticeable that the Premier avoided answering my question about the sittings of the House, I should be indeed surprised if we sat for a day longer than it was necessary for the Government to get its legislation through. I make clear to you (as I do to every member) that our aim is to get the Government out of office as quickly as possible and to bury it politically, and I do not believe that the Government will last for its full term. Once the Government is out, our aim will be to keep it out for a long time, and we will take every legitimate step we can to bring about that result. I say "legitimate step": we will not, I hope, do anything unfair. However, when we have an opportunity to bring the Government down, we shall certainly take it. I say this deliberately at the beginning of this Parliament, because I believe that it should be said.

Many times during the election campaign I said on behalf of my Party (and others said the same thing) that the present Government was a Government of the A.L.P., and it must take its share of responsibility not only for what that Party did here but also in Canberra and elsewhere throughout Australia, because they are all members of the same Party, with the same objective and the same policies. I do not think that anyone who has seen the performance of the Commonwealth Government could possibly blame me for saying that or for saying that I wish to see the A.L.P., both here and in Canberra, out of office at the earliest possible opportunity.

I believe that the Party here has moved significantly to the Left as a result of the election and its aftermath. We have, of course, a new Minister now in this place; the member for Mitchell is now Minister of Community Welfare. I say no more about him. The member for Elizabeth is now Whip, and undoubtedly he has eyes on a job in Cabinet at the earliest opportunity. I believe that both of those members (and I say this quite apart from my personal regard for them) are to the Left of the Labor Party. If we look at some of the new members in another place, there can be even less doubt about the shift to the Left than I believe there is here.

We have several Labor members in the Legislative Council. How that august Chamber can contain them, I sometimes wonder. I go up from time to time to have a look to see whether the walls are still standing or whether they have cracked. There is no doubt whatever that, in their views, they are well to the Left of their Party. I give a specific example of the change in outlook of the Labor Party that I believe confirms what I have said; that is, the policy of the Party on the question of worker participation. I must make clear that I believe that the idea of worker participation is a very good one. I will quote a paragraph from an article written by Mr. Lindsay Bowes, head of the Department of Labour and Industry. This appears in the *Journal of Industrial Relations* and I think it sums up my idea of worker participation. He says:

It is a sad fact that many Australian managers pay more regard to the efficiency of their machinery, plant and equipment than they do to the human aspect of their role as managers. Any organisation that is not willing to change its current methods and procedures will not survive in today's conditions. It is vital that any progressive manager accepts that people are our most precious resource and their full potential will only be realised if they obtain satisfaction from the work they do. This can only be achieved if they are involved in their work.

A little earlier in that article Mr. Bowes sets out what is undoubtedly true, that while we may have an idea, a concept, people do not really know what worker participation means. Indeed, it means different things to different people. This is what he says:

One of the difficulties that emerged early was the lack of any clear definition of "worker participation"—a fact that was referred to in the opening paragraphs of the Report of the Private Sector Committee. The practice has become firmly entrenched of accepting that the meaning of the term is anything to support one's own views that "worker participation" is something to be avoided. Some managers consider the term to be synonymous with "worker directors" which to them is anathema; at the other end of the spectrum some trade union officials will not have anything to do with schemes that do not achieve their ultimate objective of "worker control", i.e. they consider that improved consultation or the worker having a voice in the way he undertakes his task is a waste of time.

That, I think, is sadly all too true. What has the Labor Party said about this matter of worker participation? It was mentioned by the Premier in his policy speech, as follows:

The Government will pursue its policy of worker and community participation in industry. Over the next three years we will establish the principle that decision making should involve representatives of investors, workers, and the community in all Government-owned undertakings. We will encourage private industry to involve itself in these developments. Such a process is necessarily evolutionary. It must take time, but from the lessons of the next three years we should be able then to lay down rules by which South Australians can grapple with this problem which is bedevilling the whole of industrial society and solve it.

They are typically grand words. Just what they mean is not quite clear and, of course, that is one of the tricks

of the Premier. He is adept at saying something that can have a lot of meaning or none at all, just as he sees fit later. I do give one warning about this and I quote this time from an article in *Rydges Journal* for July, 1975. It points out that in the report to the British Government in 1968 the Royal Commission on Trade Unions and Employers' Associations made some quite adverse comments about worker directors in industry, as follows:

A majority of us feel unable to recommend the appointment of "worker directors" to the boards of companies and have reached the conclusion for a number of reasons. They are then set out. What we have is a Labor Party that is quite specific in its proposals for worker participation. I will now quote from proposals that were adopted (I believe this to be so, and I am sure the member for Florey and others will correct me if I am wrong) at the South Australian convention in June of this year. They dealt first with access to information that should be made available. I will not go into that. The next heading is "Board Representation", and the upshot of this is that in future the Labor Party believes that there should be equal numbers on the board of directors representing the company and the workers and a third category of people who must be public servants employed by the Government, who are described as follows:

We should train and appoint, publicly, experts in company management who will be public officers and who will have equal members with the first two groups mentioned on boards (that is, one-third) with the duty of maintaining community interest—

whatever that may mean: it may mean something or it may mean nothing—

and of reporting to the Treasury, the companies office, and the public. They should also have the duty of assisting the shareholders' representatives to have constant communication with shareholders or investors and the workers' representatives to maintain constant communication with the shop floor—

whatever that may mean. Therefore, the policy of the Labor Party on this matter is that boards of directors should be equally representative of investors, workers in the undertaking, and public officials who will have the interests of the community, so it is said, at heart. If there is an attempt to bring such a policy into effect in South Australia, it will mean the wholesale leaving of industry from this State, because people will simply not put up with such an extreme plan of worker participation. At a time like this, when the economy is in such a disastrous condition, we cannot afford to undertake experiments of this kind, and I hope we will not do so. I use this example simply as an illustration of the way in which the Labor Party in South Australia is moving to the Left. To underline what I have said, I will quote from a document that received some publicity a few days ago—the W. D. Stott report that was made in 1975 about how our top executives see Australia's prospects. Members opposite probably congratulated themselves, because the Premier gets an honourable mention in the report. What is more significant is that the report states:

The replies of the respondents cannot fail to add weight to the view that the private sector of the Australian economy is in deep shock. Such strong withdrawal symptoms seem evident that the private sector cannot be relied on to lead any recovery in the economy.

We in South Australia cannot do much to assist the economy of this State but we can, by our actions, prevent any further harm being done to it. Indeed, I hope that the Labor Party will not embark on a programme of putting into effect the policy it adopted in June this year.

I remind members opposite of their Party's situation electorally. I have already referred to the Party's position

in this place, but members opposite should remember that, before the recent election (statistically, anyway), only one seat held by the Party in South Australia could be classified as marginal, and that was only by our being optimistic. The seat, of course, was Gilles, and a 5.6 per cent swing was necessary for the Government to lose it. In the metropolitan area there are now nine seats which require a swing of less than 5 per cent for the defeat of sitting members. I probably do not need to remind members opposite which seats they are, but I shall. In order of vulnerability, they are Gilles (which requires only a .4 per cent swing for the sitting member to be defeated), Brighton, Henley Beach, Coles, Unley, Mawson, Tea Tree Gully, Peake and Mitchell.

Mr. Simmons: I'm as safe as a bank.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member says that, but we will take him up on it later, because it needs only a 4.1 per cent swing against him to put him out. The figures themselves should be warning enough to the Labor Party. Of course, it has had a few other warnings in the past few days. During Question Time I referred to the *National Times* (which was good bed-side reading on Sunday), and I again refer to that paper, especially to an article headed "How Labor is tearing itself apart: an insider's account of the A.L.P.'s agony," which has not been denied since. The article relates to a report given by Mr. Combe to the A.L.P. executive meeting last week. It titillates the imagination by leaving out little bits, which it is stated were highly personal references. I would dearly have loved to read about those. Maybe they will be revealed by a member of the executive, perhaps by the member for Price.

Mr. Rodda: Perhaps they will be revealed by the next leak.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That will undoubtedly fix it up. I do not need to go through the article because I am sure members opposite, like several members on this side, have already read it. However, I will simply refer to the last sentence, which is all too true:

We look like a Party of junketeers who don't expect to be in office often or long.

That is precisely what the Prime Minister said in 1957 when delivering the Curtin Memorial Lecture. He said that it does not matter how long the Labor Party is in office but that it is what it achieves in office that counts. Whatever the Prime Minister has done either voluntarily or involuntarily shows that he is working on that principle, because it will not be long before his Government is out of office. When thinking about the election I was amused to read in the July issue of the inestimable publication *Scope* (copies of which are provided near our letter boxes for the edification of honourable members) an article headed "Whitlam set Dunstan up" which states in part:

The dilemma of Mr. Don Dunstan during the concluding stages of the South Australian election campaign is one of the strongest indictments of Mr. Gough Whitlam's chequered career in the Labor Party.

I will not read the whole article, because it is probably well known to honourable members, anyway. It is little wonder that the author concludes as follows:

... he—

the Premier—

felt himself placed in a position where he had no alternative but to damn Mr. Whitlam and the Australian Government during the latter stages of his campaign.

The Party opposite is in disarray, and I have drawn attention to that situation not to be uncharitable or to embarrass individual members but simply to warn them that they are in disarray and are in Parliament on a

knife edge. Speaking for the Liberal Movement (and I can speak for no other Party on this side) we will do everything proper that we can to take advantage of the situation and to get the Government out of office at the first possible opportunity.

Mr. Langley: We're not in disarray.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know the honourable member well enough to know that he speaks only from a sense of loyalty and for no other reason when he says that. As long as the Government remains in office we shall continue to put forward Liberal Movement policy on a number of topics to test the feelings of the House. We have already given notice of certain motions to be debated and about our intention to introduce legislation relating to shopping hours and secret ballots in union affairs. Legislation to deal with many other matters will follow. I look forward to this session and this Parliament. Life is seldom dull in South Australian politics even if sometimes it is not as easy or as enjoyable as it could be. I support the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I, too, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I make the normal affirmation made at this time of my loyalty to the Crown. I, too, express my condolences to the families of the late Sir Norman Jude and of the Hon. Les Densley who, as members know, was President of the Legislative Council for some time. Sir Norman was a member of the Playford Administration for some years. Both of them were known personally to many honourable members still in this House.

We on this side are pleased to congratulate and welcome as colleagues the member for Mount Gambier, the member for Millicent and the member for Heysen. I also extend our congratulations to the new members of the Government. At first glance, having heard their utterances in this House, I can say that they appear to be reasonably moderate in their approach to some matters. What the member for Mitcham said about the Labor Party in this State being in the grip of the Left wing is perfectly true.

We heard from the member for Florey a rather less able speech than we usually hear from him. It was a reasonably amusing speech, but not up to his usual standard. He indulged in considerable abuse in an attempt to denigrate the Leader of the Opposition and to drive in wedges. It seemed to me to be a rather lightweight speech, much lighter than those we are accustomed to hearing from the honourable member. The Labor Party has its problems, whether they be confined to this State or not, and I certainly do not believe they are without problems in this State. One has only to look at the national scene and at their colleagues in Canberra and in Tasmania, the latter of whom represent the moderate wing, to see just what the Left wing is doing to the moderates in the Labor Party. Labor enjoyed being in office a good many years in Tasmania because Premier Reece and people like Mr. Harradine represented the middle course of the Labor Party. We are seeing at present an internecine warfare between the Left and Right wings of the Labor Party in Tasmania. It ill behoves the member for Florey to try and make political capital out of an election that took place in the Liberal Party and seek to cause a division which in fact does not exist.

The Labor Party has its problems, and it certainly has them in this State. As the member for Mitcham has rightly pointed out, the Labor Party survived the recent election by the skin of its teeth. Government members come to this House claiming, on the strength of about a 50 per

cent vote, a mandate for a whole range of legislative proposals. If we look at the Upper House, we see that a positive gerrymander is acting in favour of the Labor Party. If we look at the total votes cast for group A (the Labor Party), which had the most favoured position on the Legislative Council ballot-paper, we see that the total vote cast for the Australian Labor Party was 332 616 and the total cast for the Liberal Movement and the Liberal Party was 352 078. One of the unfortunate circumstances of the electoral gerrymander that now exists in the Upper House is that over-quota votes tend to be lost with the major contenders who are having people elected to that House. For years the Labor Party used in this House the argument that the Party or Parties gaining more than half the votes in any one election should enjoy Government. It just did not work out that way in the Upper House.

Mr. Langley: It never used to happen in this House, either!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier said the other day that things are not the same when the boot is on the other foot. The Labor Party did not get 50 per cent of the votes but it managed to get six of the 11 members elected. Members of the Labor Party cannot have their cake and eat it too. Looking at the election results, the only conclusion one can reach is that the Labor Party is extremely lucky to survive, and it has survived only because it has been able to make "suitable" arrangements with you, Sir, the Independent member who was elected to this House. Do not let them come here with this nonsense that they have an overwhelming mandate for all their radical legislative electoral proposals.

I do not know how close some of the Government members are to local government bodies in their districts, but country members, and all members on this side, are in close contact with such bodies. I know that local government authorities are greatly distressed and worried about the source of their funds. I will cite some figures later that will bear out this point. Local government provides a source of stable employment within small country communities, and its existence is being directly threatened in the first instance by the determination of the Commonwealth Government in relation to road grants. If ever I saw a Minister lose his enthusiasm for the centralist type policy of the Commonwealth Government it was the Minister of Transport, the Hon. G. T. Virgo, when he learned from his colleague in Canberra, Mr. Jones, the conditions and the actual size of the grants being made available for the forthcoming year and the way in which that money was to be spent. From memory, I think about \$31 000 000 is being made available, exactly the same figure as was made available in the previous 12 months, with no escalation for inflation. What is more, the State Government was told it had to provide matching grants, and it was also told not only how to spend the Commonwealth money but how its own money was to be spent and on which categories of roads. If ever I saw a Minister's enthusiasm for his Commonwealth Canberra colleague evaporate, it was the enthusiasm of the Hon. G. T. Virgo when he learned this quite by chance from information given by the member for Gouger, who had a letter one of the councils in his area had received.

Mr. Venning: Tell us more about that occasion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The occasion will be well known to those of us who were privy to a telephone conversation in the refreshment room when the Minister of Transport rang his Commonwealth colleague and spoke to him in unparliamentary terms. He certainly did not



speak in drawing-room language: even I had difficulty in translating it. I have never heard a Commonwealth Minister dressed down in such trenchant terms as I heard that night from the Minister of Transport, and if Mr. Jones has any sensibility his ears would have been ringing for the next week. The beginning of local government's current problems were brought into focus at that time. The State Government was told not only how it was to spend not only the Commonwealth funds (and there was to be no escalation for inflation) but how it was to spend its own road taxes, and the amount of money that was to go to the rural roads, for which councils are responsible, had greatly diminished. That was the start of their problems. Then we saw the State Government grants to local government being cut drastically. We have heard from the Minister that local government could no longer depend on debit order work.

Since then we have seen the haphazard infusion of Regional Employment Development scheme money into the local communities. The employment of a stable work force at the local level is being threatened, and employment is being offered by the haphazard infusion of funds under the RED scheme to people who are unemployed not necessarily in the town but in the surrounding district. The authorities seem to take as their barometer the number of registered unemployed in an employment centre. In some of the smaller towns in the Murray Plains people were sent to other towns to work. People were sent to tile the Cambrai swimming pool simply to make the unemployment figure look better, but the very livelihood of people in the Cambrai district council area is being threatened because the council no longer has access to funds on which it has become dependent over the years.

Let us start at the top in this exercise, with the Prime Minister. What are his thoughts on the idea of decentralisation of decision-making and centralisation of power and, in fact, allowing people to make decisions? The Prime Minister has gone on record many times, and his radical thinking is well documented. He delivered the Chifley Memorial Lecture in 1957, he delivered the Curtin Memorial Lecture in 1961; and he gave an address entitled "Labor policies and Commonwealth powers" to the Australian Labor Party Commonwealth Conference in 1963. So let us go back a little in history, and find out what exercises the thinking of the man who now purports to lead this nation. The book I have here belongs to another member of this Party. It is a blue book, but it ought to have a red cover as members will agree when I read what I am about to read; it will be more properly aligned to the colour red. This is what the current Prime Minister said then, in one of the lectures:

There are few functions which the State Parliaments now perform which would not be better performed by the Australian Parliament or by regional councils. The States are too large to deal with local matters and too small and weak to deal with national ones. Three-quarters of the Acts which each State Parliament passes are repetitions of the Acts which every other State Parliament passes. The same applies to regulations gazetted by each State Parliament.

He also referred to the role of State members, as follows:

It continues to hammer away at the authority of States and their ability to pass their own legislation. Much can be achieved by Labor members of the State Parliaments in effectuating Labor's aims of more effective powers for the national parliament and for local government. Their role is to bring about their own dissolution. When the Labor Party holds office in the Commonwealth Parliament, the States which have Labor Governments could readily make agreements under section 51 (xxxiii) and (xxxiv) for the acquisition and construction and

extension of railways in the States by the Commonwealth and under section 51 (xxxvii) for the reference to the Commonwealth of many of their present functions.

In more recent times, more specifically, he said:

We do not envisage in future the continued existence of six State Governments and some 975 local councils. We reject the idea that local government should comprise so many individual bodies. What we envisage in the future is one Commonwealth Parliament in Canberra, consisting of only one House, with the abolition of the Senate, and no State Governments. In the place of six State Governments and the 975 councils there will be 12 city assemblies and two score or so regional assemblies.

Local government is under direct threat not only from the Commonwealth Labor Government but also from this State's Labor Government. We have heard the way in which the Minister has threatened local government, saying, "If you don't agree to the proposals of the Royal Commission, we'll starve you." That is precisely what is happening. Let me quote one or two pieces of correspondence that have come to me from my constituents. A letter from the District Council of Sedan states:

At a recent meeting of council I was directed to inform you that council is gravely concerned over the small amount of road grants allocated for the year 1975-76. Council received this year \$27 000 for roadworks;

Then the roadworks are listed. The letter concludes:

Therefore, I respectfully request that this matter be brought to the attention of the House of Assembly.

Similarly, a letter from the neighbouring Marne council states:

Council has noted the nation-wide campaign which has been evident in the daily press instigated by the Australian Automobile Association. We feel that we must agree with the statements made in this campaign concerning the unwarranted reduction in road funds being made available by the Australian Government. Our own area has suffered a severe reduction in Government assistance, and it may be necessary for council to retrench some of its work force. This does not seem to be logical in times of high unemployment, particularly when one considers the vast amounts of money obtained by the various Governments from roads. We urge you to do all in your power to encourage the Australian Government to increase road funds to a realistic level, thus ensuring a continued improvement to the nations road system. Good roads are vital to Australia.

I understand several members have received similar correspondence in connection with the grants that will be made available to councils in South Australia. I quote some random figures from around the State, supplied by some of our members to support my argument. In the District Council of Tatiara in the South-East, in 1971-72, the sum of \$211 588 was available for council works; that includes money for debit order work, Government grants, and rural and urban roads, and also includes money for the RED scheme last year. Councils are interested in total funds available, because it is the total funds available which provide continuity of employment. In the following year, 1972-73, \$225 733 was available; in 1973-74, the sum was \$153 208; in 1974-75, it was \$219 609, and this year it is \$106 289. Now, that is a dramatic drop.

Mr. Nankivell: That is an all-time low.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is an all-time low for the five years' figures I have quoted; it is about one-half of what the council received five years ago. There is inflation and jobs are threatened, and the funds available are the basis of a stable work force in a country community. Let us consider the Lucindale District Council: in 1971-72 it had \$121 000 available; in 1972-73 the sum was \$61 000 (which appears to be very low); in 1973-74 it was \$81 000; in 1974-75, \$67 000 was available; and for

1975-76, \$20 000 is available, with a grant from the Grants Commission of \$35 000, making a grand total this year of \$55 000. If it were not for the grant from Commonwealth Grants Commission, the council would be in a hopeless position. It is in a desperate position because there has been a consistent reduction, but there has been a most significant drop this year.

I refer to the Penola Council: for 1970-71, the sum available was \$135 254; in 1971-72 it was \$163 255; in 1972-73 it was \$35 463, a significant drop; and in 1973-74 it was \$40 083. Last year there was a sudden boost for some reason. The council had a special Commonwealth grant last year up to \$106 217, but this year the sum is down to \$32 108, with a Commonwealth grant of \$40 000. Let me quote Marne District Council in my own district. It is one of those smaller councils, and has employed people for 12 or 15 years. If the council worked on the last-on, first-off system, which is the basis on which it is suggested retrenchments should be made, the first fellow who would be sacked would be a man who had, been on the council for about 12 years. This is the seriousness of the situation. In 1974-75, this council received \$101 000 in Government grants, and that included debit order work and \$7 000 from the Grants Commission. This year it is proposed that it receives \$35 000. Added to that is a Commonwealth Government grant of \$18 000, so that the grand total is \$53 000, which is about half what it received last year. Let us now consider the Gumeracha council. The money available to the Gumeracha council in 1969 (and I will give an extended period to show the trend) was \$121 000; in 1970, \$93 000; in 1971, \$68 000; in 1972, \$78 000; in 1973, \$73 000; in 1974, \$56 000; and in 1975, \$79 000, plus \$13 000 from the Grants Commission. This year it is to receive \$19 409, plus \$27 000 from the Grants Commission. If these two figures are added, the council will get about one-third this year of what it got in 1963.

Mr. Becker: Who is getting all the money?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It seems to me that Grants Commission money is distributed in a haphazard fashion. I recently attended a meeting at Gumeracha of the Southern Hills Association. The local government representative on the Commonwealth authority gave a report. The Commonwealth authority had been making approaches for funds to be made available from the Grants Commission, with no strings attached. It is highly significant that one question that local government put to the Canberra authorities was, "Is there any likelihood of strings being attached at any time?" The reply was, "We are interested, of course, in the question of franchise for local government and the question of size of councils."

Mr. Coumbe: What has that to do with it?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If that was not an implied threat and pressure being applied already from the central authorities, on just where the squeeze would come in relation to the Grants Commission grants to local government, I would not know what it was.

Mr. Evans: It's that octopus.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course it is. Who pays? The piper calls the tune. All the evidence that we have at present on the operations of the Commonwealth Government is that, if it hands over money, strings will be attached. The implied threat in that statement was that, if the State Government could not bring about its boundary redistribution, the Commonwealth Government would help to squeeze councils out. The Minister of Local Government has stated that councils no longer can rely on debit

order work. I ask what they can rely on. One council in the South-East already is on the maximum rate that it is legally allowed to charge, and the member for Victoria would know the council to which I refer.

Mr. Rodda: It is the Tatiara council.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, and I have quoted the figures. We have the South Australian Government with its new-found money. We heard the Premier bragging last week that we had \$26 000 000 in surplus. The figures change from day to day and it is difficult to keep up with the current bulletin, but that is the figure that springs to mind. The Treasurer said that we were in the most buoyant position we have ever been in because we have managed to sell our country railways.

Dr. Eastick: And our souls, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. Of course, the Government never is concerned about selling out its soul or about selling out its mates in Canberra, either, for that matter. We have in South Australia this new-found affluence. If the Government genuinely wants to do something to help local communities and if it has a desire to ensure that local government survives, let some of these new-found funds flow to those people where the money is really needed. It is all very well for Mr. Cameron, the sacked Minister for Labor and Immigration, to float this brilliant RED scheme to mop up some of the unemployment and make the figures look more favourable, but if the Commonwealth Government really wants to do something about unemployment and help rural communities, let it funnel some funds to local government, to local people who know what decisions to make and know where money can be spent profitably, so securing the jobs of these employees whose jobs are threatened at present.

The matter is not confined to rural councils. I have referred to them because I represent a rural district, but much information is available from the member for Davenport and from the Adelaide City Council. The honourable member and the council know the position. There was nothing for the Adelaide City Council from the Grants Commission. A recent press report in the *News* of August 6, headed "Councils in Canberra grab fear", states:

Fears that area improvement programme grants from Canberra could lead to federal control of local government have been expressed by Australian municipal councils. The Town Clerk (Mr. Arland) reported this today after returning from a Melbourne meeting of State chairmen and secretaries at an Australian Council of Local Government Association conference. He said, "Those regions receiving financial aid under the programme were very happy with the way they were working. Those not operating in the programme feared Federal centralism coming into the regional set-up. The experiences of those operating under this arrangement were able to allay most of the fears of the other groups. But the fear is still in many minds that the system could be used as a vehicle for centralism." Mr. Arland is secretary of Metropolitan Eastern Region No. 3 and Ald. R. W. Clampett is retiring Chairman.

Those fears are not groundless. From the report I had at the meeting last Friday of the Southern Hills Association, I know that certainly they are not groundless. Strings certainly will be attached to these grants from the Grants Commission to the councils, and councils that do not toe the line on questions of franchise and the size of councils will simply be starved out of existence. This runs completely counter to the philosophy that we on this side espouse. We believe that the fundamental freedoms of people in this country are secured by the decentralisation of authority and decision-making.

That belief is in direct contradiction of the philosophy espoused by the Labor Party, regardless of whether members opposite like it. Obviously, the Minister of Local Government did not like it when he saw it in action, as it affected him personally, but that is what members opposite espouse and that is what their Commonwealth leader has espoused publicly many times. I have referred to some of those occasions, and that is what the philosophy of members opposite is bound to.

I am pointing out the practical results. We are totally opposed philosophically to the point of view that the Labor Party holds on this question. We believe that it is fundamental to democracy and the freedom of individual people that decision making be kept as close as possible to the people, and we believe that that can be done through the three-tier system of government, with the Commonwealth Parliament being responsible for the national economy, defence, and other major issues.

What does it matter if laws vary from State to State? What does it matter if the Criminal Code varies slightly from State to State? Surely to have such variation is the prerogative of the people. I believe that local government has a most important role to play in this three-tier system of government, because local government is as close to the people as we can get. This Labor Government, with its pettifogging directions on how and when councils shall charge rates, is simply strangling the autonomy of local government in the State. Regarding the Adelaide City Council, the newspaper report states:

Council may be forced to cut services in city. The Adelaide City Council was faced with a cut-back in public services, the Lord Mayor (Mr. Roche) said last night. He was commenting on the Grants Commission programme for councils for 75-76 which was announced in Canberra by the Special Minister for State (Senator D. McClelland) and the Minister for Urban and Regional Development (Mr. Uren). Under the programme, councils throughout Australia will receive \$79 900 000 and South Australia will receive \$6 780 000—an increase of nearly \$2 000 000 over the previous year. The city council will not receive any grant from the commission.

Now the Minister of Local Government gets into the act. The report continues:

The Minister of Local Government (Mr. Virgo) said last night he was concerned about the absence of help for the city council. "It will be of great concern to them," he said. "Last year, they came to the State Government and we assisted them in two areas to help them. They didn't get any help from the Grants Commission last year. Unfortunately the same dose has been repeated." However, Mr. Virgo would have liked to see a "little more".

It is difficult to gauge the Minister's true feelings, because he is charged with the responsibility of trying to support this octopus from Canberra that is seeking to erode not only his authority but also decision making and government in this State. Indeed, there is a challenge to the very existence not only of local government but also of this State Parliament. I have raised these matters early in my remarks because they are of vital concern.

I will comment briefly now on the Government's electoral proposals. It is difficult, not having prior knowledge of exactly what the Government proposes (except that we again have the catchcry of one vote one value), to say what the Government intends to introduce.

Mr. Duncan: Why don't you wait until we tell you?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: For the edification of Government members, I draw their attention to some matters that are pertinent to country members. We well know that the Labor Party mostly farms out the city electoral districts to well tried and faithful Party hacks.

Mr. Duncan: What a scurrilous thing to say.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, about as scurrilous as the remarks of the member for Florey earlier today. If Government members are willing to dish it out, they must also be willing to take it. If ever insults were levied at the Opposition, we got them from the member for Florey today. If it is good enough for us to receive them, it is good enough for us to give them. In the main, and members opposite can exempt themselves if they wish, safe metropolitan seats are farmed out by the A.L.P. to Party hacks, and we well know the contribution they make to the House. The Labor Party does not now hold any truly rural seat that involves the farming and rural community. Let me refresh the memory of some members opposite regarding what was said when electoral proposals were before the House some years ago. I make the point that it will be extremely difficult for country members to represent their districts adequately and, indeed, for those districts to receive satisfactory service from their members if country seats are made significantly larger.

Mr. Duncan: Do you think we should enlarge the size of the House?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We will judge the proposal on its merits. I believe there is a case for more metropolitan seats being created, but I do not wish to be distracted from my main point of pointing out to the Government just what are the facts of life in connection with country representation. I ask the Government why it was that the Deputy Premier, who is now in the Chamber, decided to leave the seat of Millicent. The only authentic reason we can hope to find is from his own mouth. I have a relevant press clipping in which the Deputy Premier gave his reasons for abandoning the seat of Millicent, as follows:

Mr. Corcoran, who is also Works Minister and Marine Minister, said the main reason for his decision to resign from Millicent and contest Coles was because of his family. Mr. Corcoran, who has eight children, said: "I have been a weekend father and husband for the past 13 years. My wife, Carmel, cannot manage to be mother and father to the children from Monday to Friday. My eldest girl is now 14 and I believe the children need attention, direction and guidance from a father more than simply at weekends. The only way I can do that and get some personal satisfaction from my children is to move to the city."

I do not disagree with those sentiments, but I point out to the Deputy Premier that those problems were not peculiar to him when he was a country member: they are peculiar to all country members and, the larger the district, the greater those problems are exaggerated. Let us have a look at another press report published in the *Age* of February 15, 1975, and written by an obvious admirer of the Deputy Premier. The report states:

Des Corcoran is now moving to the Adelaide suburban seat of Coles, due to what is described as the fortuitous resignation of the State Attorney-General (Mr. Len King). Mr. King's elevation to the Judiciary is expected shortly; his freeing of his safe seat is held by sceptics to be not quite so accidental as it might appear. But in any case, the Corcoran name will stay on show in Millicent. The Deputy Premier's nephew is the pre-selected Labor candidate for a seat which has always been held by a Corcoran. The reason for the change is not merely political (Des Corcoran held it by a mere one vote in the late 60's). His health is indifferent, and he spent three months in hospital with rheumatoid arthritis recently.

Mr. Langley: You know that's true.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it's public knowledge, and I bring it up not for any base motive, as the honourable member might like to impute to me, but because the Deputy Premier has moved to a city seat for two reasons: first, he had to neglect his family when he represented a country seat and, secondly, it was easier for him because

he had suffered ill health. In plain language, the Deputy Premier bailed out of Millicent because his job of representing a country seat was too hard. What argument does the Government have for enlarging country districts? I will now refer to a debate that took place when electoral reform was mooted earlier, going back to the time when Mr. Frank Walsh was Leader of the Opposition. He said:

The Bill proposes to reduce the number of country representatives from 26 to 20. Why should country people be denied adequate representation in this Parliament? I challenge the Government to deny that country areas will be deprived of some representation. I could not find sufficient words within the limits of Parliamentary language to describe my feelings on this aspect.

Later, in Committee, he said:

A district must have a reasonable shape with reasonable means of access between the main population centres therein. I have heard members, including the member for Burra (Mr. Quirk), complain about the difficulties of travelling from one country town to another. For instance, in the Frome District a member would have to travel 150 miles from Peterborough to reach the boundary of his district. The Government should supply him with a helicopter or some other fast means of transportation. I oppose the clause because, if it is difficult for a country member to adequately service his district now, it will be impossible if the country representation is reduced by six.

The now Premier (the then member for Norwood), at a time when we were in Government, said:

The Premier says it is difficult to represent country districts because of the long distances that have to be travelled to keep in touch with the electors. We agree with him. We have every reason to agree with him because the Labor Party in this Parliament represents not only the overwhelming majority of the people of this State. We represent far more electors here than honourable members do on the other side, but we also represent the majority of the area of the State as well. The vast majority of the area of South Australia is represented in this House by Labor members. The honourable members for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) and Frome (Mr. Casey) both have electoral districts larger than the British Isles in area. Why, they comprise the major portion of the Commonwealth district of Grey, which in itself comprises some two-thirds of this State. We do not believe that the present number of members representing country districts can be properly decreased, because thereby it will make country representation less efficient.

It will not be possible for members to travel the vast distances that now have to be travelled by the honourable members for Frome and Whyalla and then go further. The Premier, having said that it was not possible to decrease country representation (and he has said it here, as the member for Whyalla has pointed out, time and time again), now intends to reduce country representation, and particularly in the sparsely settled areas of this State. It will make the task of the members for Eyre (Mr. Bockelberg) and Frome almost impossible. The member for Frome would have to represent an area from Coober Pedy to Cockburn and from just north of Quorn to the Northern Territory and Queensland borders.

Mr. Casey, then a country member, but now elevated to the Upper House (kicked upstairs by his Party), said on February 25, 1964 (page 2098 of *Hansard*):

I believe in the principle of one vote one value, for I think that is the basis of all democratic thinking. However, there are times when that policy could not possibly be put into effect, and I think that that is the position in this State because of the vast areas in the north of the State which are so sparsely populated. . . . I represent what is known as a rural area and I am proud to do so; it is sparsely populated and extends over vast distances, and under the proposed legislation that area will be increased. I say emphatically that if those areas in the north, such as the districts represented by the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) and myself, are increased, it will not be possible for us to do the job we wish to do and what we set out to do, for such a task would kill us and the members who come after us.

From this, one might be assured that the Government would seek to reduce country representation whatever its electoral proposals might be. Whatever Bill comes before the House, one could honestly assume that it would not be in favour of a reduction. I repeat that the reason why the Deputy Premier left Millicent was obvious: he could not handle it. Does the Deputy Premier not think that present country members want some family life and that they have precisely the same problems that he had? Being a Minister, he was involved in extra duties, but does he not believe that other members of Parliament are involved in extra duties that take them away from their homes? I think the point has been well taken. The Government must look very hard at its electoral proposals. We cannot debate them now because we do not know what the Government intends. If the Government intends to reduce country representation, all it is doing is making a liar of itself, because it is perfectly obvious (and it is on record) what was the attitude previously of the Premier, the late Frank Walsh, other rural members and the Hon. T. M. Casey.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Policies change from time to time.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: They tend to change with the wind in the Labor Party. Reference is made in the Governor's Speech to the optional preferential voting system. Everyone knows that what impels Labor Party thinking is an electoral advantage. Let us be frank about this. The Labor Party seeks to introduce optional preferential voting if it is of electoral advantage to it, and of course it is of advantage to the Labor Party. A well-esteemed book entitled *Parliamentary Representation* by J. F. S. Ross states:

To sum up, then: the two really fundamental and serious defects of the present method of electing members of Parliament as it works within a single constituency are (a) that it all too often results in the election of a minority candidate—

He is referring to first past the post voting that operates in Britain, but exactly the same situation obtains in relation to optional preferential voting, where a minority candidate is often elected under that system. In other words, a candidate is elected who does not enjoy total majority support in his district. It depends on how many voters exercise their preference. In Australia, the Labor Party has much to gain from this system of voting. Because we have more than one Party opposed to Labor in this country whose preferences are exchanged, the deletion of preferences works to the advantage of the Labor Party. Mr. Ross states:

. . . it all too often results in the election of a minority candidate whose views are unacceptable to the majority even of the electors actually voting, and (b) that it gives the elector no choice between candidates of his own party and therefore no effective means by which he may endorse a wise choice of candidate or register his disapprobation of an unsuitable one, so that in consequence there is not the incentive that there should be for the selectors to seek really able men.

In a footnote, Mr. Ross states that there were no fewer than 315 minority members returned at the 1929 general election, which represented well over half the number of members of the House of Commons; these members represented only a minority of their constituents. The last experience we had in Australia of optional preferential voting (and I do not have the time to canvass this matter at length but will do so when the Bill dealing with the matter comes before the House) was during the 1941 election in Queensland. The Labor Party won the election with 51 per cent of the vote but gained 66 per cent of the seats.

Mr. Slater: What's the position now?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the honourable member would care to analyse the results of the recent Queensland election, he would see that a redistribution on the basis of one vote one value (which we think the Labor Party espouses) would have meant that in Queensland it would have finished up with fewer seats than it now has. The results in individual seats won in the 1941 Queensland election clearly indicate the inadequacy of the system. In the seat of Windsor there were three candidates. Moorehouse received 4 185 votes, O'Sullivan received 1 401 votes, and Williams received 4 491 votes. Only 561 O'Sullivan voters exercised their preference and, of these, 462 went to Moorehouse who was declared elected with only 46.1 per cent of the vote supporting him. Although Williams was first past the post, Moorehouse beat him, even though he had considerably less than half the votes.

That shows just how arbitrary is the optional preferential system. There are many such examples. In the 1942 by-election in the seat of Cairns an anomaly resulted. Of the candidates, Barnes received 2 101 votes (30.5 per cent), Crowley received 2 169 votes (31.4 per cent), Griffin received 851 votes, and Tucker received 1 776 votes (a combined total of 38.1 per cent for the latter two candidates). Only 600 Griffin and Tucker voters (or 8.7 per cent of their 38 per cent primary vote) exercised their preferences and, of these, 435 went to Barnes who was declared elected with only 36.7 per cent of the voters supporting him. The Labor Party in South Australia obviously wishes to introduce optional preferential voting into South Australia simply because it is seen by the Government to be of electoral advantage to it. There is no other valid argument. The Government wants to cut out the preferences that normally flow against it; it wishes to minimise the effect of preferences, thus maximising its chance of winning, although it may enjoy only a minority vote.

There are other matters I wish to canvass in the debate. The member for Florey made great play about the rural community being referred to in the Governor's Speech. The Government is going to make sick cattle better so that in the end they will not be worth anything to farmers but will be healthy cattle to shoot. The Government also intends to license meatworks, a proposal of a type that is dear to the heart of Labor administration. The Government is licence and regulation happy. I have canvassed some of the country butchers in my district (not all of them), and they are rather disturbed about this proposal. I do not know of anyone in my area who has died recently of meat poisoning. However, I remember a case of some poisoned sausages some years ago when an apprentice tipped too much nitrite into the sausage mix and someone died because he ate unhealthy sausages. I do not know of anyone in my area who has had trouble with meat poisoning. Should any member opposite know of examples would he please let me know? It seems to me that the Government is again embarking on an operation that is so dear to its heart.

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

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Before the dinner adjournment I was pointing out that I was not aware of cases of people suffering from meat poisoning in country areas. It was drawn to my attention, however, that there was one case of poisoning at a well known hotel in Adelaide, the meat for which came from the metropolitan abattoirs. Nevertheless, that is all the Government has to say about our

rural industries. I will now refer briefly to the Callaghan report, which puts in correct perspective the importance to this State of the rural economy. On page 6, the Callaghan report states:

Frequently overlooked is the tremendously important contribution made to the growth of industry by demand from the rural sector for farm machinery, transport vehicles, fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides and veterinary medicines. Moreover, rural industries support and stimulate large segments of commerce and finance through the transport, storage, processing and marketing of rural products and the financing of production and distribution.

Regarding the impact of the rural section of production on the economy, on page 4 of attachment I, under the heading "A gauge of economic change", the report, in referring to the past 25 years, states:

Permanent rural workers declined from 41 500 to 28 700, that is, from 6.6 per cent to 2.4 per cent of the total work force.

So we can see that these people now represent a fairly small minority. Let us now have a look at the contribution they make to the economy of the State. The report continues:

Value of production per annum per farm worker increased from \$4 800 to \$7 800 in real terms—a 62 per cent increase.

The footnote says:

Conversion of monetary figures to real terms throughout this attachment is based on a 4.3 times increase in the consumer price index.

The report further states:

One farm worker now provides for 65 people compared with 45 in 1948.

That is not a bad contribution to the welfare of the people of this community. Under the heading "Present Importance", the report states:

The following figures of present production highlight the importance of the rural industries to the State: Rural production exceeds \$400 000 000 per annum in value; makes up one-third of the total State production; contributes 50 per cent to the value of South Australian exports; has a rural work force, including seasonal workers, of 42 000; and supports ancillary industries employing another 30 000.

So let no-one minimise the importance of the rural side of the economy to the general welfare of this State. If country people are to secure adequate representation in this House, it is essential that country districts be not enlarged in size, for the very cogent reasons that I advanced earlier in this speech.

Having another glance at the Governor's Speech, we see that it is a fairly mixed bag. We see item 12 is a straight lift from Liberal Party policy. This was advocated by, I think, the member for Chaffey. The member for Florey complained that we had nothing constructive to offer, but the Labor Party during the life of the last Parliament disposed of no fewer than, I think, 26 items that were initiatives that came from this side of the House.

I will now briefly refer to financial matters, which are mentioned on the last page of the Speech. We all recall during last year's Budget session the Premier saying that we did not have to increase State taxes and charges. Of course we did not, because one month before he had increased stamp duties, fees on conveyancing, and duties on mortgages, and had significantly increased duties on motor vehicles. He was able to mislead the public, stating there were no increases in the Budget. We were also promised \$6 000 000 from the Federal Government. He was quite certain we would get an additional grant of \$6 000 000, but almost a year later he acknowledged that the \$6 000 000 was not received, and said that the Government was obliged to seek new revenue from sales on

petroleum and tobacco. South Australia is the only State that imposed those taxes.

I have some matters of some importance in my own district, and in the remaining few minutes I will raise them. The Government has made great play about the filtration scheme for the metropolitan water supply. I hope that the incompetence of the Commonwealth Government will not mean a deferment of that scheme. It is important that the water supplied to the Barossa Valley be included in any appraisal regarding the necessity for filtering water supplies in this State. The Barossa Valley is of foremost importance to the tourist industry and to the economy of the State, and its water supply is hopeless. The quality of the water in the summer months is pathetic. It is a brown mess, particularly during the summer.

Mr. Evans: It's mineral water.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not. It is muck which is stirred up in the pipes. Frequently tourists have commented adversely at the major motels and hotels in the Barossa Valley. It is in the interests of this State, not only for the people in the Barossa Valley but for visitors, that something be done about the water supply. The other matter that I must mention is the great perturbation that is being felt in the Barossa Valley regarding the attitude of the Commonwealth Government to the revaluation of wine stocks and to the fact that it intends to increase the excise on brandy. These matters are having a tremendous impact on the Barossa Valley, and they strike at the grass roots of its economy. If the Labor Party is intent on smashing the small independent grower, it has gone about it in the right way. If members opposite believe, as we do on this side, that we want to encourage the small independent growers, who are willing to do something for themselves, that is the sort of decision at which the Commonwealth Government should be having a good hard look, because this will smash those people first. We all know that when things get hard the small man goes under first, and the economy of the Barossa Valley is largely centred around small independent grapegrowers. I would be remiss in my duty if I did not stand up here and admonish the Government and urge it to do all it possibly can to protect this vital part of the economy of that part of the State, and indeed, of the State as a whole. I support the motion.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I would be remiss in my duty if I did not point out to the member for Kavel that nobody has worked harder than the Premier of this State to get a remission and abolition of the wine tax, but to date he has had limited success.

Mr. Evans: Do you think he will keep working?

Mr. McRAE: I believe the Premier will keep working. I wholeheartedly agree with the member for Kavel. The only point I am trying to make is that it is unfair to suggest that the State Government has not pursued every line at its disposal to do something about the matter. I want to refer to the need to tackle the central problem, as I see it, of government in Australia and it lies in the very Constitution of our nation. I am reminded of the need to tackle this problem by the discussions that I have had during the past few weeks with so many different groups of people, young and old, from so many different parts of the community and with so many different educational backgrounds. In tackling the problem, it seems to me we might do well first to give credit to our forbears, and secondly to acknowledge their capacities, considerable as they were, to foresee the technological, financial and social changes of the ensuing 75 years. If we give credit

to our forbears, we will note that they were able to collaborate and co-operate to achieve a new nation without crippling the Constitutional Conventions by refusing to accept compromise, by insisting at all costs on entrenched beliefs, or by completely failing to show that the people and the nation take precedence of Party political dogma and petty personal hatreds.

It may be suggested that our forbears had less difficulty because they had less entrenched beliefs, but I point out that the 1890's saw a depression, which was nearly as bad as that of the 1930's, and also vicious industrial upheaval and bloodshed that, thank God, we have not experienced since. It was against this background, with the same Country Party elements, Conservative Party elements, and Labor Party elements, that the first Constitutional Convention to frame the Constitution met in the 1890's, yet clearly (and from our own State Kingston stands out as one of them) those at that convention embraced among their ranks statesmen who saw further than their own ego and who, notwithstanding the most brilliant and forceful debates, achieved a comprehensive result that, in general, has been of tremendous advantage to the nation.

Therefore, one must ask where the statesmen are today. Are any to be found? Everyone agrees that many areas of the Constitution require amendment to bring this fundamental instrument into line with the realities of 1975. One need point only to the constitutional provision in relation to "postal, telegraphic, and other like services". With some difficulty, the High Court was able, by so-called progressive interpretation, to incorporate radio and television within this phrase.

It is hard to imagine the founding fathers contemplating wireless communication, let alone wireless-picture communication. Of course, they could not possibly have foreseen communication by laser beam, and we will have that form of communication with us soon. I cannot see any way in which the High Court will include that sort of communication within the existing power. It must be changed, but it must be changed by referendum and, with our knowledge of referendums, we see it as unlikely that the people will support change unless all political Parties support the change sought.

That is just one of the many changes required that will increase the powers of the Commonwealth Government. Equally, examples can be given of changes which are required and which would decrease the powers of the Commonwealth Government. I believe the most obvious of these is the need to increase real tax grants to the States progressively. Any objective observer can see the need for both sorts of change. Unfortunately, the hatred and lack of compromise between the fanatical centralists and the fanatical States-righters have swamped the genuine efforts of the federalists, who have had the vision to perceive that Party belief and personal distrust and dislike must always be subject to the overall benefit of the nation: that principle is as true now as it was in the 1890's.

What the federalists did perceive to the largest extent was the need to achieve a balance of powers and jurisdiction when they framed the original Constitution. By accepting State sovereignty as a starting point, by using the mechanism of transferring powers to the Commonwealth Government, and by establishing the House of Representatives and particularly the Senate to equalise the rights of the States and the rights of the smaller and less wealthy States as against the larger and more wealthy States, they

achieved some of the essential protections that have stood us in good stead for a long time.

They also saw the need to divide legislative and judicial powers and to ensure basic freedoms of belief and criticism. These factors have been a shield to us all from the overriding authority of any one political Party, and it has been because of the nature of the Constitution that, in our blackest moments, we always have had at least one political Party standing alone against the mass throughout Australia. I remember that at one stage we had only one Liberal Government in this country, with all other Governments being Labor Governments, and I think that on another occasion we had only the South Australian Government or the Tasmanian Government—

Mr. Dean Brown: There was a short period of five months when there was no Labor Government in Australia.

Mr. McRAE: It is dangerous for any one political group to have such dominant political power.

Dr. Eastick: There will soon be a Liberal Government in Tasmania.

Mr. McRAE: There may be. These guarantees are still required by the people of Australia. The people recognise the need for more power for the national Government in certain fields; for example, I mention defamation, family law, and shipping and navigation. The people equally recognise the need of the States to have their sovereignty maintained and their financial position secured. Following the Constitutional Convention in 1973, four committees were established. Those committees prepared their reports, and the reports have now been published and are available.

I believe that there is a desperate need for the Constitution Convention to be proceeded with, but it will never get off the ground until the leading politicians in all the States and in the Commonwealth Parliament, of all political persuasions, whatever they may be, cast off the shackles of their dogmas and their historical distrusts and hatreds and become something like the statesmen of the 1890's. The people also demand one other thing: they demand a greater power of the press to criticise and analyse Government. That relates back to the laws of defamation and also, of course, to the specific Statutes of the Commonwealth Government and State Governments relative to official secrets, and the like.

Efforts of the press, particularly in the Watergate affair and the Pentagon Papers affair in the United States, have highlighted the necessity for greater press power, not less, and I believe that the young people of Australia see the need for the balancing of powers that I have stressed to protect their liberties in future. They also see the need for a vigilant press that is not hamstrung by obsolete laws on defamation and secrecy that prevent active investigation into all Governments, of whatever persuasion, be they Liberal, Labor, Country Party, or whatever.

Mr. Evans: What about the licensing of newspapers?

Mr. McRAE: I am totally opposed to the licensing of newspapers. I regard it as utterly absurd. If such a thing came to fruition, it would be the beginning of a disaster. I do not believe that it is seriously suggested that such a thing would come.

Mr. Evans: What about press councils?

Mr. McRAE: I believe that press councils have a role to play, provided the people of the press are represented on them. Of course, one can go to other extremes. I believe in the judgment of the American Supreme Court

which said, in relation to the nation itself, that one could not afford to quash the press even though one might jeopardise the actual political security of the nation. That was what was said in the Pentagon Papers case and again in the case where Nixon and his cohorts tried to cover up Watergate. Equally, it was said by the American Supreme Court that, if a person was not in Government but was a private citizen and wanted to remain so, he had rights that the press should not trample.

Mr. Goldsworthy: On whose side are you in connection with the Tasmanian row?

Mr. McRAE: I am not involved in the Tasmanian row. For once, I am not involved in a row, and I am so happy.

Mr. Becker: I thought you were going to be appointed to the Industrial Commission.

Mr. McRAE: I have not had such an offer. I turn now to one of my favorite themes, the need for law reform. There are two sorts of law reform, one being substantive and one being procedural only. One of the arguments often raised against substantive law reform is that it costs money and that, in an era of inflation, we should not be involved in law reform that costs money. I do not quite agree with that argument but, for the moment, I will put forward two propositions that do not cost any money or more judges and staff. The first one is the simplification of legal procedures. What we need is not quite the divorce kit with which Mr. Romeyko used to roam around. I would not go as far as that. However, instead of the mass of legal documents and rules that are as thick as some of Tolstoy's novels, surely we can have simple, straightforward documents and surely we can let the evidence speak for itself. The following rule could be incorporated in the rules of the Supreme Court, taken straight from our industrial legislation: equity, good conscience and the substantial merits of the case shall in all cases prevail, and all legal technicalities and procedures shall be overridden by that dominant philosophy. I have seen too many cases in which people with genuine and legitimate grievances attempt to get their cases ready, only to find, when they reach the Supreme Court, that some genius has dreamed up subrule No. 3250 to rule No. 50 to regulation something or other, and so the case is put off for another two weeks. When it finally comes to court, some procedural expert then says that the statement of claim is defective because line No. 32 on page 8 does not incorporate something or other. As a result, more trouble occurs. Let us get rid of this garbage and let us get down to the substance of the matter.

I shall give a specific example in connection with wills. There are many cases in which it is very difficult for a court to determine who is entitled to the proceeds of an estate. Two people may have died together, and it may be impossible for a coroner to decide who died first. One of the people may have had a will, and the other may not. Depending on who died first and whether the will was valid and whether there were letters of administration, a million consequences could follow. I saw a case held up for eight years because no-one, including the Registrar of Probate, could think of an appropriate procedure. Surely all we need is a simple summons for directions. The matter can be called before the court, and evidence can be called. Let all the parties go along to the court and say, "These are the facts." If we need to patch it up, let us do it as we go along. Let us not bog down the courts with endless procedural technicalities, which become so bad that no-one can follow them.

Mr. Evans: Do you think we need a body instead of the Law Society to judge whether lawyers have acted in good faith?

Mr. McRAE: I do not see why lawyers or doctors should be treated as the chosen few in the community who deal with their own discipline in the first instance and are not subject directly to the law. Of course, it is still necessary to have a statutory body because, if we want to stop frauds, we must jump in before the fraud starts. There are two points of substantive law to which I want to refer. Each of these points is referred to in a report of the Law Reform Committee of South Australia, which I have praised before and I now praise again for the excellent quality of its work. The member for Fisher may care to note that this is the work of lawyers who are not paid for the work they are doing.

The first point I want to raise deals with the question of an appeals cost fund. This may sound technical, but let us remember how often, because of the complexity of a legal question or because of a mistake or pressure of work, a lower court gives a wrong decision. It is not the fault of either side, but someone appeals and someone must pay. The normal principle is that he who succeeds is entitled to his costs. So, let us assume that Joe Bloggs is charged in the Magistrates Court with an offence. The magistrate misconstrues the Statute and, on appeal, the Supreme Court says just that, and it orders a retrial. It is unfair that Joe Bloggs should bear the costs. The court has discretion and could say, "Each side must bear its own costs." Whichever way we go, we end up in most cases with people unfairly bearing costs. I therefore believe that an appeals cost fund of the sort recommended by the Law Reform Committee is a worthwhile idea.

The most important substantive change to which I refer is the question of criminal records of people I would call ordinary citizens. I am not referring to the long-time well-known repeated offender. On the figures I have before me, there are 20 000 people in South Australia in the category to which I am referring, namely, the sort of ordinary person who, in his youth or adolescence, has committed a serious offence, say, robbery, violence or an offence against morality, who has been given a lengthy gaol term, who has served his gaol term, and who since that time has been a good citizen. He is now between 35 and 40 years of age, and his offence was committed 15 years previously. Think of the penalties that befall this man. He has already served his, say, five-year term, and he has already had to put up with the odium and dislike of the community. Now, I will detail some of the other things he must put up with.

When he applies for any conceivable kind of job, he is asked, "Do you have any previous convictions?" First, this is an incitement to a person to tell a lie and to say that he does not have any previous convictions, hoping that an obliging policeman will hide the fact. If the man is honest, he will say, "Yes, I have a previous conviction." If the employer has to toss a coin between choosing applicants of about equal ability or is a little worried by the vague possibility that this man is not now rehabilitated in the eyes of the community, himself and his family, that man loses the job. This kind of thing happens. Not only that but under our Statutes, one of them the Education Act, I think, and another the Public Service Act, even if the offence occurred 30 or 40 years ago, the man is obliged to disclose the offence. If it was a felony, it may well be that he would be unable to be admitted to either of those two services. That is wrong.

It goes even further: a man may seek an insurance policy of some kind, and again he is faced with a form. What do we do? I have greater sympathy for the rehabilitated person than I have for what the sociologists call the recidivist, or the long-time offender.

We spend millions of dollars on our recidivists, who, in many cases, are the least deserving in our community, yet for the fully rehabilitated person we do not seem to be willing yet to spend anything. Here is a plea from one member that we spend a little. We need not spend much, because we can cover the point by, first, deciding what the person's remedy is. Should he apply for a pardon? I suggest not. A pardon is available in Canada, but the fact of applying for it may highlight the case. Let us assume that this person has reached the rehabilitation phase. If he applies for a pardon, it is a public hearing, and suddenly his old offence is splashed all over the newspapers. Do we give him immunity from answering the question on the form? I do not think we should do that, because that would condone the breaking of the oath. In saying that, I do not think that one Statute should conflict lightly with another.

Another method we could use would be to make it an offence on the part of those producing the forms to ask the question in relation to a given period. For instance, depending on the person's age, it would have to be decided what is considered to be a period of genuine rehabilitation, but opinions on this will vary. Let us say that the man had been convicted at the age of 20 years of robbery with violence and gaoled for five years. The most severe people in the community would probably say that, after 10 years with no further trouble, he was fully rehabilitated, whereas those with more lenient views would probably say he was rehabilitated after five years. Let us take 10 years as the extreme.

What we then need to do is devise a form of administration of documents by insurance companies by amending Acts of Parliament, such as the Public Service Act and Education Act, and by amending various other procedures to protect such a person, who is genuinely reformed and rehabilitated, from having that one mistake of his life used against him. I will also refer to two other factors which are the horror of a person like the one I have mentioned and which must be dealt with. A person may lead an exemplary life and suddenly be called as a witness before a law court, and one of the factors open to either counsel is his credit. A man who, 20 years ago or even 30 years ago had committed an offence and who had been blameless ever since, could suddenly have it put to him in public court, "Is it not true that in the year so and so you committed such-and-such an offence and were sentenced to prison for such-and-such a time?" It is wrong that there should be any possibility of such a thing happening. I am aware of English case law that suggests that these days the courts would not permit things to go quite that far, but the idea is there. That is one example.

The other example is the horror of the rehabilitated man that someone may find out about what had happened in his past. I ask all members to consider seriously what I have said (because we have now accepted social reform of the recidivist) and to consider the fully rehabilitated persons, the 20 000 of them, in this State. I obtained that figure on the basis of the report of the Justices Committee in Britain which estimated, on Home Office figures, that there were 1 000 000 such people in the United Kingdom, and I have taken the ratio based on South Australia's population, assuming that the social pattern is roughly the same.



I am pleased to see that the Planning and Development Act was referred to in his Excellency's Speech as due for revision. I am not sure what the revision will be, but whatever it is I hope that it includes a capacity for the private citizen to be involved in the formulation of city plans. I am amazed at some of the ideas being broadcast around the city at present, particularly from the planning authority of the city of Adelaide, regarding what the future of our city should be. If some people have their way, we will have two-storey buildings dotted around Victoria Square instead of the multi-storey buildings that would make it one of the most majestic and beautiful squares in the world. I find that one of the complaints about the Act is its very technicality. I know that its philosophy is based on locality of interests and community of interests, but there are some things so important that I believe that everyone ought to have a say in them, and one of these aspects is the city area itself. I believe that ordinary citizens should have a right to have their say on matters of this kind. I believe that the legislative programme before us will be of benefit to the State and will continue the Government's good record, and I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment as Speaker of this House. I believe you have shown in the first four days of this session much independence. I also pay my respects to the late Leslie Harold Densley and the late Sir Norman Lane Jude and compliment them on their services to this State. In addition, I congratulate the new members who have come into the House, especially three members because I have been most impressed by the contributions they have made so far this session. I refer to the members for Millicent, Heysen, and Mount Gambier; I wish them a long and successful Parliamentary career, which I am sure they will have. The Special Minister of State for Monarto and Redcliff is now leaving the Chamber. I suggest that he return because I am about to discuss Monarto. I realise the Minister has been blind or has cut off his mind to the facts relating to Monarto. His leaving is a classic example of the fact that, as soon as the subject arises in the House, he departs. He cannot face the truth. In fact, he is like the previous Minister who handled Monarto and who could not face the truth either.

Whether or not they are here, I will proceed to expound the truth about what should happen to that development. It was about 12 months ago in the Address in Reply debate that I pointed to what I believed were the major deficiencies of the major development project of Monarto. I pointed out that circumstances had changed since the concept was originally put forward by the Premier and how those changing circumstances began to condemn Monarto. It is interesting to look back over the 12 months since I spoke in the Address in Reply debate to see that the same change is taking place in public opinion throughout the State. It is obvious that the public no longer supports the project, and that the majority of South Australians believe that Monarto should be stopped.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Nonsense!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: They do. In support of the statement I refer to a survey that was carried out.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood. A survey you no doubt conducted over the telephone.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I now refer to three deficiencies that I put forward concerning Monarto. First, will there be a population sufficient to develop Monarto? I believe

population predictions have changed so rapidly that no longer will there be sufficient people to inhabit the town. Since my speech last year the Borrie report has been published. That report casts a severe doubt on the figures originally used by the Premier about the potential growth rate of Adelaide and Monarto. I refer also to figures supplied today in the reply of the Special Minister of State for Monarto and Redcliff to a question I asked on notice. The Minister stated that Monarto has been planned to accommodate an eventual population of between 180 000 and 200 000 people. Initial indications were that that figure might be achieved early next century. However, such a projection was made in the context of an Adelaide regional population of at least 1 300 000 people at that time. The planning of Monarto was based, as I understand it, on a population in Adelaide greater than 1 300 000 people. The Minister in his reply continued:

State population predictions recently endorsed by Cabinet indicate that the Adelaide region, including Monarto, will contain at least 1 100 000 persons by the year 2 000. The initial development proposals for Monarto are being re-examined in the light of this reduced scale of regional population growth.

Originally Adelaide was to have a population of 1 300 000 people, and Monarto was to have a population (included in that 1 300 000) of about 200 000. Now it is predicted that Adelaide's population will be 1 100 000 by the year 2 000, which is 200 000 people fewer than was originally predicted. Incidentally, that figure of 200 000 people is the same as the Monarto growth figure. I suggest that, if the present Government of this State has any rationale or logic whatever, it would see that growth rate is insufficient for Monarto. If the Government could do its sums, it would see that no-one would live at Monarto by the year 2 000 unless, of course, the Government's original assumptions were entirely false.

I am gravely concerned because I have started to wonder when the Premier and his Government will wake up from their wonderful Monarto dream and see the facts that are staring them in the face concerning the population predicted for Monarto. I am afraid that, unless they do so quickly, this State will suffer in the long term. The second matter relates to finance for Monarto. Figures were released today by the Government indicating that \$12 600 000 has now been spent on Monarto, of which \$10 000 000 has come from the Commonwealth Government with the balance of \$2 600 000 coming from State finances. However, a report produced by the Monarto Development Commission indicates that the financial requirements for Monarto up to and including 1984-85 will be about \$600 000 000. The report goes on to say that about 30 per cent of this expenditure will be on housing, the costs of which could be assumed to be recouped in full. The balance, however, will be offset only by revenue from the sale or lease of land to the value of about \$80 000 000 during the early period. By 1984-85 about \$600 000 000 on present-day values will be needed for Monarto. The Government has spent \$12 600 000, so it is clear that the remaining \$588 000 000 must now come from either the State or the Commonwealth Government.

Also, in a reply today to a question I asked, the Minister indicated that the Government is not expecting to get the necessary finance for Monarto from the Australian Government. He pointed out that, for the current financial year, the estimated net expenditure on Monarto is to be \$10 100 000, of which the Commonwealth Government, it is hoped, will provide \$9 200 000. The Minister also said that it was unlikely the South Australian Government would receive the requested finance from the Australian

Government, and that a revised programme was being considered that would involve an expenditure of between \$4 000 000 and \$5 000 000 for 1975-76. This sum is based on the assumption that the amount requested from the Australian Government will not be received. We can assume from those figures that the State Government in its original proposal had expected to invest \$900 000 into Monarto this year. The South Australian Government hoped to get from the Australian Government the remaining \$9 200 000.

If we deduct the sum of \$900 000 from the \$4 000 000 or \$5 000 000 referred to by the Minister as the likely expenditure this year, we see that the Australian Government is unlikely to supply more than \$3 000 000 or \$4 000 000 in the current financial year—about one-third of what has been requested. The Minister also indicated that about \$1 000 000 was needed to continue to employ the 65 people currently employed by the Monarto Development Commission. Therefore, the State's total expenditure will be about \$3 000 000 to \$4 000 000, possibly less when the Budget is presented by the Treasurer. At least \$1 000 000 of that sum will go directly to paying salaries, so the chance of any capital works being carried out at Monarto this financial year is almost totally out of the realms of reality. The Australian Government has not come good with the money. I will now quote from the speech I made in the House 12 months ago. I said:

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 aged 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.

That prediction was made by me 12 months ago and it has now come true, even though the Government 12 months ago quite flatly denied any such prediction would come true. Because of the entire lack of finance, I believe we can see the new town proposal for Monarto being placed in mothballs or indefinitely shelved, through the lack of sufficient finance from the Australian Government.

The third criticism I made 12 months ago related to the site. I talked about the threat to the Adelaide Hills and the Murray River, and the deficiencies and soil difficulties involved in the location of the town. I also spoke about the difficulties with industrial development in this area. I believe that all these deficiencies still exist today. The Government, for all its rantings and ravings and assurances about Monarto not having created any of these difficulties, has still put forward no suggestion how these present problems may soon be solved. I hope that the Government has now seen the light. I put forward the three major areas of criticism of Monarto. I hope that, despite the glib phrases that have come from Ministers of the Government, they are willing to admit what are the true facts. I will not continue to rub salt into the Government's wounds. The important thing is the future of the Monarto area if, in fact, the project is shelved indefinitely.

To start with we have a Monarto Development Commission employing 65 persons, and I should like to make a few predictions as to what will now happen with the land, the people, and the resources that have already been involved in Monarto. My prediction is that the Monarto Development Commission will become a planning commission for the developing areas of Adelaide.

Mr. Evans: To the north and south especially.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes. This has been the substance of several speeches I have made over the last 12 months, requesting that such a development or planning commission be established for Port Noarlunga, Tea Tree Gully, Christies Beach and similar areas.

Secondly, I predict that the 6 500 hectares currently held by the Government will continue to be held by the Government. No doubt, additional trees will be planted but little or no capital works will proceed. This means that this 6 500 ha will now basically lie completely idle in the immediate future. It frightens me considerably that, if Monarto is not to proceed at least before the year 2000, for the next 25 years we will have 6 500 ha lying entirely idle.

Thirdly, I predict that there will be a continuing dribble of funds from the Australian Government and also from the State Government. The reason for this is that, if the Government continues to put a small amount of finance into the project, it will not have to appear to the South Australian public to have backed down on Monarto. I reiterate that it will be only a dribble of funds. What the Government is now doing is banking on a Commonwealth Liberal Government being elected some time within the next two years. The Government knows that a Commonwealth Liberal Government will not waste public funds on simply trying to prop up a dead development. It is banking on the fact that the Liberal Government will stop any future funds to Monarto and stop the development. Government members will then try to place the entire blame for Monarto being stopped on the next Australian Liberal Government. They are therefore deliberately keeping a small amount of funds going into Monarto simply to save face. I suggest that this is a rather costly face saver for this State.

The fourth point concerning Monarto relates to the Agriculture Department. I say this because the other public servants committed to Monarto can stay here in Adelaide. The Agriculture Department, especially the research centre, is in a somewhat difficult position because the Government has now promised a portion of the land, the existing research centre at Northfield, to be an area for a future produce market within this State. The Government is slowly painting itself into a corner on this matter. As it promised the land at Northfield for a produce market, it had to put the research centre of the Agriculture Department somewhere. I believe it will probably proceed with the research centre on the south-west corner of the allocated site for Monarto. It will expect the employees of that research centre to live in the town of Monarto. Therefore, the headquarters for that Government department, which were originally planned in the late 1950's and early 1960's will be further delayed (and possibly indefinitely delayed) while the Government tries to decide whether the headquarters should be near the research centre at Monarto, at Northfield where the existing centre is, or in the Adelaide metropolitan area. It will keep the research centre at Northfield on a much scaled-down basis, simply as a dairy research centre.

The final point about the future of Monarto is that I believe that the entire investment in that project so far of \$12 600 000 and the potential further \$3 000 000 or \$4 000 000 this year will be an entirely wasted investment on behalf of this State. We will have almost poured down the drain many of the benefits we will receive from the sale of our railways to the Australian Government. I finally refer to the speech I made 12 months ago. On that occasion I concluded my remarks on Monarto with a

statement that I think is just as applicable today (if not more so):

By the year 2 000, 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.

The population of this State will have lynched the Premier by then if he wastes that much finance on their behalf.

The second subject I refer to relates to a very unfortunate circumstance that has taken place within the Education Department. This concerns a swimming instructor for schoolchildren by the name of Mrs. N. Nelligan of 58 Statenborough Street, Leabrook. I am disappointed that the Minister of Mines and Energy (the former Minister of Education) is not here, because he made certain administrative decisions that I believe he should regret and be ashamed of at the present time. This is a very complex case that has been proceeding for almost 12 months. I will relate in some detail the letters and the events that have occurred during the past 12 months. I do so because I believe justice is necessary. I believe that Mrs. Nelligan has been severely and unjustly dealt with by the State Government. I believe that she was initially dismissed and then demoted within that Government department on completely unfair grounds. I will develop the case by reading the letters and the substance of any correspondence that has transpired.

First, I refer to a letter of September 23, 1974, which was signed by Mr. K. G. Richter, organiser of swimming and lifesaving in the Education Department of South Australia, and which was sent to Mrs. Nelligan. It states:

We have been discussing the positions of instructor-in-charge of term-time swimming centres and we have found it necessary to make some changes. Although we are appreciative of the years of service that you have given to swimming, we feel that we have an obligation to the children attending classes and to other instructors to appoint only qualified staff to instructor-in-charge positions at metropolitan pools. I am fully aware that you could present an excellent argument giving your reasons for not completing a course, but you can appreciate that we have demanded this basic qualification from our other instructors. I find myself in the awkward position of asking one of our most experienced instructors to step down. Any difficulties that have arisen in the past year at the pool have in no way influenced our decision.

I believe that that is a significant statement that was the real ground for her dismissal and subsequent demotion. The letter continues:

If you can assist us with suggestions as to a suitable replacement, we would be most appreciative. At the moment it would be between—

I will not mention the names, because I think that unimportant but that letter was signed by Mr. Richter on September 23, 1974. Mrs. Nelligan wrote to the Director-General of Education (Mr. Jones) on October 10, 1974, stating:

I enclose herewith a copy of a letter sent to me by Mr. K. Richter, Organiser of Swimming and Lifesaving. I have had an interview with Mr. Stanton and Mr. Richter and found it most unsatisfactory.

Herewith my swimming qualifications:

1. Bronze Medallion for Life Saving
2. S.A.A.S. Instructor Badge
3. Royal Lifesaving Instructor Badge
4. Royal Lifesaving Examiner Badge.

Then she dealt with her considerable experience in teaching lifesaving, swimming, and other matters from 1946 to the present time. She gives much detail about her experience, first as an instructor and then as an instructor in charge of swimming lessons. She refers to the education that she has had. I need not go into details: the facts speak

for themselves. Those four qualifications show that she is probably one of the most qualified instructors in this State, and there is also the experience she has had from 1946 to 1975. On December 5, 1974, the Deputy Director-General of Education (Mr. Barter) sent a letter to Mrs. Nelligan stating:

I thank you for your correspondence concerning your non-employment as an Instructor-in-Charge for the Term Time Swimming Programme 1974-75. It is clear that you have had a long association with swimming instruction in Learn to Swim Campaigns, Term Time Swimming and Royal Lifesaving Society awards, and I am aware that your qualifications and experience are valuable. I have discussed the matter of qualifications for swimming instructors with Mr. Stanton, Supervisor of Physical Education and I agree that it is desirable for all instructors and especially Instructors-in-Charge employed under the Part-Time Instruction Scheme for swimming instructors to have basic training through the Education Department qualification. This training emphasises a different attitude to teaching from that of the Royal Lifesaving Society and the South Australian Amateur Swimming Association. However, notwithstanding the fact that you have not qualified in this area, employment as a swimming instructor is still available to you but not as an Instructor-in-Charge. If you wish to continue as a swimming instructor, I suggest that you approach Mr. Stanton, Supervisor of Physical Education, who will be able to offer you employment at a pool mutually agreeable to you both.

In two months, we have seen a change in attitude by the Education Department. The initial letter sent to her on September 23 dismissed her from any employment whatsoever. Then, on December 5, she was told she would be allowed to come back as an instructor, but that she had been demoted as instructor in charge. On January 31, after considerable discussion with Mrs. Nelligan, I wrote to the Hon. Hugh Hudson (then Minister of Education). I had already had a telephone conversation with the Director-General of Education and a private discussion with the Minister. In my letter I pointed out Mrs. Nelligan's qualifications, particularly the four qualifications that I have mentioned this evening. I also stated:

On September 23, 1974, Mr. K. G. Richter, Organiser of Swimming and Lifesaving, wrote to Mrs. Nelligan informing her that her services were no longer required because she was not "qualified staff". On December 5, 1974, Mr. K. E. Barter, Deputy Director-General of Education, wrote to Mrs. Nelligan offering her a position as a swimming instructor, but dismissing her as an Instructor-in-Charge. No reasons were given why she was suddenly acceptable as a swimming instructor. It appears to me, as I know the circumstances, that Mrs. Nelligan has been given very poor treatment. The information I have obtained suggests that the qualifications held by Mrs. Nelligan are far superior to the standard required in the basic training through the Education Department. If this is the case, it suggests that Mrs. Nelligan is being demoted for other reasons. Unless my information is incorrect, I believe that Mrs. Nelligan has not been given fair treatment. Would you please investigate this matter?

On February 4, I received a brief note from the Minister stating that he would look into the matter. Just so that I can follow the sequence of correspondence logically, I mention that on March 17, I wrote to Mrs. Nelligan stating that I had had a further private discussion with the Minister and was awaiting his reply. On March 26, I received a reply from the Minister. Again, unfortunately the letter is lengthy but I think I should read it all, because it is important evidence. The letter is signed by the Minister and is addressed to me. It states:

I refer to your letter of January 31, 1975, in which you raised the matter of the non-employment of Mrs. N. Nelligan as Instructor-in-Charge of the Kensington and Norwood swimming pool. As you note in your letter Mrs. Nelligan has given many years of service as a swimming instructor and many children have passed through her hands. The point is, however, that the philosophy and

content of Education Department swimming instruction have developed considerably during recent years; they are designed to enable children to have a variety of satisfying aquatic experiences. As Mrs. Nelligan is not qualified for the position of Instructor-in-Charge it was not possible to continue to employ her in that capacity. It has been made very clear for some years that applicants for the position of Instructor-in-Charge are expected to have Education Department qualifications, but Mrs. Nelligan has made no effort to gain them. Her swimming qualifications are adequate for the purposes for which they were given, namely instruction in competitive swimming strokes and in gaining R.L.S.S. Certificates. The Education Department swimming instruction bears little resemblance in either philosophy or content to the teachings of the other two associations, and Mrs. Nelligan's qualifications do not meet present day requirements.

In other words, the Minister stated clearly that in order to continue as an instructor-in-charge she must have an Education Department qualification. The letter continues:

There are some untrained swimming instructors among our 350 part-time instructors but instructors-in-charge are now all qualified.

I will completely refute that, showing that it is an absolute fallacy. The letter continues:

However, following early representations the Supervisor of Physical Education offered her a position as an instructor, at a pool mutually acceptable to both, but she has not contacted him on the matter. You suggest that Mrs. Nelligan is being demoted for reasons other than her lack of qualifications. Lack of qualifications was in fact the major issue in the decision. However, the active control of other instructors in the methods suggested by the Education Department is another important consideration. I think that that statement relates back to the suggestion that there was some sort of personality trouble between some people involved in the Education Department and Mrs. Nelligan. The Minister's letter continues:

The department is responsible both for efficiency in instruction and the safety of the children taking part.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Is the Minister telling lies in that letter?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes. I am building up the case. The Minister's letter continues:

In this connection it is worth pointing out that the Norwood pool is one of the deepest in the metropolitan area and as such creates a greater opportunity for a difficult rescue situation to arise.

The Minister suggests that the Norwood pool is exceptional, since it is very deep and requires special qualifications. Mrs. Nelligan was an honorary lifesaver at the Norwood pool, and she had by far the best qualifications of any instructor at that pool. The Minister's letter continues:

I am sure that you will agree that the department as the employing authority must do all in its power to ensure that the supervision of all children in the various swimming programmes is controlled by a qualified person with qualifications relevant to and accepted by that employing authority. If this were not the case the question of negligence could rightly be applied to the Education Department.

No-one casts any doubts on Mrs. Nelligan's devotion to her swimming activities over many years. However, in the circumstances I regret to have to confirm that it is not possible to employ her as an Instructor-in-Charge.

Yours sincerely, Hugh Hudson, Minister of Education.

I believe I can point out substantial lies in that letter. I then telephoned the Ombudsman and discussed the whole situation with him at some length. The Ombudsman pointed out to me that unfortunately he could not investigate the matter because it related to the appointment of a person by the Government, and the Ombudsman has no power of investigation with regard to the employment or dismissal of a person by the Government. When I asked the Minister of Education about the qualifications required, he talked about the philosophy of the training course that

people had to go through. The Minister enumerated the following standards and achievements involved in the course:

(a) PRACTICAL

(1) Swim continuously in a style suitable for demonstration purposes, entering with a neat dive or shallow header.

- a. 25 metres front crawl;
- b. 25 metres back crawl;
- c. 25 metres breast stroke;
- d. 25 metres side stroke;
- e. 25 metres el. back stroke.

(These are maximum distances.)

In his reply the Minister also refers to performances, the ability to remain afloat for five minutes, the demonstration of survival swimming, the demonstration of the survival travel stroke, and other demonstrations, including a one-contact rescue on an unconscious patient. The Minister then deals with the theory. On the practical side, Mrs. Nelligan's qualifications far exceed all those qualifications. In connection with the distance of 25 m, Mrs. Nelligan's qualifications would probably be nearer 400 m. In dealing with the theory, so important for an instructor-in-charge, the Minister gave the following requirement:

Answer satisfactorily a written paper on teaching swimming and diving, swimming techniques, artificial respiration, water safety, lifesaving and first-aid.

The Minister states that six 1½-hour lectures are given by the Physical Education Branch. Finally, in connection with instruction, the Minister gives the following requirement:

Satisfactorily instruct a class of pupils for at least 10 lessons.

If we look at the theory, we find no philosophy there. Mrs. Nelligan had proved her ability. She had gone through the same motions for the previous 30 years, and let us remember that the theory dealt with by the Minister was covered in only six lectures, whereas Mrs. Nelligan had given about 30 years of swimming instruction in this State.

Several points can be made. First, Mrs. Nelligan was dismissed because she did not have the Education Department qualifications. She needed the qualifications because there was some mystical philosophy involved in them. The *Hansard* report indicates that there is no mystical qualification. Indeed, Mrs. Nelligan has far exceeded all the qualifications in the report presented by the Minister. The Minister's second point is that there are no instructors-in-charge who do not have the Education Department qualification. I have the names of pools and the addresses of four instructors-in-charge who do not have the qualification. I believe that the Minister has unfortunately misled, or has deliberately misled, Mrs. Nelligan and me in that letter.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I received from the Minister of Works a letter that falls into the same category.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Here it affects the integrity, the qualifications and the employment of an individual who has given a great deal to swimming and education in this State. It is most unfortunate that the Minister has not given this matter more careful consideration. I have much more evidence here which documents the case further. The evidence I have already presented shows that Mrs. Nelligan could not have been dismissed on the ground that she did not have the qualification, because there are four other instructors-in-charge without that qualification. I therefore suggest that there were some other reasons for dismissing Mrs. Nelligan. The following is portion of my letter:

It appears to me, as I know the circumstances, that Mrs. Nelligan has been given very poor treatment. The information I have obtained suggests that the qualifications held

by Mrs. Nelligan are far superior to the standard required in the basic training through the Education Department. If this is the case, it suggests that Mrs. Nelligan is being demoted for other reasons.

I believe I have presented sufficient evidence to show that Mrs. Nelligan was demoted for other reasons. I call on the current Minister of Education to open up the entire investigation to give Mrs. Nelligan an entirely new assessment. The other incredible inconsistency is that on September 23, 1974, because she did not have suitable qualifications, Mrs. Nelligan was dismissed as an instructor. By December of the same year the department was willing to employ her as an instructor, but not as an instructor-in-charge. Again, there is an inconsistency here. Finally, I have a letter from the headmaster of one of the most respected schools in the metropolitan area. Mrs. Nelligan has been an instructor at the school for many years. The headmaster points out some of the difficulties the school has experienced with swimming lessons. Mrs. Nelligan has produced further evidence to me suggesting that there is considerable doubt about the qualifications supplied by the Education Department and about the safety of some of the children involved. I do not want to be involved in that aspect. At this stage I am simply concerned about getting justice for Mrs. Nelligan. Sufficient evidence has been presented by several people to suggest that there should be a further investigation into the safety of swimming instruction in this State. The letter from the headmaster to whom I referred is as follows:

The instructors were not qualified to instruct the students at all levels.

He is talking about recent swimming lessons. The letter continues:

The examiner in lifesaving found that the boys had not been trained adequately and a number failed the test—something that had never happened here before. The instructors themselves admitted inadequacy on their own part in preparing the boys.

I conclude this subject by asking the Minister of Education to reassess the entire circumstances. Mrs. Nelligan and I gave the then Minister of Education (the Hon. Hugh Hudson) and the department a year in which to come forward with some kind of justice for her. Unfortunately, the Minister has continually refused to give such justice or the matter the fair investigation it deserves. I believe that the former Minister now stands condemned for initially dismissing and then demoting a person from the Education Department on grounds other than qualifications or competence. I believe that this occurred because of some personality differences between one, two, three, or four people. I believe there were no grounds for dismissing and terminating the employment of this person, and I hope that the Minister is suitably ashamed. I come now to the third of the four subjects I wish to mention this evening. I refer to the ethics of present Government Ministers.

Mr. Becker: What if they haven't any?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am willing to grant them a certain amount, but I am starting to question how much there is on the Government front benches now. The Liberal candidate for Coles (Mr. Peter Lewis) has sent me a copy of the local *Messenger* newspaper which shows on the front page a photograph of the former Attorney-General (Mr. King) and the Minister of Works (Hon. J. D. Corcoran) taken at the Morialta High School, which is in my district. I wrote to the Minister of Works saying that I was somewhat distressed by the fact that he had paid a visit to a high school in my area and had not shown me the courtesy of telling me that he intended

to do so. I particularly appreciate that the then Attorney-General equally should have shown me the courtesy of informing me that he was coming into my area. I say this, because I had tremendous respect for the former Minister of Education when, I think earlier this year or late last year, he apologised to me that he had not informed me that he intended to visit another school in my area, accompanied by two other State Education Ministers. I believe that this showed great integrity, but it concerns me greatly when I find that two Ministers have come into my district to visit a school and have not shown me common courtesy. I refer also to a case referred to me by the member for Victoria regarding the reaction of Labor Party members between 1968 and 1970 when the Liberals were in Government and how they insisted that on two occasions the Liberal Ministers must notify Labor Party members when Ministers visited their districts. On August 6, I received the following reply from the Minister of Works:

Your letter of August 4 about my visit to the Morialta High School has surprised me. If you are under the impression that local members of Parliament are notified of and invited to accompany a Minister on visits to the member's electorate, you are mistaken: this is simply not so. It is the prerogative of the Minister of Works to decide who should accompany him on matters which affect his portfolios. I make it quite clear that I do not intend to consult with you or any other member of the House on my intention to visit an electorate to deal with matters which come within my jurisdiction, unless I consider it necessary to do so.

I believe that that letter clearly indicates that an ethic which this House has upheld for many years (and I have seen references going back to 1965, when it was raised in relation to a matter concerning the then Attorney-General, the Hon. D. A. Dunstan) has been broken. On the whole, Ministers in previous Governments have respected it, and I give them credit for that. However, it now seems that, because the numbers in the House are even and because the Government is under tremendous pressure, it is willing to throw aside those ethics and not to abide by the rules of the game. I draw this to the attention of the House, because I believe that the Government has suddenly changed the ground rules and no longer will the ethics it has abided by in the past continue in the future.

Finally, I refer to the damage done by trail bikes near Adelaide, particularly in the hills face zone. During a previous Address in Reply debate I raised the subject of stray dogs and mentioned the nuisance they were. I think it was the member for Semaphore who mentioned the noise they made and the danger they were, particularly to postmen. I suggest that trail bikes are rapidly creating the same kind of nuisance, but in a manner different from that of stray dogs. Trail bikes are causing considerable damage to our environment, particularly in the hills face zone. Unfortunately, we see large areas in my own district severely eroded, first by paths created by the bikes and then by the water washing down the paths and washing away further soil. They are destroying the entire vegetation in and ecology of the area. The second point with the bikes is that they create considerable noise and, therefore, considerable nuisance to nearby residents. I have received many complaints from people at the top end of Dashwood Road in the Burnside and Beaumont area. This area is a disused quarry, part of which is owned by the Highways Department, which has co-operated, because it is constructing new fences to keep people off the land. It concerns me to know of the considerable noise and damage created by these trail bikes.

The next matter also relates to another area in my district, namely, the Mount Osmond walk trail. This matter was raised during the last session because of the unsightly site of this trail on the side of a hill. Unfortunately, even though work has now stopped on the bulldozing of the walk-way, it is now being used by trail bikes. I urge the Government to introduce as quickly as possible some kind of legislation or other measures, whatever are necessary, to ensure that the damage to our environment, particularly in the hills face zone areas close to Adelaide, is not continued in the future. However, I have some respect for the people using these bikes and believe that only a small minority abuses the privilege it has. I believe that, as it is a growing sport, we as a community should make available suitable areas where little damage can be done and where noise created by the bikes would not disturb people in residential areas.

Mr. Becker: Monarto!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I cannot think of a better use than to allow the trees to grow and allow the use of the area for trail bikes. I am sure even the Minister would agree that that is the first useful suggestion which has been put forward about how the land could be used. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): I rise in this debate to support the adoption of the Address in Reply and to make some fairly brief comments about remarks made by the member for Davenport relating to Monarto. Before doing so, however, I should like to apologise to the new members of the House on behalf of the member for Davenport, because I believe he sets a bad example in the extent to which he indulges in personalities in making the points he wishes to make. I hope that the new members who heard him this evening will not be misled by his bad example. Regarding the case of Mrs. Nelligan, I am not in a position to say any more than there was nothing inconsistent between the situation in December last and the position in September, 1974; the decision that she could be employed as an instructor was made as a consequence of my review of the departmental decision on the matter. It is clear that personality conflicts were involved in the whole question, and I do not wish to go into the matter any further than that.

Perhaps I could draw members' attention to the situation in this life where justice is not always done. Until recently we had a hard-working Leader of the Opposition, a conscientious man who was within a few votes of becoming Premier of this State. He was as well qualified as anyone else to be Leader of the Opposition. No doubt on previous occasions the member for Davenport supported him in his position as Leader of the Opposition but, for reasons best known to the member for Davenport (reasons which he has not stated but which we might infer as a consequence of the change in seats in the Opposition), he supported the change. Whether he regarded the former Leader as not competent, as unsuccessful or as not having worked hard enough, he will not tell us nor will we ask him to tell us. However, there are occasions in life when changes that involve all of us in some way or another are made. Sometimes we are involved in them to our own personal advantage.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Now you're suggesting there was something for you in the sacking of Mrs. Nelligan.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That was the suggestion of the member for Kavel.

Mr. Goldsworthy: If we carry the illustration you made on it, that is the logical conclusion.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Kavel is using his usual *non sequitur* in his argument. My real reason for rising in this debate is to deal with the question of Monarto. I should like to state a couple of general propositions that I believe are relevant in relation to Government policy on Monarto. The first is that anyone who has lived in Adelaide over the past 15 years or so would not have been impressed by the extent to which there has been increasing difficulty in getting from one place to another within the city, for example, in moving from an area such as Noarlunga into the city or from Elizabeth into the city. From experience in other States it is clear that that kind of problem will get considerably worse unless action is taken now to moderate the future growth of Adelaide. It will not be possible to do that without providing an alternative growth centre within close proximity to Adelaide so that a spill-over effect can take place.

The area around McLaren Vale and Willunga is not, in the Government's opinion, a suitable alternative, because, if that area were developed, it would soon become a continuous suburban sprawl and a direct continuation of the suburbs around Christies Beach and Noarlunga. By the time that area was developed (say by the end of the century) Adelaide would extend from Gawler to Willunga over an area that would substantially increase the problems of living for every citizen of Adelaide. Recently, because of the responsibilities I have had, I have spent more time in Sydney and Melbourne than I did when I was a backbencher. I was brought up in Sydney, and I think it is true to say that the growth of Sydney, the growth of the motor car and the way in which it is used have destroyed significantly the quality of life in that city. It is no longer possible to undertake cultural, sporting or other activities in Sydney without being involved in considerable delay, difficulty and nervous tension. Much the same is true in Melbourne. This exists to such an extent that I know families in Sydney and Melbourne who rarely go out because of the difficulties with which they are confronted. Not only does the size of the city affect the extent of air pollution, noise pollution or the time it takes people to travel around but it also affects people's lives because certain options that are open to them when a city is smaller are removed.

Mr. Dean Brown: The Premier—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: When the member for Davenport was speaking I left the Chamber so that I could listen to his comments about Monarto without interjecting. I suggest that, if the honourable member wishes to interject, particularly when he is out of his seat, he might care to leave the Chamber and listen to me elsewhere. The position in Sydney and Melbourne has now reached a stage where the problems are inescapable; there is no solution to the problem. Both those cities are still growing, have increasing traffic congestion, and noise and air pollution are getting worse. It will not be long before Sydney and Melbourne start to follow some of the more extreme situations that have developed in the large American cities. These problems could be experienced in Adelaide, which has a much lower level of population, because of its geographical nature. Adelaide lies between the Hills and the gulf, and is an elongated city that extends all the way from Gawler to Noarlunga on about an 11 kilometre to 12 km belt through its whole length. In future Adelaide will be a difficult place in which to live.

No-one who travels to the south of the city or regularly to Elizabeth at peak hours would say anything other than what I have said. If we wish to avoid the problems facing Sydney and Melbourne it is necessary to take action now. It will not be good enough to wait until the late 1980's or early 1990's or whenever the population of Adelaide begins to get too large.

Mr. Gunn: How will people get into Monarto?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: When the freeway goes through to Murray Bridge, Monarto will be as close in time to the centre of Adelaide as is Noarlunga and closer in time to the centre of Adelaide than is either McLaren Vale or Willunga. Unless Monarto is developed, there is no doubt that Adelaide will spill over into the McLaren Vale area, and another significant wine-growing area, another breathing space for the existing city, will have been lost. If one considers carefully the problems of movement between McLaren Vale and Adelaide, or between Monarto and Adelaide, there are significant advantages so far as Monarto is concerned.

Mr. Wardle: You would have to increase the speed limit greatly.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That will not be necessary, because if development were allowed to go to McLaren Vale and Willunga, the traffic congestion that would develop along the main South Road would be such that the average speed to get into town would be about 25 kilometres an hour, taken over the whole journey. So far as the existence of the freeway is concerned, the time that can be taken, sticking to the existing speed limit along the freeway from Monarto to Glen Osmond and into the city, will be significantly less than that. That is a basic factor that honourable members have to take into account if they care to look ahead to what the future problems of Adelaide might be.

If we are to have any decentralisation away from Adelaide that enables a spill-over effect to occur (which enables people, for example, to live at Bridgewater or Stirling and perhaps work at Monarto, or, if there are employment problems in the Monarto area, which enable people who live there to work in the city if necessary), it is necessary to have a gap that cannot be filled in by further suburbs between the new growth area and the centre of Adelaide. That gap can be provided by the Hills area, and it can be provided if we take action to ensure that the Hills area itself is not over-developed. It is well known that the consequence of any freeway such as we are already committed to constructing is the development of a ribbon-type development along the freeway. If Monarto does not go ahead, the pressure for suburban development at Oakbank, Balhannah, Nairne, Hahndorf, Littlehampton and Mount Barker will ultimately lead to the area becoming almost one extensive suburb (or one extensive built-up area); the pressure for that will be irresistible, and the quality of the existing Hills area will be significantly affected. It is vitally necessary, in addition to going ahead with the Monarto proposition, to ensure also that the rate of development in the Hills area is effectively controlled so that the first opportunity for ribbon development of any significance is Monarto itself.

Mr. Evans: Do you know that the freeway carries 70 per cent of its density at peak periods now?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I realise that that problem exists, and we may well face the situation of having three lanes each way on the freeway in the foreseeable future. I have little doubt that the Highways Department has undertaken some plan.

Mr. Dean Brown: Will you accept one other point, that is by the year 2000—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I heard the speech of the honourable member for Davenport, and I intend to reply. A fundamental point in relation to any development of this kind is that this State undertook from its own resources the development of Elizabeth and Salisbury as a satellite city.

Mr. Gunn: At what distance?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: At a lesser distance than Monarto, but not a significantly lesser distance in terms of time when the full traffic congestion builds up and affects movement between Elizabeth and Salisbury or between the northern end of Elizabeth or Gawler to Adelaide. Secondly, we already have the entire land for the city of Monarto, obtained at a cost of \$9 000 000 or \$10 000 000, the bulk of which was provided by the Australian Government. When one considers the cost of further subdivisional land in Adelaide, it is clear that, in terms of land costs anyway, Monarto will have a very significant advantage indeed. Thirdly, it is obviously essential that in any kind of development (whether it be Elizabeth or Salisbury, whether it be some project in the Spencer Gulf area or in the South-East) one can set what will be target figures. The project must then be planned on a flexible basis in terms of the requirements of the community and the resources likely to be available. This is the situation in relation to Monarto.

Certainly, when the population of the Adelaide region was expected to be about 1 300 000 by the year 2000, a possible population of Monarto of 180 000 to 200 000 by the turn of the century was capable of achievement. If the expected population on the basis of our current forecasts for the Adelaide region by the turn of the century is 1 100 000, Monarto will not have reached the figure of 180 000 or 200 000 by that time: it may be as little as 60 000 to 80 000. The one thing we can be quite sure about is that, if we assume that the present tendencies will continue for the next 25 years without change, we are bound to be wrong. If honourable members assume that we will not have any further bursts of migration at any time between now and the end of the century, that the present lower rate of population growth will continue from now on, the lessons of the past will suggest that they are bound to be wrong in that assumption. It is likely that there will be further bursts of population, and these bursts of population, be they from migration or through the increase in the birth rate, will largely be in Adelaide if Monarto is not available. If that occurs, say, during the 1980's and we then decide to plan Monarto, it will be too late, because the basic planning stages for a project of this kind take a considerable length of time, and the planning needs to be done properly in order to ensure that the necessary decisions are made in the right kind of order.

Mr. Dean Brown: The Premier's Department says we will have static population by the year 2000.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We may have a static population by the year 2000. The honourable member does not understand population projections. Those projections are based on certain assumptions which are stated specifically and which even the member for Davenport could read if he cared to do so. They are based on certain assumptions about current natural increase, migration and movements to South Australia and other States. Any projector of population will point out that his assumptions

can be wrong, but he would point out that, if this trend continued, that would be the projected population. That is the only kind of basis on which planning can take place.

Mr. Dean Brown: If you thought those figures were wrong, why did you give them to me today?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Davenport is not listening. He keeps on interjecting and he is being stupid and obtuse. If the population of the Adelaide region, including Monarto, is 1 100 000 by the end of the century and if Monarto then has 60 000 to 80 000 living there, what will be wrong with that? A city of 60 000 to 80 000 is perfectly viable. If those population projections turn out to be wrong and we get a further burst of population so that at the end of the century the population of the Adelaide region is 1 200 000 instead of 1 100 000, and the population of Monarto is about 130 000, so much the better for Adelaide. Adelaide will have grown that much less, and the quality of life in Adelaide will be so much better.

The trouble with the member for Davenport and other members opposite is that they are more concerned about making political points than about long-term planning for the future. The choices available regarding the future of Adelaide are to allow extensive development in the Hills areas and the areas of possible suburban development, such as Mount Barker, Hahndorf, and Oakbank, and in addition to allow extensive development south of Noarlunga (and the member for Glenelg should know of the extremely rapid development in the Morphett Vale and Christies Beach area in recent years and the extent to which that area is filling up—

Mr. Mathwin: You have ruined it with your immigration policies.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: One sends up a prayer all the time that our immigration programme was so successful in the past that it produced only one member for Glenelg. One gives thanks for that. Let us not judge the immigration programme on that score, however, and it is not a matter which is within the control of the South Australian State Government anyway. In my opinion, there will be future occasions on which there will be a boost to immigration and, without the assisted passage programme carried out by the Australian Government, we will not get it under our own steam. The matter is as simple as that.

Mr. Dean Brown: According to your own—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Davenport has made one speech.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask that the Minister be given an opportunity to explain without so many interruptions. Otherwise, I shall be forced to name someone.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Surely the appropriate thing to do is recognise that any projection made about future population is a projection, and to recognise that by the year 2000 any projection made previously could turn out to be wrong. We should recognise that, with any of these projections, there will be an appropriate size for Monarto, and that our planning should be flexibly based so that at any time the rate of growth planned for that area can be adjusted to the rate of growth that otherwise would occur in Adelaide. If we do not plan now for the future, we will not have the capacity to absorb extra population outside the central Adelaide region when the time requires that to be done.

The member for Davenport is simply not interested in this. He has a fixed idea about Monarto, but I suggest that other honourable members think carefully about the matter

and consider future problems of Adelaide, comparing the quality of life in this city now with that in Sydney and Melbourne and comparing, if they like, what Sydney and Melbourne were as places in which to live 15 or 20 years ago. I suggest that honourable members ask the people of Sydney and Melbourne what has been the change over the past 15 or 20 years.

Those honourable members should ask whether we wish to take action to ensure that Adelaide in future does not have the kind of problem that Sydney and Melbourne have. Honourable members should ask whether we should wait until we start to experience those problems or plan beforehand and ensure that our planning is carried out of a flexible basis. I know the sensible way to approach this matter. I believe that, if the right decisions can be made with respect to development south of Noarlunga and in the Hills area, Monarto will be a fully viable alternative. It may well be much smaller in the mid-1980's than projected. It may well have only 60 000 or 80 000 there at the end of the century, but, whatever its population will be by that time, it will have helped to limit the growth of Adelaide, and therefore it will help to protect the quality of life for the people who live in the city. If one sees the problem in any large city anywhere in the world, one must be concerned about that issue. If we do not take appropriate action now and over the next few years, this Parliament will allow the quality of life for future generations in Adelaide to be destroyed, and I would not be a party to that.

My final comment is that I regard Monarto as an entirely separate question from questions relating to the development of the South-East, Whyalla, or Spencer Gulf. Monarto is an Adelaide problem. Monarto, in the way it should be conceived and planned, relates to developing a factor that can balance out some of the excess development that otherwise would take place in Adelaide. I do not believe that Monarto precludes any development project that needs to take place anywhere else in the State. After all, in the past we were able to develop rapidly in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, in Whyalla, in the Port Augusta area, and in the South-East.

There is no reason, if we are determined to do that again, why the Monarto project cannot go ahead on a basis of flexible planning. There is no reason why projects for Spencer Gulf cannot go ahead or why developments based on the resources of the South-East cannot go ahead. All these things are within our resources if we want to take action. The only question is whether we, as a community, wish to face up to the challenge. I do not want members opposite to talk the member for Davenport around this evening, but I suggest they have a private chat with him and try to show him the error of his ways.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I support the motion and, while I am welcoming you to this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to your immediate predecessor, because, in the undue haste with which the Government withdrew the previous Parliament's Commission to sit, it was not possible to refer to many people who had served this Parliament well. I refer to a number of people who had their term of office cut short. Those who were here on the occasion of the Deputy Premier's announcement will know very well the attitude expressed by people at that time. I refer particularly to the former Attorney-General and the former Speaker. The Hon. Mr. Ryan was appointed Speaker following the untimely death of the Hon. Reg Hurst. Whilst it could never be said that Mr. Ryan was silent in the dispensation of his wisdom, he



certainly brought a great deal of balance to the debates in this place. I congratulate him on the service he rendered.

I refer, too, to Mr. McAnaney and the former Minister of Labour and Industry (Hon. D. H. McKee). I remember, too, the former member for Mount Gambier, who did not make the grade at the election. The former member for Spence (Mr. Crimes) entered this place as one of the class of 70 but, by virtue of age and the requirements of the Labor Party, he was denied the opportunity of continuing further as a member of this place. A number of members of the other place retired of their own volition. I refer particularly to the long term of service to the Party of which I am proud to be a member, of Sir Lyell McEwin, who was President of the Legislative Council, Leader of the Opposition in that place, and also Chief Secretary, Minister of Health and Minister of Mines over a long period. He also served in many other capacities to the benefit of the South Australian community.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, a former Lord Mayor of Adelaide and an ex-serviceman, also made a major contribution to the work of the Legislative Council. The Hon. Dr. Springett, a member for the Southern District of the Legislative Council, brought expertise in the areas of medicine and social welfare. His work has been valuable in connection with heart disease, the Cancer Foundation, and the Red Cross. Further, his efforts in Biafra, Ethiopia and elsewhere will long be remembered by many South Australians. At the end of the last Parliament we also saw the end of the Parliamentary careers of two former Ministers in the Legislative Council, the Hon. Mr. Shard and the Hon. Mr. Kneebone. Whilst they were not of my political persuasion, I acknowledge their work. Other members who have left Parliament are the Hon. Ross Story, a former Minister, and the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan, the former Opposition Whip in the Legislative Council and a member of the Public Works Committee.

The Minister of Mines and Energy has made a plea for flexibility and for a new approach to the thinking on Monarto. It would be easier to meet his request if the Government had been completely honest with this House and with the public in connection with the information made available about Monarto. It would have been much simpler for all members to appreciate the real benefits of a Monarto-type development if much of the information available to the Government had at the same time been made available to the Opposition. Had Ministers in recent weeks been completely truthful in connection with information freely available in Canberra as to the sum available for Monarto this year, there would have been a much better relationship and greater knowledge on the part of the Opposition and the people.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What do you mean when you refer to the sum available?

Dr. EASTICK: I will be very surprised if the sum is not less than \$5 000 000. In reply to a Question on Notice, a figure of between \$4 000 000 and \$5 000 000 was mentioned. No-one denies that it is important that we have the right quality of life—a term used by the Minister and members on many occasions. However, one must balance the quality of life and the distribution of population against the utilisation of the limited resources available to us. In the information that the Minister has given this evening it is clear that, when he speaks of a much reduced population base at Monarto if, in fact, Monarto

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I didn't use those words. gets off the ground—

Dr. EASTICK: They are my words. If Monarto goes further, we will have to consider seriously what we will do for the quality of life of people at Murray Bridge and elsewhere. These people are calling out for money to be spent to improve the standard of education, hospitals and roads. It will be important to know that we are getting the greatest value from the expenditure of Government funds. The real danger exists that in the formative years Monarto will not have a hospital; it will use the hospital facilities at Murray Bridge. Further, Monarto will not initially have a high school, because it will use the high school at Murray Bridge.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Which will require a second high school at Murray Bridge.

Dr. EASTICK: It is interesting that a former Minister of Education should say that. Last Friday I visited the Gawler High School, which currently has 1 270 students, but it certainly does not have the facilities for that number of students. I found classes in what were previously harrack areas. Whilst the areas were carpeted and whilst the students were enjoying proper instruction, nevertheless the facilities were inappropriate for secondary education. It is easy for the Minister to say that it would mean a second high school for Murray Bridge, but let us remember that there has been a 100 per cent increase in the cost of providing facilities. Indeed, as the Premier said today, there has been a 40 per cent increase in the last 12 months in some instances. Consequently, what chance is there of providing a second high school at Murray Bridge? Will the Monarto students be put into the existing Murray Bridge High School, with the addition of some portable classrooms? The Minister may shake his head and think, "We would not do a thing like that or what has happened to the Gawler High School", but it has happened. The Public Works Committee recently visited the school and considered funds to provide new resource centres. I hope, on behalf of the school council, that the high school is one of the first of the high schools in this State to receive the necessary funds to provide that resource centre and the opportunity of proper instruction, although I recognise, as other members do, that these things have to take their right priority.

Mr. Mathwin: A school in my district has a secretary in a cupboard.

Dr. EASTICK: I have seen some rooms being used which were originally designed for one teacher but which currently house five teachers. I saw a workroom available to the balance of the staff, the former meal area, which served as the work area for 72 staff members. This was an abomination for any staff member, and it was not conducive to the best in teaching. I recognise that it is not always possible to progress as quickly as desired, be it a Labor or Liberal Government. It is simple for the Minister to say that Murray Bridge would get a second high school, but I wonder whether it would.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It has to get one, anyway.

Dr. EASTICK: There has been an upgraded hospital in the area, but, if the projected population growth of Monarto was diminishing rather than progressing, obviously the strain that would be thrown on to that hospital service would be to the disadvantage of that entire community for a long time. When this Bill was first debated in the House, it was made clear that with any new town (call it Monarto or Port Augusta North, South or East, or Mount Gambier Central or whatever) it becomes extremely important that certain facilities are made available to the population so that it may enjoy the circumstances in which

the people are forced to go and live. We cannot have a situation where we deny them the opportunity of social enjoyment by way of theatre, dance facilities, concert hall, etc. One of the real lessons to be learnt from travel overseas with new town developments there is that, wherever there has been a major delay in the provision of such services to the community, there have been major socio-economic difficulties. Where those facilities have been introduced at an early stage there has been a relatively happy set of circumstances, provided (and this is the big proviso which has been talked about here and publicly for so long) there is work opportunity near the town development. I will come back to that situation later.

Regarding the prediction of population (and I accept some of the premises of the Minister's argument about being unable to determine clearly today what the position will be in 2001), I refer to a table called "South Australian Population Statistics and Projections" which was compiled after the census of June 30, 1966, and which made projections of the estimated age distribution and the total population forward at five-year intervals for June 30, 1971, June 30, 1976, June 30, 1981, and June 30, 1986. I seek leave to have the table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN POPULATION STATISTICS AND PROJECTIONS

Age Group	Census		Estimated Age Distribution							
	June 30, 1966		June 30, 1971		June 30, 1976		June 30, 1981		June 30, 1986	
	Nos.	Per Cent of Total	Nos.	Per Cent of Total	Nos.	Per Cent of Total	Nos.	Per Cent of Total	Nos.	Per Cent of Total
0-4 ..	107 488	9.84	113 280	9.47	137 500	10.40	157 460	10.76	172 100	10.65
5-9 ..	113 637	10.41	113 260	9.47	118 080	8.93	142 300	9.72	162 260	10.04
10-14 ..	107 340	9.83	117 780	9.84	117 220	8.87	122 040	8.34	146 260	9.05
15-19 ..	103 207	9.45	110 540	9.24	121 160	9.17	120 780	8.25	125 520	7.77
20-24 ..	77 988	7.14	107 760	9.01	115 180	8.71	125 780	8.60	125 420	7.76
25-29 ..	66 072	6.05	83 080	6.94	112 800	8.53	120 300	8.22	130 820	8.10
30-34 ..	62 098	5.69	69 680	5.82	86 920	6.58	116 540	7.96	123 960	7.67
35-39 ..	72 444	6.63	64 780	5.41	72 300	5.47	89 460	6.11	119 080	7.37
40-44 ..	74 888	6.86	73 760	6.16	66 440	5.03	73 960	5.05	91 020	5.63
45-49 ..	64 936	5.95	75 140	6.28	74 020	5.60	66 800	4.57	74 420	4.61
50-54 ..	60 642	5.55	63 860	5.34	73 860	5.59	72 760	4.97	65 940	4.08
55-59 ..	49 478	4.53	58 680	4.90	61 600	4.66	71 320	4.87	70 340	4.35
60-64 ..	38 917	3.56	46 400	3.88	54 960	4.16	57 800	3.95	67 020	4.15
65-69 ..	31 484	2.88	34 920	2.92	41 600	3.15	49 380	3.37	52 040	3.22
70-74 ..	26 198	2.40	26 260	2.19	29 060	2.20	34 780	2.38	41 360	2.56
75-79 ..	19 014	1.74	19 480	1.63	19 540	1.48	21 680	1.48	26 000	1.61
80-84 ..	10 610	0.97	11 600	0.97	12 080	0.91	12 240	0.84	13 700	0.85
85 + ..	5 434	0.50	6 400	0.53	7 380	0.56	7 880	0.54	8 160	0.51
Total ..	1 091 875	100 Per Cent	1 196 600	100 Per Cent	1 321 700	100 Per Cent	1 463 300	100 Per Cent	1 615 400	100 Per Cent

SOURCE:—Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics.

ASSUMPTIONS:—

1. Net migration level of 8 000 p.a.
2. Migrants have same fertility, masculinity of births and mortality as present population.
3. Average fertility and masculinity of births during 1965-67 will apply in the 20-year period to 1986.
4. Mortality based on Commonwealth actuary figures.

20-YEAR GROWTH RATE = 1.96 per cent p.a. on this projection which includes a conservative assumption regarding net immigration into South Australia.

Dr. EASTICK: If we take that figure and look at it against the figures provided by the Premier in answer to a Question on Notice this afternoon we find that, whereas it was suggested that by June 30, 1976, there would be 1 321 700 people in South Australia, the predicted figure is now 1 252 300. The 1986 figure given on the prediction was 1 615 400, whereas the figure given this afternoon was 1 366 100. During that period there has been a marked change. These sort of changes will go on on a regular basis whenever the responsible officers are called on to look at the figures and the current information. It was interesting to note in the detail given with the answer this afternoon that the intention was to review the matter on an annual basis, and I look forward to that information being made freely available to members.

I will now refer to the figures the Premier provided this afternoon in a document which was prepared in the Premier's

Department, which is dated June, 1975, and which has not been distributed previously. The document was prepared in the Premier's Department after the Borrie report was first brought down. The document is a Government assessment to determine whether the Borrie predictions for South Australia were correct. I refer members to the Questions on Notice that will appear in today's *Hansard* wherein the Premier gave a series of reasons why his Government was unable to accept the Borrie predictions. One might well ask whether these altered series of figures have been referred to the Borrie committee and whether it accepts the alterations that have been made to the document by the South Australian Government. I think that that would be a useful exercise, and we should know what has taken place. More particularly, in referring to the figures given this afternoon, we find that, between 1975 and 1976, the Government has reckoned on an increase in population

for the 12 months of 11 400 people from all sources, such as immigration and natural birth, as against deaths and loss by people leaving the State; that represents a 0.91 per cent increase of the present population.

We find that the same figure of 11 400 increase is indicated right up to 1979; and then in 1980 and again in 1982 an increase of 11 500 is shown, or 100 greater than the 11 400 base figure to which I have referred. From 1982 onwards, there is a reduction in the increased population of this State; it goes down progressively to 1987, with a figure of 10 900 as against the much larger population of the State at that time. In effect, it is a population increase of only 0.7 per cent a year. The increase between 2000 and 2001 is predicted to be 5 800 people, against a predicted total population of 1 491 500. In other words, the Premier has indicated in these figures that the percentage increase by 2001 will be down to 0.38 per cent, an extremely minimal increase in the size of the population. During a debate between the Minister of Education when he was Minister of Development and Mines and me on the ABC programme *Today at One*, the Minister said that what we were looking at in housing people was not so much the size of the family but the number of married couples. I accept that, if there is a reduction in the overall size of the family, it does not necessarily decrease the demands made on the State, private enterprise or the individual to provide housing. However, it is pertinent to say that the size of the areas required for housing reflects the expected size of the family unit.

Whilst it is expensive to provide individual units, there is a reduction in the overall cost. This is a matter that will be built into all the forward projections. This afternoon the member for Florey spoke about the will of the people and indicated the importance of their vote to the percentage of the vote, but he failed to refer to the situation that with 48 per cent of the votes cast at the recent State election for the Upper House the Labor Party gained 54.6 per cent of the seats. Far be it for the member for Florey or any other member opposite to talk about a gerrymander when the Labor Party has been responsible for introducing a form of election for the Upper House that has provided just that result.

When legislation dealing with the form of voting for the Legislative Council was recently considered, the point I have just outlined was raised, but no time was provided for the necessary drafting to be completed to ensure that the provision I have raised would be included. However, it was subsequently shown that it was possible to transfer the remainder of a quota after the whole quotas had been allotted. If the Party opposite wishes to maintain its holier than thou attitude, which does not suit it, when it is responsible for perpetrating on the people of this State an electoral system that is unjust and does not provide for one vote one value, it is high time it accepted and stated publicly that it will accept a series of amendments that will allow the preferences of the remaining quotas to be allotted.

If members opposite are to be fair to all concerned, they will accept a series of amendments framed in the manner I have outlined. Before discussing various aspects of the Corbett report and the effects outlined by His Excellency of the undertaking that would lead to a review of the growth centres for the north and south of Adelaide, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): This afternoon I asked a question of the Premier relating to a letter, which he says he has received, advising him that Commonwealth funds might not be available for planned and promised State projects, and asked what effects this would have on the level of unemployment in South Australia and on the welfare generally of South Australians. I received a reply that was evasive in the extreme. My colleagues who asked questions on specific matters relating to Christie Downs electrification, water filtration and sewerage got short shrift indeed and were given the run-around, to use a colloquialism—we got no information whatever. In fact, the Premier went so far as not to tell untruths but to distort the truth and to deliberately ignore other parts of the question I asked.

To me, this evasiveness can mean only one thing—that the Government knows full well that it cannot honour the election promises it made at the time of the recent election and, indeed, the election before that.

Mr. Coumbe: You're not attacking the Government's credibility are you?

Dr. TONKIN: I am indeed. The election promises contain the unconditional removal of the petrol tax on the passing of the railways Bill, the removal of succession duties on the average-size marital home, the pursuit of the development of Redcliff, the pursuit of the setting up of the Nissan/Datsun motor engine production plant, and the undertaking to proceed with the development of water filtration and sewerage works (which especially affects Port Pirie). Now, only one month since the election, many of these promises have proved to be pie in the sky and we have almost said goodbye to the development of Redcliff, because it is doubtful whether it will ever proceed, goodbye to the small engine manufacturing plant, which I doubt we will ever see, and we have almost said goodbye to Monarto. It was interesting to hear the Minister of Mines and Energy this evening speak of the scaling down (which is the best construction we could place on his remarks) of Monarto. Indeed, the Minister said Monarto could well be much smaller. What a back-down from the first wonderful, glossy, full-page pictures that were issued by the Monarto Development Commission. It now looks as though some other long-term, long-outstanding election promises will not be honoured, too. I refer again to the Christie Downs electrification, the sewerage works (which the Minister of Works has said many times that he believes are so essential to catch up the back lag), and the water filtration plan that was originally the policy of the Liberal Government but was put forward by the Labor Government as its own policy, more than two elections ago. Even education is going to be affected, and we see that national parks will possibly not be acquired, including those most important and imaginative plans for the wet lands.

To put another point of view, at least we have seen some action taken in this House to remove the petrol tax, but I point out that the promise was that the petrol tax would be removed, and no promise was given that it would not be put back on again. If we put the correct construction on the details of the letter that was sent to the Premier, and consider the Premier's evasiveness in relation to it, we can only wonder whether he will be forced to reimpose a petrol tax as a way of raising finance; there are not many other avenues open to him. To put the

very best construction on the events of this afternoon, the Premier was remarkably ill-informed on the current situation of the affairs of this State before the election; to put the worst construction on it, he knew perfectly well what was the true state of affairs and deliberately withheld that information, information that the public was well entitled to and should have been able to expect from him as a matter of course. If the Commonwealth is to put the financial screws on South Australia and these other projects are to fail or be adversely affected, we have the right to know about it now.

The electors of South Australia need to know about it now and it is their right. Evasive answers, such as those given by the Premier and his Ministers this afternoon, demonstrate an absolute disregard for their responsibilities to the people of this State. The replies were disgraceful. It is time we had some honesty from the Government opposite. It is about time this Government lived up to its policy of open government. Perhaps the Premier is not willing to face facts: perhaps that is the answer. Perhaps he believes the unemployment problems will go away if he ignores them. I do not think that is really feasible, as I do not think he is really as silly as all that. I believe that Question Time is a most important time for the Opposition. It is one of the few times when the Opposition has a chance to probe and penetrate, and to find out, on behalf of the people of South Australia what the Government is doing. I believe that, if Question Time is to fulfil its proper function instead of becoming the farce which the disgraceful performance of the Premier and his Ministers made it today, they must act responsibly and live up to all the responsibilities they owe to the people. It is essential that they treat Question Time seriously, provide information when it is requested, and do so in a way that will restore the trust of the people in the Government again. I believe that the trust of the people in this Government is presently at an all time low; it is only a matter of luck that it is not in fact occupying the Opposition benches now.

Mr. GROTH (Salisbury): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate you on your elevation to the Speaker's Chair. I also congratulate you on the manner in which you have handled your duties since taking office. I wish to grieve about a situation that has developed in my district relating to a major traffic hold-up problem. The problem exists at the junction of Port Wakefield Road and Salisbury Highway. The problem is caused mainly in the morning. I have received many complaints in relation to this bank-up which my constituents say occurs on most mornings when workers are going to the city and to the Port Adelaide area. This takes place over three kilometres. I will read a letter which I have received from a constituent and in which he points out the whole problem. He states:

I am writing this letter in the hope that you might be able to speed up the construction work at the junction of Port Wakefield Road and Salisbury Highway. In particular I refer to the widening of the railway bridge some half a mile south of the junction. This morning, August 5, at 7.30 a.m., the traffic was banked up for approximately 3 km—the distance from the bridge to the commencement of buildings at Parafield Gardens along Salisbury Highway. It took me 20 minutes to travel this distance, making me a corresponding time late for work in the city. This is not an isolated incident, and occurs at least two or three times during the working week—the worst day being Tuesday for some reason. On other days, whilst the traffic is still fairly heavy, it does keep moving without too much delay, but nevertheless, we would not travel at more than about 20 m.p.h. till clearing the bridge and regaining the dual carriageway at Cavan.

Whilst I realise that there are alternative routes to the city, these are impractical for me due to delivering children to Parafield Gardens ready for school at Shepherdson Road, and would necessitate retracing my tracks back up to Kings Road, which adds both to mileage travelled and time consumed. Many motorists, upon finding the Salisbury Highway blocked, turn on the highway at risk to themselves and oncoming traffic, and travel along Ryans Road, which at the northern end is only a potholed track and make their way out to Port Wakefield Road via Windsor Street. This in turn adds to the delay for the motorist remaining on the Salisbury Highway as these people who would normally be awaiting access to Port Wakefield Road are now approaching from the right, and of course, gain right of way. Consequently, once the Salisbury Highway has reached its banked-up capacity, it remains full and the last people find the alternative route more attractive—namely to the detriment of those in front of them.

What is happening is that many of the people who are travelling to the city and other suburbs are aware that there is a hold-up at this junction, and there are various routes that they can take from Salisbury and Elizabeth to get on to Port Wakefield Road so that they gain right-of-way at this junction. This means that these people who find it necessary to use Salisbury Highway have the hold-up problem, and, of course, that is making them almost 20 minutes to 30 minutes late for work. If there is a possibility of anything being done, my constituents and I would appreciate it.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I draw attention to the situation and conditions of the mobile patrol vehicles used by the Surf Lifesaving Association on the beaches. Some relief ought to be given and a special dispensation granted to this association. I do not think that any fees should be payable in relation to the vehicles that this organisation uses. At present, three clubs own mobile patrol vehicles, namely, the Taperoo Beach Surf Lifesavers Club, the Semaphore Surf Lifesavers Club, and the Henley Surf Lifesavers Club, with the West Beach and Grange clubs both negotiating to purchase vehicles next season. Last season saw the introduction of the mobile patrol vehicles, and it is logical to assume that over the next few years every club along the metropolitan coastline will own a mobile patrol vehicle of some kind, thus providing more protection for the beach-going public. I refer now to the vehicles that are used at present. For a Land Rover, the registration fee is \$24.60 and the third party insurance charge is \$61. The registration fee for a Suzuki is \$18, and the third party insurance costs \$73. The registration fee for a Honda tricycle is \$9, and the third party insurance costs \$28. The total cost to the association for the three vehicles is \$231.60 a year. The vehicles are equipped with two-way radio, rescue equipment, a shark siren, a first-aid kit, and many other things used in rescue. The vehicles are never used on the roadway or outside the patrol hours. For these reasons, I consider that exemption should be given, particularly in regard to registration fees. I understand that relief is given in this field to other community service organisations.

The association is required to register its mobile classroom. This is another service that it provides to train lifesavers to protect our beaches. The registration fee for this classroom is \$63, and there is an insurance charge of \$70. The vehicle is used solely to educate students and the public, and it is a Honda Civic. For another Honda Civic, the registration fee is \$18.20, and insurance costs a further \$58. The Assistant Secretary uses this vehicle for promotion and fund-raising functions. The association also has a Datsun four-wheel drive vehicle for which the registration fee is about \$60, and insurance costs about \$70. This vehicle is used exclusively for

towing out the jet rescue craft from the beaches. The jet rescue craft is used on the beaches in patrol times right throughout the summer.

I think all members, particularly some front bench members opposite, realise the job that these young life-savers do. The organisation is voluntary and those in it give many hours to it. They are trained for this type of work and they aspire to make our beaches safe for all who use them. Many lives have been saved on the beaches throughout Australia by the efforts of lifesavers. To many people throughout the world, the movement signifies Australia. People abroad have said that they relate the association to Australia because it is well known throughout the world, I, as a past State President of the association, hope that the Government will consider this matter sympathetically and alleviate the position that the association is in regarding additional finance that it must raise to continue serving the public of South Australia.

The other matter that I raise relates to Standing Orders of this House, particularly regarding Question Time. I am most disappointed at the present position. It is extremely difficult for us to ask a question each day. I suppose that the average for one who was fortunate would be two questions a week. The position is quite different from what obtained at the end of last session, when Government members rarely asked a question. It is obvious, from the results of the last election, that Government members have been told by the Party hierarchy that they must ask more questions, get more publicity, and make it seem that they are working a lot harder in their districts. Therefore, more questions are asked from the Government side, and that reduces the availability of time for the Opposition.

During last session, the Government halved Question Time from two hours to one hour, and most of that hour would be taken up by the lengthy replies that some Ministers give. Those Ministers seem to give lengthier replies as Question Time proceeds, but unfortunately until now they have not been scolded for the action they are taking. I hope that they will be scolded. We have two additional members on this side, and it is practically impossible for each member to ask a question each day.

I believe it most important that the Opposition should have the opportunity to test a Government and get replies from Ministers. Those replies should be short and snappy, but it is probably stretching the point too far to ask for that from some Ministers. It is necessary to put this difficulty to the Government, and I hope that Government members will relax a little and allow more time for our questions. After all, before long we will have private member's day and usually fewer questions are asked in Question Time on Wednesdays, so we will be fortunate if we are able to ask one question a week then. If a change is not made soon, I will try to move a private member's motion that Question Time be extended to two hours to give the Opposition a fair go in this Parliament.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I welcome the opportunity to speak in this debate, and I was pleased to hear the member for Salisbury complaining about the lack of funds for road construction. We do not often hear the honourable member in action, but I draw to his attention and that of other members some problems that country people face regarding the lack of funds, which have been created by this Government and its Commonwealth colleagues. The member for Salisbury referred to the road from Port Wakefield

to Salisbury. What about the Flinders Highway? An amount of \$650 000 was spent on that highway and it was built up to sub-base standard, but not one cent has been spent on it for about 12 months. Whose fault is that? The person who created that situation also created the situation faced by the member for Salisbury. For the next three years the Hon. Mr. Jones, the Commonwealth Minister for Transport, will allocate to South Australia only \$2 000 000 for rural arterial roads. In 1970, under a Liberal Government, the road between Tumby Bay and Cummins was built up and made ready for sealing, but for nearly five years nothing has been spent on that road. Further, local government has had its funds drastically cut, with the result that it will have to stand down staff. Like the member for Kavel, I have been approached by local government in my district, complaining about the decrease in allocations. It is all very well for the member for Salisbury to complain: he will campaign at the next election for the Hon. Mr. Jones and his bunch, who are wrecking the economy. Every member can point to projects in his area that have been cut back because of the actions of the Labor Party in this State and in the Commonwealth sphere. It is Mr. Jones and his colleagues who are to blame.

The Stuart Highway is a disgraceful situation. Prior to the May, 1974, Commonwealth election, Mr. Whitlam promised the Alice Springs people that he would immediately seal the Stuart Highway, but nothing has been done. That road is in a deplorable condition, with people stranded for days on end. The people at Andamooka are often cut off because there is no money to provide reasonable access to the town. It is the fault of this Government and of the friends in Canberra of the member for Salisbury. The people of my district showed how much they appreciated the representation that I gave them by returning me with the highest percentage vote recorded.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: I appreciate your protection, Mr. Speaker, from the rabble on the Government benches.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is an unparliamentary remark, and I must ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

Mr. GUNN: I withdraw it out of complete respect to you, Mr. Speaker, and this institution. The member for Salisbury should now join with members on this side and make the strongest possible protest to Mr. Jones and his colleagues. The sneering member for Stuart ought to get up and say something, instead of continually interjecting. I appeal to the Minister of Transport and the Government to try, if they have any influence with their Commonwealth colleagues, to get more money released for rural arterial roads. Thousands of dollars have been spent on some projects, but those sums have been virtually wasted because the work done has deteriorated rapidly, and people still have to travel over poor roads. It is unfair that the people at Andamooka and Coober Pedy should have to face such problems as they have faced in the past two years regarding access to their towns. When there is heavy rain, the roads are cut and the airports are out of commission. On one occasion a helicopter had to ferry goods to the people.

If the Government is not willing to accept the challenge, the problems will be rectified on the election of a Commonwealth Liberal Government. The sooner such a Government is elected the better for the people of South Australia.

Mr. Fraser will soon be Prime Minister, and the Leader of the Opposition in this place will be the Premier. Then, positive action will be taken to give country people a fair go, instead of the shabby treatment that they have received from the Labor Party, which has a hatred for people outside the metropolitan area. The Labor Party has demonstrated

this hatred by penalising country people. The Labor Party hates country people because they will not support a Socialist Party.

Motion carried.

At 10.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 13, at 2 p.m.