

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 13, 1975

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

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mrs. BYRNE presented a petition signed by 1 026 residents of South Australia stating that the burden of succession duties on a surviving spouse, particularly a widow, had become, with inflation, far too heavy to bear and ought, in all fairness and justice, to be removed. The petitioners prayed that the House would pass an amendment to the Succession Duties Act to abolish succession duties on that part of an estate passing to a surviving spouse.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS**STATE'S FINANCES**

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say whether, with the imminent breakdown of the present system of Commonwealth-State financing as administered by the Commonwealth Government, he will support new proposals for equitable revenue-sharing between the Commonwealth and the States that will guarantee South Australia a more reasonable proportion of taxation revenue to meet its needs? The Premier, after many Premiers' Conferences (too many), has left no doubt as to his dissatisfaction with the financial deals he has negotiated with the Commonwealth. The State is financially more than ever in the hands of the Commonwealth Government, as evidenced by the Premier and his Ministers' evasive reaction to the question asked yesterday about the warning letter received. As the financial squeeze is applied by the Commonwealth, it is imperative the State's revenue is sufficient to match increasing State costs, and obviously the Commonwealth Government will not provide sufficient funds. Therefore, will the Premier put Party affiliation aside and advocate and support a new financial arrangement that will provide the fair proportion of funds so urgently needed for this State's welfare?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will always support any proposal which will ensure that this State has sufficient moneys for its basic requirements for services. I can only say to the Leader that we got a lousy deal from the Liberal Party when it was in Government in Canberra.

Mr. Millhouse: You always say this: why don't you answer the question?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader is talking about putting aside Party affiliations. He must know that we got a very poor deal from the Liberals in Canberra, as did my predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Steele Hall, who rightly complained bitterly, and I supported him in that complaint. I have not been influenced by Party considerations in making complaints of this kind. I supported the then Premier when he complained. I did not get the same kind of support when I complained, (regardless of who was in power in Canberra) if we did not get a good deal, and I complained publicly. If the Leader's question is seeking to let me—

Mr. Rodda: You complained privately, too!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I complained not only publicly.

Mr. Venning: You haven't stopped!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: My complaints have borne fruit. I point out to the honourable member who has just interjected (I know it is not in order for me to answer interjections), that at the moment South Australia has by far the best financial position of any State, and, despite the things said recently in South Australia by the Leader of the New South Wales Government, his Government is facing a \$200 000 000 deficit on its railways and in excess of that on its total revenue, and he has repeated that to a great extent recently in the paper. His denials a little while ago apparently did not have much basis. If the Leader is suggesting to me that I should support some proposal for tax-sharing on the Canadian basis, I can only say to him that any examination of the Canadian tax-sharing system can give little confidence that it will produce the result that he is asking me to support.

In fact, the Canadian tax-sharing system does not advantage the smaller Provinces of Canada. The amount per capita which the Provinces get out of the tax-sharing system is not as much as we get in financial reimbursement grants from the Commonwealth under the present formula. The extra money that the Provinces get in Canada comes from special purpose assistance grants. Quite frankly, I am not enthusiastic about a proposal of that kind. I have no doubt that the States of New South Wales and Victoria will be enthusiastic about it, because they will reckon that they will receive a larger share of the amounts paid in income tax than the other States receive, as they have a richer tax base than have the smaller States. However, I notice that certain of the Commonwealth members of the Liberal Party who come from the smaller States, including Mr. Kevin Cairns, are likewise not enthusiastic about the proposal. I assure the Leader that, if there is a reasonable proposal that will give to the States a better assurance of reasonable finance to carry on their services, I will support it.

MARDEN HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Education say what is the priority allocated to providing a Commonwealth library resource centre at Marden High School? The school applied for such a centre last year. It is important for the future overall planning of the school that it should be aware of the allocation of the complex so that it can provide a site for the proposed building, taking into account public access and, of course, also ensuring that any intrusion on present playing areas is prevented. I therefore ask the Minister to ascertain whether the centre can be provided soon.

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

COMMONWEALTH PURCHASING COMMISSION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Premier support the Commonwealth Labor Government's proposal for a centralised purchasing commission to do all Government buying? In addition, can he say what impact such a commission will have on Government purchasing in South Australia? Legislation was introduced in the Commonwealth Parliament last session to set up an authority to do all Government purchasing, and the sum involved is quoted at about \$13 000 000 000 a year. The commission will obviously have a tremendous impact on companies and industry throughout our community. I therefore ask the Premier whether he supports this centralist socialistic move by the Commonwealth Government and just what impact it will have broadly on Government purchasing in South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know why the honourable member raises this question with me. In South Australia we have a State Supply Department, which normally provides for tendering to the State Government in relation to its purchases and which is the normal purchaser on behalf of the Government for all purposes. If the Australian Government believes it should rationalise its purchasing procedures in the way in which the States have already done, I really cannot see that this matter is something about which we should complain. In fact, I am not certain why the question was asked in this House.

BOATING TRAGEDY

Mr. OLSON: Has the Minister of Marine received additional information regarding the recent boating fatality at Semaphore?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. The honourable member asked me yesterday about the report, which I received from the Marine and Harbors Department late last night. The report states that there was some evidence to indicate that the alleged cries for help heard at Outer Harbor last Friday evening and the weekend boating tragedy may have been unconnected. The report reveals that a fisherman had told the watchman at Outer Harbor at about midnight that he heard faint cries for help. The watchman reported this information to a signalman in the signal tower at Outer Harbor who scanned the area with a searchlight for a quarter of an hour and also listened intently, without result, for any cries for help. The weather was fine, with a calm sea and a light northerly breeze. In fact, it was a night on which voices would carry well. After his fruitless search the signalman telephoned the watchman asking that the fisherman let him know if he saw or heard anything further. The fisherman left, and nothing further was seen or heard of him. The police were not notified. I think it is well known that Outer Harbor is visited by numerous fishing parties and young people who skylark in the area. It is not unusual to hear cries for help when this skylarking is going on. There is no hesitation by signalmen in contacting the police when they consider the circumstances warrant it. In fact, there is a close liaison between the signal station and the police. I have furnished a copy of the full report to the police, who have established the fact that there was no safety equipment on board the boat. I think that this underlines the importance of the new boating legislation which provides that, from September 1, adequate safety equipment must be carried on all pleasure craft. In fact, they must be registered, if they are used after September 1. It is interesting to note that a watch found on the only body recovered following the tragedy had stopped at 11.20 p.m., and that could have been the time the boat capsized.

CONTAINER TERMINAL

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier start negotiations immediately with the Australian Government and with the Australian National Railways Commissioner for the establishment of an international container terminal at Outer Harbor, together with appropriate new railway links and storage facilities? Much benefit would accrue to South Australian industry if such an international container terminal was established at Outer Harbor as quickly as possible.

Mr. Whitten: We'll start tomorrow.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If the Premier can do that, all the better, but I am just asking him to do it as quickly as possible. Now that the Australian National Railways is able to establish definite links from this State with other

States, such a scheme would improve the railway links for the transport of such containers. Under the railways transfer agreement, the national railways is given access to the Dry Creek and Islington storage facilities, and I understand the Commissioner would also be able to use wharf facilities on LeFevre Peninsula. I also understand the Bureau of Transport Economics in Canberra has recommended that Commonwealth finance be provided for the establishment of a heavy-duty freight line to Outer Harbor, perhaps over a new bridge via Torrens Island. Such an international container terminal would have great benefit to this State, particularly for the struggling manufacturing industries mentioned in this House and in another place yesterday.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The negotiations have been under way for some time, and I am told they are progressing satisfactorily. The Bureau of Transport Economics has not yet reported in such a way as the honourable member has suggested; investigations there are still proceeding.

WHYALLA TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Mr. MAX BROWN: Can the Minister of Education say whether there has been any development concerning the possibility of proceeding with the intended expansion programme for the Whyalla Technical College? Although I appreciate that the Minister has only recently been given the portfolio of Education, he may nevertheless know about the matter. I understand that the expansion project was curtailed by a cut-back in Australian Government spending in this area, and was to be the subject of negotiation. Have negotiations taken place and, if they have, is there any better possibility now of the project being proceeded with?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am well aware of the honourable member's interest in this matter; in fact, I recall that he raised the matter during a grievance debate in this House. Considerable developments have been made recently, and we will be in a position to call tenders for March next year. I can give that to the honourable member as a definite date.

FRASER PARK SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Government has the funds to build Fraser Park Primary School and, if it has, when it will be built? I believe that probably the Minister may have had time, since his appointment, to familiarise himself with the history of the Fraser Park school. What is happening is that there are two schools on the one site, with two headmasters, two staffs, and two groups of children. In fact, 800 children are being accommodated in a school built for 600. Other than several appropriate classrooms for the additional 200 pupils, all the other facilities on the school site are designed for 600 students. When this matter first came before the Public Works Committee, the department believed that this new Demac school would be occupied in February, 1975. Following inspections by that committee and further submissions to it, it was believed that the school would be occupied in May, 1975. However, so far not even the earthworks have commenced, so that there is no sign at all at present of this school being built at Fraser Park. Because of the congestion taking place, afternoon recess has had to be cancelled, as many accidents were occurring in that period. As the optimum use is being made of the facilities by the two schools on the one site, it has been suggested that perhaps the headmasters and staffs have made things work rather too well, so that the whole situation has been left, and the new school not even begun.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I suppose it is obvious that it is not only a matter of money but also of priority. Those two elements must congeal, as it were, to determine when a project gets off the ground. As I do not have the immediate information which the honourable member requires, I will get it for him.

SEATON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. HARRISON: Can the Minister of Education say when the stage I conversion of changeroom and toilet facilities for girl students will commence at the Seaton High School? The name of this school, previously known as the Seaton Boys' Technical High School, has been changed to Seaton High School and it has become a comprehensive co-educational high school. In a press statement appearing in the *Weekly Times*, of Wednesday, July 23, 1975, the Minister said that stage I of the conversion, which comprised the erection of the girls' changeroom and the provision of girls' toilets, would be completed in two months. The school council has expressed to me alarm and concern at the fact that at this stage work on the changerooms and toilet facilities has not commenced.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As the honourable member raised this matter with me some time ago, I have some information for him. Stage I of this project involves the construction of girls' toilets and changerooms. Stage II of the project involves the construction of a home economics block. Regarding stage I, the Demac changerooms are expected on site in September. Although this may not be the point of the honourable member's question, no doubt he will be interested to know that work on stage II was started on July 14 and that the target date for completion is May next year.

COOPER CREEK FERRY

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands how many cattle and vehicles were ferried across the Cooper Creek on the Birdsville Track crossing during the flooding of that creek last year, and what was the total cost of the operation? Members will recall that submissions were made in this place (and also in another place) to have a ferry introduced at the Cooper Crossing, so that cattle owners could ferry cattle across to the southern markets. Unfortunately, there was a delay at the commencement of this project, and prices of cattle were reduced drastically during that time. When the ferry came into operation it worked well, with most people being pleased with the result. As the creek has now ceased to flow and the road is open again to traffic, people wish to know how many cattle and vehicles were ferried across the creek.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain that information from my colleague and let the honourable member have it.

MODBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Works obtain a report for me on the possibility of the sewerage by the Engineering and Water Supply Department of Grove Street and part of Radar Street, Modbury? I have raised this matter previously, a reply being given in this House on August 21, 1973. In a letter dated June 2, 1975, in reply to other representations, the Minister informed me that the area east along Smart Road and part of another street situated near the area to which I am referring have been approved for sewerage, and that the construction of the sewer main is expected to begin this month. I ask that consideration be given to sewerage both areas simultaneously.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to discuss the matter the honourable member has raised with the Engineer in Chief and bring down a report for her as soon as possible.

NARACOORTE WELFARE OFFICE

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say what plans he has to upgrade his department's office in the town of Naracoorte? I understand that for a little over a year we have had the services of a social worker, Miss Carol Joy, who has done an excellent job in her field. I think it is fair to say that she has had more work than she can cope with, because Naracoorte and the surrounding areas have their share of underprivileged people. She had good liaison with the Mount Gambier office. I understand that another officer, a female, has been appointed to Naracoorte. This appointment is looked on favourably by the people of the surrounding area of which Naracoorte is the centre. I ask the Minister whether he can say what he intends regarding the extension of this valuable work in the township of Naracoorte.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for saying to me earlier that he might want to know something about this matter. Because of his kindness, I am able to give him information that I would not normally have held off the cuff (particularly as a new Minister in this portfolio). It gives me some pleasure to be able to say that, a second Community Welfare Department officer has been appointed to the branch office at Naracoorte. This young lady's name is Miss Marion Rodda; I think that possibly indicates why her appointment has been looked on by the honourable member with some pleasure. The department intends that this office become a district office, instead of a branch office. At the same time, it is intended to set up in the area a community council for social development, in effect based on that office. Hitherto, that has been good news for the honourable member but, unfortunately, I now have to change my tone slightly and say that, at present, the overall upgrading of the office depends on priorities which have not been decided.

STRAY DOGS

Mr. WELLS: Will the Minister of Education investigate an anomaly that appears to exist concerning the removal of stray dogs from school properties? The headmaster and staff members of a school in my district have complained to me that stray dogs are often on the premises; some of the children have been bitten and some of the teachers have been bailed up. When I suggested that they should contact the local council, they told me that they had done this and that the police had been notified. Nothing could be done, and the only suggestion was that the animals be tied up. The council told the headmaster that it had no authority to send its dogcatcher into the school because it was Government property. This anomaly should be removed in the interests of the safety of schoolchildren in Government schools.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I thank the honourable member for his question. I can vividly remember in grade 5, I think it was, the headmaster coming into the classroom with blood streaming from a hand as a result of his attempt to remove at least a part of the canine menace from the schoolyard. The matter seems to me to involve a technical legal problem that may require legislation. However, I will have the matter examined.

POWER STATION

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy inform the House of the plans and specifications and any other detail of the intended coal-powered electric power station to be built in the Mid-North of South Australia? During a radio newscast in Adelaide at 9 a.m. today it was announced that the Electricity Trust was to build a \$100 000 000 powerhouse powered by coal with a capacity output of 400 000 kilowatts to be completed by 1983. The site envisaged is somewhere between Wallaroo and Whyalla. The news item invited submissions from the public, together with appropriate details, suggesting and supporting a suitable site. Only a few years ago Wallaroo made a relevant submission that was well received. I submit that Wallaroo, with its present resources and established services, such as port installations, road communication, rail service (with the suggested gauge standardisation), and water supply, and the availability of a local labour force, would be the ideal and logical site for such a power station.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that, if you had known that this question would be asked, you might not have given the honourable member the call. The position with respect to the site of the proposed power station is that a committee has been appointed to consider alternative sites and the environmental consequences in relation to any particular site. The committee, which was appointed by the trust some time ago, includes environmental representation. I suggest to the honourable member that, if he has some submission to make, he make it directly to the committee or, alternatively, if he wants to use my office as a post box, he may send it to me and I will ensure that it gets to the committee.

Mr. Dean Brown: At last a useful purpose for the Minister has been found!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We know that the honourable member is an intelligent person; if he wants to make a submission, he should by all means do so. We believe that the power station can extend the life of the Leigh Creek coalfield and, for the future, there is a back-up supply available from Lake Phillipson. The Lake Phillipson deposit would ensure sufficient coal to enable power to be generated in the Spencer Gulf area well into the twenty-first century. The economic problems relating to the establishment of the power station suggest that it must be established on the gulf, with coal brought to the power station, and the committee will recommend on the site of the station. The terms of reference indicate that as far south as Wallaroo is a possibility, but any submissions must go to the committee.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. WHITTEN: Is the Minister of Labour and Industry aware that employees who are injured in the course of their employment are being advised to claim the cost of medical treatment through Medibank and then submit their claims for any difference in charges to their employer? A constituent of mine has advised me that a large engineering company, Mechanical Handling Limited, of Rosewater, has directed its employees to take this course of action. It appears that this method is being used so that the Australian Government will bear the cost of workmen's compensation, instead of the employer's insurance company. If the Minister is unaware of this procedure, will have this matter investigated?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have been aware of the situation for a couple of days. I have been trying to obtain a report from the insurance companies about what

they are doing, and also with regard to Medibank. I have been informed by Medibank as follows:

Where a workman is injured at work and incurs medical and/or hospital expenses, Medibank pays its proportion of the costs as provided for in the Health Insurance Act direct to the workman, who hands the accounts and Medibank cheques to his employer. The employer then pays the accounts in full to the doctor and hospital and recoups the difference between the account total and the Medibank cheque from his insurance company. Medibank does not recoup from the insurance company the amount paid to the workman.

In my view, that raises two problems: first, I cannot agree that it is the workman's responsibility to carry out these Medibank duties. I think that they are either the duties of the insurance company or, alternatively, the employer; on thinking about it, I believe they more directly concern the employer. Therefore, I do not think that any responsibility should be placed on the employee to go through this machinery. I will have that matter investigated and bring down a further report on the outcome of the investigation.

Secondly, and more importantly, I see a situation developing here whereby insurance companies will rip off some more cream; my view is that they are ripping off enough now. Unless they are willing to reduce the premiums for workmen's compensation which, obviously, are expensive and excessive at present, it appears that this is a cash-in for the insurance company.

Mr. Dean Brown: Oh!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Obviously it is. It is no good saying "Oh"; obviously it is a rip-off, and there is no question about it.

Mr. Chapman: I support the investigation.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am pleased that some Opposition members are showing some sense in this matter, which must be investigated. Unfortunately, the South Australian Government has no control over the prices paid for premiums. The prices are set by a committee of insurance companies over which the Government has no control, but it is certainly something into which I shall be looking. I will be introducing amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act soon, and will be looking into this area to see whether we can get some control over premiums. Cases in which people are finding it difficult to become insured will also be examined. In the meantime I shall be writing to the insurance companies' committee, asking for a full report regarding their plan to reduce premiums if they intend to claim committee rates.

REGIONAL EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

Mr. EVANS: Is the Premier aware of the chaos that is occurring with the Regional Employment Development scheme in this State, and can he offer any advice to these organisations that are attempting to complete approved projects? RED scheme projects have been approved within the State, some of them after June 30 of this year. A circular has been sent to organisations that are attempting to develop areas through the RED scheme, saying that any project approved after June 30 will get no assistance. Some of these groups (and they are community groups) had actually bought materials ready to commence the project. They cannot return the material, they have not paid for the material and they do not have the money to pay for it, so they are placed in a very difficult situation. Other organisations (councils and community groups) that had projects approved before June 30 have been told that they are not allowed to employ any more personnel, that if any personnel have left and wish to come back they are not allowed to reinstate them, and that their whole scheme

is to be reviewed. In some cases projects have been started and extra clerical staff have been employed to help administer the extra workforce that will be handled by the organisation. The extra workforce was not brought to full complement, so the clerical staff really is working only part time, so there tends to be a loss of monetary benefit in that area. I am sure the Premier must be aware that the problem exists. There have been attacks in the past regarding my policy for stop-go economic policies. We have a policy now that is taking people backwards, because they cannot complete their projects.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must keep to the question and not debate it.

Mr. EVANS: I will explain the question further, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for pulling me into line. I will explain the question further by saying that, under the present arrangement, organisations that have committed themselves to an expense will go backwards in their financial terms within their own organisations because the money will not be forthcoming from the Federal authorities. As I am sure the Premier is aware of the matter, I ask what sound advice he would give to these organisations to overcome the problem.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am aware of several difficulties in relation to the RED scheme, and those difficulties have obtained regarding governmental agencies as well as with non-governmental agencies. I have made representations to the Prime Minister concerning this matter, and I joined with the Premier of Victoria only yesterday in submissions to the Commonwealth Government concerning the continuation of money to the States so that the State's own employment relief schemes may take up some of those areas. I believe that the Commonwealth Budget will provide some ongoing moneys in the RED scheme area and that the position regarding the RED scheme will become very much clearer after Tuesday next. I do not believe that all RED scheme money will be cut off immediately. It was clearly necessary for some revision of the RED scheme to take place, because it was clear that in some cases commitments had been made to projects which could not be considered as being on as good an accounting base as they should have been. However, at this stage of proceedings it is not possible for the State Government to give any clarity in the matter until the amounts to be committed over the next few months in this area are clear from the Commonwealth Budget. I believe we will know more next week.

LAW SOCIETY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Attorney-General but, remembering what happened yesterday, I think that the Premier may care to take the matter away from himself and answer in his capacity as Premier, treating it as a matter of policy. Will the Attorney-General re-examine the request from the Law Society for its grants for 1975-76 to finance the legal assistance scheme with a view to making it adequate to ensure a proper return to practitioners? I am encouraged to ask this question for two reasons, the first of which is because of the Premier's boast in his reply to the Leader of the Opposition early in Question Time today that his complaints in Canberra about State finances have borne fruit (I think they were the words he used). My second reason is that I also remember what he has said about the buoyancy of State finances because of the transfer of the railways. I refer to a letter which I have from the president of the Law Society, Mr. Matheson, about this matter in which

he sets out, as indeed was set out in the *Law Society Bulletin* a month or so ago, that the Law Society estimates that a total of \$987 907 will be required from Government resources to finance this scheme. With the letter from Mr. Matheson comes one which the Attorney-General wrote to him dated July 28, and I quote briefly from the letter:

I have noticed that the Budget submitted by the Society calls for contributions amounting to \$758 000 from Australian and State Governments. I am not aware what funds may be available from Australian Government resources—and this is the significant part, in view of what he or his other Ministers said yesterday—but I believe it may be materially below the \$289 000 received last year—

so it is pretty obvious he has got an idea of what is in the budget—

In these circumstances I do not believe that the South Australian Government can accept responsibility for meeting the shortfall between Australian Government funds, payments by applicants and other possible revenues and the amount necessary to make an 80c in the dollar payment to practitioners on a level of assignments determined entirely by the society. The maximum amount which can be provided in the 1975-76 estimates is \$500 000—

and he concludes by saying —

which appears to me to be not ungenerous.

That is not the view taken by the Law Society in the letter which Mr. Matheson has written to practitioners. It is because of the state of the finances that I ask him to reconsider what he has undertaken to the society in this respect.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I find it very strange that members of the Opposition Parties should constantly now demand of the Government an expansion of expenditure. I point out to the honourable member that the increase that was proposed to the Law Society in my letter is a far greater increase than has occurred in almost any other area of Government spending, it being an increase in contributions to the Law Society of about 100 per cent. The President of the Law Society has seen me and admitted that the figure provided and proposed by the State Government could not be said to be ungenerous.

Mr. Millhouse: Not from his letter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is what the President has said to me. The President has asked that the Government consider certain provisions for transitional payments, and I have told him that it will consider those, but I am certainly not in a position to provide an expansion of Government expenditure of a marked degree in a time when, given the inflationary situation in Australia, we ought to be conserving Government finance.

Mr. Millhouse: You know this means that practitioners will get less.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In that case, I think the practitioners can bear it.

Mr. Millhouse: Right-oh! Now I'll ask the member for Elizabeth and the member for Playford what they think about it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Contributions from State and Commonwealth Government sources to legal assistance schemes have shown a marked increase in the past few years, and we are not now in a position simply to provide an escalation in costs, on a scheme administered solely by the society and on criteria laid down by the society, far above what we are providing in other areas of Government service.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you dissatisfied with them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. I am not saying that. I am simply saying that this is an escalation in an area over which the Government has no direct control. The contribution we are giving to the society in this area shows an enormous increase. Beyond that, the Government cannot go. I do not accept the view that is constantly being advanced by members opposite that, since the revenues of this State (contrary to what they said at the recent election) are buoyant, we can spend the lot. We simply will not do so.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM CORPORATION

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends further to expand the activities of the South Australian Film Corporation? With the success of *Sunday Too Far Away*, *Picnic At Hanging Rock*, and documentaries about the Barossa Valley which were educational (and which were seen by honourable members), I ask the question to further tourism, because one finds as one travels around South Australia that there are many areas in the North and Mid North of this State which, if a documentary were made, could attract more tourists from the suburban areas of Adelaide. A documentary about these areas would enable tourists to know about facilities available and the beauty of the areas.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The activities of the Film Corporation are financed in two ways. First (and this is apart from the cost of the film library, for which the Government has to pay as a service, as it does with other library services), a specific amount is provided to the corporation. A set figure was reached last year after investigations by the special Treasury committee set up to oversee finance in all areas of this kind. That figure having been established for orders for films required by Government departments and for the special grant towards establishing the corporation will escalate only at the rate of escalation normally provided in the Budget to other Government undertakings. That will be done in the Budget this year, and this will allow the corporation to plan ahead its activities. The sum is less than the corporation requested but is in accordance with Government budgetary policy. In addition, as a semi-governmental authority, the corporation can borrow \$700 000 a year at the semi-governmental interest rate without the approval of the Loan Council. In consequence, the corporation has raised much money in this way to finance its commercial activities, which are proving to be the most successful the Australian film industry has ever seen.

MURRAY RIVER WATERS AUTHORITY

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made towards establishing a Murray River waters authority? I was pleased to see an article in the *Advertiser* of August 5 this year attributed to the Minister for Minerals and Energy, in which he said that wider controls of the Murray River were essential. He also said that, on the completion of the Dartmouth storage dam and when it became effective, it would safeguard South Australia's water needs for the next 30 years. The Minister also pointed out that that storage area would not necessarily bring about quality in the water. To South Australians, the quality of water is just as important as is the quantity of water, and they realise the need for additional dilution flows immediately following floods (the Minister would be well aware of the problems faced immediately following the recent flood). On April 18 this year the Prime Minister was asked what

steps were being taken to strengthen the River Murray Waters Agreement, and he replied that he was willing to call the Premiers together on the request of a State Premier suggesting that the Premier of South Australia would be the most logical person to call the meeting, because South Australia was in the worst position of any of the States affected by the agreement regarding water quality. I ask the question in the light of a recent press report that appeared in Victoria in which it was stated that the Victorian Government intended spending \$40 000 000 to remove about 355 000 tonnes of salt annually from the Goulburn Valley. The River Murray Commission believes that 40 per cent of this tonnage will be disposed of by the flow of the Goulburn River into the Murray River, and it will eventually flow through South Australia. In the light of the points I have put forward, I ask the Minister as a matter of urgency what progress has been made.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The recent comments made by the Minister for Minerals and Energy were really based on statements I have made previously on numerous occasions. I am sure the honourable member would be aware of that. I am not happy, nor is the South Australian Government happy, with the progress made to date in connection with establishing an authority to control not only the quantity of water in the Murray River but also the quality of water. As the honourable member has said, this problem is causing increasing concern. Indeed, I take the honourable member back about three years ago, when the South Australian Premier initiated through the Prime Minister a meeting of Premiers and Ministers responsible for this function in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, and also for the Australian Government. This was the first meeting in many years. At the meeting it was decided that a working party consisting of experts would be established, and that that working party would report to a steering committee. The steering committee would consist of the relevant Ministers of the various States and of the Australian Government and would make a decision in connection with the working party's report. On many occasions I have complained about the progress that has been made by the working party; in fact, it has not yet reported to the steering committee. The Prime Minister has also expressed concern that no positive steps have been taken. It is only about a week since I wrote to the new Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Berinson) about this and several other matters. I expressed concern and pointed out that the Prime Minister had also recently referred to the lack of activity in this area. It is absolutely essential to South Australia either that the River Murray Commission's powers are extended or upgraded to cover this situation or that some other authority be established. South Australia is perfectly happy to go along with any extension of powers that may be granted either to the commission or to a separate authority (which I do not believe it will be necessary to set up) in order to control the quality of water coming into South Australia from the other States. The honourable member would appreciate, as would other honourable members, the difficulty that one may encounter when three States and the Australian Government are involved. I will not take the matter any further than that, but I hope that, within the next two months and following a Water Resources Council meeting, we can get the working party's report (which I understand has been drafted but about which there has been some complaint). The report is in the process of being re-written and will be submitted to the steering committee. When that stage

is reached I hope we can finally get down to some serious negotiations to set up this sort of authority. I am as concerned as is the honourable member. I assure him that we will do something about this serious threat to one of our major water resources. I think the honourable member will be aware that we have problems within our own State boundaries, because the water that causes the problem is not all tipped on to us; some of the problem occurs within our own boundaries. We, too, are engaged in extensive investigations into solutions that we may apply to the problems, and they are not easy to solve. The South Australian Government is doing everything possible to bring about some finality to this matter.

HIGHWAY No. 1

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Transport investigate as a matter of priority the gazetting of that section of Highway No. 1 that runs through Port Augusta? Highway No. 1 is the busiest of the roads in Port Augusta and it is used to a large extent by interstate traffic, so the advantages of gazetting the road as a priority road are obvious. It is essential that an investigation be undertaken into installing traffic lights at the various intersections that are causing so much concern because, as we all know, within the next few years another powerhouse will be built in that city.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to ask the Commissioner of Highways to give priority to the investigation into Highway No. 1 becoming a priority road.

GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. GUNN: Will the Premier please clarify his attitude towards the Commonwealth Labor Government and say whether he intends to continue to support it? It has been widely reported in the press that the Tasmanian Australian Labor Party seems likely to secede from the Commonwealth A.L.P., amongst other things because of the Commonwealth A.L.P.'s dictatorial attitude towards that State. Since the election of the Commonwealth Labor Government in 1972 the Premier has on numerous occasions protested against and condemned the actions and the numerous bungles of the Commonwealth Labor Government, and particularly the Prime Minister. At the recent State election we witnessed the incredible spectacle of the Premier disowning the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth A.L.P. and trying to run the campaign as the Dunstan Government and not as the Dunstan A.L.P. Government. I therefore ask the honourable gentleman whether he will clearly state his policy and say whether this State intends to secede and follow the line that has apparently been adopted by his Tasmanian moderate counterparts.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At the recent State election, the election campaign was run by the A.L.P. in South Australia with me as its Leader, and I put the policy on behalf of my Party without the necessity of a mammoth invasion of heavies from elsewhere trying to distract people's attention from the issues before the people of this State. I was able to do that, and I believe the people of South Australia are perfectly clear in their minds on the way in which the Labor Party in this State operates and will continue to operate under my leadership.

RAILWAYS (TRANSFER AGREEMENT) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BUSINESS FRANCHISES (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL

Third reading.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Pursuant to order, I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 12. Page 118.)

Dr. EASTICK (Light): When addressing myself to this motion last evening I referred to several statements made by the Special Minister of State for Monarto and Redcliff relating to the Monarto exercise and also to the Borrie report and the predicted population of this State over the next 25 years. The State Government, in reassessing the population trends in South Australia, worked on the premise that there was a 0.91 per cent increase in population at the moment and that that would diminish to about 0.7 per cent in 1986. According to the Premier's statement, it will have reduced to 0.38 per cent by 2001. The Minister has already indicated that there will be a more flexible approach to Monarto and that there will be a downturn in the number of people who will live there. This seems to indicate that, when Monarto is expected to come into its own as a population centre, the percentage growth in population will be at its lowest level. There could therefore be a large outlay of public resources without the population to use the available facilities. Under the heading "Growth of industry" in *Town and Country Planning*, Volume 39, January, 1971, Mr. W. F. Luttrall stated:

The lifeblood and means of growth of the British new towns have in nearly all cases been the flow of manufacturing industry that has come to them. It is still true of the new towns that were established soon after the Second World War that a remarkably high proportion of their employment is in manufacturing, despite the fact that they have become fairly self-contained. They do have their shopping centres, their schools and other services but nevertheless the table below shows that over half their employment is in manufacturing compared with the national average of 39 per cent.

I seek leave to have that table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EMPLOYMENT

Table 10

Industrial employment and total employment, 1970, in the first fifteen post-war British new towns

	(a) Industrial employment '000	(b) Total employment '000	(a)/(b)
8 London new towns ¹	120	250	0.48
4 English and Welsh new towns ²	41	71	0.58
3 Scottish new towns ³	30	45	0.67
Total (15 new towns)	191	366	0.52

Notes to table:

¹Basildon, Bracknell, Crawley, Harlow, Hatfield, Hemel Hempstead, Stevenage, Welwyn Garden City.

²Aycliffe, Corby, Cwmbran, Peterlee.

³Cumbernauld, East Kilbride, Glenrothes.

In the cases of Aycliffe and Corby the main industrial zone is adjacent to but outside the new town designated area: for Aycliffe the industrial estate, for Corby the major steelworks. In both cases the employment concerned has been added to both columns.

"Industrial employment", as used here, is almost equivalent to manufacturing employment.

Source: *Town and Country Planning*, Vol. 39 No. 1, January, 1971.

Dr. EASTICK: It goes on to illustrate clearly that there is an urgent need for major industry within the area of a new town if it is to be a viable concern. This fact has been referred to on several previous occasions, and I have no doubt that it will be referred to in the future. I said last evening that I wanted to direct my attention to the statement in the Governor's Speech that the Government would give special attention to the southern and northern metropolitan growth regions. The reference in the Governor's Speech is as follows:

An intensive study of the developing northern and southern metropolitan "growth" regions will be undertaken during the next 12 months. It is planned to produce intermediate stage concept plans to co-ordinate the growth of these areas until the year 2001, thus giving direction to public and private developers in the "fringe areas". When completed, the studies and resulting concept plans will form the basis for a comprehensive review of the Metropolitan Development Plan, which will then be undertaken. I am fully in accord with the review that is to be undertaken. Considering the number of announcements made in this House by members of the Government in the not too distant past, I should have expected that such a review would be undertaken much earlier, and that we would currently have definite plans for the development of those two areas. Last evening the Minister of Mines and Energy indicated clearly that we do not want a sprawl, with metropolitan development from Gawler in the north to Noarlunga in the south. I understand that the Land Commission, which has taken over the responsibility for all the land owned by the Government on the eastern aspect of the Main North Road near Smithfield, has sought to obtain a considerably greater area of land and is preparing a plan for the future development of that area.

From discussions I have had with members of the Commission, I understand that the plan will be something quite new in the developmental concept for South Australia. I am also aware that, in approaching this subject, the view is held that there should be a limit to the northern development of the Adelaide metropolitan area, and that in fact the northern limit should be somewhere near Dalkeith Road, Smithfield, an area almost identical to that originally set aside as the site of the potential third university for South Australia. There seems to be some major doubt whether the third university will now proceed in that northern area. I make this point to indicate to members where the northern development should cease according to members of the Land Commission task force. Indeed, I believe that the opinion they have expressed is one firmly held by people who live in that northern area.

For many years, persons associated with the Munno Para District Council, and the Gawler Corporation, have said that a green belt should be developed between the Elizabeth-Smithfield Housing Trust development and the Gawler area. An opportunity exists at present, whilst most of that land is held for rural purposes, to make a determined effort to pinpoint the extent of the northern development at about the point I have suggested, and then allow the outer metropolitan area to develop (indeed, the whole of the Gawler corporation is contained within the outer metropolitan development area in decisions taken by the planning organisation), starting at the coast near Port Gawler, circling the whole of the metropolitan area, and going southwards, taking in the areas of Victor Harbor and Encounter Bay, through to Sellicks Beach, Normanville, and Yankalilla. That concept would be in the best interests of the South Australian community. In fact, it would decrease by about five kilometres the northern extent of the area that is contained within the original 1962 Metropolitan Development Plan.

I believe that, with the other development that we hope to see for South Australia in the green triangle and in the iron triangle, the opportunity exists for reducing that northern sprawl. I will be equally interested to learn in due course the attitude of the review group with regard to development in a southerly direction. Obviously, with the escarpment behind Willunga, it is not possible to go on developing indefinitely that site, and I hope that in that case a similar decision to that which I hope will be taken for the northern areas of the metropolitan area will be eventually taken to the benefit of South Australia. Having given my support to that aspect of the Governor's Speech, I now pose a question that I think is extremely important—what is the value of a life? I say that against the background of future development, particularly the planning of the Highways Department and the other major utility organisations of the Government.

At present, the Sturt Highway to the Eastern States is being redeveloped between a point about 1.6 kilometres on the western side of Greenoch to a point about 2.4 km to 3.2 km on the north-eastern side of Nuriootpa. That roadway will completely bypass the town of Nuriootpa. It will take away the pressures that now exist of a large volume of interstate and commercial traffic passing through the main street of Nuriootpa. A decision, taken after a deputation was presented to the Minister of Transport by me, will augur well for the future. This by-pass road will cross the existing Greenoch-Nuriootpa road (or the existing Sturt Highway) at a point about half-way between the two. It was intended that there be a crossing at right angles, 183 metres apart: one road from Greenoch would come in 183 metres to the Adelaide side of the exit from the same road to Nuriootpa. This would have meant that a large volume of traffic (school buses, tourist traffic, and general commuting traffic between those areas of the Barossa Valley) would cross on a very busy highway, a highway that had a speed priority.

The recommendation was made that an overway and underpass should be developed at this junction, and the Minister of Transport accepted that recommendation. It will cost probably \$80 000 to \$100 000 more for that road system. However, it will prevent the unnecessary crossing by traffic of that section of the highway.

In the 12 years since its introduction, the Gawler by-pass has claimed more than 20 human lives. One intersection, which has recorded eight deaths, required at the time that the by-pass was built an over-pass costing about \$35 000 to \$40 000, but for reasons of economy that over-pass was not constructed, and a right-angled junction, even though guarded by "stop" signs or "yield" signs, has been the site of a large number of accidents, resulting in no less than eight deaths.

I make the point that those eight lives are valued at present at \$5 000 each. I believe that that is a completely wrong method of looking at the importance of road safety and of future development. I believe that \$35 000 to \$40 000 spent in the initial development would have been well spent and, even though it might have delayed the roadworks for a period of some six months whilst those additional funds were found, the end result would have been far better.

In relation to the new by-pass in the Greenoch-Nuriootpa area, it is to the Minister's credit that he accepted the recommendation of putting in the overpass-underpass arrangement at the junction. In the future development of the Adelaide metropolitan area and of the areas immediately to the north, the south, and the east, I think it is important not to lose sight of where the priority expenditure of available funds should take place. The dual highway that

passes through Elizabeth northwards to Gawler allows a fairly safe passage of traffic at present and will continue to provide a safe passage of traffic for a considerable time. I believe it is necessary to take away from the main street of Gawler the real danger that exists of heavy industrial traffic entering the main street, Murray Street, from Lyndoch Road, from the whole of the Barossa Valley, and via Carlton Road from the very large mineral deposits being developed and exploited on the eastern side of Gawler.

Metal trucks or sand trucks come down the steep Carlton hill loaded to the extent of 28 tonnes and move into the main street of that town. There have already been accidents when heavily laden vehicles have lost their gears or braking power whilst traversing both the Lyndoch Hill and the Carlton Road. Nobody is happier than I that no deaths have resulted from the very serious accidents that have occurred when those heavily laden vehicles have plunged into the main marketing or shopping street of the town of Gawler. However, can we expect that that situation will continue for all time? I believe it is important in allocating funds for the development of roads, that, rather than expend funds at this moment on duplicating the highway from Adelaide to Gawler or the highway through Elizabeth, serious consideration be given to putting the funds in the first instance into an effective by-pass on the south-eastern aspect of Gawler so that the traffic coming from the Barossa Valley, and from the eastern States when drivers elect to traverse the Barossa Valley instead of coming through to Adelaide via Greenoch and Daveyston, will have, as a result of the expenditure of available funds, an effective by-pass to reduce the potential danger to life by the continued passing of heavy transport through the Gawler area.

I believe that my proposition is completely consistent with the proposition contained within the Corbett report. Whilst that report was not commissioned for the purpose of looking at the utilisation of funds in relation to roadworks or major works, the argument that the Corbett committee brought forward is equally pertinent. The report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Public Service of South Australia, brought down in April of this year, is a guide to the future development of the Public Service in this State. The committee was set up as a result of a promise, which was made by me on behalf of my party at the 1973 election, that there would be a complete review of the Public Service.

We considered it essential that the whole of the Public Service be investigated, not because of any desire to question the activities of any member of the Public Service, but more to make sure that the Public Service was working more efficiently on a plan or a system that was more in keeping with the current era. In the report at page 238, under Appendix 8/3, headed "Planning Programming Budgeting (P.P.B.)", a number of very useful points are made, and those are the points that I refer to in the better utilisation of existing funds in respect of the roadworks. The report states:

P.P.B. is not a radically new idea, for its central theme of output-oriented budgeting was put forward in 1912 by the Taft Commission in the United States, and the Hoover Commission referred to it again in some detail in 1949. In the 1960's it found increasing application both in U.S. government departments and in the Public Service of Canada following the Glassco Commission's Report. "P.P.B. has been defined as an information system aimed at helping management make better decisions on the allocation of resources among alternative ways to attain government objectives. Its essence is the development and presentation of relevant information as to the full implications—the costs and benefits of the major alternative courses of action. A public sector budget should perform three separate functions:

- (a) Assist in planning, by enabling rival projects to be evaluated and hence a programme developed.
- (b) Help management to have meaningful targets to aim for.
- (c) Provide control by enabling the executive arm of government to be held accountable to the Legislature."

I will not go into the further discussions that follow in the report about this matter, but I will briefly refer to the following further remark:

Apart from cost benefit analysis techniques, P.P.B. also carries a requirement for sound basic cost data, which in turn requires a good standard of analytical accounting practice. Further, P.P.B. requires that the budgetary plan should deal with the programme as a whole, and it is frequently necessary to cross the boundaries of the budgets between several departments.

On that basis alone, I believe that there is an urgent need for the Government to implement these aspects of the Corbett report. I do not deny that there will be difficulties in changing the course of action that has been followed in the various departments over a long time, but I believe that South Australians will benefit as a result of that better analysis of the programmes undertaken on their behalf. Regarding the benefits from making use of resources (they are limited financial resources, because so many of the Government's plans are being shelved or run down or, as the Minister said last evening, a more flexible attitude is being adopted to the creation or implementation of the programmes), it is important that we obtain the best value for money and ensure that the greatest number of members of the community benefit as a result of the decisions made.

Expressing it more simply, it is important to ensure that Government expenditure is productive and that the greatest possible production is obtained from the money spent. I believe that, with regard to the by-pass requirement of the Gawler area, the best interests of the community will be recognised and that the Government and the Parliament will be truly coming face to face with the importance of questioning what value there is in a human life.

I will make only one further brief contribution. His Excellency's Opening Speech is rather typical of the type of document which has been put into his hands and which has been used by the Premier in more recent pronouncements to the House. Page 1 of the document states:

Plans have been prepared for a rapid expansion of the programme should further funds be made available by the Australian Government.

We have seen in so many budgetary documents reference to grandiose schemes subject to—

Mr. Mathwin: You'd think they'd make a rubber stamp, wouldn't you?

Dr. EASTICK: It is typical of the attitude the Government has adopted of attempting to hoodwink the people of the State. The announcement having been made, it is not uncommon for the self-same announcement to be made three, four or five times over to try to give the impression to the public that these are a whole series of new projects. Undoubtedly, the Deputy Premier would acknowledge that he has made several announcements about increased sewerage facilities for this State as a result of funds being made available by the Australian Government. Certainly, the \$3 500 000 (which, if my memory serves me correctly, turned out to be a smaller sum) was announced no fewer than four times. Even though it was announced, first, as a sum that was to be made available to the State as gift, we subsequently found that it had to be repaid over 35 years at 8½ per cent interest.

The point I make is that so many Government activities are determined by the priorities set in another place. More than 60 per cent of the additional Commonwealth funds made available to the State during the past 18 months have been directly tied grants. In other words, decisions have been made elsewhere about where the funds will be spent and on which projects. I look forward to the day soon when funds will be made available to the States, which will then be responsible for determining where those funds will be spent. I believe that, until that is possible, in South Australia will have to suffer a series of stop-go programmes, not all of which will necessarily benefit the people of this State.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): In supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, first, I pay my respects to the members of the families of former members of the Legislative Council who have passed on. I refer particularly to the late Sir Norman Jude, who served as a Minister of the Crown for several years and whom I knew to be a very able person. However, I was not quite so familiar with the late Mr. Densley, who served in another place as President. I take this opportunity of wishing a happy retirement to the former member for Heysen (Mr. Bill McAnaney), who was a wellknown authority on this State's railways and who was Chairman of my Parliamentary Party, to which office I have now been elected. He served with distinction as a member of the Public Works Committee. The only fly in the ointment he caused me was that he did not approve of a certain school in my district, but I cannot hold that against him forever. I welcome into our midst the new members of the House, particularly the new members for Heysen, Millicent, and Mount Gambier. The member for Mount Gambier and I have something in common: we were born overseas, we came to Australia by choice, and we are Australians by choice. Therefore, that gives us a good edge on the other members.

Mr. Max Brown: You aren't bragging, are you?

Mr. MATHWIN: I am indeed. I also welcome to the House the new members for Spence and Price, about whom I have heard. Indeed, I have read about the member for Spence many times, because I am a regular reader of *Rank and File*, which is distributed by certain elements at the Flinders University and which is distributed within the motor trade, particularly at the Chrysler company. The member for Spence has often been referred to in that rag.

Mr. Gunn: Did it praise him?

Mr. MATHWIN: No. It has printed some nasty things about him at times, but, if a person is referred to in it, I suppose it means that he is not a bad kind of person. The Governor's Opening Speech reminds me of the election. He said that, since we had last been called together, there had been a general election. When one thinks of a general election, one does not think of a Government which is in office by the skin of its teeth. The Government lost the seat of Millicent, which one expected, anyway, and it also lost the seat of Mount Gambier. That meant a large swing to non-Labor Parties of over 14 per cent, and this is something about which the Government should think. It should realise that the people have not given it a clear mandate for all the legislation it will introduce during this session. Now that the election is over, the Government is already extending the olive branch and saying that it will drop the petrol tax because it has sucked the motoring public dry during the past six or seven months in which the tax has operated.

Of course, one must remember that it is also in preparation for a Budget. We will have to face a horror Budget, no doubt, from the Commonwealth Government, and another State Budget is to be introduced soon. No doubt the Government is trying to soften the blow by introducing it at this early stage in its reign, probably the last reign it will have, because there is no doubt that it is on its way out. The Governor's Speech contains the old catchphrase of the Labor Party of one vote one value, and it is interesting to read the following reference:

My Government will, in furtherance of its policy of eliminating electoral inequalities and establishing the principle of one vote one value, introduce measures to alter the Constitution to provide for electorates for the House of Assembly of equal numerical size.

It seems that the Government is posing a threat to us in that it suggests that it will alter the method of voting to what we term optional preferential voting, so it is obvious that the shock has been so great to the Government that panic prevails within its ranks and it cannot wait to do something about making itself safe and sound. The Governor's Speech refers to legislation for environmental impact studies. This is a welcome innovation and something we need. However, I wonder how long it will be before the Government introduces this legislation: next year, the year after, or when? I think the Government will keep it off the book as long as possible, for obvious reasons, because of the activity within my district. I wish that that legislation had been introduced, but I will watch with eagle eye to see how far the Government kicks it under the table and tries to hold it back. The Governor's Speech also states:

My Government considers it essential that the purchasing power of wages should be maintained and not eroded by increases in prices.

An increase in wages means that there will be an increase in prices.

Mr. Evans: What about the price of water?

Mr. MATHWIN: It has arisen to a colossal figure, particularly in the Liberal areas, where it was given a slight nudge before the election. In some areas there was a 300 per cent rise, and these were effected in my district, in that of the member for Hanson and of the member for Bragg, and the member for Fisher also had problems in this respect. The Governor's Speech stated that, in order to combat inflation, wage increases should temporarily be confined to quarterly adjustments. At last, after all these years, the Government is realising that inflation is a problem. When one understands socialism, one realises that it means high taxation: there is no other way out of it. We cannot have social welfare from the cradle to the grave unless somebody pays for it, and it has to be paid for by the people. Inflation is another problem which I think is revelled in by socialist Governments. The great communist Lenin said many years ago that if one wanted the downfall of capitalism one inflated the economy, as inflation is the way to end it.

Mr. Max Brown: Willie McMahon was a bit of a socialist, with 25 per cent inflation then.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member should not talk about inflation, because it is the highest it has ever been and has lasted for the longest time. I know the honourable member is the great protector of socialist theory—

Mr. Max Brown: You don't know what you're talking about!

Mr. MATHWIN: I do indeed. I know that inflation is the way to beat capitalism. The problem about inflation

is that the people who suffer most are the aged and those on fixed incomes. The Government's socialist brothers in Canberra believe that inflation is something that we have to live with. Let us talk about the Commonwealth Government's latest grab. If we look at the *News* of August 1 we see that the cost of telephone rents and calls are to increase. Business calls will increase from 6c to 9c from September 1, private rental is to be increased from \$65 a year to \$85 a year, business telephone rentals will increase from \$85 to \$110, and telephone and telex connection fees will increase from \$80 to \$110. Red public telephones will be converted to 10c calls, and ordinary rate telegrams will increase from 72c for the first 12 words to \$1.08. Of course, telegram sending will affect the Commonwealth Government: it is a past master on telegrams, and sends big healthy telegrams at every opportunity. I had one some months ago from the Minister for Immigration. As it was not important, he could have sent a letter instead, which may have taken a little longer. However, he sent a telegram to let me know what was wrong, and at the end he said that a letter would be following.

Mr. Allen: What about the telegrams relating to the Grants Commission?

Mr. MATHWIN: They cost \$23 000, and that is a large amount. The Commonwealth Government is stimulating inflation by the rise: it is trying to soften the blow by giving a month's notice in the hope that people will get tired of talking and will forget about it and just pay the increase as a matter of course. A report in the *News* of August 5 states that post office clerks in South Australia may refuse to charge the new stamp rates on September 1, when the ordinary 10c stamp will cost 18c. This union, whether it is right or not, intends to refuse to take the money, and will sell 18c stamps for a 10c payment. One cannot condone this action, because none of us likes the idea of unions running the country. We know that at times they seem to be doing that, and we cannot condone it. Nevertheless, this action seems to have been approved by union members. The Commonwealth Government is doing nothing more than increasing inflation and affecting everybody throughout Australia, and the unions are going to do something about the situation. The union's explanation, which was reported in the *News* on July 9, was that G.P.O. fat cats were getting fatter. The unionists were talking about the postal services fat cats who filled positions in the top levels of the old Postmaster-General's Department who were growing even fatter with large increases. Some of the salary increases the fat cats have received have been more than \$5 000 a year. Instead of one permanent head being in charge of all operations, there will be five permanent heads. Jobs are being created in the Commonwealth area for officers other than rank and file union members. A unionist said that the two most senior men in the post office earn \$37 500 a year, whereas a normal permanent head earns a salary of \$35 000 a year. This is a reason why some union members have decided they will not accept money over the counter from the public to pay the increased rates for postage stamps, which are to go up from 10c to 18c.

The people who will be affected and hurt by increased postal charges are mainly pensioners, people receiving fixed incomes, and the ill and infirm. If one thinks about what is right and what is wrong, one at least believes that some union members are sympathetic to people of this nature, which is more than can be said about the Commonwealth Government. By increasing

postal charges the Commonwealth is increasing inflation. Increased postal charges will make people apply for higher salaries and wages. What happens to the man in the street if he receives an extra \$18 or \$20 a week? How much of that increase does he put in his pocket? The majority of it is paid to the Commonwealth Government as income tax for whatever purpose it wishes to use it. As far as I am concerned, and from reports I have received, those funds are not necessarily being used for desirable activities.

Another matter in the Commonwealth sphere to which I wish to refer relates to what the Prime Minister said regarding the Returned Services League. We all know that the Prime Minister wishes Australia to be a republic; we all know that the Queen's head has disappeared from most of the stamps we buy; we all know that the Prime Minister is anti-Royalist; and we all know that O.H.M.S. has disappeared from all Government stationery. Therefore, it is obvious what is happening. Being a socialist, the Prime Minister believes that society can and should be changed by political action. The Prime Minister condones that situation. It is surprising to note that Mr. Whitlam joined the Royal Australian Air Force in 1941 in the general duties branch and that he was discharged in 1945 as a Flight Lieutenant. It is interesting that he was involved in combat duties and took part in a number of sorties off the Queensland coast.

In his recent attack on the R.S.L., he claimed that the league was intolerant and fanatical to which ex-service leaders reacted angrily. The Prime Minister made these comments at the opening of the World Assembly of Veterans at the Sydney Opera House, which is not an inappropriate place for the Prime Minister to perform. Mr. Whitlam said that too often the R.S.L. seemed to be out of step. He accused the league's leaders of using the catch cries of the cold-war ideology; he said that opportunities for peace in the South-East Asian region had been tragically wasted and that they must not be wasted again. I should imagine that even the Prime Minister would agree that it was only with the efforts of Australian servicemen, combined with other people, that we have been able to keep at bay the problem of communism for the next 20 years, anyway. Surely he would agree with that even though he is aligning himself with the Third World. When the Prime Minister was in the Air Force in the thirteenth squadron, he came under fire from an Australian warship when returning from a sortie. It would be interesting to know how the gunner who missed hitting him with anti-aircraft fire some years ago now feels about what he reads of the Prime Minister's antics. I bet he is kicking himself for missing him.

Mrs. Byrne: That's a poor statement to make.

Mr. MATHWIN: That is what is said in his history.

Mrs. Byrne: At least he was doing his bit for his country.

Mr. MATHWIN: I understand that the Australian Government under the leadership of Mr. Whitlam is trying to end the school cadet system. It is expected that the Minister for Defence will recommend the abolition of school cadets. Such a decision would involve at least 35 000 Army cadets, 5 700 Air Training Corps cadets, and 2 000 Naval cadets. The State President of the R.S.L. made his position clear; he believes there is much merit in this type of training for young people. It trains them not only for the service in which they are cadets but also for the experiences of life which, after all, is probably more important. Although the training is elementary, I believe it is good for cadets. That view is shared by

Mr. Smith of the R.S.L. In a newspaper article headed "Cadet units may be abolished" appears the following article:

A report is being ordered on this matter. The Federal Government is considering scrapping all school cadet units and it has asked the Department for Defence to report on their military usefulness.

Surely people realise that school cadets have a job to do and that, if they are trained for nothing else, they are at least trained to accept discipline. I have seen a number of young cadets who get great benefit from the system, benefit that shows up later in life. Many cadet units have been set up in independent schools, and this is another reason why I believe the Commonwealth Government wishes to abolish them. We all know that the Commonwealth Government believes that private schools are far too independent; and it is now putting into practice the needs basis method that has been used in Sweden to get rid of independent schools. For years in Sweden there were many independent and private schools; now there are none at all. The way to get rid of them was to place them on a needs basis. The Premier has said that he will make South Australia the Sweden of Australia, so he is working on the same system: a needs basis.

We have seen many rapid changes in the Commonwealth Government, including the demotion of the local lad, Clyde Cameron, who has had the chop. As we all know, Mr. Cameron made quite a mess of the immigration portfolio, although I admit that many of the problems that he faced were left to him by his predecessor, Mr. Grassby. At one stage, when the Government called for British migrants to become Australian citizens, it stated that, if they did not do so, they would lose some of their rights. When I challenged this, Mr. Grassby and our Premier said that I did not know what I was talking about. However, it seems that I certainly did know, because people who return to the United Kingdom and wish to come back to Australia face quite a problem. If people go to England to see their relatives and friends, having taken out Australian citizenship but not travelling on an Australian passport, they must obtain a visa to enable them to return to Australia and live here.

The member for Elizabeth recently referred to the case of, I think, an Irishman in his district who wanted to migrate to Australia but who was not permitted to do so. The problems that that person was experiencing at the other end were indeed considerable, and he is now unable to get to Australia. I have had many such cases in my district. In one case, a young man whose father was a widower in England left his home in the United Kingdom and came to Australia late last year to settle. After settling up in England, his father decided that he would follow his son to Australia. He had the money to pay for his own fare and his accommodation here and, indeed, he had a job to which he could go. However, when he applied to come to Australia to join his son, he was told to apply again after August. I believe that the system has broken down completely and that there is no welcome here for migrants, particularly British migrants. That is how it seems to me and to many people who have come to me for aid in this field. Also, the time that it takes to obtain an answer from the department in these matters leaves much to be desired.

I turn now to the Governor's Speech, at paragraph 13 of which he said that during this session legislation would be introduced to give further effect to the Government's plans for a more efficient public transport system. That is another field that is dicy at present. If we want to have a good transport policy, it must involve freedom of movement

for both passengers and freight. Freedom of competition among the providers of transport and the choice of the customer are essential. No transport system can operate without an adequate road system, but motorways, with all their advantages, can cause serious problems; of that there is no doubt. Proper provision must be made for the traffic that these road systems generate. The construction of by-passes must be encouraged to divert heavy traffic from built-up areas; it is imperative that this happens. It will help the situation if the Government supplies efficient bus and rail services. However, it must provide those services.

What is the situation at Christies Beach, where there is much development and practically no bus services? We quiver in anticipation of what our Commonwealth colleagues will give us, as all this finance is tied up with the Commonwealth Government. I refer, of course, to the electrification of the Christies Beach train line. One would surmise from the present situation that that was a dead duck. We have all these people living at Christies Beach and Noarlunga, who have been promised a new, speeded up and electrified rail service. But what happens? They are practically stranded and have no alternative other than to travel into the city by private car. So, the Government says that it will get these people to live on the outskirts of the city and supply them with a new, fast, electrified train service into Adelaide, provided the Commonwealth Government gives it the necessary finance. However, if this does not happen, the people to whom I have referred and who have purchased houses in these areas on the outskirts of the city find that they are in difficulties and must get out of the situation as best they can. This relates to road grants, and in this respect attention should be given to the submission by the Highways Commissioner (Mr. Johnkin) relating to the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads 1975 Report to the Australian Government. At page 36 of that report, the Commissioner says:

Under the current road grant arrangements, South Australia receives a total road grant of \$100 000 000 for the three-year period 1974-75 to 1976-77. This represents 9 per cent of the total grant of \$1 115 000 000 distributed to States. The grant to South Australia is \$13 200 000 or 15.2 per cent greater than the grant funds for the previous three years. However, in 1971-72 prices, the intended Australian Government grant to South Australia is \$4 200 000 or 5.2 per cent less than the grants for the preceding three years.

The total Australian Government grant to South Australia is \$16 000 000 or 13.8 per cent less than that recommended by the Bureau. However, the Australian Government grant for national highways construction is \$9 500 000 greater than that recommended by the Bureau. The apparent reason for this increase is to ensure that the total warranted and feasible national highways programme can be undertaken. Consequently, Australian Government grants for other categories are reduced by \$25 500 000, with \$24 400 000 of the reduction taking place in the rural arterial, rural local and urban arterial categories. This severe reduction in funds, combined with the limited mobility of road construction resources, means that the resources employed in the construction of rural arterial, rural local and urban arterial roads will be under-utilised.

Later, the Commissioner continues:

Although the Australian Government undertook the responsibility for financing the full cost of developing and maintaining national highways, it did not provide sufficient grant funds for maintenance. It appears that the maintenance grant of \$3 900 000 for the three-year period is at least \$2 700 000 less than that required to carry out the necessary maintenance work.

That is the problem we face with regard to our roads, and yet the Government sees fit to create bigger problems by failing to provide proper transport for the people it is trying to house. I believe the effects of inflation are

detrimental to the road programme, and an adjustment has to be made. The President of the Australian Automobile Association (Mr. M. A. K. Thompson) has stated:

The creation of a safe efficient road and highway network is the most urgent developmental task facing Australia today. No nation can hope to achieve its full potential without an adequate system of roads, the very arteries and sinews of development. Australia can no longer afford not to have an efficient road system. Apart from the tragically high annual road toll, largely contributed to by our outdated and overloaded roads, modern society cannot function efficiently without a proper road and highway network . . . Australia has an enormous tourist potential both for domestic and overseas tourists. This potential cannot be fully realised until we have proper road access to our resorts and natural attractions.

Despite what the Premier has said to the contrary, I believe that the promotion of tourism in South Australia has been a failure and the Government has nothing to boast about in this area. When considering road transport and roads, we should address ourselves to the Australian Labor Party policy booklet which is on sale for 50c at any bookstall. I remind members of the Labor Party if they have not read this little book—

Mr. Evans: It is too expensive.

Mr. MATHWIN: I believe it is donated if a person cannot afford it. Under the heading "Roads" on page 48 the book states:

1. The State to press the Commonwealth for an equitable share and distribution of finance for road construction and maintenance.

It is the duty of members opposite to do this, as it is all in the book. The book continues:

2. Bold road construction policy with adequate provision for maintenance.

The Labor Party is committed to that, its members having signed the pledge; they will get the sack if they do not do what is in this book. They are committed to have a bold road construction policy with adequate provision for maintenance. If they are falling down as a State Labor Party, they had better get on to their Commonwealth colleagues, because they are falling down on their job. The fourth policy on roads states:

4. The active promotion of all aspects of road safety.

If the Labor Party believes in road safety, it must agree that roads in South Australia are in a shocking condition. If it intends to do anything about road safety, it had better tidy up the back garden first, because this is where it is falling down. It is doing very little about the shocking condition of the roads. Government members had better pull up their socks or they will have bigger and more difficult problems. The situation concerning metropolitan roads could be compared with creeping paralysis. There has been a slowing down in expenditure on metropolitan roads rather than an increase. The Government has created a Land Commission, of which the Premier is very proud. The United Kingdom created a land commission, but got rid of it after two years because it was not working. This Government insists that the Land Commission is working well. A recent newspaper report stated that the average price of a block of land in the Adelaide metropolitan area was \$5 300—

Dr. Tonkin: That was the morning price; I think it went up as the day progressed.

Mr. MATHWIN: That was the red hot off-the-line price but the price increased as the day went on. I could find plenty of buyers for proper blocks of land for \$5 300. Last year I read out an article that stated that this Government had sold blocks of land in the metropolitan area, and had made profits of over 1 000 per cent in some cases.

Mr. Coumbe: Why don't you read that list again?

Mr. MATHWIN: If I had the list, I should be only too glad to read it. The Government talks of providing cheap blocks of land in the southern districts, right out in the country, where people can hear the magpies in the morning. However, it has failed in its duty because it sold the land, without providing transport. What possibility do those people living in those areas have of getting to the city unless they have a private car? Therefore, the situation arises of private cars coming into Adelaide, and the Minister of Transport often asks people not to bring private cars into the city because they are creating a problem. What is he doing about it? He is not providing public transport for them to help them—not on your life. During the peak traffic hour any morning of the week a driver can wait for quarter of an hour to half an hour to get from Sherriff Road on to the main South Road, and there is no alternative to the private car. I dare any member on the Government side to go, at the peak hour, along Majors Road, Seacliff, from the west and try to cross over South Road to travel to Coromandel Valley. I should be surprised if he could get across that road in half an hour.

Mr. Evans: You'd be decorated for bravery.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, but the Government does not believe in awards. They might get a second-class citizenship or some sort of certificate for that brave action in crossing South Road. It is practically impossible to do that, at the point to which I have referred, even in off-peak traffic time. The new system of priority roads is continuing with all speed; every week more roads are being declared priority roads. However, this type of road works well only if we have the main ingredient for that to happen: courtesy on the part of the people who use it. Unfortunately, there appears nowadays to be less and less courtesy. At the intersection of Jetty Road and Brighton Road, Glenelg, a "stop" sign for traffic coming out from Jetty Road means that a person has no right of way at all; he must give way on either side. He has no alternative but to wait, and with a bit of luck he will get over before he dies of dehydration in the summer. He may have to wait for some time, because he has no rights at all.

With the creation of priority roads, we find that people wishing to enter those roads have no right of way and therefore the only way the system can work is by courtesy on the part of road users or by the placing of traffic lights so that traffic can use those lights. That is the intention of the Government, of course. The only problem is that traffic lights are not being supplied. The Minister has given as a reason that the equipment is not available, and that it is not being produced. I asked that a traffic light be installed in Jetty Road, Glenelg, to enable elderly residents to cross Brighton Road. When I asked the Minister about 18 months ago, he said that we might get the lights in about 12 months from then. The answer now is that the equipment is not available and perhaps we will have it in the middle of 1975. No doubt Brighton Road will be a priority road, because priority roads are still being created even though no traffic lights are available. The whole system therefore falls down.

It is all very well to come along with bright ideas to set the world alight and settle all the traffic problems, but it is useless to come up with half a scheme. Traffic lights must be installed. If this type of development is to take place, it must be properly planned, and the Government must not use as an excuse that it cannot get the equipment. The problems being created will become insurmountable; the Government must realise that. If and when we do get the traffic lights, if they dribble through as they are

produced, where do the Government's priorities lie? In my area priority must be given to Jetty Road, as well as to Whyte Street and Oaklands Road. In the area of the member for Mawson, priority must be given to Majors Road and South Road.

Mr. Evans: He's a new doctor.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes. I thought he was blowing his trumpet about something at lunch time. The Government is completely mixed up. Last year, against the wishes of the local council, the Government installed traffic lights at the corner of Sturt Road and Brighton Road. The local council believed that the lights should have been in other areas. The council at that time was trying to get the Brighton Hotel to remove its verandah, but it received no assistance from the Government. The verandah was a hazard. When the Minister decided to provide a bus service from Brighton to Flinders University, he found that the bus could not do a left-hand turn at that corner because the verandah prevented the bus from turning the corner from Brighton Road into Sturt Road. The bus route had to be planned so that the bus could turn right, which was the only way it could get around the corner. I do not say that there was no need for the installation of traffic lights at that corner, but I think that location was not as urgent as some others, such as Jetty Road, Glenelg, and Majors Road and South Road.

It is difficult to understand how the Government allots its priorities. It must speed up the installation of traffic lights and pedestrian crossings on priority roads, because pedestrians must be able to cross them. There is a great need for crossings on Brighton Road, and certainly on Morphett Road. If the Government cannot provide them, it should ease up on its priority road plan until it can provide them. It is useless to do half the job; that is only creating bigger problems for pedestrians and road users.

Mr. Coumbe: How about the trams?

Mr. MATHWIN: The Government is fond of safety, yet this Government cannot see fit to do much about the trams and to make them brighter. Another problem has been created in Partridge Street, not far from one of my main schools, Glenelg Primary School. The children have great difficulty in crossing the roads. This results from a failure on the part of the Government; when it provides extra traffic and when it is responsible for creating traffic problems, it must do its research. The job should not be half done. In his Speech, His Excellency indicated that we would be asked to consider again a measure intended to ensure that the sex of a worker will not be a consideration in the fixing of wage rates. That was a private member's Bill moved by the Leader of the Opposition, the then member for Bragg. The Government tried to bring in such a measure last year, but the Premier has been playing with it for ages. He has never got down to the job, but perhaps at last he is doing something about it, and it appears that he will bring in a sex discrimination Bill that will go half way. If that happens, I think we, as a Party, would have to finish the job for him.

His Excellency also mentioned that a Bill is to be brought down to grant long service leave to building workers. This is a great point, pushed very hard by the member for Florey, who sought long service leave for building workers based on the aggregation of their service to the industry and subsequently to extend such legislation to casual workers in other industries. The building trade, of course, has always been regarded as a casual work trade, and a loading in pay has been included to cover

this aspect. Building workers who are casual workers have had an extra loading to cover such aspects. Whether the Government intends to drop that loading and provide some other method, I shall be quite interested to find out.

Mr. Groth: There is no loading for long service leave.

Mr. MATHWIN: There is a loading for building workers. Any tradesman—

Mr. Groth: None whatsoever.

Mr. MATHWIN: You are right out of your ground here, Reg. You might be all right in Holden's, but you are out of your ground in the building trade.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the honourable member's attention to the fact he must address the member as "the honourable member".

Mr. MATHWIN: I apologise, Mr. Speaker, it slipped out: the honourable member came at me on the flank. The honourable member for Salisbury would know much about the motor car industry, but I doubt whether he would know very much about the building industry. We are talking about what will happen with these members of the building trade. We know the situation in the building industry in South Australia. We know that the past Minister for Housing was ashamed of his record in housing in this State, and that the industry is at the lowest ebb it has ever been. We also know that the boss of the Australian Council of Trade Unions and the Federal President of the Labor Party, Mr. Hawke, said he was coming over here a couple of years ago to provide low-cost housing for workers. The Premier offered him some land at Port Noarlunga to erect these low-cost houses. Mr. Hawke said he would outdo the Housing Trust, but he cannot run a haberdashery store at a profit in Melbourne. He is now getting into the petrol field.

The Government is to allow him to come here and undercut the petrol price by 5c, 6c, or 7c. Perhaps he will get into the beer trade. The Government did not like the fact that beer was being sold at 15 bottles to the dozen, making it easier for the working man to buy beer. We have seen no move regarding this low-cost housing, and I should imagine that the Government ought to do something about it; contact Mr. Hawke, this great genius. It ought to get him over here and say, "When are you going to start building, because we need housing?" We are in the worst state we have ever been in the history of South Australia regarding housing. We are buying old properties at exorbitant prices, redecorating and remodernising them at a colossal price just to provide housing, because we cannot build it, the housing industry being at its lowest ebb. We should say, "Please come over, Mr. Hawke, and help us build some more houses as you promised you would some years ago." Good advice for the Premier would be to approach his Federal boss and say to him, "Come over, Sir, we need you in South Australia." If the Government wants advice, this is one place where it could start to wrestle with the problem it has created and for which it is responsible in the housing industry in this State. I support the motion.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I, too, support the motion, and, in doing so, I, like other members, first congratulate you on your election, Mr. Speaker, both to the district you now represent and also to the high office in this Parliament. No doubt it was a shock to the present Government to lose the seat of Pirie, although it was not a surprise to residents outside of the District of Pirie. I was told many times before the election to keep my eye on the figures for Pirie, as there would be an upset. Sure enough there was,

so it was not a great surprise to many people outside the area, but it was most certainly a surprise to the Government.

I also congratulate the new members on this side. They will no doubt add quite a bit of lustre and debating ability to this Parliament, particularly the member for Mount Gambier, who also featured in another upset, something the Government did not allow for. I am sure that he, too, will make his presence felt in this House. I also congratulate the two new Government members, the member for Spence and the member for Price. I have not had the pleasure of meeting these new members, but I expect the time will come when I will have the opportunity. I am particularly pleased to see the member for Spence in this House with the name of Abbott, because he now takes precedence on the list of members. Alphabetically, his name is on top of the list.

Mr. Evans: Do you think he will get a parcel some time?

Mr. ALLEN: My name has been on this list for the past seven years, and some years ago a parcel was delivered to this House. After much investigation, it was decided by detectives that the parcel had been sent with the motive of getting rid of the then Government. At that stage we were in exactly the same position as the two new members in this House at present, in that the Government had no majority and members had to be present at all times. It was only a matter of one member being absent and the Government would fall. That was the situation we were in, and it was realised that the motive for sending this parcel was to get rid of one of the members. As my name was on the top of the list I got the parcel, so I warn the member for Spence that now he is on the top of the list he should be careful of any parcels delivered to this building. If he does not wish to open them, I suggest that he contact my wife, because she is the expert on opening parcels without triggering the device inside. I suggest she would be happy to do this for the member, at a fee, of course.

I also thank all those people who helped me during the recent election. It is humbling for a member to accept an office in Parliament when there are so many hundreds of people who support the member unbeknown to him. For instance, there are 50 polling booths in the District of Frome, and the number of people who work at individual polling booths would total quite a few hundred. Also, I thank all the people who supported me (and one thing the member knows is the exact number of people who support him at an election). To those people who did not support me, I am quite willing to support them in this House as the member for this district. Everyone has his political beliefs, and is entitled to have them. This is the fourth election I have contested in this place in seven years. It is becoming quite a habit. I know that many years ago Parliamentarians always seemed to run their full term, and some members remained here for a period of 15 years unopposed. Those days seem to have gone, and all members now seem to have to face the music on fairly frequent occasions.

It is freely stated by some people that members of Parliament are old, dodderly people, but when one looks, particularly at members on this side and at the length of time they have been in this Parliament, one realises that such is not the case. I have been in this House for about seven years and, on a seniority basis, I am fourth in line on this side. At the recent opening of Parliament we lined up to move up to the other place. There were five members who entered at the same time

as I, but, on an alphabetical basis, I take seniority, and I was fourth in that line. This fact gives the lie to the suggestion that we have members on this side who have been here for a long time. I suggest that the average age of members on this side would be below that of Government members.

I express condolences to the families of those two members who have died since the last opening of Parliament. The late Mr. Densley was unknown to me. However, the late Sir Norman Jude was well known to me. In fact, I knew him before I entered this House. I had dealings with him on local government matters when he was Minister of Roads, and I recall one instance when as chairman of a council, I had the pleasure of introducing a deputation to him. We received an excellent hearing, although he did jibe me at the finish of the hearing, saying that the council I represented was slow in undertaking work on a certain road. I recall saying to him, "That may be right but, whenever we started work on the road, you ran short on money and withdrew the grants, and that is the reason for the road not progressing as fast as you would have liked."

After becoming a member of this House and joining the Parliamentary Bowling Club I got to know the late Sir Norman Jude well. He was a bright personality in the team whenever we went away to play bowls. In opening Parliament the Governor in his Speech stated:

My Government will continue to act to improve the working conditions of persons wherever they are employed in the State.

I was especially pleased to hear the Governor make that comment, because the Government claims that, no matter where a person is employed, it will continue to improve working conditions. However, this is not borne out in fact. Several years ago, after I started to represent the district of Frome, I visited Leigh Creek which is a coal-mining town outside local government boundaries. Therefore, the town had no organisation to press its case whenever a new facility was required. An organisation known as the Far Northern Development Association was formed, and it has done an excellent job in pressing various Government departments for facilities required in the district. The association keeps pressure on members of Parliament all the time, and it has achieved much for its town. The association took up the matter of a television service for the Leigh Creek area.

As most honourable members would know, there is as yet no television reception at Leigh Creek, but the association has been pressing for about seven years for a service to be introduced, but so far it has achieved no result. I recall the first meeting of the association that I attended. It was then pointed out that the association had been making approaches to the Commonwealth Government through its local Commonwealth member of Parliament. As a result, the Australian Broadcasting Control Board had sent a representative, Mr. Brownless, to visit Leigh Creek to address a public meeting. Also with me at the meeting were Senator Jessop and Mr. C. R. Kelly. As a result of that meeting the association wrote a letter to the Premier. The Australian Broadcasting Control Board representative, Mr. Brownless, said at the meeting that it was possible to provide Leigh Creek with a videotaped television service, whereby the town would receive the metropolitan programme a day late, but it would be necessary for the State Government to contribute about \$30 000 a year if the project were to be proceeded with.

The Commonwealth Government was willing to contribute to the scheme, but it asked that the State Government

pay the balance so that this television service could be provided. A letter written by the secretary of the association under the heading "Television Coverage for Remote Areas of South Australia", states:

Since the above association was formed in 1969, a number of projects have been undertaken, one of which is television for remote areas. All correspondence to the present time has been directed either to Mr. C. R. Kelly (member for Wakefield) or Senator D. S. Jessop and, finally, the Prime Minister, Mr. McMahon. All efforts to date have proved to be unsuccessful, but at least the Postmaster-General saw fit to send one of the department's senior officers (Mr. Brownless) to the area, who explained some of the technical difficulties, also the high cost for servicing such a small number of people. It appears from what Mr. Brownless stated that there is little chance of "off air" television being available for between five and 10 years, the only possibility being by videotape. We believe that a videotape station is under construction at Alice Springs which is to be maintained and operated jointly by the P.M.G. Department and the Federal Government.

That is, the Postmaster-General was paying half the cost and the Federal Government was paying for the other half. The letter continues:

Will your Government give consideration to investigating and possibly entering into a similar arrangement for this area?

I was asked to support this request to the Premier, and on November 1, 1972, I wrote a letter to him, as follows:

I am writing in support of a submission made to you by the Far Northern Development Association relative to the provision of television in the Leigh Creek area. The association has been endeavouring to obtain television in this area for some time but without success. At a recent meeting of the association in Leigh Creek, Mr. Brownless, of the Australian Broadcasting Control Board gave little hope of television being provided in the near future. As a result of this forecast it has been suggested that perhaps television could be made available by means of videotape. I understand this is being done at Alice Springs.

As Leigh Creek is a mining town and comes under the control of the Electricity Trust of South Australia it is felt that the State Government should assist in some way in providing television to this area. Your views on this matter would be very much appreciated.

On November, 13, 1972, I received the following reply from the Premier:

I have just recently made representations to the Commonwealth Government regarding television reception in the far northern areas of South Australia.

He refers to certain irrelevant matters, but the crux of the letter is in the following section:

Your inquiry regarding the practicability of making television available by means of a videotape has already been canvassed. It would not be possible, however, for a State Government to enter into such an undertaking. The control of radio and television rests with the federal authorities and the only means by which a video-tape station could be established would be as the result of a decision by the Commonwealth Government.

We were not asking the State Government to enter into television or any other undertaking: all we asked was for the State Government to pick up the tab, to contribute financially toward the project, because the Commonwealth Government was willing to put in a certain amount towards it. In his reply, the Premier completely missed the point. Further negotiations were made over the next two years, but the association did not get anywhere. On July 4, 1975, I attended the annual meeting of the association, when I was again asked to take up this matter with the Premier to see whether we could get assistance in this matter. On July 18, 1975 (about three years after my first letter), I wrote the Premier the following letter:

I am writing in support of submissions that are being made to you from the Far Northern Development Association in relation to the availability of television at Leigh

Creek. On November 1, 1972, I wrote to you in similar vein and your reply on that occasion was that television is the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government.

Further on the letter states:

It is argued, quite rightly, that in areas of isolation that Leigh Creek comes under in regards to mining ventures, most mining companies subsidise the provision of television to these isolated areas. We can quote, for instance, Mount Isa and quite a few other places. As Leigh Creek is purely a mining centre and is owned by the Government of South Australia, it is felt locally that the Government should contribute towards the provision of television in this area. I understand at the present time the cost to install a videotape service would be approximately \$80 a head and, as there are approximately 1 000 people in Leigh Creek, it would cost approximately \$80 000 to install.

Having carried out some research since writing the letter, I have found that about 1 600 people live within the colour television reception area of Leigh Creek. My letter continues:

I believe the Commonwealth Government are prepared to pay up to \$45 per head or \$45 000 towards the scheme and it would need another \$35 000 to be supplied to make the proposition viable. It is felt locally that this is not a great amount to ask for the State Government to contribute particularly as the mining venture at Leigh Creek, in a large measure, does help to supply by far the greatest proportion of the State's electricity.

At present, this venture is supplying more than 40 per cent of the State's power, and sometimes it has produced as much as 70 per cent. My letter continues:

There is another angle also and that is since television and radio licences were removed, the taxpayers in this town are now contributing towards the cost of television in other areas when they are unable to have a television service themselves, which I think is quite a reasonable argument. At the present time the whole of the work force in Leigh Creek are very dissatisfied. They are proud of the fact that they have never had any industrial strife and they desire to maintain this record but they fear that unless the Government is prepared to make some move in this matter they will eventually have to recourse to action of this nature. As their representative in this State I am particularly concerned about this matter and I am quite willing to provide any additional information that you may require.

The sum of \$30 000, which the Government was asked to contribute towards providing television for this area, is only about the cost of two press secretaries—a small sum when one realises the service that is being given by people in such a necessary venture. An article appears in the *Advertiser* in July, 1975, under the heading "Unions to Consider Action on TV Delay", which states:

The Leigh Creek Combined Unions Council was considering taking industrial action to get television for the area, the State A.L.P. council was told last night. . . . Mr. Scott said the C.U.C. had been trying without success for seven years to have television brought to the area.

He repeats much the same information as is contained in my letter. The article continues:

The State Government and the Electricity Trust of South Australia should be approached to match the Federal Government's allocation of \$45 a head to enable the repeater to be provided.

That is the history of the matter and, to add further to those remarks, I have a report written by Mr. Ian McLaren, Victorian M.P., who has recently completed a tour of the whole of the Western Australian north-west area. I had the pleasure of being associated with him at the Parliamentary Conference held in London last year, as a result of which he sent me a copy of his report. One extract in it is interesting, in relation to the present subject. His report states:

The two Hamersley towns of Paraburdoo and Mount Tom Price are 245 and 183 miles respectively from Dampier. All is bustle and dust in this hard-working world. Water has to be piped or taken from bores;

supermarkets provide necessities. We were surprised to hear T.V. direct from Perth at Karratha and Dampier, and taped T.V. at Tom Price and Paraburdoo.

That is an instance of mining companies providing a television service to their employees, whereas at Leigh Creek, which is a Government-owned mining venture, the Government is unwilling to assist in any way to provide television. The people at Leigh Creek consider that the Commonwealth Government should have provided them with television before it went into the costly business of providing colour television for the rest of the State. The Government says that it wants every vote to be of equal value, namely, one vote one value, in this State, but it does not consider the people in the north to be of equal value to those in the south, and I think that they have a very good argument. If the Government considers that they are equal, it would provide them with television and an all-weather road to Leigh Creek. At page 1 of his Speech, His Excellency refers to one vote one value, and says:

My Government will, in furtherance of its policy of eliminating electoral inequalities and establishing the principle of one vote one value, introduce measures to alter the Constitution to provide for electorates for the House of Assembly of equal numerical size.

I would be failing in my duty if I did not speak on this matter now and lodge my protest. I do not object to any additional electoral districts in the metropolitan area, because we agree that the numbers have increased considerably, but I believe that doing away with any country districts would be doing away with the service that the people there now have. Country members often receive complaints from constituents that they seldom see their local member, despite the fact that we do our best to represent them in the best way we can. The Government says that it wants electoral equality, but I do not think that it would ever be possible to have it in South Australia, where we have a built-up area in which three-quarters of the population live, the other one-quarter living in the outlying areas. I do not see how we could get electoral equality on the basis of one vote one value.

I also protest at the short notice of the last election. We all know that it was a snap election but, first, it did not give the staff in the Electoral Office the opportunity to carry out their duties as efficiently as they would have liked, although they did a magnificent job in the circumstances. The election put the people in the outlying areas to considerable inconvenience and deprived some of them of a vote. The Government claims that it wants one vote one value but, at an election of this kind, it even deprived some people of a vote. That is a case not of one vote one value but of one vote no value. Many outlying stations in my district have only one mail a week at the most, and the cumbersome system of postal voting in these areas takes people there a few weeks to go through the procedure of obtaining a postal vote. The post offices in the north hold only a certain number of application forms for postal voting and, as soon as the election date was announced, they were swamped with inquiries. The people on one station came in and took the whole of the supply of postal voting application forms from the post office, and the rest of the people in the area had to wait for additional forms to be sent, with the result that some people did not have the opportunity of voting at all, because time was so limited.

This is borne out by figures I have taken out over the past three elections for the seat of Frome. In 1970, 526 people failed to vote; in 1973, 539 (a difference of only 13); and in 1975, 703. So, about 200 more people

failed to vote at the recent election than at the one preceding it, simply because they did not have the time to vote. I know that the Electoral Office will consider these facts when the time comes for people to explain why they did not vote. This again bears out the Government's attitude: it wants one vote one value but, at election time, it gives some people one vote with no value. Certain people were deprived of the opportunity of having a vote.

Earlier this year the Commonwealth member for Wakefield (Hon. C. R. Kelly) wrote me that he had been informed that the Commonwealth Government was seriously considering closing every polling booth in the State that had fewer than 50 registered voters. I immediately wrote to our Attorney-General, who is responsible for electoral matters in South Australia. I told him what had been suggested to me, and requested him not to take the same action, because in a scattered district like the Frome District or the Eyre District this would put a heavy burden on electors.

I agree that some polling booths have only six voters or eight voters and, because it costs more than \$50 to conduct a polling booth, it is very expensive to conduct them. However, we must also consider the inconvenience to which people would be put if a polling booth was closed. I suggested to the Attorney-General that perhaps the postal voting system could be streamlined; the Electoral Office agrees with me. If a person lived permanently in an outlying place, his name could be placed on a list, and he would not have to apply each time for a postal vote; the necessary documents could be sent to him directly. I ask the Government to consider this matter. In this way some small polling booths could be closed. At one polling booth in the Frome District only six people voted, and the officer conducting the booth had five voters who were members of his own family.

Mr. Coumbe: Was it a secret ballot?

Mr. ALLEN: Yes. His Excellency's Speech also referred to the control of bovine tuberculosis brucellosis. Yesterday I was interested to hear the member for Florey give us the benefit of his wide knowledge of this subject. I think he was voicing the opinion of many Rundle Street farmers. Paragraph 5 of the Speech says:

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 . . .

The member for Florey tried to give the impression that the State Government would be a big brother, doing everything. However, I point out that in all these programmes the owner incurs expense. He may not have the expense of actually testing the cattle, but he has the considerable expense of mustering. In the inside country, where there are small paddocks, the mustering problem is slight; people are able to carry out a 100 per cent muster, and in a short time they have their herds free of disease. However, in the other areas, on bigger stations it is impossible to get a 100 per cent muster. If a few infected cattle are missed, before there is a second muster those cattle infect the other cattle. So, it will be a big problem to eradicate totally these diseases.

When I was in the North recently the manager of the biggest cattle station in the world (it is in my district) said that two or three years ago the proceeds from the sale of one bullock paid the wages of two men for a week. However, at present the manager has to sell three steers to

pay the wages of one man for a week. To muster on such a large station, it is necessary to have up to 50 hands. So, mustering is a colossal and costly task. I agree that we must make every effort to eradicate the disease because of our export markets, but it is not as easy, as was suggested by the member for Florey yesterday.

Last week in the *News* the Minister of Agriculture announced that the Government would pay 75c a head for all sheep delivered at the slaughtering works on Eyre Peninsula. This sounds good when we read the headlines but, when we analyse the situation, we find that it helps only certain producers near the slaughtering works. At present, stock transport operators charge \$1 for each 1.6 kilometres. So, producers within a radius of 80 km or 96 km could send their sheep to the slaughtering works and receive at least a small return for them. Anyone who was close to the slaughtering works could deliver his own stock and possibly receive the full 75c a head, but producers farther away could not send their stock to the slaughtering works, because the transport costs would be greater than the return. They therefore have to leave their stock on their properties and destroy them. In addition, those producers will have to make up the losses at the meatworks. The Government cannot pay 75c a head, slaughter the animals, turn them into meatmeal and tallow, and show a profit. So, the taxpayers will foot the bill.

Also, it was said that the Minister of Agriculture would discuss with the Agricultural Council the possibility of a similar scheme for the beef industry. This could be done; once again, people near the abattoir would be paid a certain sum a head for store stock and, if the producers delivered the stock themselves, they would get some return. However, as we consider producers farther and farther away from the abattoir, we realise that it is impossible for them to take advantage of the scheme economically. It takes \$15 a head to send cattle to the abattoir from Marree; \$28 a head for cattle from Alice Springs; and about \$30 a head for cattle from Birdsville. It is impossible to send cattle from there.

Mr. Rodda: Do you think the Government should subsidise the freight?

Mr. ALLEN: It would not be practicable. Once the animal was down here it would still have to be processed at a loss. Two weeks ago, when there was industrial trouble at the abattoir, some of the prices had to be seen to be believed. In one instance 50 cows in calf were sold for \$4.50 a head. By the time the producer paid commission and freight, there would be nothing left. I shall give some examples of cattle from the Far North. Roseberth station at Birdsville sent down steers and received \$70 to \$80 a head; as the costs were \$30, they still received about \$50 a head. This station sent down nine heifers, which realised \$40 a head. Taking into consideration expenses of \$30, they are netting only \$10 a head for those heifers. There would have to be many heifers to pay the interest on the overdraft. Todmorden station at Oodnadatta sent down five heifers at \$40 each; they would receive less than \$10 a head. Roseberth station sent down five cows at up to \$38, averaging \$37. They would get less than \$5 a head for those cows. So, what is the good of subsidising freights? We must investigate this matter more deeply. The Minister suggests that buying store cattle at a certain price will assist those people close to abattoirs, but it is not the answer for people living in the outback who are faced with high freight costs. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): As this is the first opportunity I have had to speak in general terms since the recent State election I wish to thank the electors of Tea Tree Gully for once again returning me as the member for that district. This is the fifth time I have contested an election in 10 years and I, like the member for Frome, hope that it will be a full three years before we have to contest another election.

Mr. Gunn: It will be the last election you'll win.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs. BYRNE: I think I will win a few more yet. At the recent election I had four opponents, and although one of them did not have a how-to-vote card, the other three candidates did, and I was placed last in preference on all three how-to-vote cards which meant that I had to win on first preferences. I am pleased to say that I was able to do that. However, I do not consider that my win was entirely my doing but was the result of being endorsed by the Australian Labor Party, a Party which is acceptable to the majority of people in South Australia. I also believe I was returned because of the dynamic leadership of our Premier who is, of course, the Leader of the Labor Party in this State and because the Labor Party is united, progressive and a Party that has many achievements. At the recent election some former members did not seek re-election. Unfortunately, there was another member who was defeated. I wish all members who are no longer with us a happy retirement. In the case of the former member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) I hope he will be returned to the House in future.

Probably the most satisfying aspect of the recent election as far as I was concerned was that the A.L.P. was returned with six additional members in the Legislative Council. When I entered this Chamber 10 years ago I never expected to see that situation apply in my lifetime. It just goes to show how things have changed—certainly for the better. Let us hope that, after the next State election, the Labor Party has a majority of members in that place. When members on this side were elected it was necessary to re-elect a Cabinet, and I congratulate all our Ministers. I congratulate you, too, Mr. Speaker, on your election to your high office and hope that your term of office will not prove to be too difficult.

Some of the new members have made their maiden speeches and, on whatever side of the House they happen to sit, makes no difference to me. I congratulate them on their effort and I am sure that, in some cases, it must have been an ordeal for them. We have all gone through that situation, so I am sure they are all glad they have it behind them. I now refer to some of the points made by the Premier on June 24 in his policy speech. Under the heading "Electoral reform" he said:

The electorates of the House of Assembly are now very uneven in numbers. We ask for a mandate to redistribute the electorates of the House of Assembly on the Labor Party principle of one vote one value based on single-member electorates.

The necessity for such an electoral system is obvious when one looks at the Tea Tree Gully District which, at the time of the election, had an enrolment of 30 764 electors. The District of Mawson has an even greater number of electors, having 33 440, which is certainly too large and unworkable. By comparison the metropolitan seat of Bragg has an enrolment of 16 364. The country seat of Stuart has an enrolment of 14 692, compared to Frome with an enrolment of 8 612. It can be seen, therefore, that in Frome the value of a person's vote is four times more than that of a person living in Mawson. That situation should not continue, because it is not in the best interests of the state of

the electors. The District of Tea Tree Gully is fairly large and embraces mainly the city of Tea Tree Gully, which covers an area of 125.1 square kilometres and extends from Goulds Creek in the north to the Torrens River in the south, and from Paracombe in the east to Para Vista in the west.

Numerically, the number of electors in Tea Tree Gully, as in some other districts, is too high and creates much work for the sitting member. The same situation applies to other developing fringe areas because of the development that is taking place. As a member in a numerically large area I point out that I do not get additional staff to compensate me for the extra work I do.

Mr. Evans: Has all the sewerage work been done in your area?

Mrs. BYRNE: No. In fact, I asked a question today about that matter. The reason I have had so many sewerage connections completed in my area is that I am a forceful member and have obtained it from the Government. Because the matter of electoral redistribution is covered in His Excellency's Speech, I hope that the anomaly that I have said exists in several House of Assembly districts will soon be rectified.

The Governor's Speech contains other matters of interest to me. I will refer to a few of them where it is intended that legislation be introduced. Legislation will be introduced to prohibit discrimination on the grounds of sex or marital status, the scale of succession duties will be revised, certain concessions in the field of gift and stamp duties will be made, and a measure will be introduced to impose financial liabilities on builders for doing defective housing work. Legislation to regulate the sale of firearms and the letting of residential premises will also be considered. I will not elaborate on any of these matters now because I will have an opportunity later when the appropriate legislation is before Parliament.

Mr. Evans: Is there a shortage of rental accommodation?

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes, and it is common knowledge to members on both sides of the House. His Excellency, in paragraph 6 of his Speech (the paragraph also referred to by the member for Light), states:

An intensive study of the developing northern and southern metropolitan growth regions will be undertaken during the next 12 months. It is planned to produce intermediate stage concept plans to co-ordinate the growth of these areas until the year 2001—

I do not know whether I will be alive in 2001, but I certainly hope I am. However, I do not believe I will be representing the electors of Tea Tree Gully because I hope to retire long before then. His Excellency continues: thus giving direction to public and private developers in the fringe areas. When completed, the studies and resulting concept plans will form the basis for a comprehensive review of the Metropolitan Development Plan, which will then be undertaken.

I wish particularly to direct my remarks to the reference to private developers in fringe areas. As I have already stated, the Tea Tree Gully area is a rapidly expanding one, and serving the needs of this development places a continual pressure on the State's financial resources as well as on those of local councils. This pressure will persist with further land to be brought into city development with the acquisition of large areas of rural A land in the Golden Grove area, where land has been purchased by the South Australian Land Commission. Also, there are areas of land that will be developed by private developers. Some land, on which houses are being built or will be built, has already been subdivided.

There are many services and areas of community development for which the State Government is providing monetary assistance at present. Nevertheless, the Government still cannot keep up with demand. At present, nine new schools or additions to schools have been recommended by the Public Works Standing Committee. Some are already under construction, others not having been commenced. Some pre-schools are being built with Australian Government finance, two of them having just been completed. Another involved an altered building on a primary school site. Three school dental clinics are also proposed. A health centre is being built at St. Agnes, and again some grants have been given to various recreation projects, as well as grants to the city of Tea Tree Gully to assist with roadworks and the purchase of land for public parks, reserves, and/or recreation purposes. Regarding transport, improvements are also to be effected to existing routes, and some services are to be extended. Nevertheless, this still does not keep up with demands.

Only within the last couple of weeks I received a letter from a constituent that contained five requests. The letter referred to private and public telephones, and public post boxes (which come, of course, under the jurisdiction of the Australian Government). There is a bus service in the area concerned, and the writer of the letter wanted it improved or perhaps rerouted. My constituent also refers to the lack of a primary school, and the condition of a road, which came under the jurisdiction of a council. This type of problem is referred to me frequently by residents who have shifted into these new areas.

The constituent to whom I have referred resides in an area of private development. Evaluations should be made of the present and possible future development and use of an area to be subdivided. Consideration should be given to land being acquired for rental housing, and what type of housing, other than the conventional type, is intended to be built. I refer, of course, to flats and unit-type accommodation deemed suitable for different age groups, such as single people, widows and widowers, and elderly citizens who wish to live close to their families.

Christian development, further education, theatre facilities, sport (whether competitive or otherwise), recreation facilities (either indoor or outdoor) and noise pollution are just some of the matters that should be considered beforehand. Pre-planning of common use areas and community facilities that will be required is necessary. I give as examples churches, police stations, ambulances, fire stations, schools, pre-schools, shops, heavy duty roads, public transport routes and bus services. This list is, of course, not exhaustive, and probably other members can think of other facilities.

Again, some of these buildings could be used by several groups and, in planning, consideration should be given to the common use of some of these buildings so that duplication does not occur and all buildings are used to the maximum extent possible. However, any plan formulated, after being discussed and evaluated by interested parties such as the local council, and State and Australian Government departments, and after it has gone on public exhibition for comment and suggestions by the public, if it is to be effective, will need to have statutory powers; otherwise, it will be of no value.

I now refer to a matter that has developed in my district because of the lack of planning to which I have just referred. I have mentioned the need for heavy duty roads to be planned, and the extension of bus services. This

matter relates to the extension of the Municipal Tramways Trust bus service to serve an area at Fairview Park. Although I first made representations in February, it took until June before it was agreed that the school bus only could be extended into the area at this stage. This was because council approval had to be given to operate buses over the roads in question. Portion of my correspondence states:

I understand that the council agreed to this route being used, provided the M.T.T. paid for reconstruction of any roads which buses may damage. This is unacceptable to the M.T.T.

I do not wish to quote from all the letters I have received because I am sure I have made my point. Fortunately for the schoolchildren concerned, this school bus is now going into the area. I make the point that, if pre-planning of areas such as this occurred, such problems would not arise and, of course, the people who are affected are the constituents and ratepayers. Again, once a proposed bus route is known, objections to it are received from people whose houses happen to be in the streets concerned. If this pre-planning takes place, people will know before they build their houses that certain streets are to be used as bus routes. In that way, problems of this nature would not arise.

I now refer to the Lower North-East Road in the Tea Tree Gully District, reconstruction and widening of which is long overdue. I have written letters and asked many questions in the House on this matter. For today's traffic and population, this road is certainly outdated and unsuitable; what is more, it is dangerous. Unfortunately, the time for commencing work on it has again been delayed. I trust that this matter will be reconsidered so that this work can start soon, if not immediately.

I think that a Government regional office should be established in the Tea Tree Gully area, because that would be in the interests of the people living there. They have a good shopping centre, and often it is not necessary for people to travel to Adelaide because they use the local facilities. However, at times they must come to the city when they do not want to because some Government offices they wish to visit are situated in or near the city.

At present, the Community Welfare Department has offices in one building on the North-East Road and it is intended that a branch office of the Motor Registration Division will be housed in another building to be erected further down the North-East Road. My office is in yet another building, and I think all these Government departments as well as others that must eventually come to the area should be housed in the one building. Nor do I think this should be confined to State Government departments. The building should be a joint venture, if such a thing could be arranged, with the Australian Government so that, for example, an office of the Social Security Department could be located in the building. All members receive many inquiries from people with pension problems and community welfare problems and it would be to the benefit of those people if, having gone to the wrong department, they could be referred to another department in the same building. I support the motion.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I support the motion. Earlier in this session I expressed my congratulations to you, Sir, and I now commend you for the manner in which you are discharging your duties in this House. I have previously mentioned new members in this House and again, after having heard those new members speak, I congratulate them and express goodwill to those who served in this Chamber before the election on July 12. In his Speech, His Excellency mentioned the passing of

two previous members of the Legislative Council. I had the honour to serve in another place for some time, and I had the pleasure of knowing Sir Norman Jude, with his jovial but at the same time serious attitude towards his work and towards those who knew him. I here pay a tribute to the gentleman whom I knew.

I had occasion to meet the Hon. Leslie Densley in 1964, when he was Chairman of the Industries Development Committee convened to investigate the decentralisation of industry in country areas. Mr. Densley served this Parliament and the people of South Australia well and we will possibly, among other things, remember him for the Densley committee. I make those comments before proceeding to make further remarks regarding the Parliamentary responsibilities which I have had the honour of accepting following the recent election.

I thank those who were responsible for electing me to this place, as well as those who assisted me in achieving that honour. Although I express this appreciation, I realise that my responsibility is to represent all the people in the District of Gouger and the people of South Australia in any other way in which I am asked to do in this Parliament. First, I must refer to local government. I realise that this matter has been discussed by many others in this debate and I do not wish to repeat unnecessarily many of the things that have been said. However, it is such an important subject (and I have a vital interest in it) that it is my right to discuss the matter briefly.

One of the major problems confronting local government at present is finance. It is the concern not only of city and metropolitan councils but also of the municipal and district councils throughout the State where local government is affected. We have all been concerned that because of certain moves, particularly by the Government in Canberra, there could develop a situation of centralism. While this is denied and while it is not accepted by many, the Prime Minister himself has mentioned and commented on this aspect of the new pattern that has emerged in Australia in the relationship of the Australian Government and local government. In many cases, I think, the Prime Minister is endeavouring to by-pass State Governments. To substantiate that remark I refer the House to the opening address given by the Prime Minister in Alice Springs on Monday, November 11, 1974. He said.

There is a symbolism about this gathering which one may find fascinating, according to one's prejudice. Australian local government has at last come to the Centre. When you choose not only to meet in the Centre but have the Lucifer of centralism open your conference and have your meeting on an Australian Territory, then the Premier of Queensland might well wonder what the world is coming to. I naturally, and by contrast, find both your choices, the venue and the opening speaker, welcome and gratifying.

I do not know why he mentioned that word and referred to himself as being the Lucifer of centralism. He must think he is a little bit of a devil in that context. At the close of his speech he said:

The role we assigned to local government is the real answer to charges of centralism. Under a variety of programmes we have provided local government with the funds to undertake a range of activities previously inadequately carried out or totally neglected. We deliberately have made and shall make local government a vehicle for our legislation on aged person's homes and hostels, sheltered employment, handicapped children, meals on wheels, home care and nursing, nursing homes, and homeless men and women. These are all activities which cannot be closely regulated from the national or State capitals and are best planned and implemented by local government working with local communities. They justify assistance from the nation's finances but not increases in rates. Last month we were fortunate to be able to announce that Mr. Justice

Else Mitchell, Judge of the Land and Valuation Court in New South Wales since 1962, had accepted appointment as Chairman of the Grants Commission for the next five years. He is a man with a very deep understanding of the problems of local government.

When he was Chairman of the Royal Commission into New South Wales Land Valuation Rating Systems in 1965, he said:

Present centralised policies, which have reduced local government to a state of vassalage and councils to the role of mendicants need drastic reappraisal, though I wonder if State Governments are very anxious for local authorities to gain any substantial measure of financial independence or to develop qualities of strong local autonomy.

The Prime Minister went on to say:

The policies and programmes of the Australian Government will, I believe, go far to end that condition of vassalage. The paradox is that more direct co-operation between the National Government and local government can help end State centralism by giving the chance for the regions and to promote equality between the regions. It can be achieved only through co-operation between the national Government and local government; there is no other way. This is not just my choice: it is a choice imposed on us by necessity, by inevitability of Australian history.

I suggest that, through those statements that were made by the Prime Minister about the intentions of the Government in Canberra to by-pass the States and by the fact that the Prime Minister referred to centralism in the State sphere, there is strong reason to believe that the central Government in Canberra is exercising centralism by by-passing the States and going directly to local government and endeavouring to take over the responsibility of local government.

I admit that, through the financial channels, there have been no strings attached up to now, but I would suggest that always where there is money involved eventually there will be conditions, and this is the fear. In the *News* on the sixth of this month, when the Town Clerk of Adelaide returned from a conference of the Secretaries and Presidents of the same organisation from which I read the conference opening speech by the Prime Minister, the Town Clerk said this:

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 of an Australian Council of Local Government Associations 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.

May I refer the House to a press release following a conference of the Lord Mayors in Perth and to the press release made available on March 25, 1975. It states:

The Lord Mayors' Conference today reacted angrily to a statement by the Minister for Urban and Regional Development, Mr. Tom Uren, that central city areas were no longer the preserve of a single council, city or State—but a national responsibility. The Lord Mayors said this was a threat to govern the people of every capital city in Australia, from Canberra. The conference said that the suggestion was irrational and would be fought by capital cities through every avenue at their disposal. The Lord Mayors said they would fight to preserve the rights of the citizens in their respective cities. They unanimously condemned Mr. Uren for statements that he would use his Government's economic influence as a form of development control in city areas.

And so, therefore, finance can be used, and from the Minister's statements the financial whip will be used to

control local government in city areas—and this is the concern of many of those today who are involved in local government.

Might I turn now to a more direct interest in the finances of local government in this particular State, because I am sure that before next Christmas, or by next Christmas, in many areas there will be a crisis as far as finance and local government are concerned. We know that the Lord Mayor has recently stated, concerning the financial situation of the Adelaide City Council, that the council is endeavouring by all means to restrict spending. I notice in the *News* of August 6, 1975, the city's rats earned \$4 000. The report states:

The City Council has decided to save \$4 000 by delaying appointment of an extra rat-catcher. However, there is no danger of the city being overrun by rats in the Pied Piper of Hamelin situation. There are other full-time ratcatchers on the Town Hall staff. Prospects of a \$1 500 000 deficit this municipal year is forcing council to make cost savings. There is an \$8 000 a year vacancy on the Town Hall rat-catching staff and nobody will be appointed for at least six months.

I bring this point forward to illustrate that the City Council is endeavouring to follow all the avenues it can, irrespective of the type of saving, in an endeavour to save money so that it might be able to control its financial affairs. Then we look to the country councils. I have before me a letter from the Minister of Transport in answer to a question that I asked in the House on June 18, 1975. It states:

During the financial years 1972-73, 1973-74, 1974-75, allocations of grants to local government, in money terms, have remained constant at about \$3 800 000. The proposed allocation to councils for the 1975-76 financial year totals \$4 100 000. Debit order expenditures by councils have decreased from \$4 700 000 in 1972-73 to an estimated expenditure of \$2 600 000 in 1974-75. An allocation of \$1 400 000 is proposed for 1975-76. Debit order funds are provided to councils to carry out works on behalf of the Highways Department, on a road priority needs basis. The funds should not be considered by councils to be part of their normal income. Debit order funding to councils is governed to a large extent by funds received from the Australian Government.

I now refer the House to a news release of July 31, 1975, with the heading "Rural local road programme approved in South Australia (statement by the Australian Minister for Transport, the Hon. C. K. Jones, M.P.)". The release is as follows:

The Australian Minister for Transport, Mr. Jones, has approved a rural local roads programme for South Australia in 1975-76 involving an expenditure of some \$5 500 000 from Australian and State Government sources. Under the Roads Grants Act, 1974, all States are required to submit programmes of works for approval by the Australian Government where these involve commitment of Australian Government funds. Mr. Jones said that in the case of rural local roads, he had approved the allocation of Australian Government rural local road funds rather than a programme of actual roadworks. He had also approved the expenditure proposed by the Highways Department on construction and maintenance of rural local roads throughout the State.

He said he had taken this course this year because he recognised that local authorities would have been hard pressed to have had their road construction and maintenance programmes prepared in time for his approval at the beginning of the financial year. At the end of the 1975-76 financial year, the State would provide him with details of the works (both construction and major maintenance projects) on which the South Australian allocation had been spent.

I hope that the Minister will be satisfied with the way in which money has been distributed in South Australia, and that the report will show that the money has been spent and allocated in a wise and effective way. The news release continues:

Mr. Jones said that 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.

Has the Commonwealth Minister any doubts? This statement was not released in all States; it was not released in States whose Governments are of a different political persuasion. It is written about South Australia, and the Minister hopes that the right thing will be done; I concur with him in that. All honourable members on this side of the Chamber hope that the right thing will be done by the South Australian Government in the allocation of funds to local government so that local government can carry out its work, with its finances remaining buoyant. I now refer to *Hansard* (page 95) of July 25, 1974, where the Minister of Transport was asked a question by the member for Eyre concerning finance and grants for local government. In the Minister's reply, amongst other things, he said:

Until now the Government has told councils, whenever we have had the opportunity, that they need to plan their programmes to sustain them from their own resources. In other words, they should not expect assistance merely because they have received it in previous years. Unfortunately, I cannot give a full reply to the member's question, other than to repeat that local government must stand on its own two feet.

In other words, the Minister is saying that councils should rely on their own resources, and should stand on their own two feet financially, irrespective of the system operating in the past, and irrespective of the fact that councils have received grants in the past, on which they have budgeted; that has been the pattern over the years.

Now, without any real warning, councils are expected to stand on their own two feet, using their own resources based on the rates that they raise. No wonder that, in the last Parliament, in the Local Government Act Amendment Bill the Minister saw fit to have inserted a clause providing that there be no ceiling on the cents in the dollar that could be charged in relation to rates. To illustrate their difficulty and to show the decrease in revenue that many councils have experienced over the last two years. I have a concise and comprehensive survey that has been presented by a Mid North district council. Although I have much other evidence from other councils, I do not intend to weary the House by relaying all this information, but I will refer to this one example, which is significant. The figures to which I refer relate to the total grants and contributions made available, and the sums actually spent. The figures referred to are not necessarily the allocation, as some allowance has been made from carry-over figures.

The two aspects that I should like to bring to the attention of the House are, first, the grants, and secondly, the percentage of grants in comparison with the rate revenue. In 1960-61, the council now under scrutiny received a total of \$26 318 in grants, and a rate revenue of \$29 086, the grants as a percentage of the rates being 90.48 per cent. In 1962-63 the figures were similar. In

1967-68 the grant allocation was \$57 842, rate revenue was \$43 836, and grants as a percentage of the rate revenue were 131.95 per cent. In 1971-72, grants totalled \$55 222, rates were \$50 668, and the grants as a percentage of the rates were 108.99 per cent. However, in the ensuing four years I should like members to note the drastic decrease in the size of the grants received by this council.

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

Mr. RUSSACK: Before dinner, I was quoting figures supplied by a council in the Mid North. I will quote the last four years to show the drastic decrease in the grants, the drastic increase in rate revenue, and the decrease in the grants as a percentage of the rates. The grants in 1972-73 were \$48 805; in 1973-74, \$40 969; in 1974-75, \$38 060; and in 1975-76, \$25 213, while the rate revenue increased from \$50 827 in 1972-73 to \$67 225 in 1973-74, to \$83 814 in 1974-75, and to \$97 587 in 1975-76. The grants as a percentage of the rates were for 1972-73, 96.02 per cent; for 1973-74, 60.94 per cent; for 1974-75, 43.84 per cent, and for 1975-76, down to 25.84 per cent. These figures indicate that councils are being forced to rely on their own resources, stand on their own feet, and bleed the ratepayers for their liquidity. Regarding grants from the Grants Commission, I will read from a booklet that has been prepared by the Australian Government, page 3 of which states:

The commission's recommendations will in no way be a substitute for the revenue normally raised by local governing bodies by the long established methods such as rates and charges for services. Nor will the commission replace assistance normally provided by State Governments to local governing bodies.

I therefore suggest that, even though councils are receiving money from the Grants Commission, it was never intended that this money should replace money that originally came from State sources. In the First Report on Financial Assistance for Local Government, concerning the Commission's reasons for providing financial assistance and the equalisation of the standard of services, I emphasise two words that appear in paragraph 1.5 on page 4. The words are "reasonable effort", and the relevant passage is as follows:

All the local governing bodies in a region to function, by reasonable effort, at a standard not appreciably below the standards of the local governing bodies in other regions. I suggest that many councils in this State are going beyond reasonable effort to make ends meet and to ensure that their finances are sufficient for the coming financial year. However, I predict that at Christmas, or half-way through this financial year, many councils will find themselves in difficulty. The only reference I can find in His Excellency's Speech to local government is contained in paragraph 14, which states:

My Government is engaged in continuing discussions with numbers of local government councils with a view to securing their agreement to changes in boundaries in the interests of efficiency in administration.

I sincerely hope that councils will examine closely the situation concerning their boundaries and that they will be willing to come to an agreement so that, where necessary, these boundary changes will take place. Having been a member of the Select Committee considering local government boundaries, I know it was the committee's finding and hope that local government by voluntary means would assess the situation and, where necessary, come to an arrangement, and I hope that this will be done.

I will now refer to housing. The member for Mount Gambier has said that there is an acute shortage of rental housing in his district. I point out that that is not a singular case, because in most country towns it is almost

impossible to rent a house, and this situation is affecting employment in many country areas. Many people in provincial towns between 65 and 80 kilometres away from Adelaide are commuting daily to the city in the course of their employment; many of these are city people who have moved out, and this is causing a shortage of available rental houses. Of course it is desirable that these people move out of the city and reside in the various towns, but there is this great need for rental housing, which could be made available to people on fixed incomes, and for pensioner accommodation.

Many pensioners live in country towns, and I know of two houses in Kadina that were built about 30 years ago by the Housing Trust under a special scheme whereby the rental was based on a percentage of the pension the occupant received. This is an excellent scheme and I would like, if possible, to see a similar scheme introduced in country towns. First, a survey must be conducted where the need is on a local basis, and a report must be sent through correct channels to the trust. A need exists, and it would be most desirable if such a scheme was reintroduced. I will now read from a letter I have received from a Mr. Denis O'Connell of Riverton.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Is Riverton in your district?

Mr. RUSSACK: Yes, and I have Mr. Connell's permission to quote from his letter to the Premier, as follows:

I am writing to you asking for your personal assistance with a matter that is of paramount importance to my business at Riverton and to members of our staff; the matter is housing. For approximately 2 years I have been pressing the South Australian Housing Trust for rental homes to be built in Riverton, primarily for our staff, also for residents in our district who continually ask me (as the S.A. Housing Trust agent) for rental houses.

The reason given by the trust for not being able to assist is that they cannot purchase any land in or around Riverton for further development, and in fact the last advice was to the effect that there was simply no money for Housing Trust land at Riverton. Contrary to the statement that there is no land available in Riverton, I have been assured by independent authorities, including the District Council of Riverton, that the Housing Trust through its agents, have been offered several lots of land at reasonable prices. These offers have been declined, or delayed and when further interest was displayed the land had been sold to others.

I started this business in 1946 after discharge from the A.I.F. as a one-man operation; since that time, through hard work, long hours and an undivided interest in the electrical retail and service industry, I have been successful in extending business to five additional outlets, namely, at Welland, Findon, Burra, Enfield and Whyalla, employing a total staff of 39. Our head office is in Riverton and I want this to remain so, as I live here and I take credit for creating employment here. Surely this is in keeping with the Government policy of decentralisation.

I am well aware of the responsibility you have as head of the State and I can assure you that it is not my wish to take advantage of your time; however, I feel sure you will have some appreciation of my concern and I sincerely trust you can have this matter resolved. I listened with interest to a new Housing Trust development of 42 homes at Whyalla. Do you think six at Riverton would be possible, providing I were to guarantee the rent? I am appreciative of the enthusiasm with which you have handled the affairs of this State, and I wish to compliment you in this regard. I look forward to your support of my enthusiasm here at Riverton.

I have given an instance of a person in a country town who has been successful in providing employment for many people but who has experienced difficulty because no houses are available for some of his employees. That example is typical of the situation in many country towns, and I sincerely hope that something

can be done in that case and in other similar cases throughout the State. People in the Gouger District are aware of the need to care for the aged. It is commendable that people in country towns endeavour to fulfil this responsibility to senior citizens. At present new homes for the aged are being established at Riverton, which was one of the first towns to establish such homes; it did so in the 1950's, before there was a Government subsidy. Since then a very liberal subsidy has been received from the Australian Government. The building that is now almost completed is costing more than \$400 000. New homes are being erected at Balaklava, and the foundations for new cottage homes have been laid at Moonta. There are cottage homes also at Hamley Bridge and Kadina.

Housing is needed in the Watervale-Auburn area in my district, because the wine industry is developing there; increasing acreages of vines are being planted annually. The Gouger District is not an isolated instance of the need for employment in country towns. However, the major industry in the district is primary industry, particularly mixed farming, cereal growing, sheep and fat lamb raising, cattle, pigs and poultry, and the extension of vine planting in the Watervale-Auburn area. The towns in the district depend mainly on tertiary commercial industry, but tourism is developing in the coastal areas, particularly Moonta, Wallaroo and Port Hughes. The people would appreciate any assistance that the Government can give in connection with providing a sea-water pool at Wallaroo. Following a public meeting in the Wallaroo Town Hall some months ago, a district committee was formed comprising representatives from as far afield as Alford, Bute, Wallaroo Mines and Kadina. Plans were drawn up for a sea-water pool and dressing sheds at Wallaroo. Correspondence was sent to the appropriate departments, and any assistance would be appreciated.

This afternoon I asked a question about a survey into a proposed coal-powered electric power station that could be erected in the future, according to a news report, on the sea-board between Wallaroo and Whyalla. The Wallaroo area is an ideal site for such a plant. In reply, the Minister of Mines and Energy suggested that I or others should make a submission. I give an assurance that such a submission is being prepared by the Wallaroo corporation and other interested bodies and people. As amenities and facilities exist in the area for such a power plant, the site is well worth considering. At the time that the Densley committee sat, Wallaroo was favourably considered in connection with a power station, so I hope the project will come to fruition there.

I was very disappointed at the Government's response to an approach made by a gentleman who had acquired a plant for the manufacture of solvents. At Wallaroo Mines there is a disused primary school consisting only of the walls and the roof. On the last occasion I saw the building, it had no windows, no floors and no ceiling, but a prospective industrialist, after inspecting the site, considered it would suit his purpose for the establishment of a small industry for the production of solvents. He bought secondhand plant from a company in the city, and he had orders and the means to dispose of the product, but he needed the necessary area in which to establish the factory. He considered that the old Wallaroo Mines school was a desirable site.

When he approached the Education Department he found that, in his opinion, the building had been passed to the Lands Department. He contacted me on March 5, 1975. On March 6, I wrote to the Minister of Education, who replied on March 10. I then contacted the Minister

of Lands on March 27, because it was considered that the property had gone to the Lands Department. The Minister of Lands replied on April 15. The Minister of Education and the Minister of Lands gave the same information: an indication had to be given that the property was not required by any other Government department, and it took several weeks to ascertain whether, in fact, the property was required.

In the meantime the National Trust branch at Wallaroo was asked by the Government whether it wanted to restore the property and use it as a museum. Apparently the trust was not interested because it was about 8 km from the property. However, the National Trust branch at Kadina was less than 2 km away and was asked whether it would like the building and the money to restore it as a museum. While all this was happening the person interested in using the building could not wait any longer for a decision to be made, so the building remains in an unkempt state and, because of long-winded, red-tape procedures, the district has lost a prospective industry that may have employed as many as 20 people, mainly females.

I express my appreciation to the Government for upgrading certain schools in country areas such as Balaklava, Brinkworth, and Snowtown. Two used buildings were transferred from Snowtown Area School when its new building was erected to Alford. The people of Alford appreciate this, but for many years they have been trying to have the yard repaved at the school.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They've done better under Labor Governments than they've ever done before.

Mr. RUSSACK: They can do better though. Requisitions and applications have been made for a basketball court to be repaved. Also, there is an area where a solid building once stood but the site is irregular. I inspected the schoolyard last Saturday afternoon and would say without hesitation that the yard, in its present condition, is dangerous for young children. I therefore ask that something be done about this matter.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Have you telephoned the Minister of Education about it?

Mr. RUSSACK: No, but I will.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You've not yet spoken to him?

Mr. RUSSACK: For that school, no. Although I am thankful that legislation was introduced last session regarding land tax, I believe the true situation was misrepresented.

Mr. Keneally: Is this a vote of thanks?

Mr. RUSSACK: I believe in giving credit where it is due. I also believe in bringing forward matters which I consider have been neglected or misrepresented and which can be improved. When the land tax equalisation scheme was introduced I am sure the impression was given that it would reduce taxation. Although there has been an equalisation, I have a copy of the land tax equalisation listings, which I do not wish to read now, but which indicates that, in many areas, valuations will again rise. In other words, the equalisation scheme will mean a revaluation each year and, with escalating values, the amount of tax paid will escalate, too. Admittedly, the reverse will apply if there is a drop in the valuation, but the Government should consider altering the tax scale each year, just as an equalisation adjustment is made each year.

During the debate on this matter in the previous session I raised the matter of the land tax assessment relating to the Flagstaff Hill Golf and Country Club. The Government in considering rural areas, had used the 1973-74

valuation. I asked whether something could be done for the club, and I have been informed that the matter has been considered.

Mr. Keneally: Did they advise the local member accordingly?

Mr. RUSSACK: That is the trouble with the Government. If someone gives the Government credit for something it does, so much is made of it, one wonders whether it is right, proper and necessary even to give credit to the Government. In my district, rural activities are the major industry, and the outlook this season is not especially good. With rising costs and farmers receiving less for their products, creating a cost-price squeeze, this year will be no different. Transport is a major consideration for primary industry, and many farmers have to buy new trucks to comply with the new legislation. I know there are other avenues through which I could make inquiries, but I have not yet been able to find out what is the best truck for a grower to buy. Perhaps the Minister could help me, because it is a question I am asked continually. In addition, I am asked what is the most appropriate size of truck that the legislation will allow for a grower to be able to carry the maximum load. I have asked the Chairman of the Road Traffic Board about the matter, but I believe that those responsible for the legislation should have some idea of what is necessary and should be able to suggest what is the best and most economic size of truck.

His Excellency's Speech indicates that the legislative programme this session will not be large. Among the measures to be considered are electoral reform, involving a redistribution of boundaries. Some members on this side have already commented on that, so I will reserve my major comments until the legislation is introduced. A recent report that appeared in the *News* stated:

Mr. Dunstan said today the Assembly would still have 47 seats under the Labor proposals. The scheme would mean a sharp drop in the number of country seats in the Assembly. The Premier went on: "There are country seats at present with about 9 500 voters and city seats with 30 000 voters. If you bring them to equality in vote value, then there will inevitably be a reduction in the number of country seats."

Mr. Dunstan said he was confident the Liberal Movement would support the Government's measures and they would be approved. He added: "In Parliament, representatives represent electors. All electors should have equal and effective representation within their electorate in the law that governs them. There was no longer any great problem in servicing large electorates."

They could be easily travelled, and electors could easily contact country members and get service. In addition, assistance to country members from the Government had been improved with electorate offices, travel assistance, free intra-State plane travel and electoral allowances.

I accept that members have received those advantages, although I consider that in many respects the Premier is out of touch with certain aspects of a country member's duties and the difficulties with which he is faced. I travel 55 000 kilometres a year, and I know that it is not easy for a country member to attend to his constituents' requirements or in many instances for his constituents to contact him. With those remarks, I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): I take this opportunity, the first formal one I have had this session, to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to this place and on your appointment to the high office that you occupy. I assure you of my support at all times. I also congratulate and extend my good wishes to all new members who have entered this place as a result of the recent election. I submit, however, that the two new members opposite could

hardly claim to have won their way into this Chamber. They arrived in this place by inheritance. Having received the nod of their Party and aspiring to what are safe seats for their Party, they have inherited membership of this place.

Mr. Abbott: What's wrong with that?

Mr. BOUNDY: I am not suggesting that anything is wrong with it, but those members are here by inheritance. However, members on this side of the House who are here for the first time won their seats. I am pleased to see here the members for Millicent and Mount Gambier, who wrested those two seats from the Government and won them for the Opposition. I also welcome the new member for Heysen. Indeed, I welcome all new members and wish them well in their time, be it long or short, in this House. I express condolences to the families of the late Sir Norman Jude and the Hon. L. H. Densley. Neither of these gentlemen was known to me personally, but both had a long and distinguished career in the Parliament of this State. Their families can be comforted in the knowledge that they added lustre to and improved the quality of life of this State.

I am pleased to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I refer to the speech made by His Excellency in opening this, the first session of the Forty-Second Parliament. In paragraph 3 of his Speech, His Excellency said that we had had an election. I deplore the result of that election. The Government won it only by the skin of its teeth; nevertheless, it won the election. I am thankful to my supporters in Goyder District for endorsing me as their representative for the second time in a little over 12 months. On the first occasion, it was contended that I got in on some sort of a Liberal Movement and Australian Labor Party axis. The figures at the recent election disprove that contention. Just over 12 months ago, I received 46.4 per cent of the primary vote in a three-way contest. In the recent election, I was fortunate enough to receive 45.4 per cent of the vote in a four-way contest. Therefore, it was not the Labor Party vote that put me there on the first occasion, and I owe no allegiance to members who sit on my left in this Chamber.

His Excellency went on in his Speech to refer to the issue that brought about the snap election that we endured: the agreement for the transfer to the Commonwealth Government of the South Australian Railways, and the repeal of the Business Franchise (Petroleum) Act. They are mentioned in the Speech more or less in the spirit of business arising out of minutes. We had an opportunity again to look at this matter, but we had no hope of renegotiating it, because it was the issue on which the election was called. My concern in this new session of Parliament will be to harass the Government and attempt to keep it on its toes at all times as we consider the legislation that it introduces into this place.

I am concerned on another point: *detente* is supposed to be the spirit that is abroad on this side of the House. I would support any measure for co-operation among all Opposition members. However, I find it difficult to co-operate with one or two members over this vexed matter of the transfer of the railways. I refer in this respect to the Leader of the Opposition in another place who, I feel, has fostered fear and emotionalism throughout country areas and brought down censure on the heads of my colleagues in another place, as well as on me. His posturing has had to be seen to be believed. In post-election publicity, the Leader in another place has called for the appointment

of a Select Committee, a Constitutional Convention, and a referendum.

Mr. Chapman: You voted for a Select Committee.

Mr. BOUNDY: I voted for a Select Committee on the first occasion that this matter was before the House. I submit that the Leader in another place knew all the time that his lack of action in seeking the appointment of a Select Committee before the election rendered impossible any further consideration of the details of the agreement.

Mr. Chapman: But you voted for the Select Committee after the election.

Mr. BOUNDY: True. We did not move for it, but we supported it, knowing that it would not work.

Mr. Chapman: The House divided and you voted for it, and you know it!

Mr. BOUNDY: For the benefit of the member for Alexandra, I am managing quite well on my own. On the third reading of the Bill in this place, we recognised that we had tried all the means at our disposal to renegotiate this matter and to try to convince the Government that a further look at the matter should be taken. However, the democratic process of majority government must prevail, so we reluctantly crossed the floor and voted with the Government. The Leader of the Opposition in another place and his colleagues should have been honest enough, as we were, to accept that the case was that it could not be renegotiated.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They are not honest: that's the difference.

Mr. BOUNDY: It was incredible to witness matters in that House last night. When the vote was taken, there was no dissenting voice. I hope that the honourable gentleman in that other place now receives the censure of country people for his dishonesty. The Business Franchise (Petroleum) Bill, popularly referred to as the petrol tax (although that is a misnomer because it applies to all fuel) was brought forward from the previous session. That legislation has caused significant cost increases in primary production generally, and I now applaud the fact that it will be removed. His Excellency also referred to electoral inequalities, and mentioned impending legislation. We will support such a measure if it is fair, but we must contain our vessel until the Government sets down the guidelines before we decide whether it will have our support. In spite of what the member for Florey said yesterday (and he claims his Party represents country districts best) the fact is that his Party does not represent one truly rural seat, and it is obvious from the swing in the recent election that many metropolitan seats are winnable for non-Labor. Nine seats require less than a 5 per cent swing to bring them to our side of politics. These seats are winnable for non-Labor by a Party occupying the middle ground of political philosophy in South Australia; therefore, we have only a temporary Labor Government. In my short term here, both speeches I have heard by His Excellency the Governor have commenced with matters relating to agriculture. I cannot decide whether the Government considers agriculture first in importance, or whether it deals with matters alphabetically. Last time, I remember, His Excellency referred to measures to introduce a butter-margarine combination which would be more spreadable. Unfortunately, that commodity has not yet reached South Australian tables. In this year's Speech I am pleased to hear that funds will be made available for tuberculosis and brucellosis control, and if the Commonwealth comes to light with a little more assistance that measure will be extended considerably.

Well I remember from my term on the Advisory Board of Agriculture the introduction of this measure across the State and the desire of the then Director of Agriculture (Dr. Marshall Irving) to render this State free from these two diseases, enabling us to enter any beef market in the world without a stigma in relation to animal health. Funds are vital for this matter to be carried to its full and proper fruition. As a little sideline on the matter concerning tuberculosis and brucellosis control, I am concerned about the lack of effectiveness of the tail-tagging programme that has been undertaken as a trace-back measure to check out which properties are suspect in relation to these two diseases. I do not know whether it is in order to ask the Government to see that the sticky tape is a little stronger on the plastic-type tags so that they do not come off the tails of the cows and fall on the floors of the transports, thereby rendering the suspect cattle unidentifiable, or whether it should be necessary to ban those tape tags altogether and endorse the use of the ratchet-type tags only.

Mr. Evans: Say that again, but slowly.

Mr. BOUNDY: I think I have been sufficiently explicit. If ever this Government and its Commonwealth colleagues can control inflation we may be able to find export markets again and enter them, as I have said, with animals free from disease. His Excellency's Speech referred to the amendment of the Planning and Development Act. Naturally, we on the Opposition side of the House do not know exactly what the Government has in mind in referring to this measure—

Mr. Keneally: Or anything else.

Mr. Chapman: When we find that out we want to find out what is in your mind.

Mr. BOUNDY: I am trying to explain it. Reference to the Planning and Development Act leads me to refer to the draft development plan for Yorke Peninsula. I recognise that we have before us at present for discussion only a draft for our perusal so that it can be further discussed before the final development plan is arrived at. However, I express my concern at some of the implications of that draft plan. I agree that this is necessary for the proper control of our coastline. The Coast Protection Board has a very real and proper function to perform, as does the State Planning Authority, but some of the measures contained in that document give me and many of my constituents a great deal of cause for concern. As honourable members are aware, Yorke Peninsula lends itself to tourism. Indeed, it is one of the industries we can develop and promote for the betterment of our total community. Therefore, it was with the greatest alarm that we read in the draft development plan the suggestion that it might be necessary to resite the Black Point shack area back behind the road on private land.

Mr. Keneally: It might be better to resite Yorke Peninsula.

Mr. BOUNDY: I think Yorke Peninsula is ideally situated. We would welcome the member for Stuart if he cared to visit us for a holiday at any time he should be free. He may well consider hiring a shack at Black Point, partaking of the pleasures of that locality. In this matter I refer specifically to Black Point. I point out for the benefit of those members who are not familiar with the locality that the shack area is developed with a frontage immediately on to the beach; there is no road between the shacks and the sea. I agree that all future development should be sited the other way around, but in the case of Black Point the shack development

sits on top of the coastal sand dunes. It is a great long ribbon development giving access to the public at various—

Mr. Keneally: And so we say farewell—

Mr. Coumbe: Let's take a Fitzpatrick.

Mr. BOUNDY: Touché! The value of Black Point is enhanced by the presence of the shacks in their existing positions. If it was the bay it used to be, with no development, not a soul would visit us. It is only the presence of the amenities as provided that draw the people to enjoy the facilities that are available. Therefore, we are most concerned about some aspects of the attitude of the Coast Protection Board towards tourist development. I am concerned, too, as are my constituents, about the uncertainty of some of the guidelines laid down for subdivision by the State Planning Authority and the Coast Protection Board. Only yesterday, a constituent placed before me his problems in establishing a subdivision at Port Clinton. I took the opportunity on my way to the House yesterday to inspect it with him. It appears that the requirements of the Coast Protection Board with regard to land on the coast on the seaward side of the subdivision are a trifle unreasonable. The demands on his privately held land are greater than is really necessary for the protection of the general public.

With regard to this particular subdivision at Port Clinton, another problem that raises its ugly head is the situation of the rural council in assisting subdividers to establish areas ready for sale. Rural councils have difficulty in servicing shack areas, as they receive from them only a minimal amount of revenue. In the case of Port Clinton, the council is only small and is not a profit-making organisation. Therefore, it has no accumulated funds with which to provide roads in this area. This area was laid out many years ago as the township of Port Clinton, and there are surveyed Government roads. As the council is now required to provide roads within this development area, it needs about \$5 000 in order to provide this facility for the benefit of the development that will almost certainly take place there. It is asking the Highways Department for a grant to enable it to enhance the beauty and usefulness of that tourist area in its district.

Paragraphs 11 and 12 of the Speech refer to a Murray River working party and a steering committee of State and Australian Government Ministers to look at water quality and quantity and its management in relation to the Murray. Paragraph 12 refers to legislation to ensure that the quality and quantity of all the State's water resources will be conserved and enhanced. I agree that water is the most vital resource in this State. It is vital, as honourable members would know, to the future welfare of all people in the State. Without doubt, the Murray is our lifeline now, and will be more so in the future. We need the co-operation of the Eastern States in this matter. There is a need for a responsible attitude by those Governments with regard to the river; perhaps they should live according to the principles of the golden rule.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do you think you can get responsible attitudes from the New South Wales and Victorian Governments, though?

Mr. BOUNDY: I would sincerely hope so.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Wishful thinking, I think.

Mr. BOUNDY: It is vital to our future welfare that they should be responsible. I view with alarm the extension of the Albury-Wodonga area and the influence the effluent from that city will have on our lifeline. It may well be, if we are not very careful, that the Murray

itself will become a sewer. Then, too, there is danger in the establishment of Monarto, as effluent from that area will doubtless find its way into Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are you talking about "affluent" or "effluent"?

Mr. BOUNDY: The effluent I refer to may well damage the future viability of the irrigation areas around the lower Murray, and it could affect the welfare of all South Australians. Water is also vital in relation to tourism. I hark back to the matter of shack development and subdivision for tourist purposes. It is necessary to have a bit of fresh water so that proper health standards can be provided, and the quality of life properly maintained, even in shack areas. It will be necessary for the Government to consider reticulating water to the established areas, as well as providing for it in any new subdivisions that are developed.

I refer to that part of my constituency in the Virginia area, the Northern Adelaide Plains water resources area. Producers in that area are most concerned about the use of water and the depletion of the aquifers there. Action must be taken with all speed to ensure that their viability is retained. Obviously, the Virginia area provides the closest locality in the State for the growing of vegetables for the metropolitan market, and every opportunity must be taken to see that its viability is maintained.

Mr. Evans: How far is Virginia from the East End Market?

Mr. BOUNDY: I do not know, but it would not be far. It may be the member for Fisher has a few market gardeners up his way, who are closer.

Mr. Evans: No, in Heysen.

Mr. BOUNDY: Wherever they are, it is accepted that Virginia is fairly close to the East End Market and that water is vital to it. It is a matter of some note the work that is being done under the auspices of the Regional Employment Development scheme in the Munno Para council area in providing a drainage scheme from that area towards the sea. I believe that the stormwater that will go along that drain, which is currently being built—at a cost of \$1 500 000—can be channelled back into the acquifers in that basin to the north of the city. It is agreed that it will not recharge the aquifers to the level that it will need, but any opportunity that exists for returning water to the underground basin should be investigated and undertaken.

I cannot leave this point without referring again (as I did in my maiden speech here) to the matter of the use of Bolivar effluent. I note that the Government has instituted a feasibility study, and that alternative plans have been submitted to people of that area for the reticulation of Bolivar effluent for the use of market gardeners in the area. Once again, the Government must use all speed to see that that water is put into use. A further problem in that area with regard to water is the matter of mains water that is reticulated throughout the area. Housing development is taking place and I have received many complaints about the poor pressure that exists in house water supplies. Residents are expressing alarm that further development in housing is being undertaken, even when the existing system is already overtaxed. Therefore, there is a crying need for the whole system to be not only upgraded but, almost certainly, entirely replaced for the benefit of that area.

I refer to the relocation of the East End Market. For the benefit of the member for Fisher, and perhaps the honourable member for Heysen, I point out that to lessen the

distance between the Virginia area and the market it is suggested that the East End Market be relocated at Northfield. This would almost certainly make Virginia closer to the Adelaide Market than any other area. The growers in my area accept the inevitability of the relocation of the market at Northfield. I question it because the area that is being suggested for the new site for the market is part of that area presently held by the Agriculture Department. I think that the Government of the day will be remiss if it takes over too much of that area for other purposes. Future generations in South Australia would rise up and call blessed the Government that had the courage to leave that 283 hectares as open space. It appears that we are beaten on this issue, as the market will almost certainly be located opposite Yatala Labour Prison.

Mr. Evans: Don't you think it should be nearer the railhead?

Mr. BOUNDY: Perhaps the Government will provide a railway. However, the location of the new market is not of so much concern to growers in the Virginia area as is their autonomy in the market place. A report in the *News* of July 2, 1975, under the heading "Growers to fight takeover" quotes Mr. Joe Sparnon, a leading Virginia market gardener.

Mr. Chapman: You don't know his politics!

Mr. BOUNDY: I do not know his politics, but I do know his concern for the welfare of the industry. I count him a personal friend. Moreover, my friendships are above politics. The report states:

Mr. Joe Sparnon, 55, a leading Virginia market gardener who called the meeting today, said: "If the Northfield market operates with commission agents we will be finished. We will lose control of our own produce forever." These gardeners are concerned about the quality of their produce, and the quantity of it that goes into the market. They rightly desire to retain control of their product from seed to sale. That is their right, and I believe that we must resist every attempt to take away their autonomy. In fact, the Government should have the sense not to want to do that.

In paragraph 10 of his Speech, the Governor referred to health services in South Australia. I was interested to hear the member for Florey say in his speech yesterday that social welfare is the right of every person in this country. I refer to one aspect of social welfare. I hope the Government will do something in relation to dental health services in the community, especially those provided to indigent persons in South Australia. I refer to the matter I raised here as long ago as August 29, 1974, when I mentioned two examples of difficulties facing pensioners in country districts in freely getting assistance under the pensioner medical scheme. On that occasion I made the following statement:

First, I refer to the case of a legless man who has been hospitalised in my locality and who needs dentures. Even had he been able to get near the top of the list for dentures—

and all members know that there are about 9 000 names on that list, which goes back as far as 1965—

several trips by ambulance to the city would have been involved for the required service to be provided by the Royal Adelaide Hospital Dental Department. All of this would have been at the expense of the taxpayers, yet a satisfactory result could have been obtained locally. Secondly, I refer to the case of a patient who has required continued and frequent hospital treatment for a bronchial disorder when he could have been cured permanently by having several infected teeth removed. I am concerned about the whole matter of dental care for indigent persons.

Our local community dentist was sponsored from England (incidentally, he came to Australia to escape welfare medicine). However, right from his earliest days in our town and in this country he expressed his willingness to undertake pensioner work under contract. He has written many letters to his association seeking the opportunity to do that, but the opportunity has been refused.

I now refer to the situation that obtains in our town regarding treatment of Aboriginal people from the nearby Point Pearce community. They need only sign a declaration that they are of Aboriginal descent and present themselves to our dentist in Minlaton, and they are immediately treated. The account for their treatment is sent for settlement to the Repatriation Department. I applaud the situation that obtains in relation to Aborigines, as they are well provided for in this regard, but I submit that this service could be extended with little difficulty to include pensioners living in our community, and it would allowed them some dignity and comfort in their declining years. Before leaving that point I refer also to the excellent dental clinic situated in my district. However, it appears that greater use could be made of this facility by pensioners in need of dental treatment.

I refer to the need for rental housing in country areas. As the member for Gouger pointed out, the need for rental housing in country areas is well known and widespread, and the situation obtaining in the District of Goyder is exactly the same as that which the honourable member described as obtaining in Gouger. I have in my possession letters from employees of the Highways Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, who have been transferred to the country to serve their departments. However, some of these officers are living in farm houses many miles from the town, at great inconvenience to their wives and families. Obviously, there is a need for the Housing Trust to provide further rental houses, so that not only people who are transferred to the country to do a job but also those people who want to reside in the country have the opportunity to rent houses. There is certainly a need for early appraisal of the situation and prompt action.

Paragraph 8 of the Speech refers to controlling inflation and to protecting the purchasing power of wages, etc. For this Government, that is a most important priority, but it must also give great consideration to protecting the viability of the private sector and to the role the private sector plays in the employment field, which have never been fully recognised by this Government or by its Commonwealth colleagues. I hope that in the life of this Parliament the Government will see the errors of its ways and will correct them. I support the motion.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity of congratulating you on your appointment as Speaker, and I wish you a long and successful term in that office. I think it would be fair to say that from this Parliament's commencement you have carried out your duties most ably, that you have put up with the settling-in period of both the Government and the Opposition, and that your confidence in being able to handle your position will be proven as time goes by. I am sure that all other members offer you their utmost co-operation as we settle into the normal routine of this Parliamentary session.

I extend condolences to the families of members who have died since the last session of Parliament, particularly to the relatives of the late Sir Norman Jude, whom I knew well and whom I respected greatly for the vast knowledge he was able to pass on to new members and for the guidance he gave us. I am sure that we will benefit from

his services to this Parliament and the State. I express good wishes to those members who have retired from Parliament, more particularly those from this Chamber, and I single out the member for Heysen (Bill McAnaney), who also was willing to help any new member. He was a wonderful friend and colleague, and I hope that he and his wife will now enjoy a long and healthy retirement.

I extend similar wishes to Mr. and Mrs. Paddy Ryan. Mr. Ryan was Speaker during the last session of Parliament, and he had the respect of all members because of the way in which he carried out his onerous duties. He was a friend, and we will miss him. I place on record my appreciation of the services to this State of members of my Party who have retired from another place, namely, Sir Arthur Rymill, Sir Lyell McEwin, Dr. Vic Springett, Ross Story and Gordon Gilfillan, who, each in his own way, contributed much to the State.

Most particularly, I refer to Sir Lyell McEwin's service as Minister and later as President of another place, and also to Sir Arthur Rymill for the manner in which he investigated and critically reviewed Government legislation irrespective of the Party that introduced it. It is people of their calibre that the State will miss. It is easy to criticise gentlemen with an opposing political viewpoint, but the State will be worse off as a result of their loss, because for years they contributed much in a way that the general public does not necessarily appreciate.

I welcome to the Chamber the new member for Mount Gambier, and I know that "our 'arold", as he has become known, will certainly give that part of the State sound representation. He has proved that the Party choice in the district produced the right man for the seat and for bringing it to this side of the House. We have already seen a campaign conducted against him by certain Government members and Ministers, but I know that he will be beyond falling for that trap, because he has fallen into a situation similar to that in which I fell about five years ago, namely, no matter what one does or says, one is attacked. I am sure that he will go about representing his district first and will not be fobbed off or intimidated by those who wish to attack him in an attempt to destroy his credibility.

Certainly he will have many colleagues on this side who will see that that kind of tactic will not continue in South Australian politics. Our Party, more than any other Party, has suffered over the years from the personal denigration of a member by an organisation setting out to destroy him in a certain area. I assure him that I have had to put up with it for five years. I am still here and it has not affected my health, even though at times people go further than attacking the member himself and try to attack and destroy the credibility of his family. It is time that we as members of Parliament protected ourselves against people who descend to these kinds of tactic by seeing that they are removed from the political scene. I think we have proved that in my area, but certainly we should show no quarter to people who persist in this type of campaign. I do not know whether the member for Mount Gambier is receiving abusive phone calls but, if he suffers an experience similar to what I have suffered, he will find that, if he puts up with it for three years, such people will not be able to get to him. I wish him well, and I know that he will do what is required by the people of his district.

I also welcome the new member for Millicent (also an outstanding choice by his Party), a solid worker who will prove his worth to the House and to that part of the State so that it will have a worthy and creditable member. I

also welcome the new member for Heysen, who follows in the footsteps of the former member for the district. We know that the new member will have little difficulty in settling in and becoming part of the solid team on this side and that his background in politics will ensure that he will make a worthwhile contribution to seeing the Liberal Party on the Government benches at the first opportunity.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I hope he's a railways expert.

Mr. BECKER: I think he has had sufficient advice so that he will be expected to comment from time to time on railway reports, although his duties will be much easier than were those of the former member for Heysen. We have now lost the country railway services and some of the other bits and pieces also tied up in the agreement, so the new member will not have to wade through a mass of figures regarding huge railway debts, loan borrowings, etc. He will find that the railways deficit this year will not be as great as it was last year. We will give this Government a couple of years, if it remains in office that long, and we will see an even greater deficit.

The recent election campaign will probably go down in the history of this Government as one of those campaigns brought about by a sudden outburst of the Premier. There is no way in which he could ever convince me that his Party was ready for an election campaign. I believe that the decision was made in Canberra in a fit of rage, and we have now become accustomed to that. He and his Ministers found out at the last minute that they were in the midst of a fierce campaign, and they had to do the best they could. The statistics indicated that the Government could expect to be returned to office. However, anyone can be fooled by polls or by their own workers going out and obtaining information, and the Government was under pressure from the beginning, because its organisation was not prepared for the election campaign, although it claimed to be prepared. We found in the first few days of the campaign that my Party's supporters had erected signs and got things under way, but the Labor Party made excuses for not doing things. It was caught flatfooted, and it was most fortunate for the Labor Party that through the television media, through switching tactics in the last few days and through the Premier's plea that he had been smeared by the Opposition, the Government was able to rescue a few hundred votes and get back into office. Never before have so many people been fooled by the misleading type of campaign conducted by the Government. If any private enterprise organisation had conducted such an advertising campaign, it would be before the courts for misleading advertising. Political Parties should be subjected to the same type of treatment as are commercial undertakings; in other words, political Parties should, if necessary, be required to go before the courts and prove that the statements they have made during election campaigns are justified. If such a requirement had been in force, the Labor Party would be out of Government right now.

We have never been frightened to tell the people the truth. However, when we see misleading statements and smear tactics throughout the State, we realise it is about time that someone demanded that the rights of voters be respected and took the Government to task. This Government has forced stupid legislation through the House, and it has made so many mistakes that the taxpayers have been fleeced right, left and centre. The Labor Party should never have got away with the type of statement it made during the last election campaign.

Mr. Slater: Give an example!

Mr. BECKER: The reference during the campaign to the sum of \$800 000 000 was a fiddle, and the reference to Land Commission prices was another fiddle. The Premier admitted it on a television programme during an interview with the member for Light. In my district the Labor Party made all sorts of smearing statements. However, as long as the Labor Party mentions my name, I do not mind: it is when my name is not mentioned that I worry. As long as the Labor Party smears me, my majority increases.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Don't forget that we are on the Government benches.

Mr. BECKER: I was returned with a bigger majority.

Mr. Langley: What about schools?

Mr. BECKER: The honourable member should stick in his own back yard. If he thinks that his race horses are more important than are the children at Plympton Primary School, he ought to be ashamed of himself.

Mr. Langley: You couldn't get more personal.

Mr. BECKER: I can throw it back whenever the honourable member gives it to me. Schoolchildren come before race horses.

Mr. Langley: I haven't got any race horses.

Mr. BECKER: The Government thinks it can walk all over the people of this State. Government members are the greatest lot of hypocrites we have ever had. The people have to put up with housing shortages, but we should remember that in the past some members have occupied low-rental Housing Trust houses while the working man, whom they claim to represent, is unable to get housing. I am sure that the Housing Trust's services have deteriorated in the past few years. Some time ago a man about whom I am concerned applied for a Housing Trust rental house. He was informed about six weeks ago that his name was almost at the top of the list, that he and his wife should fill in the necessary forms, and they would be allocated a rental house. Unfortunately, after he visited the Housing Trust office six weeks ago, his wife passed away. When he informed the Housing Trust of his wife's death, he asked whether it would make any difference to his application, as he found it very difficult to survive on the widower's pension. He was told to re-apply and that his name would go back to the bottom of the list, and he would have to wait for three or four years. If that is the sort of treatment the working man deserves, there is something wrong with this Government's administration. Where will that man live? He cannot afford to stay in a flat. Fortunately, his daughter will put him up in the short term if she can.

Where will that man end up? Will he have to go to the Salvation Army Home? This is what the Government is doing to the community. It claims it represents and helps the people but, when it comes to the acid test, it is found wanting. Government members are only looking after themselves; that is all that they have done since they have been here. Some legislation has been forced through the House by the necessity to raise money to pay for the Government's extravagances. The Government must live within its income, and it must watch its expenditure and forward commitments. What is going on in connection with petrol price discounts? About 100 service stations have not been able to maintain their comparable petrol sales relative to last year's figures. Their licence fee is based on their petrol sales for 1974. One of my constituents had to pay about \$200 a quarter more than

he received in petrol tax on sales. Why should that service station proprietor have to pay to the Government a tax on sales in those circumstances, yet down the road service stations are discounting petrol? One service station near South Road stands to make \$15 000 because of the loophole in the legislation. The Government would not be told, and it would not see this.

This loophole has been very apparent in the liquor licence legislation. Everyone knows that Mr. Warming has made about \$140 000 through discounting beer at the Rose Inn Hotel; nothing can be done about it. The Parliamentary Counsel has had great difficulty in preparing amending legislation. I have twice requested him to prepare a private member's Bill, but we cannot come to a satisfactory answer. Because legislation has been forced through this House as a result of the sheer necessity to raise money, anomalies have been created. Some people have used the law and have pocketed money, while others who have done the right thing are out of pocket.

Mr. Mathwin: How will Bob Hawke go in the petrol business here?

Mr. BECKER: He will find it difficult to justify establishing service stations in this State, as we have rationalisation of outlets. The South Australian motorist is entitled to cheap petrol, and I hope no-one will deny private enterprise the opportunity of making a fair and reasonable profit. However, why should the honest people in the community suffer because there are people who are cunning enough (and it is nothing else but cunning) to use loopholes that exist in the Act? If service station proprietors apply to the Government for a remission of tax because of hardship resulting from the loss of income because they cannot maintain their petrol sales, they are being given some remission, but my constituent who operates a service station is not receiving the full benefit from the Government for this purpose.

When I asked a question of the Premier on June 10 this year, he was unable to give information relating to the sales of super grade and standard grade petrol for the 12 months ended May 31, 1974, or the 12 months ended May 31, 1975. How did the Government base its Budget Estimates on the income it would receive from petrol sales in South Australia? The Premier claims he could not tell me. However, he jolly well knew he would have to get a figure. He knows and his departments know how much is outstanding, how much the Government will receive and how much it will have to remit. Something has to be done about the situation. In reply to a question asked a few days ago, the Premier said that if he wished to close this loophole he would have to introduce retrospective legislation or regulations. We will then see whether the Government can get back the money given out by service station proprietors as petrol discounts. There has been too much emphasis on the hustle and bustle of passing legislation without proper examination. When members of the Legislative Council want to discuss or examine legislation, the Government accuses them of being members of an obstructive House. We have lost honourable members of the likes of the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, who was willing to look into legislation and to protect people's interests.

Mr. Gunn: What about Jim Dunford?

Mr. BECKER: He and the Hon. Mr. Foster will make a wonderful contribution in the other place. I hope they will be able to see past their own noses. That is the responsibility that faces them in the other Chamber. They will have to examine thoroughly and look for loopholes in

legislation. Let us now look at the anomaly of the Lottery and Gaming Act, which is not the responsibility of the present Government. It is well known that many people like to bet. Most people do so with one of the Totalizator Agency Board agencies. In any workshop, office, or practically anywhere one can find syndicates where people can put in up to \$2 a week; someone in the syndicate acts as secretary and goes along to the local T.A.B. agency to put on the bets. I have done it myself. It has come to my attention that a new Australian and three of his friends decided they would invest some money in the fourtrella and, over a period of weeks, they studied the form of horses before they decided to take out their initial investment. They worked out how much they would need to couple the various combinations.

Each member of the syndicate put in \$4.50, so the total outlay was \$18. The members of the syndicate meet regularly each Saturday morning in a hotel, where they have a few drinks. They discuss what they are going to do, and pool their information about the various horses running that day. One member of the syndicate then goes to the local T.A.B. agency. However, on the Saturday morning in question my constituent was the only member of the syndicate who had sufficient money to place the bet, and he was asked to go down to the Totalizator Agency Board agency for that purpose, where he had never been before. No sooner had he walked out of the hotel than he was apprehended by a plainclothes constable, searched and accused of carrying on as a starting price bookmaker. My constituent had never heard that term.

He was apprehended because he took money from his colleagues to put on the bet for the syndicate. Fair enough; I suppose it is time we stamped out S.P. book-making. We are told from time to time that S.P. betting is almost non-existent, but I do not believe that and never will believe it has been stamped out completely. We know people are breaking the law not in a real sense but technically under the Act. The member of the syndicate who took the money broke the law because he collected money to place on the T.A.B. In other words, this law is being broken every day T.A.B. agencies are open in South Australia. One must bear in mind that there would be hundreds, perhaps thousands, of syndicates throughout the State where a syndicate member collects money, banks a percentage of it and places bets with the remainder. These people supposedly are breaking the law. On the one hand we have too many laws and regulations, many of which do not work anyway; on the other hand we have laws to protect the innocent. Those laws, however, do not seem to work, and there seems to be a state of confusion in many areas. The Government therefore has much to answer for to the people of this State. It is time the Government learnt by its mistakes.

It really comes back to the integrity and credibility of those who lead this Government and who took it into the recent State election campaign. We have this evening witnessed performances from those who believed they are knights in shining armour, claiming to represent people so efficiently. What utter nonsense! On the opening day of this session the member for Kavel asked the Minister of Works a question about water charges. On page 19 of *Hansard* of August 5 we see the type of attitude we are accustomed to experiencing from the Minister, and it makes one wonder what is happening. He said:

Opposition members have asked for this to happen, they have got it, and now they do not like it.

At that stage I interjected, saying, "It's a con trick."

The Minister replied:

It is not. The honourable member ought to know something about confidence tricks, as he is one of the best in putting them over. He is one big confidence trick.

The Minister got away with that snide remark. He knows as well as I know that that type of remark is a reflection on my credibility. However, that is the type of practice we have come to expect from the Government. If anyone knows anything about confidence tricks it is the Minister of Works. Where was he enrolled on the electoral roll during the recent election? He had lived for some time in my district in Beare Avenue, Netley, but was on the electoral roll for Millicent. Who is talking about confidence tricks and observing the law? The Government has one law for the people and one law for itself. What hypocrites! The Government believes it is the supreme master of this State.

I now turn to areas where the Government has failed in South Australia. It has made confusing statements about law and order and has created a situation where adolescents can run riot throughout the community and, because the situation is accepted today, can steal cars and expect to be pulled up before the court to be given a lecture by a dear old judge and told that they are naughty boys and should not do it again. Perhaps they might spend a few weeks in Brookway Park. That is the attitude adopted by young people today. However, in this evening's *News* one sees that a magistrate wants to crack down on juvenile offenders. We also see a statement by the Leader of the Liberal Movement that such offenders should be given harsher treatment. However, that is where they are wrong, because that will do as much harm as is being done at present. Society must learn to live with the problems that it has created and, if we adopted the fascist attitude that we would get from the Leader of the Liberal Movement, they would have to be whipped, but that would not solve the problem. Society is becoming more and more complex and involved, and the programme that is being undertaken must be tried for many years before we get the final results. The community must become more tolerant.

There is a lack of education within this whole area and in trying to cope with the problem. I hope that this is one area that the State Government will examine further and that it will persevere with the programme. I hope that we will have more social workers than we have ever had before and that the Government will build up this area to assist not only juvenile offenders but also their parents, thereby helping society generally, because this comes back not only on the offenders but also on their parents. It is, therefore, a two-way situation. This is a big responsibility for the Government, and it is a challenge that the Government will have to meet.

This leads me to another matter that has caused me much concern in my district for some time: the continual complaints which I receive and which, unfortunately, I must pass on to the post office. I refer to vandalism in telephone boxes. I have been told that the post office will shortly undertake a large campaign highlighting the problems of vandalism with telephone boxes. It is estimated that vandalism costs the Postmaster-General's Department \$2 000 000 a year in repairs to instruments and cabinets, and that the department loses \$400 000 annually because telephones are put out of action.

If a telephone cannot be used in an emergency, it can involve loss of life. This problem has been with us for many years. I believe it is time that this Parliament examined the matter of an education programme not only of young people but also of all sections of the community

in relation to vandalism. I believe that the post office will back up its publicity campaign with a cash bonus of up to \$100 for information on the identity of people wilfully damaging its property. It is a sad state of affairs when the post office must offer rewards to prevent damage to its equipment which is needed and which can be a lifeline for a person wanting to obtain emergency services. I believe that Parliament and community leaders must now play their role in trying to curb vandalism throughout the community.

I am also concerned about another matter that was not raised during the debate on the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Bill: South Australian pensioners have, through the grace of the Government, received one free country trip on the railways. In other words, a card-carrying pensioner could travel anywhere in South Australia free once each year. With the transfer of our country railways to the Australian Government, they will now come under the jurisdiction of the Australian National Railways, and pensioners will miss out on this concession. I therefore hope the Minister of Transport will approach the Commonwealth Minister and Government and ask that this concession continue to apply to pensioners in future. I have already sent a telegram to Mr. Jones, the Commonwealth Minister for Transport, asking that this concession now apply to travel within the State on the Australian National Railways so that South Australian pensioners will not lose the benefit of a free return train trip anywhere in the State each year. This could well happen if the Australian Government does not decide to extend this concession to South Australian pensioners. I do not see why these people should be disadvantaged merely because it is attractive for the State Government to pass over its country rail services to the Australian Government.

Mr. Slater: They never got any concession from the Liberal Government for rail travel.

Mr. BECKER: I am not concerned about what happened yesterday or the day before. That is history, as the honourable member knows. I am concerned about what is happening today and what will happen tomorrow. What has been done has been done. I assure the honourable member that, if we have made mistakes in the past, we will never make them again, because we have learnt by those mistakes. We are a much more progressive Party than the honourable member's Party will ever be, and that is what frightens me. We challenge the Government: the next time we go to the people, the Liberal Party will be sitting on the right-hand side of the Speaker. I assure Government members that a Liberal Party Government will then be in office.

Mr. Slater: You said that last time.

Mr. BECKER: That is so, and what did we miss out by: only a few hundred votes! The Premier was able to get away with the stupid remark that he had been smeared. We will give him "smear" next time; he will wonder what has struck him. I revert to the old subject of this State's finances. While I am doing so, let me examine the issue that almost cost the Labor Party government in this State: the loans debacle.

Mr. Slater: But you aren't the shadow Treasurer, are you?

Mr. BECKER: The member for Gilles makes an apt interjection. I remind him of the words of Benjamin Disraeli at Manchester on April 3, 1872:

As I sat opposite the Treasury bench, the Ministers reminded me of those marine landscapes not unusual on the coast of South America. You behold a range of exhausted volcanoes.

Mr. Slater: I think what he said was, "Keep it quiet or else they will sweep the country."

Mr. BECKER: No, that is another one. This State's finances are reasonably buoyant: we finished up the financial year with a surplus of \$8 300 000. However, the Premier did not tell the South Australian public (and this is where we get at the truth of the matter) when he brought down the Budget that we were to have a \$12 000 000 deficit. I do not agree with that; I think we should have a balanced Budget. On indirect taxes, we were going to raise \$208 000 000. In fact, at the end of June, 1975, we had raised \$224 800 000. The Budget estimate for land tax was \$12 000 000, although the State Treasury actually received \$12 900 000. When we asked questions of the Government and taxation authorities in this State about what the final estimated figure would be, we could not be told, because they did not know. If ever there was the greatest guess of all times, it was on land tax payments.

This gets back to the question that the member for Kavel asked the Deputy Premier recently, when the Minister got so upset and made wild and woolly statements. We tried during the rates campaign to obtain justice on land valuations in this State, particularly in the Glenelg and Henley and Grange council areas. When we challenged the Valuer-General, we were told that our property valuations were 25 per cent below current market values. Whilst we were grizzling about a 60 per cent increase in our property valuations and water and sewerage rates with a minimum of about 125 per cent plus on land tax, we could have been hit for an extra 25 per cent. When the Government talks of the equalisation scheme we know down our way that we are still 25 per cent behind the 8-ball if the Government and the Valuer-General are to adopt the current market values of our properties.

There will always be this gap and this discrimination between certain areas as valuations are made. It will be a great problem. I realise that my property is 25 per cent under valuation, and it hurts me to pay excess water rates when I should not have to pay them. The Government benefited under the valuations of land tax and the brunt of it was borne down in my district, particularly in cases where hotels were being taxed about 2 000 per cent.

In the Budget for the last financial year the Government expected to receive \$13 500 000 in succession duties and it received \$15 600 000. This area is most difficult to estimate, but the State received \$15 600 000 from one of the most unfair taxes in existence. It is becoming increasingly difficult, because of the benefit to the State Treasury, to try to prune that figure down.

Pay-roll tax was to have produced \$94 000 000, but it produced \$101 000 000. The Treasury benefited from liquor tax, which was expected to return \$4 900 000; it returned \$5 300 000, but with no thanks to Mr. Warming and his price discounting. Racing taxation (and this shows the buoyancy of the economy) went from an estimated \$1 800 000 to \$2 100 000. Therefore, the Government did very well on indirect taxes and also from the Commonwealth Government in various grants of financial assistance and goodness knows what else it received. The Government received an extra \$44 000 000 from the Commonwealth Government to June 30, 1975. The Treasury in South Australia is in a good situation. At June 30, the actual cash was \$20 700 000, while outstanding cheques amounted to \$26 000 000, so the Treasury had about \$46 000 000 in the bank. It was not doing too badly at all.

What we want to know, however, is the cost to the State of forward contracts signed and agreed to before the end of the financial year and yet to be paid. It is no good giving an analysis of cash holdings showing that we have about \$46 000 000 in the bank as at June 30, with \$71 000 000 in trust accounts, and so on, when we do not know what contracts have been let that will have to be paid partly in this financial year and partly in the next financial year. In the Treasury a chart projects the financial affairs of the State for the next five years, and I believe there is one giving the projections for 10 years. The Opposition will never know that, nor will the taxpayers. That is where we come to open government. We want to know what promises have been made, what tenders have been let or are to be let, what is the cost of Loan Account borrowings to the Treasury and to the taxpayers of South Australia. At one stage, the interest on borrowings was almost the same as the amount of indirect taxation, but today indirect taxes in South Australia have gone up by more than 270 per cent and are considerably greater than the amount to be paid out in interest. That interest cost factor is a tremendous charge to the State.

Let us look at the proposal of the Commonwealth Government to raise \$US4 000 000 000 on the overseas loan market. That affected South Australia, too, but it was one of the untold stories. Had the Commonwealth Government gone overseas to borrow, and if it should continue to go overseas to borrow huge sums of money, and if that money is put back into the States and used by the States, that has an effect on the State Treasury. With interest, the \$US4 000 000 000 that was to have been arranged by some individual in Saudi Arabia through the use of petro-dollars would have cost this State \$20 000 000 000. The true story not told is that it has been estimated by world economists that the currency in which this money would have been borrowed (it would have been in riyals) in the next 30 years, because of the strength of the Arab nations and their economy, would increase by four or five times. If that situation had occurred, if we had borrowed this money, and if that currency were to increase by 500 per cent and was payable in a lump sum at the end of the borrowing term, the present Commonwealth Government could have been up for \$10 000 000 000 000. It was the most ludicrous financial arrangement ever considered.

That is why it was not done through Crown agencies or reputable merchant banks, but by some individual behind a tent out in the middle of the desert. I have known for years that it is possible to go to Arab countries and borrow any sum of money. I have had people telling me they could borrow millions of dollars, bringing it into Australia for property development. Fortunately, because of Reserve Bank policy, they were not able to do so or this country would have been swamped by petro-dollars years ago in real property development. One can imagine the price of a house or the cost of renting a house. The people of South Australia and indeed the people of Australia are demanding more of their Parliaments, more of the integrity of their Governments, and more communication between Governments and the people. It is more important today that Governments should communicate with the people, taking them into their confidence, and letting them know what is happening. The day of the pea-and-thimble political governments is finished in this country.

I believe, as Clyde Cameron said 12 or 18 months ago, that if Governments do not take a responsible attitude

and do not allow the people into their confidence, letting them know what is going on, we will have trouble, and we do not want internal trouble. We do not want people performing and demonstrating and rioting on the streets. That is a responsibility this Government, and especially the Commonwealth Government, must accept. They must take the people into their confidence and establish better communications.

During the recent election campaign I was the subject of interviews for the Australian Broadcasting Commission television series *Chequerboard*. This programme will not be shown until some time in October. Whilst it was an honour to be selected for the series, which was to show a situation in relation to a member of Parliament, how he goes about his duties, and what he does, I thought it was rather an inconvenience to be followed around by television cameras.

However, I want to pay a tribute to the members of my committee and the constituents in my district, as well as to my two opponents, because they also had to put up with some inconvenience, being subject to these television interviews and filming for the purposes of this television programme. I hope the programme will bring some credit to South Australian politics. No doubt people will be horrified what the local member had to say. I never withdraw any of my remarks, but the point is that the people who were involved co-operated during that television series. I do want to thank my opponents, and I want to thank my committee and the people in my electorate if they were inconvenienced in any way during the filming and interviewing of that *Chequerboard* series. As I said, we haven't heard the end of it. There is no doubt some things will probably blow up afterwards, but I am not particularly worried about that.

In conclusion, I want to pay a tribute to the members of my committee and my Party, who have worked now solidly for five years in the name of the Party and in the interests of the State. I believe that they are the real people that deserve as much credit as anyone else in relation to the electoral representation that people have in Hanson, and I only hope that I will be blessed with good health to continue to give them the service and that at the next opportunity we have to go to the polls we will be in Government. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. COUNBE (Torrens): I have pleasure in supporting the adoption of this Address in Reply, the traditional opportunity which is given to members each year to let off a bit of steam and to say a few words which they do not always have the opportunity, unfettered by the strict rules of debate on legislation, to say. The first thing I want to do is express the usual and customary expressions of loyalty, congratulations, condolences, which have been already made, and to you, Sir, to offer my congratulations. I have had the pleasure of meeting you before in another capacity and I wish you well in your present job. I only regret that those members continuing from the last Parliament did not have the opportunity of officially farewelling many of our friends from both sides of the House and from both Houses, who, I must say, retired involuntarily and somewhat precipitously; in fact, many of them got the sudden kiss of death at the unexpected call for the election, but to those who have retired I wish them well because I believe they all, irrespective of what side or what House they came from, gave great service to this State.

We now have the opportunity of speaking to this Address in Reply as a direct result of the election. One must look at the outcome of the election because this has been

analysed by a number of speakers from both sides of the House. First, I want to say how much I appreciate the support that I received from my Party and supporters in the electorate of Torrens, which has always been reckoned as a seat that is likely to fall to the Australian Labor Party. So far I have been most fortunate and I have managed to retain it.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: It will not be long. As soon as you retire it will go.

Mr. COUNBE: The Minister is jumping to conclusions again, and that will be his downfall because it seems to be one of those seats in which budding politicians seem to be trying to cut their teeth. We have Mr. Hurford in the Federal House, who stood in Torrens. We have the honourable member for Playford, Mr. McRae.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: As soon as you go, John.

Mr. COUNBE: That's all right about that: you might go long before me. We have now the Hon. Mr. Sumner, M.L.C., who opposed me at the 1973 election, so there must be a hoodoo as far as the A.L.P. is concerned as regards Torrens. My majority over Labor, in the washup, increased on this occasion. I am most grateful to the people in Torrens.

Mr. Duncan: Only by 1 per cent.

Mr. COUNBE: I said I had increased my majority. As long as I continue to increase my majority every time, that will do me. Let us look at the outcome of the election as it affects the State. One thing was very apparent, and that was that no Party in this House won the election. The Government happens to be sitting on that side of the Speaker, sure, but no Party won the election.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Have a look at the other place!

Mr. COUNBE: Look at the other place; how lucky were you to get No. 1 on the ballot-paper! Leaving that aside, you know the non-socialist Parties gained far more votes than the A.L.P. I want to talk now about the House of Assembly because it is in his House, not in the other place, that Governments are made and fall. I repeat, no Government, no Party, won the election, but the Government itself came a real cropper. They entered into this election very blithely, very confidently called on by a very petulant Premier at a moment's notice. Not in this House, of course, but from far distant places in the ivory towers of Canberra. That is where it was called on. Didn't the Government get a rude shock as a result of the election? What some people opposite, and many people, unfortunately, in the populace forget, is that since the 1970 election the majority of the Labor Party in this House of Assembly has been whittled away from a majority then of seven to a majority of zero.

In other words, when the Hall Government fell there was a majority to Labor, the Dunstan Government, of seven in 1970. At the election of 1975, that majority of seven had been completely whittled away. Who would have thought in 1970 that could have been achieved by the non-socialist Parties and that the Labor Government would have lost that majority. Now, that is the record that the Premier has to live up to. He has lost that majority. He is leading a Party which has seen their majority completely wiped out.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: We are still going.

Mr. COUNBE: You are still sitting over there, and how you justify it I do not know, because I know this: that the present Premier was highly critical in 1968 when the reverse occurred, and he moved motions galore about this

very matter. I recall the demonstrations in the gallery here, and I remember the demonstrations on the steps of this House led by the present Premier. Now, when things are different, they are not the same, are they? That is the record of the present Premier. This is the load that the Labor Party has got to bear. This is the Leader under the Whitlam Government who lost its majority in less than 2½ years. Having had that majority whittled away I want to turn to the next point that came out of the election. When the Premier made his policy speech there was point after point in that speech in which he said, "I seek a mandate for this, I seek a mandate for that", and he numbered them off. He sought mandates for five or six items.

The result, of course, depending on your good grace, Sir, is that the Government has not got that mandate that they sought, because the Parties returned to his House were 23 to the Government and 23 to the Opposition. That means that the Government which sought a mandate, which sought a majority for their Party, and did not get that majority, did not get the mandate that they sought. Its all right for the member for Elizabeth to sit over there with a smug grin on his face. I congratulate him on his preferment, but he sits there as Whip for a Party which hasn't got a majority. Certainly, the Government has not a mandate. That is the position.

Mr. Langley: What about your Government? We had five years of it.

Mr. CUMBE: Now the Government's ex-Whip is trying to join in the party. Having lost its mandate we have come to the position where the present Government is, I am sure you will agree, Mr. Speaker, governing on sufferance and is in a most precarious position. This is no reflection on yourself, Mr. Speaker, but I am sure that you, above all others, appreciate this point. During the election campaign, which was a most interesting campaign (short though it may have been), we saw some interesting things happen. One of the most interesting was the way in which the Premier, as Leader of his Party, panicked, especially towards the last week of the campaign.

What was that heading I saw in the press? "We are being smeared, and it hurts." This was the sort of thing the Premier was coming out with. He changed his tactics completely: "We are being smeared and it hurts." What did he do then? The Premier disowned the Prime Minister of Australia—the national leader of his own Party. He disowned him completely, and dissociated his whole Parliamentary Party from the national Party and invited the whole of the South Australian voting populace to dissociate themselves from the Federal Party. That is what he said: he wanted to dissociate himself from that Party.

Surely there is a parallel here with the Harradine case. Of course, Harradine will get it in the neck, but the Premier will simply go on getting the blessing from the Prime Minister now that the election is over. It is ironic, and rather humorous, when one looks at the situation in retrospect because despite all this disowning, State members are all members of the same Party. Honourable members opposite work to the same rule book as their Commonwealth colleagues and, if they do not work to the same rule book, they get kicked out.

Mr. Gunn: Like Mr. Harradine.

Mr. CUMBE: Yes. I mentioned the parallel of Mr. Harradine, but apparently the Premier is immune, although he criticised his Commonwealth colleagues and his national Party. Someone talked about the heavies

coming over here. The Prime Minister came to South Australia and attended a concert at the Festival Theatre. Certainly, he was hustled away very quickly. The Premier saw that he was not allowed to get free on the hustings. I think that what the Premier could see was that the Whitlam Government was crumbling and was not going to last long, despite the Budget coming up and despite Ministers falling left and right, being demoted, being kicked out, or whatever else happens to them.

On looking at the Governor's Speech I can say immediately that it does not say much of substance at all, apart from obvious padding and puffing that occurs in the verbiage. Indeed, little was stated, which is in contrast to last time when we almost had an alphabet of Bills that were to be introduced during the session. This Speech is one of the leanest and one of the most sparse programmes that I have ever seen contained in a legislative programme in a Governor's Speech. Obviously, the Government is not keen to keep the House in session for long. That is an obvious conclusion that one can draw from the Speech. The Government does not want to keep the House in session longer than is necessary this year and, whether it comes back in autumn, is another matter.

Mr. Venning: If it comes back at all.

Mr. CUMBE: The Government is looking so uncomfortable that it wants to rush through a few essential matters and a few Bills that have to be got through, anyway and then get the House up to avoid the embarrassment of probing questions from the Opposition. The Government does not want to stay here too long when it is in such a precarious position.

Mr. Langley: What would you do if you were in that position?

Mr. CUMBE: The member for Unley apparently does not like what I say; he always bites when I say something like that. I now refer to a couple of things contained in the Governor's Speech. I was pleased to see in paragraph 8 reference to purchasing powers and wages and I express the hope that, if indexation is to be given a fair go in South Australia, the metal workers and some of the other unions do not jeopardise the indexation case now currently under way. If indexation is to work it has to be given a fair go, and it must work within certain guidelines.

Paragraph 13 of the Governor's Speech deals with transport. I believe that there is a long overdue need for a revision of the composition of the Road Traffic Board. My view is not based on the personnel comprising the board. However, the board currently operates as a section of the Highways Department and fulfils a most important role. I believe that its role is so important that it should be established separately from the Highways Department to come under the transport authority, because of the important work that it does. Moreover, I am concerned at the economic position and the future, not only of this nation but also of this State. Business of industry or commerce, whatever facet one cares to take (and I am now referring to the private sector) is vital to the well-being of our nation. I am surprised that some of the Commonwealth Ministers, some relatively new in their portfolios, have just recognised and have given recognition to the fact that they have to rely on the private sector in order for Government of any kind to proceed. At last Australian Government Ministers have come out publicly and stated (and this is on record by Senator J. McClelland) that "property" is no longer a dirty word. Suddenly Commonwealth Government Ministers have realised that socialism does not always work 100 per cent, that someone has to make a profit or else the country cannot pay its way.

The point I really want to make is this: that business today (and no honourable member can deny this) is suffering from a lack of confidence in the future. If South Australia is to progress and expand as we want it to, business of all types must be encouraged and fostered to get back its confidence. Unless business has confidence in the future it will not invest capital, business will not expand and it will not renew plant, and opportunities to expand employment will dry up. This is the last thing I want to see happen, and I make a plea for confidence to be restored to business and industry generally so that our work force and standards of living can be maintained and improved. However, I warn that no industry will be willing to develop under unstable or unreliable Government policy, or in conditions where the Government is likely to impose unexpected taxes or difficulties on expanding industries.

In this regard I refer all honourable members to the speech made by the Hon. D. H. Laidlaw only yesterday in another place. He referred to the difficulties being experienced by a major South Australian industry. This industry employs a large work force of both men and women. The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw said that the industry was at its wits end wondering how it was going to survive and how it would keep up its level of employment. I believe that that is a serious state of affairs. I will now make a further point, namely, that I believe there is an urgent need on behalf of the whole of Australia, South Australia particularly, to review the whole system of the financial relationship between the Commonwealth and the State Governments. I believe that this is of paramount importance and that it is a problem which we must all face up to very squarely: we cannot hedge.

There are some important issues with which the Constitution Convention must deal but, unfortunately, it seems that the Prime Minister has backed away a little and that he has lost some of his early enthusiasm about the important role being played by the convention. There are certain important issues, but paramount among them all, I believe, is finance, because Government is finance and finance is Government. Although that may be a hackneyed phrase, it is as true today as it was when coined in the last century.

I believe that one of the important things to be faced today (whether by the Constitution Convention or at a special Premiers' Conference) is that we must get once and for all a clear definition of where we are going financially regarding the relationship between the Commonwealth and the State Governments. Owing to lack of time, I am unable to develop several other matters about which I wanted to speak and which, to my district, are most important. So, I have confined my remarks to matters which I believe are of prime importance. Once again, I say that the Government has come out of this election with no credit at all. It did not really win the election, but it is here on sufferance, and how long it will be here is anyone's guess. I thank my constituents who have given me the support which I greatly appreciate and, in saying that, I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. VENNING secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WELLS (Florcy): I will talk about several things in the 10 minutes at my disposal. First, I place on record my appreciation of the efforts of Government employees,

particularly those workmen employed by the Public Buildings Department and the Highways Department. We see in this building fine examples of the skilled workmanship of the Public Buildings Department employees. Prior to their coming here to effect renovations we were all discontented with the situation that confronted us, but those workmen came in and almost completely remodelled the entire building. The electrical wiring was replaced, improvements were made, and offices of a more spacious and comfortable nature were provided for all members. We have all seen the results of the efforts of these workmen in the members' lounge and in the billiard room, which is a wonderful example of the skill exhibited by these workmen.

Any motorist driving along a road built by the Highways Department must be proud of the workmanship exhibited in the building of that road. We often hear of the private sector in industry, and we hear many people saying that Government employees should be dismissed and that contractual agreements should be reached. Such people argue that this policy would save the State money, but I do not believe that that is a valid argument. However, even if it were to be considered as an argument, it would not gain my support, because I believe that no sector of private industry could display the skills exhibited by Government workmen. I therefore pay my respects to the workmen who have worked in this building, in electoral offices, on roads, and on other projects.

I now turn to a matter that was raised here briefly and with no conviction at all—the Torrens Island dispute. The Liberal Movement Leader, the member for Mitcham, who was supported by Opposition members, said that police should have been used to break legitimately formed picket lines. He also said that force should have been used to permit workmen and others to enter the power stations involved in the dispute. The Government, under a very competent Minister and a very competent Premier, played the matter very coolly and thereby brought about a solution of the trouble.

Mr. Mathwin: After three months!

Mr. WELLS: It may have been, but it was well worth the effort. Every member knows that, had force been used at that time to remove the pickets, there would have been unparalleled industrial unrest in this State.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: The pickets were there for only two days.

Mr. WELLS: Yes. I can assure honourable members that, had force been used to break the picket lines, there would not have been a wheel turned in this State. The trade union movement will not tolerate any interference with picket lines that are not offering violence. So, the Government saved the State a great deal of worry, expense and industrial trouble. The Minister of Labour and Industry and the Premier deserve the greatest credit, and I condemn any suggestion that force should have been used in connection with the matter. I now want to deal with traffic accidents and the dreadful toll they take of people and vehicles on our roads. I maintain, and have always maintained, that the Police Force of this State is the best in Australia and does a marvellous job in controlling traffic on our roads. However, the force cannot do everything and motorists must bear a great part of that responsibility. I want to deal now with two facets of motoring which, in my opinion, cause many accidents and probably death. First, I refer to ignorant motorists who insist, when driving in traffic at night, on having their headlights on high

beam. If they believe that their lights are more powerful than the lights on vehicles approaching from the other direction, they will sometimes not dip their lights, and this causes many accidents.

The other matter relates to motor cyclists. At times I shudder when I am driving along in a lane of traffic with lanes of traffic on either side of me going in the same direction, and a motor cyclist rides down between the two traffic lanes. I have seen motor cyclists, especially at traffic lights when traffic is about to move off, try to get away as quickly as possible from a stream of traffic and actually strike the sides of motor vehicles with their handlebars. The motor cyclists concerned have been most fortunate, because they could have fallen (and probably would have) under the wheels of a motor vehicle. These examples indicate carelessness, neglect and thoughtlessness on the part of motorists, and may have had some bearing on the accident rate we have experienced in South Australia, an accident rate we all abhor and desire to prevent. I appreciate the opportunity of being able to air these matters and look forward to opportunities of speaking in similar debates.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): My grievance is on one matter and only one matter. Government members are apt to express the rights of individuals and claim to protect individuals, in particular workers in the community who are only people employed. I thank the member for Mitcham for the interest he has taken in the matter I wish to raise. The matter relates to a property at Coromandel Valley about which I presented a petition to the House last week. The petition was signed by 257 citizens of Coromandel Valley and surrounding areas stating that the State Government should acquire about 13 hectares, being the property of Mr. Frank Smith, of Coromandel Valley, and praying that the House would bring to the notice of the Minister for the Environment the need for immediate purchase of the land for the benefit of the citizens of Coromandel Valley. The area will be of benefit for not only citizens of Coromandel Valley but the State generally. It is one of the few areas in the State where people can fish for rainbow trout on a reserved area near the city. I know people can fish in the Torrens River but, in season, people can catch rainbow trout in this area of Sturt Creek. This gentleman is, and always has been, community-minded. He does not mind my giving his details, because he and his wife are at their wits' end. He is about 80 years old, and in 1969 he had the area declared open space, under section 61 of Planning and Development Act, through the then Minister of Local Government (Hon. Murray Hill). He was told then and subsequently in a letter from the present Minister of Local Government that he would have the benefit of lower council rates and land tax. That proved to be false, a point which I will develop later. At least the Meadows council honoured its agreement that he should pay lower council rates, and that is more than the Government did.

The property also adjoins the Coromandel Valley Primary School, which is awaiting a little bit better attention from the Government, a new school being needed. Last year, the then Minister of Education made moves to acquire the property. He had the Land Board value the property, and it valued it at \$60 000. Just after that, Mr. Smith received his notice of valuation from the Valuer-General's Department, the valuation being \$131 000. There were, therefore, two Government valuations, one of which was 100 per cent more than the other. Mr. Smith did not object, the Minister of Education having stated that he intended to acquire the property and, indeed, having moved in that direction. The

Minister offered \$60 000 for the property, but Mr. Smith said that it was worth more, the Valuer-General having said so.

The Minister then offered \$90 000, but Mr. Smith said he wanted \$110 000. The Minister then dropped the issue, and it was too late for Mr. Smith to appeal against the valuation placed on his property by the Valuer-General. He was then faced with a land tax bill of slightly less than \$2 000. Because he did not have the money and because he is a pensioner (this land is all that he owns), Mr. Smith was faced with a bill, and a fine of 5 per cent added on, of over \$2 000. He was kindly told by departmental officials that he could debit it against his estate. That is a "wonderful" attitude to take in relation to a man who has eked out a living from the land all his life, as did his father before him.

Mr. Smith declared the land open space, for the benefit of the community, and at least expected to receive the benefit of a lower valuation than the subdivisional land around him. However, he did not receive that and, according to the Act, there is no way in which he can now have that valuation reduced. I made an application to the Minister of Transport, who subsequently passed it on to the Minister of Environment and Conservation. There were two alternatives: first, to revoke the order and have Mr. Smith sell the land on the open market for subdivision or, secondly, the Government could acquire the land.

The Government has had this matter before it for over six weeks, but nothing has happened. When one rings the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department, one is told that it has heard something of it from the Parks and Gardens Department. If one contacts the Environment Department, one cannot track down a decision there. So, Mr. Smith now waits with a bill hanging over his head and the land on his hands. The community wants the land, which lies right on the border of the Meadows and Mitcham councils. However, neither the Meadows nor the Mitcham council has the money to acquire the property. The population of Coromandel Valley is expanding rapidly and, if the order is revoked, the value of land increases every day that passes. The Valuer-General has valued the land at subdivisional value. Where is the justice of this? This man is an individual who has contributed to our society for 80 years, and he is neglected because he is one person. He was humbugged and pushed around by the Minister of Education and his department. There is no denying that and the Minister will not deny it, because in his letter he said, "I apologise". However, an apology does not help very much in paying a land tax bill of \$2 000 when one does not have the money.

For those who do not have any pride in their home or in the family property, it is easy to say that the amount can be debited against the estate, but some people have a different approach to life. Some have taken a pride in a property. They have earned a living, they have decided the property is no longer economic and that the community should have the benefit of it. This man has developed an oval of a small size and a dam suitable for trout fishing, as well as barbecue facilities. The property has been made available for the community to use, even while Mr. Smith owns it. That type of person, however, is neglected by a Government that talks of its concern for the quality of life.

With the member for Mitcham (Mr. Smith has been a friend of the member for a long time), I make a plea that his property should be acquired, so that the order

will not be revoked and the property subdivided. I know that about \$110 000 is involved, but if it is not bought today the property will be worth much more in the next couple of years. The community is using it, and Mr. Smith is willing to sell it. The Government can find money for other projects in other areas, but this property is on the Sturt Creek (which is important to the community), just above the Sturt Gorge and adjoining a primary school in a developing community with few recreational facilities. I ask Government members who are listening in the House and those who are listening while they work in their rooms to take the matter up in their Party Caucus and to say that this is one thing they can do for the benefit of society, and especially for Mr. Smith and his wife and the Coromandel Valley community.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I was pleased to hear the contribution of the member for Hanson to the Address in Reply debate, and I was especially interested in his remarks about my private life and the livelihood of one of his constituents. If a certain matter comes to fruition he will most likely be unable to continue. Does he care? This sort of thing does him and his Party no good, and I can assure him that I will not stoop to his gutter-type tactics at any time. I will tell him privately about several slogans that appeared in my district during the course of several campaigns, and about some of the things the Liberal Party had to say in my area that were definitely untrue.

Each time an election has come along, the District of Unley has always been going to the Liberal Party, but that has not happened yet. If the member for Hanson and his Party continue in the vein to which I have referred, I am sure the position in my district will never change. People do not believe in those tactics.

Mr. Nankivell: It nearly "Warked" into the hands of the L.M., didn't it?

Mr. LANGLEY: Never at any stage. I am still quite confident. I was quite happy with the result, considering what had happened. During the course of the campaign it was most noticeable that the Labor Government had been able to do something that the Liberal Government had never been able to do, and that was to help the pensioners. As I travel through my district, I am assured that the concessions they have received under the Labor Government have been of great help to them. I thought it might be a good idea to take notice of what had happened in the other States, so I wrote to the various Opposition and Government Whips in the other States (there are not many Labor Governments in the States) and found that South Australia had the best pensioner concessions of any State. Queensland had by far the worst record, as it does little for pensioners. Other States, except Western Australia, were nowhere near our standards in South Australia in relation to helping pensioners. In South Australia pensioners receive special consideration in respect of 60 per cent of their water and sewerage rates, they receive a remission on land tax, and free travel for one country return trip each year. This last concession is an excellent idea, and I am sure that the Minister of Transport has this matter in hand to ensure that the existing situation will continue. This Government never lets the people down. Certainly it seldom takes things away from pensioners.

Mr. Becker: What about the concessions to private industry?

Mr. LANGLEY: I am talking about concessions for pensioners. Members opposite had the opportunity when their Party was in Government to do those things, but

they did absolutely nothing for these people. Further, when pensioners have the opportunity to make a trip with the free travel concession, they can visit friends and relatives and have a holiday at the same time. I know of several pensioner groups and elderly citizen clubs that have taken the opportunity of going for a holiday for about a fortnight. They certainly enjoy themselves, but they did not have such an opportunity previously because of their financial position. Another factor that readily comes to mind concerns the pensions from the Australian Government. Members opposite are always willing to condemn the Australian Government at a moment's notice for almost anything. Of course, this is always of their own volition. I am sure that the Liberal Party would not have done any better in the current economic climate, because there is inflation all over the world. Certainly, anyone who has travelled to overseas countries knows that. I have never heard one honourable member opposite at any stage say how the problem of inflation can be overcome. People all over the world have tried to overcome inflation, but no-one has been able to do so, and I should like to hear from any honourable member opposite how inflation can be overcome. Members opposite always condemn the Government but, when it comes to offering a solution to these problems, they find it difficult to suggest anything. I refer to what the Australian Government has done to help pensioners. Under Commonwealth Liberal Governments pensioners stayed at the same level for many years, but since the advent of the Australian Labor Government their lot has been greatly improved. Pensioners have received more increases in pensions under a Labor Government than at any other time. There is no doubt about that. Members opposite had the opportunity to provide such benefits, as they were in power for some time.

Mr. Gunn: It has taken you only three years to wreck the country.

Mr. LANGLEY: It has not taken us three years to wreck the country. I challenge you to name a tradesman out of work currently in the building trade.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member must address his remarks to the Speaker, rather than to "you" across the House.

The SPEAKER: That is correct. I must uphold that point of order. The honourable member must address the honourable member as "the honourable member" and not as "you". The honourable member for Unley.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. The member for Eyre will find that anyone working in the building trade and looking for a job will not find it difficult to get a job.

Mr. Gunn: To build a house?

Mr. LANGLEY: To build a house is one of the troubles. The Government of your era did not apprentice enough people, and it also introduced subletting, which killed the building trade: there is no doubt about that. I happen to know that, because I was in the building trade. Subletting killed the building trade, as it took away day labour.

Mr. Evans: You mean subcontracting.

Mr. LANGLEY: There is not much difference between subcontracting and subletting. I will return to concessions for pensioners and the help they have received from the Australian Government. A pensioner in my area has told me that pensioners are better off now than they have ever been as a result of pension increases. Even more will be done to help them soon regarding succession duties. This, too, will assist many elderly citizens.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Are you on Harradine's side?

Mr. LANGLEY: As I do not know him, I cannot form an opinion of him, and I am not sure that the Deputy Leader knows him, either.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He reads well!

Mr. LANGLEY: The honourable member may think so. I will now refer to another matter that is dear to the hearts of my constituents.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Unley.

Mr. LANGLEY: During the course of the last Parliament, several things happened in my district. I have been able to go to Ministers and put the wishes of my constituents to them. Even though it took some time to effect, the lights on Unley Road have saved several lives and I know that they have been of considerable benefit to people who travel along Unley Road. The member for Mitcham

and, no doubt, the Leader travel along that road. Considerable roadwork has also been carried out on Goodwood Road, especially on the boom gates and on the new road from the gates right up to the subway. Even though this is a very consolidated area, several things have been done which have been of considerable benefit to people. Finally, I thank the workmen—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Unley.

Mr. LANGLEY: In conclusion, I thank the workmen in the district for the work that has been so helpful to my constituents.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 14, at 2 p.m.