

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, August 14, 1975

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

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 1 071 residents of South Australian 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

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

PORTRUSH ROAD INTERSECTION

In reply to Mr. SLATER (August 5).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The commencement of roadworks at the intersection of Payneham and Portrush Roads is subject to agreement between the Highways Department and the South Australian Brewing Company Ltd. for acquisition of the property on which the Duke of Wellington Hotel is sited. Negotiations have now been finalised and it has been agreed that the hotel should remain operational until June, 1976. Taking this into consideration, and allowing about three months for demolition of improvements, roadworks should commence in the latter part of 1976. I understand that the Australian Telecommunications Commission's proposals for providing telephone facilities are not adversely affected by the proposed schedule for the commencement of roadworks, and preliminary field work is proceeding.

MORGAN DOCKYARD

In reply to Mr. ALLEN (August 6).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The design of the Swanport dockyard is proceeding, and funds have been allocated for design work and other developmental work for this financial year. The actual transfer of men and works to Swanport depends on the further availability of funds for this purpose in subsequent years. The expenditure of funds on the Morgan dockyard was necessitated by flood damage.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

In reply to Mr. WOTTON (August 5).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is expected that access to Mount Barker via the Mount Barker interchange bridge will be available by the end of September, 1975.

CAMPBELLTOWN PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

In reply to Mr. SLATER (August 6).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Initially the responsibility for providing facilities for the protection of pedestrians rests with the city of Campbelltown, which acts as the local traffic authority. Council is currently investigating the need for some form of pedestrian protection on Lower North-East Road near the North Eastern Community Hospital. The Highways Department will be informed of the results of these investigations in due course, and action will be taken as appropriate and as resources permit.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say how he justifies his statement yesterday that, as regards workmen's compensation, insurance companies are "ripping off" the public? The Minister said yesterday:

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.

A report of the Australian Bureau of Statistics shows that in 1972-73 all insurance companies, including the State office, took earned premiums totalling \$18 043 000, while claims incurred and paid out totalled \$19 059 000. In 1973-74, earned premiums totalled \$28 003 740 and claims incurred amounted to \$28 488 000. This amounts to a loss on workmen's compensation of about \$484 000 for that year, and about \$1 000 000 in the preceding year. It is quite obvious that the increasing losses are largely caused by workmen's compensation legislation passed by this House, and it is also obvious that the Minister's statement yesterday is based on fantasy rather than fact and is motivated purely as part of the Australian Labor Party's general attack on the insurance industry.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not intend to deviate from what I said yesterday, and in fact I reiterate it. Since I have had the great privilege of being Minister of Labour and Industry in the Don Dunstan Government, I have had at least four visits from employer groups that have told me that their premium costs have risen in the past 12 or 18 months from what was about \$8 000 to \$66 000 a year.

Mr. Evans: Due to your legislation!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Whether it is caused by the legislation or not, the legislation certainly did not provide for that sort of escalation in any circumstances.

Mr. Gunn: Of course it did, and we told you it would at the time.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am not concerned about what the member for Eyre told me, because he would not know. He would be one of the Opposition members who would not know anything at all about workmen's compensation, so he should not try to set himself up as an authority on it. I at least think I know something about it. A valid point is that it has always been the practice, ever since my involvement in workmen's compensation, that insurance companies pay all costs relating to medical, hospital, and doctors' expenses. Obviously, if that is the case, premiums have been established to cover that circumstance. I notice that the Leader quite deliberately did not quote the 1973-74 and 1974-75 figures.

Mr. Evans: The figures weren't available.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Leader did not want to quote them and did not bother trying to obtain those figures. Let us be honest with ourselves. The escalation in the premiums has taken place since 1973-74 and 1974-75. This is when the rip-offs came and the cream started to escalate for the insurance companies. If what I am saying is a fact of life and, on the basis of workmen's compensation, insurance companies have been setting their premiums at a rate to pay doctors' and hospital expenses (and something new has occurred: they can now claim 85 per cent of those costs against Medibank), there should be some room for a decrease in the premiums charged. It was on that basis I made the statement yesterday. It is unusual that the very insurance companies that are getting people out to march against the national insurance scheme are now capitalising on this great socialist project; they are using the Commonwealth Government

scheme to capitalise and make more profits for themselves. That is the basis on which I made my statement yesterday and I do not detract from it in any way.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In what way does the Minister believe that the premiums being charged by insurance companies for workmen's compensation are excessive. The Minister said he detracts in no way from what he said yesterday. Among other things, he said yesterday:

Unless insurance companies 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 from the insurance company.

The Minister made an unequivocal statement yesterday that the premiums are expensive and excessive. Looking at the State Government Insurance Commission's latest report to hand to see how the Government sector is doing in this field (and I point out to the Minister, who was most vehement about this, that the Leader did not quote the figures for 1974-75 for the simple reason that they were not available) we find that earned premiums in 1973-74 (the latest available figures) were \$84 673, and the claims paid were \$229 359. It is well known that the rates being charged by the commission are comparable with (certainly not less than) those charged by the private sector. It is also well known that this is one field in which the S.G.I.C. is not actively seeking business.

Mr. Langley: And neither are the others.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is because the insurance companies are losing money on that type of business. The figures prove indisputably that, on workmen's compensation, the overall record is that money is being lost, and the commission is doing far worse than is the private sector. How on earth does the Minister justify the unwarranted and vicious attack he made on the insurance industry in this State where the companies involved are simply battling to break even and cannot succeed? Will the Minister therefore explain where he believes these premiums are excessive?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I would suggest two things to the Deputy Leader: first, to inform whoever drafts his questions for him to try to anticipate my replies; and, secondly, to read *Hansard* in order to get my reply to the first question.

Dr. EASTICK: I direct my question to the Minister of Labour and Industry but, if the Premier believes, as members on this side believe, that the Minister has shown himself incompetent to answer questions about workmen's compensation, the question will be directed to the Premier. The Governor's Speech states:

My Government will introduce a measure to revise the Workmen's Compensation Act to eliminate anomalies and difficulties that appear to have arisen from its operation. Does the Minister intend to introduce legislation that will overcome difficulties regarding the method applied in relation to workmen's compensation charges? It is obvious that the Minister this afternoon has been at variance with fact in attempting to answer questions that have been asked by both the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader. He has completely moved away from the detail that has been provided not only by the State Government Insurance Office but also by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. He has shown complete incompetence.

The SPEAKER: I remind the honourable member that he is commenting now.

Dr. EASTICK: I ask the Minister or, as I have indicated previously, the Premier (if he agrees with us that the Minister has shown such incompetence) whether any action will be taken by the Government to correct the

difficulties in respect of workmen's compensation charges—difficulties that were self-inflicted by the Government by the very nature of its legislation.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Come on! Question!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I must confess that, for the first time, I have been unable to understand the honourable member.

Dr. Eastick: You don't want to understand me!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do. I will not dodge questions; I have surely established that during the time I have been a Minister. However, I am at a loss to understand the honourable member. I heard him say that I was incompetent about something or other, but I am not clear what the question means. In my view, he was totally incompetent in framing his question as he did. If the honourable member is asking me what I or the Government intends to do regarding legislation to be introduced, I am telling him no more at this stage than what appears in the Governor's Speech. When I am good and ready to introduce the legislation after Cabinet has approved it, the honourable member will be made aware of it and so will the people of South Australia, as is normally the case. Until I am clear about where the legislation is heading, I do not intend to tell the honourable member what I am going to do.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister say categorically that the State Government Insurance Commission has not claimed hospital and medical benefits on Medibank in respect of workmen's compensation cases, and will he recommend and do all in his power to ensure that the commission reduces its premiums for workmen's compensation? The Minister has been asked questions and made various statements in relation to the excessive premiums charged by insurance companies for workmen's compensation. Does he believe that the commission is in the same category as are private insurance companies, or does he believe now that the commission can offer cheaper premiums and not claim on Medibank, as he has suggested?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have not said at any time in reply to a question on this matter that the State Government Insurance Commission was not using the same practice as the private insurance companies.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Well, read *Hansard*. I have never made that statement, and I do not make it now.

Mr. Millhouse: What have you said?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will not repeat it: if you cannot read, get someone to teach you.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the honourable Minister's attention to the fact that it is unparliamentary to use the word "you": it must be "honourable member".

Mr. Millhouse: Hear, hear!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I accept your authority, Mr. Speaker, but I wish that members opposite tried to help the debate, and we all might get somewhere. As I was saying when I was so rudely interrupted, I have never made any statement regarding non-claiming by the State Government Insurance Commission. Yesterday I said I would write to all insurance companies. When the word "all" is used, surely that means the commission as well as private insurance companies. I also said yesterday that there was a committee of review (a committee on premiums if you like), and no doubt most insurance companies are represented on that. They are the people to whom I shall be writing to ask them to review their charges and

their premiums in the light of their ability to claim against Medibank, which they have never had before. Surely that is a reasonable request; at least I think it is. In that vein the S.G.I.C. will also be considered in relation to its premiums. I said yesterday, and I repeat mainly for the benefit of the member for Mitcham that, if after having received correspondence from the committee I am dissatisfied because the premiums are not in accordance with what they should be, I will consider introducing legislation to control them. That applies in other States, although members opposite may not know that.

STATE HIGHWAYS

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Transport obtain for the House details of the programme for sealing the Eyre Highway through South Australia to the Western Australian border, and will he also outline the Highways Department's plan for sealing the Stuart Highway through South Australia to the Northern Territory border? In addition, will he outline what provision has been made for tourists travelling along major highways? A report in yesterday's press calls on the States to co-operate with the Commonwealth highways authorities in improving and upgrading highways for the purposes of tourism. The Australian National Travel Association was quoted as stating that poor road surfaces, inadequate signposting and lack of roadside facilities were areas for concern. In particular, the association suggests that the number of parking bays and picnic areas is inadequate.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have an explanation, because the honourable member was good enough to tell me of his interest in the subject. Work is still proceeding on 373 kilometres of the Eyre Highway between Bookabie and the South Australian and Western Australian border. The completion of the construction and sealing of this section of the Eyre Highway is expected towards the end of 1976.

Mr. Gunn: How long since the member for Stuart has been out there to have a look?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will ignore both the comment and the member, because that is not relevant. Work on the Eyre Highway is a little behind the earlier schedule principally because of the difficulties that the private contractor ran into and the necessity for re-calling tenders. Construction of 1 098 km of the Stuart Highway between Port Augusta and Erldunda in the Northern Territory is being processed on the basis of determining the best available route for the highway to follow. A study is being undertaken from the point of view of the environment and hopefully that report should be ready later this year, when it will be submitted to the Australian Minister for his consideration and determination, because that is required under the present legislation. The third road referred to was the Princes Highway. Rerouting of the section between Millicent and Kingston (and I know the Minister of Works has always taken a keen interest in this road) is currently being considered, but at this stage a good alternative standard coastal route passes close to Beachport and Robe. Signs indicating this route as an alternative national route to the existing route via the Princes Highway will be erected soon, together with tourist signs leading off this route to the various scenic attractions.

STATE BANK

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Treasurer investigate the merits of establishing a State rural bank in South Australia or at least widening the activities of the existing State Bank to encourage that bank to service totally live-

stock funding for the producers in this State? It is appreciated that the multiple function of the existing State Bank in South Australia includes acting as an agent in respect of the Advances to Settlers Act, the Fences Act, and waterworks legislation, etc. However, it is in this specialist rural area that from time to time (and certainly currently) it has its back to the wall. It is understood that loans and advances for stock have been and are still being shunted off to the stock companies, rather than being encouraged to remain within the ordinary banking structure. I understand also that producers in Tasmania enjoy the service that I suggest should be introduced in this State. A State financing authority has been established in Tasmania with the specific task of assisting the rural sector not only in land purchases and development but also in the purchase of livestock, and the maximum interest rate within that rural sector is 8 per cent. In other words, the Tasmanian primary producers are not encumbered by an interest rate beyond their reach. Also, they are not encumbered by the embarrassment of having a fine-weather banking system, which I suggest in this State goes only part of the way, and this applies as well to lending companies in South Australia. In addition, the present interest rate applicable in that area in this State is 13 per cent. I am aware also that in South Australia, farmers, for example, are required to prepare annual budgets in conjunction with their respective banking staff. I hasten to agree that this practice is desirable. However, if the banking transaction is confined to a lending authority in a specific area, I suggest that both the client and the staff become directly and skilfully concerned with those practical aspects of the industry. Naturally, this is not easy where banks are designed for multiple purposes. In Tasmania, the producers, while bound within the ordinary terms of the stock mortgage legislation, are free to buy and sell in the total course of trading in their own best interest, and are not bound by the stock firm requirements that apply in South Australia. Under these provisions growers are often required to buy and sell within the commercial scope of their respective firms, or otherwise the finance is often refused, and the opportunity is, therefore, not given to them to trade more favourably elsewhere.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must remind the honourable member that he must not comment: he must simply ask the question, and perhaps explain it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will discuss the honourable member's suggestion with the Chairman of the State Bank and bring him a report.

REGENCY PARK

Mr. JENNINGS: Can the Minister for the Environment say what progress is being made on the Regency Park reserve in the old suburb of Islington? Earlier this year I understand that the Minister revealed long-term plans by the State Planning Authority, which comes under his jurisdiction, to develop about 20 areas of open space being held by the authority for development to meet metropolitan recreation needs. It was announced that the first of these reserves would be built at Regency Park, where about \$1 000 000 is to be spent. How is that scheme progressing?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I can tell the honourable member that that project is receiving a very high priority within the Environment Department, and a couple of contracts have been let recently to commence development on the site. About 100 000 cubic metres of soil has been called for, and I believe that this will be supplied

by the Munno Para council. Another contract has been let to enable the site works to be undertaken to provide the necessary mounds to be placed on the site, because it is not intended to have simply a large flat playing area; It will be aesthetically pleasing, being broken up by the mounds. This project will mean that the needs of the community in the northern district will be catered for. I know that the honourable member has been constantly pressing for additional recreational facilities in this district. The nearby handicapped children's centre, the council, and the Tourism Recreation and Sport Department have been involved in the planning of the programme. I am able to say that it is expected that the project will be completed and available for use within 12 to 18 months.

ABALONE DIVERS

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Deputy Premier ask the Minister of Fisheries what is his policy regarding the medical examination required before abalone diving permits are renewed? Can the Minister arrange for an extension of time to divers to enable them to have the necessary X-rays carried out for that medical examination? On Tuesday, the abalone fishermen received a circular from the Fisheries Department stating that they had to have their renewal applications in by August 31, 1975. Accompanying that application had to be a medical certificate under the standard of CZ18, an examination set by the Standards Association. Concern has been expressed about two points: first, the sheer impracticability of all divers being able to get the necessary X-rays in that time; and secondly, the lack of confidentiality with regard to the examination. As this medical certificate has been requested by the Fisheries Department, the medical information involved would be virtually made public. This has aroused concern. The abalone divers organisation is concerned about this loss of confidentiality.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take up the matters raised by the honourable member with my colleague, and I will bring down a report as soon as possible.

TORRENSVILLE SCHOOLS

Mr. SIMMONS: Will the Minister of Education re-examine the possibility of establishing a complete infants and primary school at Torrensville on the site of the existing Thebarton Infants School. I have previously asked questions on this matter on July 25, 1972, and November 13, 1974. On the latter occasion, I was informed that considerable modifications would be necessary to the toilets, and that as all available funds were allocated to work of high priority, it appeared unlikely that money could be diverted to the conversion of facilities at Torrensville. However, about 250 additional children were adequately served by the existing toilets when some of the senior classes were stationed at the infants school during the rebuilding of the school at South Road. No doubt there would be a need for toilets for the additional male staff. The previous reply also included a reference to the undesirability of polarising migrant children in the present primary school at Thebarton. In fact, the division of the Thebarton Primary School into two parts itself contributes to the polarisation of migrant children in the school as a whole. The existing set-up is a cause of great inconvenience and expense to the children and their parents, and this position has recently been exacerbated by difficulties with the bus service connecting the two parts of the school. The use of this service costs parents, in total, about \$4 000 a year for the 200 children involved.

I therefore ask that fresh consideration be given to the proposal, to which I have referred and which is strongly supported by the school council.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am happy to have the matter re-examined. I appreciate the honourable member's concern that people should not be put to any discomfort with regard to the provision of toilet facilities. I think that it would also be necessary to examine closely the classwork situation. I should be surprised if the existing infants school did not require some additional space for it to become a fully-blown primary school, as it were. I suppose that we could always get around the problem by having some sort of zoning system that kept the new Torrensville school smaller than the existing school but, of course, we would not want to get into that situation in relation to primary schools. So one or two problems concerning accommodation would have to be looked at carefully before any decision was taken.

DRUGS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I want to put my question to the Minister representing the Minister of Health, but I cannot work out from the Cabinet minute to whom I should address it. Perhaps, as it is a matter of policy, the Premier might want to take it. Does the Government intend to introduce legislation to amend the laws relating to drug offences and, if it does, what are such amendments to be? One of the Premier's Party members, a new member in the Upper House, has spoken at some length on this matter. I noticed that the Premier was asked by the member for Kavel the other day a question about his attitude towards certain reported moves in this respect by the Commonwealth Government. As is usual when a question is a bit difficult, the Premier ducked it altogether. I therefore ask him whether the South Australian Government intends to introduce any amendments to the relevant legislation. I put the question to him directly so that we may know where we stand in view of what has been said by members of his own Party and what has been reported at the Commonwealth level. Finally, I make clear that I do not favour any relaxation of the laws in this regard: rather, I favour the reverse.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If he had paid close attention to the matter (as I invite him to do), the honourable member would have noticed that there was no proposal in the Governor's Speech to introduce legislation of this kind. Therefore, I can tell him that nothing will happen about the matter during this session. Regarding next session, Cabinet has not considered this matter, nor have any instructions been given to the Parliamentary Counsel about it. So, I assure the honourable member that there is no sign at the moment of anything being done in this regard.

CLELAND RESERVE

Mr. WOTTON: Can the Minister for the Environment confirm that a large sum of money has been allocated by the Government to be spent on establishing special viewing areas and extensive lighting at the Cleland reserve to enable people visiting the reserve at night to observe the habits of nocturnal wild life? Has this project been commenced and, if it has, how far has work advanced? As I have been informed that the sum involved in the project is about \$500 000, can the Minister substantiate this sum? I agree with the statement made in a recent television documentary that the reserve is one of the best wild life reserves in Australia. However, I am not sure whether, having regard to the climatic conditions in this area, such a sum being spent on such a project is warranted.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: This matter was being examined by the National Estate Committee, and I believe that, if it was willing to support and fund such a project, that would have been done after experts had properly considered the value of the project. As I am uncertain of the exact position now, I will find out and let the honourable member know how the project is developing.

VIETNAMESE CHILDREN

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether South Australia has a problem in relation to the breakdown of adoptions of Vietnamese children? A 5DN radio news bulletin referred to reports that several couples in Victoria who had adopted Vietnamese orphans were returning them to the Government because they were unable to cope with them, but the reports have not been confirmed by official sources. However, a spokesman for the Australian Society for Inter-country Aid (Children), while saying that he did not believe the reports, said that most of the orphans had gone to South Australia, where there had been breakdowns in adoptions.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am pleased to be able to say that no such problems have occurred in South Australia. On three occasions during April this year Vietnamese children were returned to the department by people who at that stage were virtually the prospective adoptive parents, not because they were unable to cope (as has been suggested in Victoria) but for somewhat different reasons. The children involved have been placed with other families, and no problem has arisen here. In one of the three cases to which I have referred, the woman concerned became pregnant (and this was probably a happy occasion for her) and, under her doctor's advice, she decided not to proceed with the adoption. I am sure that members would understand that. The second case involved a child who was considerably older than had been expected. I understand that some minor problems occurred and, by mutual agreement, the adoption was not proceeded with. In the third case the child concerned was, unfortunately, handicapped, and the prospective parents had not contracted (if that is the right word) to adopt a child of that nature, so that adoption did not proceed either. I am pleased to be able to assure the House and the honourable member that it is quite clear that no such problem has occurred in South Australia.

LITTER

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation for on-the-spot fines for litterbugs this session? Seaside councils are most concerned about the littering of beaches and how costly it is to try to keep beaches clean. They are also concerned about the problem of controlling litter on beaches, and it has been suggested that the education programme on litter has been a failure. Therefore, it leaves only one possible alternative, that is, legislation. Kesab has been very helpful, but some people will not co-operate at all.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Government does not intend to introduce such legislation during the present session. I ought to point out one or two things to the honourable member. In many cases it is quite true that some people will not be educated in regard to this matter, and there is a need for heavier penalties to give the necessary encouragement to stop them from littering. Whether on-the-spot fines are necessary is a question that has been canvassed by most environmental authorities throughout the world, and particularly throughout Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: It works in Singapore.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In those parts of Australia where they have been introduced it has not worked. It is true that it has worked in Singapore, but the honourable member should appreciate that the conditions applicable in Singapore and in Australian States are somewhat different. I also point out to the honourable member that it could well be that some seaside councils are not doing sufficient in this regard. The number of people who deliberately leave litter on beaches find that often they have no alternative other than to carry their rubbish a considerable distance away from the beach to the nearest rubbish container. I believe one of the first things one has to do to encourage the community not to litter is to provide sufficient receptacles for them to use.

Mr. Mathwin: What do you suggest—every five yards?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I certainly do not. If the honourable member troubled to go along the metropolitan beaches, he would find most times that litter bins are situated well back from the beach areas on road approaches to the beaches, and generally there are not sufficient containers to encourage people on the beaches not to litter. In addition, the honourable member would have noticed most times that, during the height of summer when beaches are most disadvantaged in this regard, the bins are not emptied as often as they ought to be. The Government is considering these aspects. I agree with the honourable member that, at present, the education that we have attempted to encourage the community to accept in this regard has not been as successful as we would have liked. Perhaps this aspect can be improved; it is being considered at present.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Mr. DUNCAN: Can the Attorney-General say whether persons being sworn in as justices of the peace may take an affirmation? Is the Attorney-General aware that the form to be completed by the officer conducting the swearing-in ceremony provides only for an oath to be taken? Yesterday, my secretary had an appointment to be sworn in as a justice of the peace, and when she attended before the magistrate who was to conduct the ceremony she was told that it was not possible for her to take an affirmation. This situation caused her some concern, because she did not feel in all conscience able to take an oath. However, because no alternative was available to her, she considered that she could only take an oath, and accordingly did so. I should be most grateful if the Attorney-General could inquire into the matter to see what the position is.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly consider it. I should have thought that any officer administering an oath or affirmation would have considered that either was available. From memory, I think the form has to be attested before a commissioner for taking affidavits in the Supreme Court of South Australia. I imagine the honourable member is one; I am one, and I should think the honourable member for Mitcham is one. I should have thought that anyone who was attesting a document would have allowed an affirmation to be made. However, I will examine the matter for the honourable member.

WOMEN'S SHELTERS

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Community Welfare obtain for me a report about the present position regarding women's shelters? On November 12 last it was reported that the State Government was providing financial assistance

to four organisations that provided accommodation for women and children. The aid was said to be part of the State Government's \$26 700 grant to four organisations, which were listed as being the Travellers Aid Society, Women's Emergency Shelter Committee, Adelaide Women's Shelter (Ovingham), and Adelaide City Mission. At the same time, I ask whether the Minister can ascertain to what extent the shelters have been used and whether they are adequate.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The extent of my knowledge about the matter raised does not extend beyond the information given by the honourable member. I shall be delighted to obtain for her a report that will cover all the aspects she has raised.

PENSIONER DENTAL CARE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health to ascertain whether the Government will consider providing dental care to country pensioner patients by arranging with private dental clinics or school dental clinics, where available, to provide this service under some form of contractual agreement? For the benefit of the member for Mitcham, I point out that I have asked the question not because he has put on notice a motion relating to this matter but because there has been a substantial increase in the number of geriatric wings and nursing homes associated with country community hospitals. Also, church and other locally concerned groups have been setting up private retirement villages in many country centres. I therefore ask the Minister to consider assisting these pensioners, because in most cases private transport is either inconvenient or not available for them to travel to the city to take advantage of the services provided at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. This matter is now assuming much greater significance because of the changed pattern of family living in the country.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I appreciate the honourable member's concern, and I shall be pleased to refer the matter to my colleague.

AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE COURSE

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Education Department still wishes to purchase land across the road from Clare High School to enable agricultural science to be taught at the school? About two or three years ago a new high school was erected at Clare, and it was considered that agricultural science would be taught at the school. As a consequence, a move was made to obtain land opposite the school across the bitumen road. There has been quite a kerfuffle about this land, so I ask the Minister whether the Education Department still intends to procure the land for the purpose I have outlined.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I understand that the reply to the question is "Yes." I am not aware of the time table involved, so I will try to cut my way through the kerfuffle so that the honourable member, especially if he wishes to enrol in any of the new classes to be provided in the new institution, will have an opportunity of doing so whilst he is still a member of this House.

SOUTH-EAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. ALLISON: Will the Minister of Education consider widening the terms of reference of the South-East College of Further Education steering committee (chaired by Mr. Doug Anders), which is considering the expansion of that college into a community college, to include more than just

local requirements. Has the composition of the steering committee almost been decided, and can we expect that a meeting of the committee will be convened soon? It is possible that certain courses to be considered for the college may attract students from outside the South-East, so that it would be unwise not to consider such possibilities simply because the committee's terms of reference were too narrow. As this matter has been of a pressing nature in Mount Gambier since 1969, any action the Minister can take to set discussions in motion will be greatly appreciated.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am aware of the honourable member's interest in this matter, because we have discussed it privately. I have asked the Executive Director of the South Australian Council of Educational Planning and Research to report to me about whether he believes the terms of reference are sufficiently wide to involve the planning over as wide an area as the honourable member wishes, and including the western districts of Victoria. I have also asked that the matter of rationalisation of courses between this institution and its counterpart in Warrnambool should be investigated. When I have that information I will make it available to the honourable member and the House.

PRE-SCHOOL TRANSPORT

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Minister of Education state the Education Department's policy regarding the carriage on school buses of children attending pre-school kindergartens in country areas? At the outset I assure the Minister that I have neither the need nor the desire to enrol at a pre-school kindergarten. However, I have been approached by constituents who have suggested that such a service could be extended to pre-school children in country areas where school buses are not overloaded, thereby allowing families using this educational opportunity for their children to save an otherwise unnecessary trip into town.

The Hon. J. D. HOPGOOD: I have received another approach on this matter from another honourable member in the past few weeks. A report is being prepared for me on the matter, and I will make it available to the honourable member when it is available to me.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. RODDA: Can the Deputy Premier, representing the Minister of Lands, say whether, since the recent State election, the Government has ordered a considerable increase in the assistance that can be given to applicants for rural industries assistance? We on this side have recently seen many of our constituents apply for rural assistance whose applications have been refused and who, because of the increasing downturn in sheep and cattle prices, are facing considerable liquidity problems. By custom a large proportion of finance held by farmers is on short-term on-demand arrangements, and their problems have been further aggravated by the depressed prices for livestock sold. Each application for assistance must be accompanied by a letter of discredit stating that no further finance can be obtained from that source. Such a letter on a customer's file is detrimental to the future creditability of the person. Many farmers are facing a crisis concerning carry-on finance. I believe it can be fairly expected that the Rural Industries Assistance Branch could materially assist in the getting down of this short-term on-demand finance in co-operation with the finance houses rather than having the letter of discredit as a qualification for the application to be considered. I think there has to be an in-league approach to this vital matter to keep some important people in their avocations.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have much sympathy with the honourable member's question, but he will understand that the criteria that are laid down and are followed by the State emanate from the Australian Government. When I was acting Minister of Agriculture I put a submission to the State Cabinet that enabled us to squeeze the Commonwealth Government to get \$1 500 000 instead of an unspecified share of \$1 000 000 towards this, and this enabled us to have \$3 000 000 available to assist producers who had liquidity problems. I consider that the criteria laid down are too stringent to serve the real needs existing among producers. I will convey to my colleague the points made by the honourable member and lend my support to any approach he might make to the Australian Minister for Agriculture to see whether or not some of the criteria that have been laid down can be eased, because the situation has deteriorated since it was decided to make that money available on the terms on which it has been made available. I will do what I can to assist in the matter raised by the honourable member.

COMPANY TAX

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier support the stand taken by the Leader of the Opposition in asking the Prime Minister to waive the payments of quarterly company tax instalments for companies that are unable to meet this financial commitment? The telegram stated:

Because of the desperate plight of business within Australia and particularly within South Australia will your Government and Treasurer immediately waive the payment of the quarterly company tax instalment of \$625 000 000 for companies which are unable to meet this financial commitment? Small business companies are having great difficulties in raising this finance because of the problems of obtaining bank overdrafts. The reduction in their liquidity involved in meeting tomorrow's tax instalment will, in many cases, be the last straw. Immediate action to protect and stimulate private industry is urgent and beyond question. I strongly urge you to consider this matter at today's pre-Budget cabinet meeting.

The telegram was addressed to the Hon. Mr. Whitlam in Canberra, and it was signed by the Leader of the Opposition, Dr. Tonkin. I ask the Premier whether he will support the request.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A request to the Commonwealth Government for postponement of a quarterly company tax payment was made by me at the end of last year, and it was successful. I made that approach together with many other approaches in relation to assisting companies with regard to liquidity. Those further approaches in relation to liquidity were again dealt with by me in representations to the Commonwealth Treasurer and the Prime Minister as recently as 10 days ago. I believe that the Commonwealth Budget will provide some measures concerning the liquidity of companies in order to assist that liquidity. Naturally enough, I have not been told what those measures are (at this stage of proceedings it would not be proper for a Commonwealth Treasurer to tell anybody what they are), but representations have already been made. I appreciate that the Leader of the Opposition wishes to take some initiative, but I can assure him that representations in these matters have already been made to Canberra.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to authorise the Treasurer to borrow and expend money for public purposes, and to enact other provisions incidental thereto. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is my pleasure to explain the proposals in the Loan Estimates which accompany the Bill and which set out in more detail the appropriations listed in the first schedule to the Bill. The expenditure proposals in that schedule aggregate nearly \$241 500 000 compared with \$211 200 000 of actual payments in 1974-75. Because of the necessity to look at the State's overall financial situation and to have regard to whether or not there may be revenue deficits on record or in prospect and, accordingly, whether or not there may be a need to reserve Loan funds to cover such deficits, it has been the practice for the Treasurer to give a brief review of the two accounts before dealing with the details of Loan Account as proposed in the Loan Estimates. I shall follow that practice, and I believe it would be appropriate to deal with Revenue Account first. The Revenue Budget for 1974-75 as introduced to Parliament on August 29 last forecast a deficit of about \$12 000 000 for the year. It took into account a possible increase of 20 per cent in the level of average wages (that was the figure we had been asked originally to provide for in the Budget by the Commonwealth authorities), and it included the expected receipt of a special grant of \$6 000 000 towards South Australia's particular problems. When the Australian Government brought down its Budget in mid-September, it included financial assistance grants to the States on the assumption of a 25 per cent increase in the level of average wages. The net effect of this increased allowance was an adverse one of about \$4 000 000 because the cost to the South Australian Revenue Budget in wage increases is greater than the increase in grants and pay-roll tax which flow from such increases. This net adverse effect and the non-receipt of the special grant of \$6 000 000 took the estimate of deficit to about \$22 000 000. A downturn in revenues and increased costs of supplies and services gave indications that the deficit could worsen to as much as \$36 000 000, in the absence of corrective action.

The introduction of franchise taxes and an even tighter control of expenditures helped to reduce the prospective deficit and, by the time of the Premiers' Conference in mid-February, it seemed that the deficit could be held to about \$27 000 000. As a result of additional grants arranged at the conference, I reported to the House on February 18 that the deficit could probably be reduced to just over \$20 000 000. By the time Supplementary Estimates were introduced on June 10, there had been some marked improvement in revenues, particularly in the financial assistance grant, which was boosted by some \$7 000 000. I reported to the House that, in the absence of the special arrangements to transfer the non-metropolitan railways to the Australian Government, the deficit seemed likely to be about \$14 000 000 to \$15 000 000. As the railway arrangements provided for a special additional grant of \$10 000 000 and a completion grant of \$10 000 000 brought forward in time and payable without further review by the Grants Commission, my estimate of the likely final result was a small surplus of about \$5 000 000.

I remind honourable members that there have been some suggestions that the \$10 000 000 completion grant, which was arranged to be paid without review by the commission, was a considerable figure and compares to the actual completion payment for 1973-74, now concluded by the Grants Commission, of \$2 500 000. My estimate of the likely final result then was a small surplus of about \$5 000 000. Over the last few weeks of the year there was some further improvement with the result that the surplus rose to \$8 400 000. Without the receipt of the

\$20 000 000 on account of the railway transfer arrangement, there would have been a manageable deficit of about \$11 600 000 for the year, and it is a deficit on Revenue Accounts. In analysing these figures, one has to decide whether one is speaking about the Revenue Account alone, whether one is speaking of the balance occurring between Loan and Revenue Account dealing with the cash position of the State, or whether one is dealing with the whole cash position of this State, which includes the reserve funds. Some strange confusion has occurred in recent political debates, because the figures quoted in respect of one account were contrasted with the figures quoted in respect of the balance on all accounts.

All of these major variations during the year had an effect on our financial planning for, and our decisions about, capital programmes as I shall describe in a moment. As to the cumulative situation on Revenue Account at June 30, 1975, the prospects for 1975-76 and the possible influence of these on the 1975-76 Loan programme, I believe all I need say at the moment is that the Government had a cumulative surplus of \$22 800 000 on hand at the end of 1974-75, that this will be increased shortly by a small completion grant of \$2 500 000 in respect of 1973-74, that I expect to be able to present to the House a Revenue Budget for 1975-76 that forecasts a balance on the year's activities, and that there is no necessity to hold Loan funds in reserve to assist Revenue Account.

I point out to honourable members that this is a markedly different situation from that which obtains in other States, and that while very heavy revenue deficits have been forecast in other States, those revenue deficits in most cases are to occur after taking into account the reservation of considerable sums of Loan money to lessen the amount of the deficit. That does not have to occur in South Australia, and we are in a position to run an effective programme of spending this year from Loan Account the total amount of new moneys. We can do that responsibly and properly whilst running a balanced Budget, and having revenue moneys in reserve accounts.

On August 8 last, I reported to the House that the allocation of new moneys determined for South Australia by the Australian Loan Council was about \$125 500 000, that repayments and recoveries of expenditure becoming available for respending in 1974-75 were expected to amount to about \$55 000 000, that borrowings to cover discounts would be about \$400 000, that a capital expenditure programme of \$181 200 000 was proposed and that, accordingly, there would be a small deficit of \$200 000 on the year's activities. It follows that the opening balance of \$4 500 000 of Loan funds was to have been reduced to \$4 300 000 by the end of the year. In the event, new capital funds, repayments and payments were all well above estimate.

The first major variation was in new funds. The original allocation I had reported to the House derived from an overall increase in Loan programmes of 10 per cent above the actual for 1973-74. By the time the Australian Government brought down its Budget in mid-September, it had realised the extreme difficulties facing the States in trying to mount capital programmes at a physical level lower than in the previous year. The Budget then provided support for State programmes at a level 10 per cent above that originally approved, that is to say about 20 per cent above those of 1973-74. South Australia's share of the addition to the programme was \$12 500 000. However, by this time it was becoming clear that the higher allowance for wage awards, the non-receipt of the special grant, the down-turn in revenues and

higher prices for supplies and services were all adding significantly to the revenue deficit. Therefore the Government considered that it should attempt to hold the additional Loan funds in reserve to cover that rapidly growing deficit.

Because the Government had decided to avoid the harsh step of actual retrenchment of Government employees, it was apparent that the heaviest impact of the State's financial problems had to be borne in those areas of works normally carried out by contract. In the closing months of 1974, I referred often to our inability to let new contracts, if the objective of reserving Loan funds were to be achieved. Just prior to the Premiers' Conference in February last it could be seen that merely to defer the letting of contracts would not have been sufficient to achieve the reservation of Loan funds which seemed prudent. We had reached the stage where retrenchments of employees had to be considered, if overall financial stability were to be protected. Thankfully the provision of additional Loan funds of \$8 100 000 and of additional revenue grants of \$6 600 000 arranged at Premiers' Conference freed the Government from the necessity to take that course of action.

As I reported to the House on February 18 last, we were able to approve additional allocations aggregating \$14 700 000, that is a total equivalent to the whole of the new funds offered at the conference, to enable construction departments to retain their labour forces and to let contracts for additional works so that contractors might retain their labour forces. The additional funds were allocated to Public Buildings, Engineering and Water Supply, Marine and Harbors, Woods and Forests, and Lands Departments. At that stage the Government was attempting to still hold about \$10 000 000 of Loan funds in reserve, and it was not practicable to allocate additional funds to statutory bodies who were facing somewhat similar problems.

In the latter part of the year, as the situation of Revenue Account continued to improve, the Government was able to release further Loan funds, and additional allocations were approved for the Electricity Trust, the Municipal Tramways Trust and the Pipelines Authority. Whereas the original estimate for repayments and recoveries in 1974-75 was \$55 100 000, the actual receipts were \$62 200 000. This net increase of \$7 100 000 was the result of several variations above and below estimate. The largest single variation was in respect of Engineering and Water Supply Department. The first estimate was that specific purpose grants of \$3 000 000 and specific purpose loans of \$3 500 000, that is, a total of \$6 500 000, would be received from the Australian Government towards water treatment and sewerage works. Only the \$3 000 000 of expected grant was included in repayments, as it was intended to record the special Loan transactions outside Loan Account. In the event, the total of such grants and loans was \$10 200 000, and it was found that the only practicable way to account for them was through Loan Account. Therefore, the whole of the \$10 200 000 was recorded as repayments.

The repayments on account of hospital buildings were about \$4 000 000 above estimate because of the receipt of additional specific purpose grants from the Australian Government. For Railways Department, repayments were below estimate because specific purpose grants towards urban transport projects were about \$2 500 000 below the forecast. For each of waterworks and sewers, hospital buildings, and railways, there were variations in gross payments corresponding to the variations in repayments.

As a result of all the factors I have mentioned, the payments from Loan Account in 1974-75 aggregated \$211 200 000, a significant increase of \$30 000 000 beyond the original estimate. The balance of \$4 500 000 of Loan funds held at June 30, 1974, was run down by \$2 600 000, so that the balance held at June 30, 1975, was \$1 900 000.

At the meeting of the Australian Loan Council held in June, the Australian Government agreed to support a total programme of \$1 291 000 000 for State works and services. Allowing for certain "offsets" because of the proposals for transfer of railway services in South Australia and Tasmania, this was effectively an increase of 20 per cent. South Australia's share of this programme is \$169 400 000. Of this allocation, an amount of \$112 900 000 is to become available by way of loan subject to repayment and to interest and an amount of \$56 500 000 by way of capital grant.

In addition to the new funds of \$169 400 000, the Government expects to receive various repayments and recoveries of about \$71 600 000. Certain discounts and premiums on loan issues and redemptions, which form part of our Loan programme and are expected to amount to some \$500 000, will not have to be paid in cash by us as further loans will be arranged through Loan Council to cover them. Therefore, the Government expects to have a total of about \$241 500 000 becoming available during the course of the year. These figures and a comparison with the transactions of 1974-75 are set out on page 4 of the Loan Estimates.

The estimate of \$71 600 000 for repayments and recoveries is significantly above the actual receipts of \$62 200 000 in 1974-75. One of the larger factors in this is the expected recovery from the Australian National Railways Commission of the amount of \$6 500 000 which is proposed to be spent on non-metropolitan railway capital works. For this year, pending the complete transfer arrangements becoming effective, the State will act as agent of the Australian Government and the appropriation for non-metropolitan works is included in the railways programme in the normal way.

Significant increases in receipts of specific purpose capital funds from the Australian Government for hospitals, water treatment and urban public transport account for most of the balance of higher estimated repayments. I propose to comment on the special Australian Government contributions when dealing with the details of departmental programmes. At this stage, I should add that we have not received firm advice of many major expected grants and loans. In view of the difficult Budget situation which the Australian Government faces, it is possible that some of the special contributions may be held to lower limits than have been adopted for purposes of these papers. This matter will be kept under close review to ensure that commitments actually made are in line with funds available.

Having regard to the favourable situation of Revenue Account, there is no requirement for the Government to set aside Loan funds and, therefore, we propose to employ in the capital programme the whole of the new funds expected to become available. The total of payments proposed is thus \$241 500 000. The balance of \$1 900 000 held at June 30, 1975, will continue to be held for the moment as a small pool from which emergency payments may be financed if they arise.

For semi-government borrowing proposals in 1975-76, Loan Council has determined an aggregate general programme 20 per cent above that of 1974-75 with special allocations to two States to take account of particular factors.

Of the total programme of \$809 700 000, South Australia's share is \$38 100 000. The allocations within this total to the individual statutory borrowers are \$10 000 000 to the Electricity Trust, \$8 000 000 to the Housing Trust \$5 000 000 to the Pipelines Authority, \$4 000 000 to the Meat Corporation, \$3 000 000 to the Festival Centre Trust, and \$2 000 000 to the Monarto Commission. \$5 300 000 has been allocated to meet the needs of larger local government bodies and at this stage I propose to hold \$8 000 000 of borrowing authority in reserve. This will be allocated later in the year to meet unforeseen requirements as they may emerge. I point out to honourable members, also, as a result of the Loan Council meeting, the amount that may be borrowed by semi-government authorities without approval of the Loan Council has now been raised significantly. In 1974-75 the maximum limit up to which individual statutory and local government bodies could borrow without that borrowing counting against the State's semi-government allocation, was \$500 000. For 1975-76, Loan Council has approved an increase in the individual limit to \$700 000. This will be very useful to a number of authorities.

I should point out that for both the larger and smaller semi-government authorities it is a borrowing programme which has been approved. The raising of the funds depends on the liquidity of institutional lenders and on the willingness of other lenders to advance moneys at the interest rates determined by the Loan Council from time to time. Nonetheless, we have succeeded in raising the full programme in other years and I have no doubt that we will continue to receive the support from lenders to enable us to raise the total sums approved. As the remainder of the explanation refers to details of the Departmental Estimates and the clauses of the Bill, I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF LOAN ESTIMATES

HOUSING—Twelve months ago I reported to the House that funds made available to South Australia in 1974-75 under the Housing Agreement were \$38 400 000 and that the allocation of these funds was \$18 060 000 to the State Bank and \$20 340 000 to the Housing Trust. In the event, housing funds were increased in late 1974 and again in early 1975, so that the total available last year was \$56 360 000. The State Bank received \$22 800 000 and the Housing Trust \$33 560 000. These funds were advanced to the State at concessional rates of interest of 4½ per cent in respect of advances to the State Bank and 4 per cent in respect of advances to the Housing Trust. In each case the Housing Agreement provides for the funds to be used for welfare housing. This means that approval of loan is granted or allocation of house is made primarily to an applicant who falls within the limit of a defined means test on income. The rate of interest charged by the State Bank on loans to persons who comply with the means test is 5½ per cent. Loans made in 1974-75 to 1 685 applicants in this category amounted to \$23 319 000.

The bank makes advances also to persons who do not comply with this primary means test, but who comply with a secondary somewhat less stringent test. Funds for these loans are obtained from the bank's internal funds and from allocations of State Loan funds, if necessary. During 1974-75 the bank made 1 152 loans in this category, totalling \$16 193 000. The interest rate charged is 6½ per cent. In March, 1975, the maximum loan available to applicants who satisfy the primary means test was increased from \$15 000 to \$18 000, while the limit for other loans remained at \$15 000.

As to the programme of the Housing Trust, dwellings completed during 1974-75 totalled 1 589, while 2 364 dwellings were under construction at June 30 last. The Housing Agreement lays emphasis on the construction of rental housing and restricts to 30 per cent the proportion of family dwellings which may be built for sale with welfare housing funds. Even in these cases the sales may be made only to persons who meet the means test specified for eligibility for a rental home.

The trust also builds houses for people who do not meet the means test and constructs industrial and commercial buildings. In carrying out these activities the trust will have available in 1975-76 some \$8 800 000 of circulating funds and \$80 000 000 of semi-governmental borrowings. As to the special funds for welfare housing in 1975-76, it is not yet known what amount the Australian Government intends to allocate to the State for this purpose. Whereas in June, 1974, at the Premier's Conference, the Prime Minister announced the allocation for housing which the Australian Government was prepared to support, at the Premiers' Conference in June, 1975, he stated that housing funds would be considered within the context of the overall Australian Budget. He added, however, that States could expect housing funds this year to be not less than the amounts advanced in 1974-75.

LOANS TO PRODUCERS, \$2 850 000—Advances by the State Bank under the Loans to Producers Act in 1974-75 totalled about \$3 960 000. Over \$1 500 000 was made available to wineries and distilleries; fruit canning and the fishing industry received about \$1 000 000 each; and the balance was distributed to a number of other industries including dairy processing, cold stores and packing houses. Of the total advances made, \$2 950 000 came from State Loan funds, while the remainder was financed from semi-government borrowings and from the bank's internal sources. An allocation of \$2 850 000 of State loan funds is proposed for 1975-76. This amount will be augmented by semi-government borrowings of \$700 000 and by the bank's internal funds.

ADVANCES TO STATE BANK, \$2 500 000—A sum of \$2 000 000 was advanced to the State Bank in 1974-75 to support its housing finance services and to allow for expansion of its normal banking activities. A further advance of \$2 500 000 is proposed for 1975-76. These funds will be used mainly for housing loans in cases where applicants fall outside the means test under the housing agreement, and for the provision of working funds to the bank's customers, including those in wine and fruit processing industries.

OTHER URBAN DRAINAGE, \$4 100 000—Financial assistance to local government for drainage in urban areas in 1974-75 was about \$1 650 000. Dollar-for-dollar subsidies to assist councils in the disposal of floodwaters amounted to \$811 000. Payments made to 26 councils and two drainage constructing authorities included \$220 000 for the Torrens Road stormwater drainage scheme. Grants towards common effluent drainage are made in accordance with local needs and the ability of councils to contribute to drainage schemes. In 1974-75, 10 councils received a total of \$839 000 towards these schemes. The need for adequate drainage has led to an increasing number of requests for assistance. A total of \$4 100 000 is proposed to be made available in 1975-76—(\$1 800 000 for floodwater drainage and \$2 300 000 for common effluent drainage).

LANDS DEPARTMENT-BUILDINGS, PLANT, ETC., \$965 000—The proposed allocation of \$965 000 to the Lands Department for plant, equipment and buildings, includes a pro-

vision of \$275 000 towards the purchase of an aeroplane which is needed for survey work and aerial photography and is estimated to cost \$850 000.

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF SWAMP LANDS, \$3 700 000—An extensive programme of work is being undertaken on rehabilitation of pumping and water distribution facilities in several irrigation areas on the Murray River. Growers are expected to benefit from these works by having a more efficient supply system while the State will benefit from the avoidance of waste of water which the present open channel system entails. In 1974-75 work continued on the replacement of earth and concrete channels with pipe mains, and on water supplies for stock and domestic use. In all, \$2 623 000 was spent on these works, including over \$1 500 000 in the Waikerie area and about \$300 000 in the Berri irrigation area. Once again the Government has been able to increase the allocation of Loan funds to this important programme and expenditure of \$3 700 000 is proposed for 1975-76.

REMARK IRRIGATION TRUST, \$525 000—Under the Remark Irrigation Trust Act, the Government provides funds by way of grants and repayable loans towards the cost of pumping stations, rehabilitation of the irrigation system and the provision of additional drainage and water supply in the trust area. These pumping stations had been completed and two put into operation last year. Pipe laying for irrigation and domestic water supply has reached about the halfway mark. A sum of \$600 000 was provided for these purposes in 1974-75 and \$525 000 is proposed in 1975-76.

AFFORESTATION AND TIMBER MILLING, \$6 200 000—In 1974-75 advances from Loan Account to the State forestry undertaking were \$4 700 000. Of this, about \$3 400 000 was spent on the establishment of new plantations, the clearing of land in preparation for planting and the maintenance of the existing forest reserves. The establishment of about 1 900 hectares as the 1975 plantation is in progress and a further area of some 2 000 hectares is being prepared for planting in the 1976 season. Nearly 1 600 hectares of land were purchased at the cost of some \$450 000. A further sum of about \$850 000 was expended on a number of machinery units and on other improvements to allow the State sawmills to keep abreast of new techniques and generally to improve efficiency of timber production. The Woods and Forests Department carries out a capital works programme which enables it to maintain a strong position in the timber industry, to replant exploited forest plantations and to expand its activities. An amount of \$6 200 000 of Loan funds is proposed for forestry purposes in 1975-76. An additional sum of \$590 000 is expected to be drawn from the softwood forestry funds provided by the Australian Government.

RAILWAYS ACCOMMODATION, \$11 000 000—Loan expenditure on railways in 1974-75 totalled \$9 983 000. Of this amount, \$2 930 000 was spent on the public transport project to improve services to Christie Downs. The balance was applied to manufacturing rail cars and freight vehicles, relaying and upgrading railway tracks, installing signals and safety devices, construction of buildings and purchase of plant and equipment. An allocation of \$11 000 000 is proposed in 1975-76 of which \$4 500 000 is for public transport projects and \$6 500 000 for other capital works. As I mentioned earlier, \$6 500 000 is expected to be recovered from the Australian National Railways Commission for the capital payments on account of non-metropolitan railways. Two-thirds of expenditure on urban public transport is also expected to be recovered from the Australian Government as specific non-repayable grants.

HARBORS ACCOMMODATION, \$7 800 000—A total of \$7 220 000 was expended from Loan Account in 1974-75 on harbor facilities, buildings and equipment. Further progress has been made on bulk grain and phosphate rock loading installations at Port Lincoln and container ship facilities at Outer Harbor. Deepening of the Port Adelaide River has been completed and widening is now well advanced. A provision of \$7 800 000 is proposed for these and other projects in 1975-76.

FISHING HAVENS, \$930 000—Nearly \$250 000 was expended in 1974-75 on slipway facilities at Beachport, Kingscote and Port Lincoln and on a fishing jetty at Franklin Harbor. Projects planned to be commenced in 1975-76 include the construction of a modern boat haven for the fishing industry at Port Adelaide and the provision of a breakwater at Port MacDonnell. The Port Adelaide fishing haven will have a steel piled wharf, a landing jetty, wave screen, mooring pontoons, cranes, amenities and a car park. It is estimated to cost \$1 100 000 when completed. The breakwater at Port MacDonnell will be some 1 550 metres long and will cost about \$1 700 000. It will enclose a large area of sheltered water and will give protection not only to fishing vessels but also to a long stretch of sandy beach making it more attractive for water sports, tourists and holidaymakers. A total of \$930 000 is proposed to be allotted to fishing havens in 1975-76.

WATERWORKS AND SEWERS, \$59 300 000—A total of \$48 470 000 was expended on waterworks and sewerage services in 1974-75. Included in this amount were specific grants and loans from the Australian Government of \$4 400 000 towards the Adelaide water treatment scheme and \$5 750 000 towards sewerage projects located mainly in the metropolitan area. Six water supply and sewerage projects were completed in 1974-75. Over 40 other projects have been under construction. Work on these projects will continue and further new schemes are expected to be started in 1975-76. A sum of \$59 300 000 is proposed for these works. Of this amount \$13 000 000 is expected to be received as specific purpose assistance from the Australian Government. I shall now comment on some larger allocations planned for 1975-76.

METROPOLITAN WATERWORKS, \$16 608 000—An amount of \$1 100 000 has been provided to complete the construction of a trunk water main from Darlington to Port Adelaide and a large capacity storage tank at Seacliff. A sum of \$2 077 000 will be made available for Little Para Dam which has been designed to act as a balancing storage for the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline system. A provision of \$8 500 000 has been made for work to continue on the water treatment project at Hope Valley and on design work for the Anstey Hill plant.

COUNTRY WATERWORKS, \$16 572 000—In 1974-75 work had commenced on the replacement of a section of the Morgan-Whyalla main. Because of the urgency of this work, a large proportion of it will need to be carried out during 1975-76. A provision of \$5 275 000 has been made accordingly. An amount of \$1 059 000 has been allotted for the continuation of work on the Lock-Kimba water main. Financial assistance of two-thirds of expenditure on this scheme is available from the Australian Government. Pipelaying commenced in May last for a scheme designed to supplement the supply of water to Victor Harbor, Port Elliot and Goolwa by pumping from Myponga Reservoir. This work is to continue in 1975-76 and a provision of \$1 219 000 has been made for the purpose. Work will also continue in 1975-76 on the Uley

South scheme which will provide a large increase in the total supply of water available for Eyre Peninsula. A sum of \$2 147 000 has been provided for this project.

METROPOLITAN SEWERAGE, \$11 495 000—An allocation of \$946 000 has been made to continue construction of the engineering and biology building, roads and car parks at Bolivar. A provision of \$1 134 000 has been made for the further reconstruction of sewers in north-eastern suburbs and \$431 000 for south-western suburbs. Over \$3 000 000 will also be provided for the construction of sewers in new areas at Blackwood, Hackham, Morphett Vale, Parafield Gardens and Coromandel Valley.

COUNTRY SEWERAGE, \$4 561 000—This provision is required for sewerage works at Balhannah, Gawler, Hahndorf, Port Pirie, Victor Harbor and Whyalla.

RIVER MURRAY WEIRS, DAMS, LOCKS, ETC., \$3 600 000—In 1974-75 South Australia made a contribution of \$2 575 000 to capital works carried out under the River Murray Waters Agreement. Our share of the cost of construction of the Dartmouth Reservoir in 1975-76 is expected to be \$6 800 000. Of this, \$3 400 000 is expected to be advanced by the Australian Government and \$3 400 000 is to be provided from State Loan Funds. A further contribution of \$200 000 by South Australia is required for other capital works undertaken on behalf of the participating States by the River Murray Commission.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, LAND AND SERVICES, \$107 500 000.

HOSPITAL BUILDINGS, \$33 000 000—Actual payments from Loan Account for hospital buildings and facilities in 1974-75 totalled \$25 425 000. This amount included about \$1 739 000 for community health projects which in 1975-76 will be shown under a separate line. Grants from the Australian Government towards capital expenditure on hospitals were \$3 236 000. A further amount of about \$1 690 000 was received towards community health projects.

Works completed during 1974-75 included additions to Queen Elizabeth Hospital which cost over \$5 000 000 and comprised a new pharmacy, an additional theatre, enlarged out-patients department and x-ray facilities. Other works in the public hospital field also completed last year, were a group laundry and central linen service unit and a 24-bed geriatric unit at Port Pirie and amenities for the nursing staff at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Completed projects in the field of mental health services included improvements to three wards and provision of an adolescent unit at Enfield Hospital at the cost of \$760 000, renovations at Glenside and improvements at Hillcrest Hospital. Some of the major proposals for 1975-76 are as follows:

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE—A sum of \$18 760 000 has been provided for the continuation of work on further development of the Centre and \$800 000 for computer equipment.

PORT AUGUSTA HOSPITAL—An amount of \$910 000 has been allotted for further work on a geriatric block, physiotherapy and occupational therapy facilities and ancillary offices.

PORT PIRIE HOSPITAL—A sum of \$1 138 000 is required to continue Stage I of redevelopment works, which will cost over \$2 000 000 when completed, to provide air conditioning at the hospital and in the nurses' home, and to start the second stage of redevelopment of the hospital, which is estimated to cost \$13 250 000.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL—A sum of \$2 540 000 has been provided for redevelopment of the Northfield wards and for other alterations and additions.

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL—A sum of \$1 150 000 will be expended on the construction of a 64-bed ward for sub-acute patients.

The construction of a frozen-food factory has been planned to start in 1975-76. This facility, to cost about \$7 000 000, will service Government hospitals and subsidised institutions. Other new works cover such diversified projects as the provision of computer equipment at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, Modbury and Queen Elizabeth Hospitals, a diagnostic radiology department at Mount Gambier, utility rooms at Wallaroo, additional staff recreation facilities and air conditioning at Hillcrest Hospital and an occupational therapy building at Strathmont Centre. Towards the total hospital capital programme of \$33 000 000 we expect to receive grants from the Australian Government to the extent of \$12 300 000.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS, \$48 000 000—During 1974-75 actual payments from Loan Account totalled \$46 861 000. Details of expenditure on school buildings and facilities are as follows:

Primary and secondary schools:

	\$
The completion of 58 major projects the total value of which was \$17 391 000 ..	9 177 000
Work in progress on 42 major projects estimated to cost \$40 678 000 in total ..	18 603 000
Prefabricated classrooms and transportable units	1 046 000
Purchase of land, buildings and residences	2 950 000
Minor works and buildings, and final payments on contracts	4 292 000
Furniture	2 030 000
Preliminary investigations and design	1 825 000
	\$39 923 000

Further Education:

	\$
The completion of five major projects with a total value of \$477 000	395 000
Work in progress on three major projects estimated to cost \$12 410 000 in total ..	4 096 000
Prefabricated classrooms	26 000
Purchase of land, buildings and residences	561 000
Minor works and buildings, and final payments on contracts	324 000
Furniture and equipment	300 000
Preliminary investigations and design	426 000
	\$6 128 000

Expenditure from Loan Account on pre-schools in 1974-75 amounted to \$810 000. Seven major projects, with a total cost of \$460 000, were completed and work on another 10 pre-schools was in progress. The capital expenditure on schools in 1974-75 was financed by grants from the Australian Government to the extent of about \$19 600 000. It is proposed to provide \$48 000 000 for school buildings and associated works in 1975-76. The expenditure of these funds has been programmed as follows:

	\$
Primary and secondary schools:	
The continuation of work on 42 major projects in progress, estimated to cost \$40 678 000	15 047 000
The commencement of 48 projects estimated to cost \$22 545 000	10 820 000
Emergency classroom accommodation ..	2 500 000
Purchase of land, buildings and residences	2 800 000

Primary and secondary schools— <i>continued</i>	\$
Minor works and buildings, final payments on contracts	4 633 000
Furniture	1 600 000
Preliminary investigations and design	1 300 000
	\$38 700 000

Further Education:	\$
The continuation of work on three major projects with total value of \$12 410 000	6 650 000
The commencement of two major projects estimated to cost \$3 208 000	1 190 000
Emergency classroom accommodation	100 000
Purchase of land, buildings and residences	500 000
Minor works and buildings, and final payments on contracts	310 000
Furniture and equipment	250 000
Preliminary investigations and design	300 000
	\$9 300 000

Grants from the Australian Government of about \$14 000 000 are expected this year—\$12 500 000 towards primary and secondary schools and \$1 500 000 towards further education projects. Members will note that no provision has been made under this line for pre-school projects. As from July, 1975, these projects are being handled separately as a part of the wider programme of the Childhood Services Council.

Other Government Buildings, \$26 500 000—Actual payments from Loan Account in 1974-75 were \$22 246 000. Works completed during the year included the Dental Therapy School at Somerton Park, seven dental clinics in country areas, four police stations, improvements to the museum and the botanic gardens and accommodation for the Environment and Conservation and Community Welfare Departments. Considerable progress has also been made on a number of projects, on which I will comment when giving details of this year's provisions. Grants from the Australian Government towards capital expenditure on dental clinics and training facilities for dental therapists in 1974-75 totalled \$1 512 000. For 1975-76, such grants are expected to amount to about \$2 000 000. Some of the larger provisions for 1975-76 are as follows:

Attorney-General's Department—An amount of \$2 700 000 has been provided for construction to continue on the forensic science building.

Department for Community Welfare—A sum of \$667 000 has been allotted to works on community welfare centres at Enfield, Marion, Mount Gambier, Norwood, Port Augusta and Whyalla, and for upgrading of Magill Home.

Department for Correctional Services—A sum of \$371 000 is required for additions to buildings and equipment at Yatala prison and Adelaide and Port Lincoln goals.

Department of Public Health—A sum of \$815 000 has been provided for the construction of dental clinics in 14 metropolitan and country areas, \$50 000 for the Principal School of Dental Therapy at North Terrace and \$285 000 for additions to the Dental Therapy Training School at Somerton Park. In addition, there is a sum of \$850 000 for the Principal School included in the general provision for the purchase of land. Grants from the Australian Government are expected to cover the cost of these facilities.

Department of Transport—A sum of \$2 500 000 is proposed to be expended to continue construction of a new office block for this department.

New Administration Building—A sum of \$6 745 000 has been included for work to continue on the Flinders Street office block and furniture.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, \$5 000 000—The capital works programme of the trust in 1974-75 was \$36 568 000 and capital expenditure of \$37 851 000 has been planned for 1975-76. These figures include Leigh Creek projects, which in 1974-75 were shown in the Estimates as a separate line. Work will continue on the first stage of the Torrens Island power station "B" where the first steam unit is expected to be commissioned next month. It is anticipated that the second unit will start operating some 12 months later. Preliminary work will also commence on the second stage of the Torrens Island station "B". The reinforcement of electricity supply to the South-East will be completed this year. This work includes the construction of the Para-Taillem Bend 275 000 volt transmission line and additions to the sub-station at Taillem Bend.

The reticulation system to consumers in the Kingston-Lucindale area is expected to be completed during the year. The 275 000 volt metropolitan transmission system has been completed at the cost of \$14 200 000 and the general expansion of the distribution system is expected to continue at a similar rate to that prevailing in 1974-75. At Leigh Creek, work will continue on the development of the lobe "B" coal area and will include the installation of the crushing plant and coal storage bins and the erection of workshops and compounds. The trust's programme is financed mainly from its own internal funds. In 1974-75 an amount of \$6 000 000 was made available to the trust from Loan Account and \$5 000 000 is proposed to be allocated in 1975-76. An additional sum of \$10 000 000 will be raised by semi-governmental borrowing.

PIPELINES AUTHORITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA—Provision was made in 1974-75 of \$5 000 000 of Loan funds and almost \$5 000 000 of semi-governmental borrowing authority for pipelines and other works associated with the construction of a petro-chemical complex at Redcliff. Following deferment of the Redcliff project, these funds were allowed to remain with the Authority to be applied towards long term financing of the construction of some 80 kilometres of pipeline to supply Port Pirie and the construction of new compressor stations and looping required to ensure that the pipeline system remains capable of meeting the increasing demand for gas in South Australia. No allocation has been made from Loan Account to the Authority this year. However, \$5 000 000 will be available from the semi-governmental raisings.

MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS TRUST, \$5 000 000—During 1974-75 an amount of \$4 400 000 was advanced from Loan Account to the trust towards its capital programme of purchase of new buses, acquisition of land for depots and construction of depot buildings. For 1975-76 a provision of \$5 000 000 is proposed towards a continuation of the programme. Finance is also being provided by the Australian Government by way of grants under urban public transport arrangements to meet two-thirds of the cost of approved projects. The amount of such assistance to be provided in 1975-76 is not yet known, but we are hopeful that up to \$10 000 000 will be available towards total payments of the order of \$15 000 000. Two major contracts for supply of buses are now under way, one for 67 AEC Swift buses and one for 310 Volvo buses.

NON-GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL AND INSTITUTION BUILDINGS, \$8 500 000—Actual payments from Loan Account in 1974-75 were \$6 197 000. A provision of \$8 500 000 is proposed for 1975-76. Thirty-two hospitals and institutions will receive grants of varying amounts, including: \$3 600 000 for the Home for Incurables to continue construction of a 10-storey block, which will provide domiciliary care for long term patients; and \$1 800 000 for the Adelaide Children's Hospital towards further work on rebuilding of the old part of the hospital.

COMMUNITY HEALTH AND ASSOCIATED PROJECTS, \$2 500 000—As I mentioned previously, community health projects in 1974-75 were included under the provision for hospital buildings. In 1975-76 a separate appropriation is proposed of \$2 500 000. Grants will be made to 32 health centres and institutions for the construction of buildings and the purchase of furniture, equipment and motor vehicles. The Australian Government is expected to contribute \$1 800 000 toward these works.

LAND COMMISSION—Actual expenditure in 1974-75 totalled about \$21 500 000. Of this amount some \$16 700 000 was for the purchase of land in urban areas, \$3 000 000 for public open spaces and \$1 100 000 for the development of land. Loans and grants from the Australian Government towards this expenditure amounted to \$20 500 000. The commission's programme for 1975-76 envisages expenditure of the order of \$34 800 000. The emphasis this year will be on development of land, for which expenditure of \$16 000 000 has been planned. A further \$13 700 000 will be expended on the purchase of land and \$3 800 000 for open spaces.

A request has been made to the Australian Government for assistance of \$24 000 000 towards this programme. However, in light of budgetary problems being experienced by that Government, we do not expect to receive the full amount requested and the planned programme may need to be adjusted to accord with funds available. The commission also expects to have about \$5 000 000 available from the sales of land and \$700 000 from semi-governmental borrowings. It will need to call on cash balances held at the end of 1974-75.

MONARTO DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION, \$1 200 000—During 1974-75, the commission spent some \$5 630 000 on its programme of land acquisition, design and development. The main contributions to the commission were \$1 000 000 of State Loans funds, \$1 500 000 raised by way of semi-government borrowing and \$5 370 000 advanced by the Australian Government. The latter advance included about \$1 275 000 due in respect of activities in 1973-74.

For 1975-76 the commission's programme cannot be drawn up in detail because of uncertainty about the extent of support to be received from the Australian Government. At this stage, the State allocations proposed are \$1 200 000 from Loan Account and \$2 000 000 of semi-government borrowing authority. We expect to receive from the Australian Government a contribution sufficient to finance a suitable programme.

DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM, RECREATION AND SPORT, \$950 000—Some 55 projects received grants in 1974-75 totalling almost \$500 000 towards sport and recreational facilities. An amount of \$950 000 has been provided in 1975-76 for assistance to local government and other organisations in the field of tourism, recreation and sport.

APPENDIX I

SCHOOL BUILDINGS

Major Completed Works, 1974-75

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
Primary and Junior Primary Schools—		
New Schools—		
Braeview Primary—Stage I	678 000	Brick
O'Sullivan Beach Junior Primary	338 000	Brick
Parafield Keller Road Primary	830 000	Brick
Pimpala Primary	637 000	Samcon
Pooraka Junior Primary	193 000	Brick
Salisbury Downs Primary—Stage I	601 000	Brick
Semaphore Park Primary	1 053 000	Brick
Major Additions—		
Berri Primary	90 000	Samcon
Brinkworth Primary	277 000	Samcon
Cowandilla Primary—Open Unit	304 000	Brick
Glen Osmond Primary—Open Unit	252 000	Brick
Loxton Primary	823 000	Brick
Madison Park Primary	156 000	Samcon
Naracoorte Primary	690 000	Brick
Northfield Junior Primary	332 000	Brick
Parafield Gardens Primary—Open Unit	385 000	Brick
Parafield Gardens East Primary	80 000	Samcon
Port Noarlunga Primary—Open Unit	146 000	Brick
Seaview Downs Primary	110 000	Samcon
Taperoo Primary	838 000	Brick
High Schools—		
New Schools—		
Augusta Park—Stage II	1 206 000	Samcon
Major Additions—		
Craigmore—Stage I	719 000	Brick
Dover—Stage I	19 000	Brick
Kidman Park—Stage I	21 000	Brick
LeFevre—Stage I	85 000	Brick
Mawson—Stage I	40 000	Brick
Mitchell Park—Stage II	112 000	Alterations
Nuriootpa—Open Unit	266 000	Brick
Para Hills—Open Unit	371 000	Brick
Port Lincoln	1 180 000	Brick
Seaton—Stage I	12 000	Demac
Vermont—Stage II	312 000	Brick
Area Schools—		
Major Additions—		
Lameroo	870 000	Brick
Snowtown	578 000	Brick
Special Schools—		
Gepps Cross	460 000	Brick
General—		
Primary and Junior Primary Schools—		
Clapham Primary—Staff Accommodation	81 000	Brick and Wood-Tex
Elizabeth Downs Primary—Staff Accommodation	60 000	Brick and Wood-Tex
Elizabeth West Primary—Staff Accommodation	56 000	Brick and Wood-Tex
Para Hills West Primary—Staff Accommodation	71 000	Brick and Wood-Tex
Para Vista Primary—Staff Accommodation	54 000	Brick and Wood-Tex
Stradbroke Primary—Staff Accommodation	54 000	Partitions
Westbourne Park Primary—Landscaping	62 000	—
High Schools—		
Elizabeth West—Craft Additions	179 000	Brick
Gilles Plains—Craft Block	94 000	Brick
Henley—Craft Blocks (2)	151 000	Brick
Marion—Craft Blocks	134 000	Brick
Moonta—Craft Block and Toilet	112 000	Timber
Salisbury—Craft Block	116 000	Brick
Seacombe—Craft Blocks (2)	219 000	Brick
Area Schools—		
Ardrossan—Changerooms	39 000	Brick
Kimba—Changerooms	31 000	Brick
Maitland—Craft Extensions	94 000	Concrete Blocks
Orroroo—Changerooms	30 000	Brick
Parndana—Changerooms	42 000	Brick
Quorn—Changerooms	28 000	Brick

APPENDIX I—continued
SCHOOL BUILDINGS—continued
Major Completed Works, 1974-75—continued

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
Subsidised Works—		
Gilles Plains High—Assembly Hall	356 000	Brick
Norwood High—Gymnasium and Change-rooms	120 000	Brick
Technical Colleges and Further Education Centres—		
Adelaide Technical College—Alterations	98 000	—
Peterborough Further Education Centre—Craft Block	101 000	Brick
Regency Park Community College—Civil Works	153 000	—
S.A. College of External Studies—Air Conditioning	54 000	—
Sturt College of Advanced Education—Roadways	144 000	—
Yarrabee Botanic Gardens—Alterations	71 000	—

Major Works in Progress at June 30, 1975

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
Primary and Secondary Schools—Primary and Junior Primary Schools—		
New Schools—		
Hallett Cove South Primary School—Stage I	1 242 000	Brick
Holden Hill North Primary	950 000	Samcon
Morphett Vale West Primary	1 520 000	Brick
Para Heights Primary	972 000	Brick
Port Noarlunga South Primary—Stage I	1 231 000	Brick
St. Agnes Primary	1 078 000	Brick
Salisbury South East Primary	1 040 000	Brick
Major Additions—		
Carlton Primary—Open Unit	299 000	Brick
Ferryden Park Primary—Library Resource Centre	80 000	Demac
Goodwood Primary	787 000	Brick
Hincks Avenue Primary—Library Resource Centre	90 000	Demac
Kilkenny Primary	630 000	Brick
Mount Barker Primary—Open Unit	260 000	Samcon
Murray Bridge Primary	1 400 000	Brick
Nuriootpa Primary	1 315 000	Brick
Peterborough Primary	777 000	Brick
Port Pirie—Risdon Park Primary	1 076 000	Brick
Salisbury North Primary	1 050 000	Brick
High Schools—		
New Schools—		
Ingle Farm	2 643 000	Brick
Morialta	2 669 000	Brick
Parafield Gardens	4 300 000	Brick
Major Additions—		
Blackwood	1 240 000	Brick
Glossop—Stages I and II	1 166 000	Brick
Mitchell Park Co-ed—Stage III	773 000	Brick
Mount Gambier—Grant	1 898 000	Mount Gambier Stone
Naracoorte	620 000	Brick
Nuriootpa	1 140 000	Brick
Port Pirie	685 000	Brick
Taperoo	510 000	Brick
Woodville—Additions Type A and Alterations	1 034 000	Brick
Area Schools—		
Major Additions—		
Coober Pedy	170 000	Samcon
Streaky Bay	888 000	Brick
Yorke town	1 600 000	Samcon
Special Schools—		
Elizabeth—Stages I and II	462 000	Brick
Modbury South	925 000	Brick
Murray Bridge	330 000	Brick
General—		
High Schools—		
Mount Gambier—Art/Craft Block	344 000	Brick
Thorndon High—Civil Works	58 000	—

APPENDIX 1—continued

SCHOOL BUILDINGS—continued

Major Works in Progress at June 30, 1975—continued

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
Subsidised Works—		
Fremont Boys High—Multi-Purpose Hall ..	175 000	Concrete Block
Loxton High—Assembly Hall	493 000	Brick
Salisbury High—Multi-Purpose Hall	158 000	Brick
Other Projects—		
Arbury Park Outdoor School	600 000	Timber
Technical Colleges and Further Education Centres—		
Port Augusta Technical College—Stage II ..	1 960 000	Concrete Block
Regency Park Community College	8 700 000	Precast Concrete Panels
South-East College of Further Education ..	1 750 000	Brick

Major Works to be Commenced During 1975-76

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
Primary and Junior Primary Schools—		
New Schools—		
Direk Primary	1 200 000	Brick
Fairview Park Primary—Stage I	800 000	Demac
Flagstaff Hill Primary	1 300 000	Brick
Frazer Park Primary—Stage I	900 000	Demac
Highbury Junior Primary	600 000	Brick
Modbury South Junior Primary	610 000	Brick
Modbury West Junior Primary	620 000	Brick
Major Additions—		
Barmera Primary—Stage I	650 000	Brick
Beachport Primary	200 000	Demac
Burnside Primary—Library Resource Centre	80 000	Demac
Camden Primary—Stage I	700 000	Demac
Christies Beach Primary—Library Resource Centre	80 000	Demac
Croydon Primary—Library Resource Centre	80 000	Demac
Croydon Park Primary—Library Resource Centre	80 000	Demac
Forbes Primary—Library Resource Centre ..	80 000	Demac
Hindmarsh Primary—Library Resource Centre	60 000	Existing Stone Construction
Madison Park Primary—Library Resource Centre	160 000	Samcon
Magill Junior Primary	860 000	Brick
Mannum Primary—Library Resource Centre	90 000	Demac
Millicent North Primary	200 000	Samcon
Mitchell Park Primary—Library Resource Centre	80 000	Demac
Murray Bridge South Primary—Library Resource Centre	90 000	Demac
Para Hills Primary—Library Resource Centre	80 000	Demac
Paringa Park Primary—Stage I	745 000	Brick
Salisbury Primary—Library Resource Centre	80 000	Demac
Stanvac Primary	105 000	Samcon
Strathalbyn Primary—Additions	250 000	Demac
Strathalbyn Primary—Library Resource Centre	85 000	Demac
Two Wells Primary	450 000	Demac
Waikerie Primary—Library Resource Centre	90 000	Demac
Willunga Primary—Library Resource Centre	90 000	Demac
General—		
Port Noarlunga Primary—Civil Works	70 000	—
Seacliff Primary—Civil Works	100 000	—
Area Schools—		
New—		
Karcultaby Area	1 700 000	Samcon
High Schools—		
Major Additions—		
Augusta Park High—Stage III	650 000	Samcon
Burra High (including Primary)	2 300 000	Brick
Kadina High—Additions Type B	850 000	Brick
Kidman Park High—Stage II	420 000	Brick
Nailsworth High—Stages I and II	2 300 000	Brick
Salisbury East High—Additions Type A ..	700 000	Brick
Seaton High—Stage II	210 000	Brick

APPENDIX I—continued

SCHOOL BUILDINGS—continued

Major Works to be Commenced During 1975-76—continued

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
Special Schools—		
Kidman Park Guidance Centre	150 000	Demac
Riverland Special School	350 000	Demac
Subsidised Works—		
Campbelltown High—Multi-Purpose Hall	450 000	Brick
Enfield High—Multi-Purpose Hall	500 000	Brick
Findon High—Multi-Purpose Hall	300 000	Brick
Technical Colleges and Further Education Centres—		
Marleston Technical College—School of Wool and Textiles	195 000	Demac
Regency Park Community College	3 085 000	Precast Concrete Panels

Major Projects for which Planning and Design is Proposed During 1975-76

Primary and Junior Primary Schools—		Gawler High—Additions
Augusta Park Primary		Glossop High—Craft Additions
Bellevue Heights Primary		Heathfield High—Additions
Coromandel Valley Primary		Kidman Park High—Stage III
Coromandel Valley South Primary		Le Fevre High—Stages II and III
Fulham North Junior Primary		Marden High—Library
Kidman Park Junior Primary		Marryatville High
Morphett Vale South Primary		Mawson High—Stage II
Narrung Primary		Modbury High—Additions
Osborne Primary		Modbury Heights High
Paradise Primary		Morphett Vale East High
Redwood Park Primary		Murray Bridge—Second High
Richmond Primary		Para Hills High—Art/Craft Building
Salisbury Downs Primary—Stage II		Penola High—Library
Salisbury—Winzor Street Primary		Playford High—Library
Seaton West Primary		Port Pirie High—Art/Craft Facilities
West Lakes Shore Primary		Seaton High—Stage III
Whyalla West Primary		Strathmont High
Woodville Primary		Thebarton Community Centre
		Vermont High—Stage III
		Whyalla High—Additions
Area Schools—		Special Schools—
Ceduna Area		Christies Beach Special School
Kingscote Area		Port Augusta Special School
Meningie Area		Whyalla Special School
High Schools—		Technical Colleges and Further Education Centres—
Angle Park Community Centre		Croydon Park Technical College
Augusta Park High—Stage IV		Gawler Further Education Centre
Bordertown High—Library		Gilles Plains Community College
Dover High—Stage II		Kilkenny Technical College
Dover High—Stage III		Noarlunga Community College
Elizabeth West High—Additions		Regency Park Community College
Enfield High—Additions		Riverland F.E.C. Theatre
Flinders High (Whyalla)		Whyalla Technical College
Fremont High—Stages I and II		

Appendix II

STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATION AUTHORITIES FOR ACTUAL PAYMENTS FROM THE LOAN ACCOUNT, 1974-75

Loan Undertaking	Appropriation Authorities							
	Pursuant to the Public Purposes Loan Act, 1974				Pursuant to Section 32b, Public Finance Act	Total Appropriation Authorities	Actual Payments	
	Schedule to the Act	Variations Made Pursuant to Section 6(3) of the Act		Total Appropriation Authorities as Varied				
		Increase	Decrease					
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	
State Bank	Advances for Homes	20 000	2 000	—	22 000	—	22 000	17 498
	Loans to Producers	2 450 000	500 000	—	2 950 000	—	2 950 000	2 950 000
	Advances to Settlers	80 000	15 000	—	95 000	—	95 000	81 329
	Loans for Fencing and Water Piping	10 000	—	—	10 000	—	10 000	2 338
	Advances to State Bank	2 000 000	—	—	2 000 000	—	2 000 000	2 000 000
	Student Hostels	40 000	—	—	40 000	—	40 000	—
Highways and Local Government	Roads and Bridges	1 000 000	—	1 000 000	—	—	—	—
	South-Western Suburbs Drainage	450 000	—	17 000	433 000	—	433 000	271 077
	Other Urban Drainage	1 800 000	—	—	1 800 000	—	1 800 000	1 650 306
	Public Parks	250 000	—	—	250 000	—	250 000	250 000
Lands, Irrigation and Drainage	Lands Department—Buildings, Plant, etc.	400 000	—	—	400 000	—	400 000	329 431
	Irrigation and Reclamation of Swamp Lands	2 300 000	400 000	—	2 700 000	—	2 700 000	2 623 770
	South-Eastern Drainage	100 000	—	—	100 000	—	100 000	88 782
	Renmark Irrigation Trust	500 000	100 000	—	600 000	—	600 000	600 000
	Lyrup Village Association	10 000	15 000	—	25 000	—	25 000	23 937
Woods and Forests	Afforestation and Timber Milling	4 200 000	—	—	4 200 000	500 000	4 700 000	4 700 000
Railways	Railway Accommodation	12 600 000	—	1 840 000	10 760 000	—	10 760 000	9 982 837
Marine and Harbors	Harbors Accommodation	5 800 000	120 000	—	5 920 000	1 300 000	7 220 000	7 219 658
	West Lakes Development	5 000	—	—	5 000	—	5 000	2 850
	North Haven Development	40 000	—	—	40 000	—	40 000	1
	Fishing Havens	250 000	—	—	250 000	—	250 000	249 910
Engineering and Water Supply	Waterworks and Sewers	35 860 000	—	—	35 860 000	12 640 000	48 500 000	48 470 158
	River Murray Weirs, Dams, Locks, etc.	2 250 000	500 000	—	2 750 000	—	2 750 000	2 575 000
Public Buildings	Government Buildings, Land and Services	83 500 000	—	—	83 500 000	13 000 000	96 500 000	94 532 551
Environment and Conservation	Coast Protection Board	100 000	—	—	100 000	—	100 000	100 000
	National Reserves	400 000	370 000	—	70 000	—	70 000	663 232
	State Planning Authority	100 000	—	—	100 000	—	100 000	100 000
Other Capital Advances and Provisions	Electricity Trust of South Australia—Loan to	2 000 000	—	—	2 000 000	4 000 000	6 000 000	6 000 000
	Leigh Creek Coal Field—Loan to	1 000 000	—	—	1 000 000	1 000 000	2 000 000	2 000 000
	Pipelines Authority of South Australia—Loan to	5 000 000	—	—	5 000 000	—	5 000 000	5 000 000
	Municipal Tramways Trust—Loan to	2 400 000	—	—	2 400 000	2 000 000	4 400 000	4 400 000
	Industries Assistance Corporation—Loan to	400 000	—	—	400 000	—	400 000	400 000
	University and Advanced Education Buildings	500 000	—	—	500 000	—	500 000	500 000
	Non-Government Hospital and Institution Buildings	6 000 000	200 000	—	6 200 000	—	6 200 000	6 197 229
	South Australian Housing Trust—Loan to	—	—	—	—	800 000	800 000	791 835
	South Australian Land Commission—Loan to	1 000 000	—	—	1 000 000	1 000 000	2 000 000	—
	Monarto Development Commission—Loan to	1 000 000	—	—	1 000 000	—	1 000 000	1 000 000
Miscellaneous	Expenses and Discounts of Floating Conversion and Public Loans	500 000	—	15 000	485 000	—	485 000	335 011
	Department of Transport—Research and Development	600 000	—	—	600 000	—	600 000	482 703
	Mines Department—Buildings, Plant, etc.	510 000	—	—	510 000	—	510 000	509 843
	Government Printing Department—Plant, Machinery, Stores, etc.	350 000	120 000	—	470 000	—	470 000	424 444
	Produce Department—Buildings, Plant, etc.	250 000	160 000	—	410 000	—	410 000	375 436
	State Supply Department—Stores	100 000	550 000	—	650 000	—	650 000	450 000
	Education Department—School Buses	815 000	—	—	815 000	—	815 000	800 814
	Department of the Public Service Board—Data Processing Equipment	1 400 000	120 000	—	1 520 000	—	1 520 000	1 505 057
	Department of Fisheries—Boats and Facilities, etc.	45 000	—	—	45 000	—	45 000	43 567
	Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport—Recreational and Sporting Facilities, etc.	800 000	—	300 000	500 000	—	500 000	499 972
	Total	181 185 000	3 172 000	3 172 000	181 185 000	36 240 000	217 425 000	211 200 576*

*Includes \$221 811 discount on loan raisings

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

The clauses of the Bill are in the normal form. Clause 1 gives the short title in the usual way. Clause 2 specifies the operative date of the Bill. Clause 3 gives definitions, as in the past. Clause 4 sets out the moneys which make up the Loan Fund. Clause 5 provides for the borrowing of South Australia's known allocation of \$112 950 000 for 1975-76. It has additional authority in general terms to cover a possible supplementary allocation and also any increased indebtedness due to discounts.

Clause 6 provides for the expenditure of \$241 475 000 on the purposes set out in the first schedule. Clause 7 authorises those advances made in 1974-75 by way of warrant pursuant to section 32b of the Public Finance Act. Clause 8 makes the usual provisions for temporary finance, if required.

Clause 9 gives the normal authority for borrowing and expenditure of Loan moneys in the early months of 1976-77. Clause 10 gives the normal authority for the Treasurer to borrow against issue of Treasury bills or by bank overdraft, if necessary. This overdraft authority, which has been held at \$2 000 000 for some years is now to be raised to \$4 000 000. Clause 11 directs that all moneys received by the State under any Acts of the Commonwealth relating to roads or transport shall be credited to special accounts to be paid out as required for the purposes of those Acts.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate in motion for adoption.
(Continued from August 13. Page 235.)

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. In doing so, I commend His Excellency for the gracious manner with which he carried out another of his State duties. We in Rocky River frequently see our Governor; he attends our rural shows. Recently, I think back in April, he was invited to Wirrabara to open the senior citizens' new hall. He was also invited to have lunch with the senior citizens at Wirrabara on that day, but he chose not to do so but to go to the Wirrabara forest, where he was met by the ranger and had lunch in the forest. I am told they spread the table cloth on the bonnet of the Rolls Royce and had lunch there. It was a beautiful day. The Governor eventually got to Wirrabara, where he officially opened the extensions to the senior citizens' hall. It was a remarkable day, because there were many hundreds of people there. His Excellency was led to the dais to perform the opening ceremony. A slight breeze was blowing, his white locks were flowing and the dais was fairly insecure. The first words of His Excellency were, "I wonder whether this dais will hold a white Oliphant."

I congratulate you, Sir, on your appointment as Speaker of this House. You have similar characteristics to His Excellency: your hair had to weather the northern winds of the State and perhaps the effect of the sulphur blowing over Port Pirie from time to time. I also extend a welcome to the new members in this Chamber. Their contributions already have been of significance, and I wish them well in this Chamber of the House. Relationships become somewhat heated at different times: we all have a job to do, irrespective of the Party to which we belong.

I was interested to read the speech of an honourable member who has taken his place in another place; his maiden speech. I mention it because there are many

of us who got a mention, and I would call the speech a "resurrection speech" because there were some people mentioned in that speech who are no longer with us. Some of the comments made by the honourable member have been complimentary, and some have not been quite so complimentary. I get a special mention, in that the honourable member says I am not a bad type. I am pleased about that, because in the election campaign my opposition would have the people believe that I was not a very good type. Knowing the honourable gentleman and realising his knowledge of what he was talking about, I go along with him and appreciate his point.

Some former members of Parliament have died during the past few months and it was significant that, during the evening on which the House rose prior to the election, two knights fell. I speak of Sir Lyell McEwin and Sir Arthur Rymill, both of whom contributed a wealth of knowledge to Parliament in this State.

Mr. Duncan: I am surprised that you should mention wealth in that context.

Mr. VENNING: I refer also to Gordon Gilfillan and Ross Story, who had been members for some years, who had gained considerable knowledge, and who contributed greatly to this Parliament and to the rural areas of this State (Ross Story being a former Minister of Agriculture). Although the Hon. Gordon Gilfillan resided in the metropolitan area as well as at Jamestown, he contributed greatly to the rural aspect of government. I wish to dwell on my reference to Sir Norman Jude, because he came out to Australia many years ago as a Barwell boy. In the early 1920's, you may remember, Mr. Speaker, Sir Henry Barwell (once a Premier of this State), in consultation with the British Government, brought young men out to Australia to work on farms, particularly in South Australia. Sir Norman worked on properties, married, entered Parliament and rose to the top, receiving a knighthood for his contribution to this State's welfare.

During his term in Parliament, he was Minister of Local Government, and I remember his being in the Rocky River District as guest speaker on one occasion. At the conclusion of his address at this public meeting, a gentleman was asked to move a vote of thanks to the Hon. Sir Norman. At about that time the Highways Department had introduced white lines on our sealed roads, and this gentleman paid a compliment to Sir Norman because often when returning home late at night these lines on the bitumen road had been a great guide to him in getting to his house.

The most recent election was an interesting one, particularly in an area adjacent to Rocky River, namely, in the seat of Pirie, and I suppose that if you, Mr. Speaker, had not been appointed Speaker, we would have heard more from you if you had been occupying a bench in this House. It was an interesting election, because the Liberal Party tried to field candidates in Pirie as well. This was not easy because, whoever we approached, the usual comment was, "We are supporting Ted Connelly." Eventually, we succeeded in getting someone to represent our Party at the election. The Premier went to Port Pirie to launch the campaign for the Australian Labor Party and, in an article in the *Recorder* of June 30, under the heading "Dunstan Slates Mayor—'On Ego Trip'", the following extracts appear:

The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, has slated the Mayor, Mr. Connelly, for opposing the endorsed A.L.P. candidate for Pirie, Mr. Jack Phelan, and has called on Labor supporters to unite for the sake of the Party. Mr. Dunstan made an emotional plea for unity at the A.L.P. rally at the

Port Pirie Town Hall on Thursday night. A crowd of about 180 people attended the meeting to hear Mr. Dunstan launch Labor's campaign to retain the seat of Pirie.

What a small number of people to attend the opening campaign in a place as large as Port Pirie! I had more people in Clare listening to the back-bencher for Rocky River open his campaign in that town. The article continues:

The meeting was chaired by the retiring member for Pirie, Mr. McKee. Mr. Dunstan said he had known Mr. Mr. Phelan for a long time. In this Party it is not enough to be a card-carrying member. What the Labor Party looks for is a man who devotes time, energy and loyalty to the cause of the people of this State.

What a comment to make! Here, as Speaker, we have the right man to do that for Port Pirie. The article continues:

Mr. Dunstan said that Mr. Connelly had sought Labor preselection on a pledge to support his Government and had now announced that he would stand against Mr. Phelan. He said it was a matter of great enormity for someone who claimed membership on the Labor Party to break such a pledge. Mr. Dunstan said that a person who unsuccessfully sought preselection and then decided to stand against the endorsed candidate was embarking on an "ego trip".

What did the Premier have to say in reply to a question a few days ago?

Mr. Goldsworthy: He proved a point, didn't he?

Mr. VENNING: For sure.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What are they going to do about preselection?

Mr. VENNING: That may prove to be an important issue. I believe that the Pirie voters should have been allowed to select their own candidate, but this has been the problem for many years. I have been told that the Premier has given an undertaking that he will recommend that, in future, Pirie voters be allowed to select their own candidate. I hope that this will apply not only in Pirie and Mount Gambier but also in other areas of the State. I have never heard of such a situation whereby the executive in Adelaide selects the candidates in remote areas. The article continues:

During question time, Mr. Dunstan was challenged by an A.L.P. supporter who said that he wanted to vote for Mr. Connelly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. VENNING: One of these days when I have the time, opportunity and inclination I will attend an A.L.P. meeting and I shall be able to give my colleagues information on how they are conducted: I will even make my identity known.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. VENNING: During question time at the meeting Mr. Dunstan was challenged by an A.L.P. supporter who said he wanted to vote for Mr. Connelly. Mr. Dunstan said that this man had said he wanted to vote for Mr. Connelly 20 years ago, but was told he had to support Mr. McKee. The article states:

"Anyone who is out to split this unity is not out to help Labor, but the enemies of the Labor Party", Mr. Dunstan said.

On that occasion the Premier was asked many questions, and he said that he was not able to make any promises to the people of Port Pirie. That was on June 30. The

Premier said that three projects were under study that could provide future jobs in Port Pirie. These were a uranium enrichment plant, a cellulose industry and a soda ash plant, attached to the Redcliff petro-chemical refinery. We know what happened to the refinery: the day after the election that went by the board. It is rather unusual that we did not hear something about it before the election. I believe that, if that information and the truth had been known before that day, I would not be making this speech from this side of the House. That was one aspect of the Premier's trip to Port Pirie to promote his candidate. He must have returned again to Port Pirie, because an article in the *Recorder* of July 9 (which is two or three days before the election, when he went there to buy votes from the people of Port Pirie) states:

The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, yesterday announced the construction of a \$410 000 bridge over the upper reaches of the Port Pirie River at Solomontown.

If any other members or any other candidates had done that, it would have been considered to be buying votes, and their seats would have been declared vacant immediately. The article continues:

The bridge to be built at Solomontown would provide access to available area close to the centre of Port Pirie which had remained undeveloped from lack of suitable access.

Those who receive the *Recorder* will know what comments followed that announcement. Comments such as, "An approach over the water where—no-where". An article in the *Recorder*, August 6, eight days ago, states:

A start on the proposed \$410 000 Solomontown bridge has been postponed due to the suspension of the Regional Employment Development scheme.

I would be interested to know how the Premier could go up to Port Pirie and make this announcement about spending over \$400 000, when we understand that it was to be RED money, that is, Commonwealth money. That is bad enough. The article continues:

This was revealed in a letter to the Port Pirie City Council from the Director of Marine and Harbors, Mr. J. R. Sainsbury. The council recently wrote to Mr. Sainsbury asking him to come to Port Pirie to discuss the inclusion of sluice gates in the design of the new bridge. The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, announced prior to the recent State election that the bridge would be built across the Solomontown embankment. He said it would be financed under the RED scheme and would employ about 40 men.

Mr. Dunstan said work was expected to start immediately. However, Mr. Sainsbury told the council this week that the Australian Government had instructed that work should not proceed on any RED project which, although approved, had not been started. He said the bridge came within this category.

Mr. Sainsbury said he would be pleased to discuss proposals for the bridge with the council, but said that it would be prudent to wait until after the Commonwealth Budget was brought down on August 19. It was the Commonwealth Government's intention to review the RED scheme and re-assess priorities.

Mr. Sainsbury said any sluice gates provided in the Solomontown bank to empty completely the impounded area over the period of an ebbing tide would need to have an effective opening width of over 33 metres.

The article continues:

The Deputy Mayor, Ald. W. G. Jones, who chaired the meeting said the council should invite Mr. Sainsbury to visit Pirie for discussions on the project. He said that 100 tonnes of steel had already been delivered for the bridge. The city engineer, Mr. Wood, told the council he could not see any point in building the bridge. He said officers of the Coast Protection Board had advised him that mangroves growing on the eastern side of the Pirie River could not be removed.

"So, if we cannot develop this area, what is the point of the new bridge?" Mr. Wood asked.

And so the interesting story goes on, with the Premier doing his best to slate the present member for Pirie before his being elected. Another comment that I make is related to the meeting of June 30. The article in the *Recorder* states:

After the meeting, Mr. Dunstan told the Recorder that Mr. Connelly, who is still a member of the Labor Party, would be automatically expelled as soon as he officially nominated for the seat of Pirie. "No action is necessary by either the State executive or the local branch—it is automatic. He will be out of the party", Mr. Dunstan said.

I would have loved to be present on the occasion after the election when the Premier met you, Mr. Speaker, for the first time! He must have looked very sheepish. However, that is the situation, and, after all that, I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment to his high office, and I congratulate you on the manner in which you are carrying out your office, particularly as you have not previously been in Parliament before as a member. In the previous Parliament I assisted the Speaker from time to time. He may have told you, or you may have heard about it. That was only of necessity, but I do not believe that it will be necessary for me to assist while you are in that honourable position.

Before I leave the aspect of the election, it was particularly noticeable that the Prime Minister of Australia kept out of our State. Perhaps very conveniently he saw fit to call the two Commonwealth Houses together about the loans scandal, because that tied up Commonwealth members and the Prime Minister and kept them out of our State. Also it kept away many of the so-called heavies of our Party involved with the calling together of the Commonwealth Parliament. It was particularly noticeable and convenient for the Premier of this State to have the Prime Minister of Australia kept out of this State at election time. Is it not shocking that the Prime Minister of Australia should have been snubbed by his own colleagues in one part of Australia? The Labor Party did not want him at its convention a few weeks before that and suggested he should not come, although he did sneak in for a short time. It is all interesting history now, but Opposition members are not blind, and notice these things. I call your attention to the state of the House, Mr. Speaker.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. VENNING: Paragraph 4 of His Excellency's Speech states:

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.

Whatever scheme the Government introduces, I sincerely hope the number of country seats will not be reduced. Perhaps additional seats should be provided in the metropolitan area, but I do not support a reduction of the number of country seats. The Governor (and remember his Speech is really the Labor Party policy) continues:

My Government will pursue its policy of preserving as far as possible the character and amenities of the rural areas.

If the Government is to pursue that policy, it must not reduce the number of rural seats in the State. To ensure that the quality of country representation will not be impaired the number of country seats must not be reduced. The words "as far as possible" are extremely important because, if they are removed from what His Excellency said, the sentence would state:

My Government will pursue its policy of preserving the character and amenities of rural areas.

Those words are important because, when an issue is raised, they can provide the Government with a let-out. One of the most important aspects of the Governor's Speech relates to the redistribution of electoral boundaries. I appeal to members opposite to consider country people, who do not have many of the amenities enjoyed by people in the metropolitan area, and hope that, with our assistance, an equitable redistribution can be reached.

Rural industry has been experiencing trying times, having just emerged from an extremely dry period. Rural people rely entirely on the weather. It seems as though it was only a few weeks ago that this State and other States of the Commonwealth experienced a record year with adequate rainfall, feed, and so on. However, almost before one could turn around Australia was experiencing drought conditions. The situation has improved a little in the past few days. The member for Frome yesterday outlined the problem facing the cattle industry in South Australia. His Excellency referred to improving the quality of the State's livestock by proceeding with a campaign to eradicate brucellosis. I listened with much interest to what he said about that matter, but eradicating the disease only keeps cattle alive, when we in the rural areas would like to see them dead—slaughtered in the proper manner. We in the rural areas of the State would like to see the Government find markets for our cattle. At present country areas are being overrun with cattle that should have been marketed long ago but, because of low prices, farmers are holding back cattle. The rural industry has not really reached the critical period. We are now approaching spring and will not have the carry-over of feed we had last year. Action will have to be taken to overcome the overstocking that is prevalent throughout the State.

One good aspect of Government policy is that it is providing assistance to farmers on Eyre Peninsula at the rate of 75c a head for stock. That assistance is certainly helping people in the area, and there would be much merit in the Government's considering extending that assistance to other areas of the State. The Commonwealth Government has set aside \$3 000 000 to assist the beef industry in South Australia. When the Minister of Agriculture announced that this assistance would be made available, many people said the sum would be insufficient and that more should be provided. Knowing that these funds would be distributed through the rural industries office, I said that, although the money was really insufficient, it would turn out to be enough because of the stringent manner in which this office hands out the money. The Minister has now requested a report to ascertain why more applications have not been made for financial assistance in this regard.

Under the scheme, to qualify cattlemen have to derive 85 per cent of their income from cattle breeding. The maximum sum they can receive in assistance is \$10 000. Recently, I read that the United States Government provides farmers with assistance of \$350 000 each, which is about \$250 000 Australian. It makes one smile to compare the situation applying in the two countries. American cattlemen have to derive only 25 per cent of their income from cattle breeding to participate in the scheme, so it is obvious that American cattlemen get a better deal than do Australian farmers. Another matter hampering the rural industry is the continual industrial strife that is experienced in South Australia. Of course, the labour force chooses the right time to strike—during the lambing season or when cattle are arriving at the abattoir! It is at that time that slaughtermen or meat inspectors decide to improve their conditions, irrespective of the effect on the rural industry and the producers

who have delivered stock. The labour force could not care less; it takes the opportunity to straighten out its differences, irrespective of the loss to the man who has sent stock to the abattoir.

Mr. Wells: That is because he won't negotiate.

Mr. VENNING: It is not the farmer who has to negotiate, but he is the one who gets it in the neck every time.

Mr. McRae: He is represented on the board.

Mr. VENNING: The farmer is not represented on Samcor board; everyone is represented on Samcor except the primary producer, although he has tried. The unions have a representative. At the time that Samcor was established the primary producers made clear that they should be represented on the board, but it was said that Samcor had nothing to do with the primary producer: he merely supplied the stock. When an approach was recently made with regard to worker participation at Samcor, it was stated that there had been worker participation for years; it was nothing new. The union representative was previously on the Abattoirs Board, and he is now on the Samcor board. The interjection indicates that members opposite do not know much about the rural situation or the marketing situation.

In His Excellency's Speech the Government has also indicated that a move will be made during this session to introduce legislation that will mean that the slaughtering of livestock for human consumption can take place only in the most hygienic conditions. We all agree that livestock for human consumption must be killed under hygienic conditions, but the legislation is of great concern to country people. Indeed, it concerns only country people because for people in the metropolitan area stock is slaughtered at the abattoir, where there are meat inspectors. So, it will not affect the situation there, but it applies 99 per cent to the rural area. It will affect the country town with a slaughter house that is now supervised by a local government board of health, and to good effect. Of course, farmers have always killed their own meat, and without costly inspections. Many fine specimens of primary producer have been developed in this State under the conditions that have existed up to the present. I therefore see no need to carry this legislation to the extent that the Government intends.

If the legislation is implemented, areas like the North will have to draw meat from Port Pirie or Peterborough. I do not know whether Clare will have to draw its supplies from Gepps Cross. This will increase costs considerably, and charges are high enough already. A butcher will have to deliver his stock to the slaughtering works, and he will have to go back in another vehicle and pick up the carcasses. Orroroo, a flourishing country town by today's standards, has been told that it will have to get meat from Peterborough. In that case the Orroroo butcher's costs will be so high that he will have to close his shop, because when Orroroo people go to Peterborough to buy their meat they will also buy their groceries and other goods, and that will be the end of an important town like Orroroo. It is for this reason that I am concerned about the proposed legislation.

I am concerned about the allocation of finance to towns throughout the State. Large sums have been poured into the large towns in the iron triangle. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. VENNING: Councillor Jones, the Acting Mayor of Port Pirie in the absence of Mr. Ted Connelly on Parliamentary duties, was reported in the *Advertiser* of January

5 (and this was also in the *Recorder*) as saying that the council was embarrassed at the amount of money it had received, because it was impossible to spend the sums received under the various grants. Of course, there are no guidelines as to the spending of money in those areas, but for small country towns it is clearly laid down exactly how the money is to be spent, if and when they get an allocation.

Mr. Max Brown: Have you been to Ceduna lately?

Mr. VENNING: I can speak only about my own district. I can speak of Wilmington and Melrose, towns that are battling to survive. They try to get allocations from the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport, but for some reason or other the answer is always in the negative. However, towns in the iron triangle seem to get around the technicalities and they get large sums, while towns struggling to survive do not get anything at all; or, if they get anything, it is a small pittance that is tied by guidelines as to how it should be spent.

Clare was recently allocated \$20 000. Although Clare had some unemployed people registered, those people were not employed: people were sent from elsewhere. This means that the last people on the register are the last to get a job. Those on the register for the longest period get the work. The authorities even sent to Clare a fellow who had his arm in plaster. I am concerned that so much money has been made available to areas where much of it has not been put to good use, while some small towns and councils are in great trouble. Their grants and allocations for debit order work have diminished. The District Council of Spalding made effective use of the small amount of money it received from the rural industries branch. In 1971-72, it received a highways grant of \$37 577, including a debit order of \$16 300; in 1972-73, it received a highways grant of \$51 000, including a debit order of \$29 000; in 1973-74, it received a highways grant of \$34 525, including a debit order of \$13 000; in 1974-75, it received a highways grant of \$23 097 and no debit order, but it received its first Commonwealth grant of \$4 000. The total for 1974-75 was \$27 000, compared to \$37 000 in 1971-72, a reduction of \$10 000 despite raging inflation.

In 1975-76, it received a highways grant of \$20 173, with no debit order but a Commonwealth grant of \$8 000, making a total of \$28 000, which is \$9 000 less than it received in 1971-72. That is bad enough, but the outcome is that the Spalding council has had to lay off three of its staff, and it has had to borrow money to sack its men. It has had to borrow \$4 500 to pay these men off. Its overdraft is up to the limit, and it has applied to the Minister to borrow money to pay off its overdraft so that it can carry on. It has increased its rates by 23 per cent recently. That is just one example of the situation in rural areas under the administration of the Australian Labor Party socialist Government in this State in carrying out the major plan of the Commonwealth Government in Australia. The Spalding council is awaiting the result of the Budget, but if I know anything about the situation it will not get much assistance from the Budget, because it is part of the plan of this Government, through suppression and lack of finance, to force councils into amalgamation. Councils did not want to amalgamate voluntarily, so the Royal Commission was set up and now the Government has decided it will achieve its objective another way—by cutting off the finances.

The Railways (Transfer Agreement) Bill needs to be mentioned this afternoon because of the situation concerning the assets of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited (the present assets of which are

\$80 000 000 in silos alone), which are not referred to in the transfer agreement. Deputations have been made to the Minister and correspondence has been entered into with him by the co-operative but it has not been able in this House to get anything written into the legislation. After much pressure, we were able to get something written into the legislation in another place, but that was knocked out on the numbers, so the legislation to hand over non-metropolitan railways to the Commonwealth does not mention the \$80 000 000 assets of the co-operative. Primary producers in this State await with anxiety the position concerning silos and their operation in the future.

Primary producers are also concerned about legislation relating to the permitted carrying capacity of trucks. The legislation has been deferred from time to time. When legislation is deferred so many times, it should be thrown out because there is so much uncertainty about it. It is significant that the Minister saw fit to defer it over the election period in order not to lose greater favour with the primary producers than was necessary at the time. I believe the legislation will be reintroduced, and that permits will be issued to people in certain areas of the State. Last year when this was discussed we were led to believe that primary producers would have no trouble in getting a permit to carry loads similar to those they had been carrying in areas where the terrain would cause no danger. Producers on the peninsula were led to believe they would be able to carry their normal loads to the nearest silos, but it now looks as though the restriction that will be placed on their loads will be the gross vehicle weight as specified by the maker, plus 40 per cent. However, over a period of five years this 40 per cent can be phased out and the actual capacity of vehicles will be that specified by the maker of that vehicle.

That will cause complications regarding the cost of delivering grain to the silos. I hope that somewhere along the line common sense will prevail and that this limitation will not be forced on the growers of this State. The safety record of farmers is good. I do not think any other industry could claim the safety record of the farmer who delivers his grain to the silo. That in itself should be sufficient to persuade the Minister to listen with common sense to the comments put forward by members on this side of the House and by members of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated who have waited on the Minister from time to time. Unfortunately, the Minister's comments seem to differ from those of the people involved. The one battle that was won by the primary producers concerned land tax, which has now been reduced on rural land. The Government has indicated that, although it has reduced land tax on rural land, it expects to increase revenue from land tax from \$12 000 000 to \$18 000 000 this year, so it will have to increase land tax somewhere. It will be of assistance to some primary producers to receive a reduction in land tax.

The Premier mentioned succession duties in his policy speech, and they were also referred to in the Governor's Speech. Succession duty has always been a problem for the man on the land. The Premier has said that a house should be held in joint tenancy. Many people have followed this advice, and they have been surprised to learn the cost involved in changing the title of a house from single ownership to joint ownership. I am told by those associated with it that the stamp duty is high indeed. It is most unfair that, when a primary producer gets into trouble, he has to walk off the property before he

can collect any social services. However, a man in a job, who is earning \$150 to \$200 a week, can be given the sack and can immediately collect social services. Fair enough, unfortunate primary producers (and areas of the State that missed out on rain, as well as some coastal areas, will find it tough this year) will have to struggle through.

In difficult periods before, it was only a matter of tightening the belt and we would all struggle through. Today things are difficult. Costs are so high that, whereas an income trickling through in difficult times was once enough, a farmer needs a stream of finance running today to keep his head above water. I am concerned about cases of the type I have described. I thank the people for Rocky River who have supported me again, and have elected me to represent them in this House for another term. It was an interesting election—short, sharp and shiny.

Mr. Slater: Did you get the Labor Party preferences this time?

Mr. VENNING: Yes, I did. It is rather interesting that today's Clare newspaper shows a photo of my opponent, with the caption, "Labor Party did not want me". I do not know that they want me, either. I got some of the preferences, but not all of them; there was a fair swing. I consider it an honour to be here representing the rural District of Rocky River, and I look forward to an enjoyable period doing what I can for those people, not only those who supported me but the people who are my constituents. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for the Environment) moved:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): Mr. Speaker, I support the motion. I compliment the mover and seconder (the member for Price and the member for Spence), who both made their maiden speeches in this House. I wish them well in their careers in this Parliament. I also extend to you, Mr. Speaker, along with other members, my congratulations on your election, and on your election to the office of Speaker. I am sure you have proved already your capabilities in respect of that position. The Governor's Speech contained the Government's legislative programme for this session. It is a continuation of the policies of the Government, policies that have been endorsed by the electors of South Australia on three occasions in the last five years. I do not intend to speak at length. I do not have the same problem with brucellosis, as has the member for Rocky River, or rust in my wheat, like the member for Mallee.

At the election on July 12, the people of this State endorsed the policies of the Government. I want to allay any misconceptions relating to the election result. We are still on this side of the Chamber; the Opposition Parties are still on the other side of the Chamber. It has been said by the member for Hanson, the member for Light, and the press, that we won by a handful of votes. The handful of votes I conclude they are alluding to is the supposed handful in the Gilles District. Perhaps we should have a look at the result in Gilles. Slater, the Australian Labor Party candidate, received 8 626 votes; Ravesi, the Liberal candidate, got 4 333 votes; the Liberal Movement candidate got 3 900 votes; and Clifton, the Independent, got 265 votes. That appears to me to be a victory by more than a handful of votes; it is an outright majority. Yet, according to the press, to the former

Leader of the Opposition and other members who have spoken on the other side, that is only a handful of votes. In fact, it is an outright majority, and it is very satisfying. On the other side, I think eight or nine members won on preferences. My election was by an outright majority; no allocation of preferences was necessary in my case.

At every election in the past five years, the various political and press pundits around the place have always considered Gilles to be a marginal seat. I am aware of the nature of the district, but on every occasion the Labor vote has been maintained. On the last occasion a rather supreme effort was made by the Opposition Parties to win Gilles. All of the Commonwealth heavy artillery was brought to bear. Malcolm Fraser, Snedden, Lynch, and others were flitting around the district in support of their candidate. The member for Mitcham was there, too. I understand Mr. Ravesi's selection as a candidate was supposed to influence the migrant voter. He claimed to be representative of the migrant community, and, I might add, a good sportsman. I understand from his publicity that he was a handball champion. I am afraid that he proved not only to be a bad competitor but also a bad loser, which is even worse.

He does not actually live in the district. He lives in the suburb of Beaumont, but he made occasional forays from his mansion up in that area. Of course, Beaumont is a working class area! His appeal to the migrant community was practically negligible. As a consequence he received about 4 000 primary votes. The L.M. candidate was the Mayor of Payneham. He fared even worse than the Liberal candidate. I take it he was especially selected because of his position as Mayor; I cannot think of any other reason. He received 3 900 votes, and ran a poor third. I am happy about the result of the election from my personal point of view and from my Party's point of view.

Mr. Chapman: Are they happy with you?

Mr. SLATER: I am sure the electors are happy with me, and that I will get the Party endorsement at the next election.

Mr. Chapman: That is a note of confidence, isn't it?

Mr. SLATER: I will admit that. Considering all the circumstances involved in the campaign, I believe the return of the Labor Government was a noteworthy achievement. What is happening in relation to the Commonwealth scene is the result of a giant conspiracy against the Australian Government by the press.

Mr. Chapman: In other words, you warn people against the Commonwealth scene.

Mr. SLATER: The conspiracy I am warning them against, my friend, is by the press, big business, and others, along with influences not always indigenous to Australia. Having combined their efforts to displace the Australian Government, they then unsuccessfully directed them towards the South Australian Government. Having made the one point that I considered to be of most importance, I want now to thank the electors of Gilles for their confidence in me, and I want especially to place on record my thanks to those people who worked hard and supported me during the election.

Finally, it is often said by members on the other side (I think they call it the non-Labor side of politics) that if they combined and voted for each other they could be an alternative Government. However, as members opposite do not even talk to each other, they cannot expect their supporters to believe that they will vote for each other. The A.L.P. has always received a majority vote, and it has to beat the other Parties combined. Members

opposite refer to themselves as the non-Labor side of politics when, in fact, there is no such thing, because if they had the opportunity to combine they would not do so. However, that is their fault, not ours. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): Like the member for Gilles, I take much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I am sorry that my attention was diverted to other important matters and I was not able to hear all the fine things that the honourable member was saying about Mr. Ravesi. He said that Mr. Ravesi was a bad loser. Of course, the member for Gilles was in the news, and publicity comes to us all sooner or later in election campaigns. First, it was Mr. Cameron in Millicent, then Mr. Venning in Rocky River, then Mr. Allison and Mr. Burdon in Mount Gambier, and finally we had Mr. Slater, and the gods were on his side.

Mr. Slater: Not the gods—the electors.

Mr. RODDA: The electors were erring, and that was causing all the trouble, but perhaps they had good reason. However, as a good sportsman I welcome the member for Gilles back to this House. Although his happy deliverance is keeping the Minister of Education and his colleagues in office, albeit with some other assistance, I acknowledge the return of the Government. I was interested to hear the forceful address given earlier by the member for Rocky River. The honourable member gave a good address for the people he represents. He espoused and underlined the confidence his electors have placed in him, as did the member for Gilles. I join with my colleagues in supporting this motion for adopting the reply to the Governor's Speech, with which he opened this session of Parliament.

This debate affords all members the opportunity to bring to Parliament's attention any subjects that need ventilation. This debate is an important part of Parliament's function, and reference to any previous Address in Reply debate over the years can be a sobering and valuable exercise. Mr. Speaker, I have congratulated you on your elevation to the Chair, but I believe that I should again make the point that your election to this Parliament underlines the power of the people. When the people are not happy or when they have reason to do so, they change their minds. After the departure from this House of Mr. Stott, Mr. Quirke and Mr. Fletcher it was said that the day of the Independents was over, but, bless you, Mr. Speaker, your election clearly illustrates how wrong the scribes were.

I am sure the Minister of Education must be extremely grateful. It was interesting that the Government's endorsed candidate did not receive the blessing of your electorate, Mr. Speaker. The people of Pirie have elected you, Sir, as their representative in this Parliament. In so doing, they have assured you of a special place in the Parliamentary history of South Australia, as you hold the balance of power. With that you have, Sir, a great responsibility. In his Speech, His Excellency indicated that we are to have an electoral redistribution and you, Mr. Speaker, cannot be unmindful of what His Excellency said on this matter. Amongst other things, His Excellency said:

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.

The phrase "one vote one value" should be examined with the deepest caution and understanding. The value of the vote can have many connotations. On the question of value, an elector in a metropolitan district can contact his local member by making a local telephone call or walking down the street. However, in your electorate of Pirie, Mr. Speaker, and in my District of Victoria, as well as in Rocky River, Eyre, Flinders, Frome, Gouger, Goyder, Alexandra, Kavel, and in all the country districts that will remain after the redistribution, country constituents will be greatly disadvantaged when they wish to contact their local members. In the main, country constituents will have to make a trunk call or engage in an extremely long journey to contact their member. Where is the value of the vote in this example? This is a very cogent point when one looks at the question of a constituent's accessibility to his member.

I can give many examples to highlight this unfair diminution of country representation which is inherent in that paragraph of His Excellency's Speech. It will help lead to the decay of this once proud State, and I greatly regret this. This matter exercises the minds not only of members of this House but also of many people to whom I have spoken since the election. This matter has been brought to the notice of the Government by members on this side, and I know it has been brought to the notice of the Minister of Works, with whom I was proud to be in cohorts as a South-Eastern representative. Indeed, the Minister has experienced this difficulty; even as a Minister, when representing Millicent, he has experienced great disadvantages in getting around to meet people in his district. This problem will be overemphasised by the one vote one value concept.

There has been an increase in the city's population, and I am not opposed to giving extra representation when the population has increased. However, the representation should be increased only when the population has increased. Let us, therefore, have an increased House to take care of this. When one looks at the Parliamentary appropriation in the Budget, one sees that the cheapest thing people get is their Parliamentary representation. Last year, it was a little over \$1·10 a head, which is not a large expenditure.

Mr. Evans: It costs \$1·10 a head each year.

Mr. RODDA: That is so, and we must be available 24 hours a day. Parliamentary representation costs the public only \$1·10 a head each year. So, the size of this House should be increased when the population increases. The Government will not find many Opposition members who would argue with this. I welcome the new members who have entered this place since the election. On the Government benches, we are pleased to welcome the new members for Price (Mr. Whitten) and Spence (Mr. Abbott). Both those gentlemen have distinguished themselves in their respective spheres in the trade union movement. As a Minister, I was privileged to meet both of these gentlemen in connection with the union offices they held, and I found them to be men of their word and honourable in every way. I congratulate both of them on their maiden speeches. It is obvious that they will bring to the Parliament an understanding of their philosophies and general approach to community activities. I am sure that they will appreciate my remarks, and I extend to them a cordial welcome to this Parliament.

On the Opposition benches, we are pleased to welcome the new members for Heysen, Mount Gambier and Millicent, all of whom have special qualifications and who will make their mark in the debates on the various matters that come before the House. The member for Mount Gambier

showed his steel in his maiden speech on the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Bill, and for a new member displayed a rare approach to a difficult and intricate subject. We look forward to his further contributions in this place on the subjects with which he deals. The new member for Heysen also made an excellent contribution in his maiden speech and displayed a fine knowledge of his district, the plight of the rural industry, the importance of secondary industry and the dependence of one on the other. He also referred to the environment and the need for common sense in maintaining control. It was an excellent maiden speech and the foundation of a fine Parliamentary career.

The new member for Millicent, whom I have known for many years, comes from a fine and respected Yorke Peninsula family, and is widely known and respected in the South-East as a member of grower organisations, as a leader in sporting activities, and in his own community at Kingston and Lucindale. His maiden speech was worthy of mention, covering as it did a wide aspect of his district. He displayed a knowledge of and a concern for the people he is pleased to represent. His speech heralded the start of a fine Parliamentary career for a member who obviously cares for the individual. The member for Millicent struck out on a discussion involving *homo sapiens* and eugenics and dealt with matters that were indeed close to the nitty gritty of keeping the race pure. It will do members good to read his Address in Reply speech, for they will see that he is a man of great attainments.

I congratulate the five new members and you, Sir, with them. All the new members have proved that they have special qualities, which they bring into this place in their own ways. I am sure they will endear themselves to the Parliament and other members. I should like, Sir, to say something about your predecessors who have gone the way that all of us in this place go. Speaking about the new member for Mount Gambier reminded me of the former member (Mr. Allan Burdon) who, with the Deputy Premier, has been my Parliamentary colleague from the South-East for the past 11 years in this Parliament. I welcome the new members for Millicent and Mount Gambier into what is now called the blue triangle. It was formerly the green triangle, but for some reason the people in that area have decided to splash some blue paint around, as three Liberal members of Parliament now represent that area. In saying this, I am not unmindful of the contribution made to that part of the State by Allan Burdon and Des Corcoran. Our association was a happy one and we were on all fours at all times regarding the progress of the South-East, and we never had any disagreements on local issues. All three supported each other on district matters. Indeed, we achieved much from that area of the State, and I pay a tribute to Allan Burdon not only as a man but also as a friend and for what he did for his district. I also pay a tribute to Des Corcoran who, as a member of the Cabinet, has always been only too pleased to help out with any matters that have come before us.

We now have a changed scene in the Upper House, the new members of which are in their early days. I think that some of the new members, although not derogatory in their remarks about the Upper House, wonder about it. However, I give them this encouragement: it is still only early days for them, and they will have a special place in the House of Review when they are examining legislation. I am sure they will settle down to their task, and the Minister at present in the Chamber will probably find that they will even criticise some of the

things that he sends up there. I am sure, however, that the Minister will not mind that, as two heads are better than one and, after all, that is the function of the bicameral system of Parliament.

I have read most of the speeches which have been made and which have been varied. The Hon. Mr. Dunford took the long handle to some of my colleagues. I suppose he meant it. I was interested to hear what he said about filling the chaff bags. As the Minister knows, I grew up on a wheat farm on the West Coast, and this sort of thing did happen on the rural scene. It was only natural that people felt sore about it. However, the Hon. Mr. Dunford said that he got even by drying off the cows. However, we must look forwards, not backwards. The Hon. Mr. Dunford has echoed something that happened in the past, and we know it went on. It is early days for him and I am sure he will become a useful member of that place.

The Hon. Anne Levy caused some headlines by wanting to legalise some things that we do not like. However, I think she was taking a soft line. Dr. Cornwall, whom we all know, is a veterinary surgeon from the South-East. The Hon. Mr. Foster was a former colourful member of the House of Representatives. Mr. Blevins, whom I do not know, is a sailor, and then there is Mr. Sumner. I extend to all those new members a welcome to this Parliament. I also refer to the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw and the Hon. Mr. Carnie, the latter of whom (to quote himself) has "come home", but this time to another place. He was formerly a member of this place but has now gone to the House of Review. I also extend a welcome to those honourable members.

The previous Parliament ended abruptly, and we did not have the opportunity for the usual valedictories to departing members. That is to be regretted, because among those who retired were some who gave long and meritorious service to this place and who distinguished the Parliament. Not the least, Mr. Speaker, was your predecessor, the member for Price (Mr. Ryan), who became a legend in his own time by his handling of the office, and there was no doubting his authority, as many Opposition members found out. He had no trouble making himself heard, and a great silence has descended on Parliament since his retirement (that is in no way meant to be derogatory). There was only one Paddy Ryan, and he certainly impressed himself on the House.

We also bade farewell to two Ministers on that fateful night, namely, the Hon. Len King and the Hon. David McKee. Mr. King brought a fine legal mind to Parliament, and I think everyone on both sides appreciated his contribution. We wish him well in his appointment as a judge of the Supreme Court. Mr. McKee, who was Minister of Labour and Industry, was an original man who did things in his own way and who gained the respect and gratitude of industry. Lastly, we had for all too short a time with us the member for Spence (Ernie Crimes), who could be a savage little man when someone got into his duck house but, out of the House and in the lobbies, he was indeed a fine gentleman. I served with him when he was Chairman of the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee, and he freely admitted that he did not know much about the rural side of things. To give him credit, he got down quickly and learned about the things he did not know about and was a good Chairman of that committee. Last, but not least, was our own colleague on this side, the member for Heysen, the one and only Bill McAnaney, who was regarded as Parliament's top host. He was an

accountant of great attainment and could always be relied on to make an informed speech on any subject at a minute's notice.

Mr. Wells: He is the author of a book on economics.

Mr. RODDA: Yes. He has a rare Irish humour and, if anyone doubts that, they should read *Hansard*, where they will find a wealth of his stories ranging from his exploits in the Pink Pussycat in Sydney to the activities of the Ostrich Club in this House and to dating Red Army girls in Times Square (which I believe he did in his youth). His escapades on the farm at Langhorne Creek would make Jolliffe look like an amateur. All these men have been our friends, but we did not have the opportunity to bid them farewell on the evening that the former Parliament ended, but I wish them a happy retirement.

In the other place, we acknowledge the retirement of Sir Lyell McEwin, who gave over 40 years of distinguished service to the State as a Cabinet Minister, Leader of the Opposition, and President of the Legislative Council. Likewise, I pay tribute to the Hon. Ross Story, a former Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Bert Shard, a former Chief Secretary, and the Hon. Frank Kneebone, who was also Chief Secretary and Minister of Lands for most of the time I have been in Parliament. These men, together with the Hon. Gordon Gilfillan, the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill and the Hon. Dr. Springett, have made a contribution that the State will long remember, and we wish them well in their retirement. I extend my congratulations to Ron Payne on being appointed a Minister of the Crown, and we have not previously had the opportunity of congratulating the other new Minister on the Treasury benches, the Hon. Jack Wright, who was appointed only recently and also, of course, Mr. Langley, the new Chairman of Committees.

As Ministers and officers of the House in a tightly-held Parliament, their life will not be a bed of roses. I know that from the 1968-70 Parliament, when I was Government Whip. Theirs will not be an easy task. The Government has the duty of holding the House and, as we settle down to legislation, this will probably be brought home to it. It was with sadness that we learnt of the deaths of the Hon. Sir Norman Jude and the Hon. Les Densley earlier this year. Both were former members for Southern in the Legislative Council who gave long and diligent representation to the Parliament. Judy, as he was called, was a man whose personality grew on one, a great sportsman, host, and a man who loved people. The same applies to Les Densley. Both men were South-Eastern graziers who were widely respected in their districts and throughout the State. I join with other members in expressing condolences to their families.

The depressing thing in the State at present is unemployment, and we do not get much pleasure from seeing the unemployment figures that were released this week right across Australia. In my district, the Naracoorte meatworks closed last week and 200 people had to lose their jobs. Today, I was informed that a council in my district had to put people off because of lack of funds. The Tatiara council had to take this step and, although it has not been confirmed, someone said today that the Naracoorte corporation was in similar straits. The Australian and State Governments must take responsibility for this situation, and their task is not an easy one. I would be failing in my duty if I did not say something about this matter. The situation of the Naracoorte meatworks has been raised during Question Time and I hope that this enterprise will be regenerated: I am sure that it will be when export markets pick up.

When it was decided to close the works, the Mayor of Naracoorte, the Minister of Agriculture and I had long discussions. The Minister, in reply to a question asked by the member for Spence, I think it was, said that the company had decided to close the works. The unfortunate aspect about this decision has been that the Minister, after long discussions last Thursday week, agreed that, if the company could see its way clear to constructing a blast-freeze chamber which could cater for the kill and which could handle the 3 200 000 lb. of meat a quarter that could be brought into the metropolitan area, as well as the meat that it could export, subject to the requirement of the freezer, he would agree during the interim period to giving the company access to the market for the time it would take to construct the blast freezer. Unfortunately, this decision came too late and, perhaps unfortunately, the Mayor and I did not have the opportunity of making these representations a month earlier. The overseas market has deteriorated, and the situation is most unfortunate. The company could not meet the deadline in handling its export quota and in freezing all the meat that came into the metropolitan area. My big fear in relation to unemployment in local government is that the present situation is only a straw in the wind. I hope that, when the Commonwealth Treasurer brings down his Budget next Tuesday night, something will be done to take up the slack in this area. A very real problem faces us.

In the shadow Cabinet, I have the honour to be shadow Minister of Fisheries, and I want to quote from a report presented to the then Minister of Agriculture (Hon. T. M. Casey) in June, 1972, on behalf of the fishing industry, by the South Australian branch of the Australian Fishing Industries Council. Three submissions were made: that South Australian fisheries should be raised to the status of a Ministerial portfolio; that the South Australian Government provide modern fishery research facilities in keeping with the value and the greatly increased size and obvious potential of the fishing industry; and that the South Australian Government should provide funds to the Fisheries Department in South Australia so that the department could function at a level at least comparable with that of departments in other States.

To its credit, the Government at that time divorced the fisheries portfolio from agriculture and forests. In making these remarks, I intend no reflection on the Hon. Mr. Chatterton, but we are disappointed to see that the portfolios are now grouped together again. The Minister is far too busy to handle all three aspects of that portfolio, and the industry is not happy about the position. In his policy speech in the recent election, the member for Light gave an undertaking that, if our Party were returned to Government, it would keep the separate portfolios. I do not reflect on the Hon. Mr. Chatterton. He is asked to do too much in looking after the fishing industry in conjunction with the other primary industry portfolios. The industry made a request, and it has been made known to me that it is not happy about the situation.

In the shadow Cabinet the member for Eyre is shadow Minister of Agriculture, and the fisheries shadow portfolio has been kept as a separate entity. We see this as the proper course of action. Like other primary industries, the fishing industry is experiencing difficult times. We were interested to hear the Minister of Fisheries say that the industry would be revitalised, as the Government's allocation of funds would be doubled in the current year. However, I do not think the funds were large; I think they are only about \$1 000 000, which is a drop in the ocean when

we consider what is required to get the industry back on its feet. First, it is essential that the Minister and the Government appoint a Director of Fisheries and get the department back on its feet. Because of lack of proper administration, the industry has not had the support it should have had on the Australian scene. The crayfishing industry in the South-East has suffered its worst season on record. Many reasons have been advanced for this, although some reasons are hidden and abstract. Obviously, too many people are engaged in the industry and there is over-exploitation.

Mr. Becker: Is there any poaching?

Mr. RODDA: I do not think we can put that one in. People with a licence find their catch is falling off. An article in the *Advertiser* early in July said that 90 per cent of the 500 people in the South-East crayfishing fleet were understood to be facing financial hardship. The article states:

The season saw a 50 per cent fall in income and a 35 per cent drop in the lobster catch.

That is at the fishing ports of Kingston, Port MacDonnell, Robe, Beachport, Southend, and Carpenters Rocks. In that area 280 cray boats are fishing an area of about 5 129 400 hectares. The article by Graham Hunter was the result of a discussion with Mr. J. W. Swaffer, the President of the Port MacDonnell Professional Fishermen's Association. He said:

I think the waters are overfished. We could have half the size of the present fishing fleet and survive.

This point will answer the interjection of my colleague, the member for Hanson:

Other fishermen are blaming the length of the season. One, who is believed to have a significant following, said: "You can't fish for 12 months and come out ahead. The season should last for only seven or eight months then stop completely and the fishermen go into some other kind of work."

At present the season lasts about 9½ months, with 10 weeks in the year for boat maintenance and repairs and for making new gear. The article also states:

"You should be able to make a go of it over a full season," Mr. Swaffer says. "The industry should be able to support itself on a year-round basis, even if it means diversifying into trawling for other types of fish."

Taking that statement and examining it further, I point out that the Victorian ban on shark because of the mercury content was a great blow to South-East fishermen. It has contributed to the parlous position in which they find themselves. The Association President of the South-East Fishing Council, Mr. R. M. Guy, of Carpenters Rocks, said that the fishermen were not seeking handouts, but low-interest or no-interest loans. Mr. Swaffer supported this and, in giving costs of gear, he said that the cost of fuel was up by 24 per cent, that replacement of gear and maintenance was up by 45 per cent, mechanical labour 25 per cent, and all those costs had to be met. The average catch, valued at \$12 690, was 120 bags a boat. The quotation continues:

In the average boat, in addition to the owner, there was usually one man as the crew, and he received a quarter or about \$3 172. General expenses, such as bait (\$1 777); fuel (\$800), gear (\$1 700), fishing licences (\$106), boat insurance (\$850) and repairs to the boat and motor vehicle (\$1 140) totalled \$6 373. This left a balance of \$3 145, from which must be deducted repayments on the boat (usually one quarter of the gross earnings, or \$3 172) and interest on the loan used to buy the boat and gear (averaging 13 per cent) and depreciation on capital of 10 per cent. "So out of what seems a reasonable income of nearly \$13,000 the cray fisherman has made a severe loss," says Mr. Swaffer. Where the Government can help is by the low-interest loan, which can be used to offset the high interest charged on capital expenditure, and by the Fisheries

Department's experimenting with trawling for other fish, with a view to getting some of the boats that remain in the fleet on to something else. Controls on the number of boats in the fleet, which came in around 1967-68 were just too late to save the industry.

That points out the problems faced by the fishing industry in the South-East, and creates much interest in what the Minister said about "buying back". I understand that funds for this purpose come from the Australian Government, and that this procedure is fraught with difficulty. I also understand that a Canadian expert (who will not be available until November this year) will look into this matter. The Minister, therefore, has problems in that regard.

Many South-East fishermen are facing problems. Individually, some of them are facing virtual bankruptcy. It has been said that the cray crawl has been slow this year because of water temperatures. Only science can solve these problems. Another problem facing the industry is that too many fishermen are exploiting the fishing grounds. During the recent election campaign I spoke to several Port Lincoln fishermen, and they, too, are having trouble. Their prawn catches have dropped and costs have increased. The same applies to the tuna industry. These problems are adversely affecting the town of Port Lincoln, which depends to a large extent on the fishing industry. Whilst in Port Lincoln I received the following information about the employment situation in that town:

Specialised boat painter—Employees reduced from 15 to 1 and now under bankruptcy deed of arrangement. Engineering business—Employs about 12: about to call meeting of creditors and liquidate. Boat builder—Employed up to 14 with casuals: insolvent, closed and left Port Lincoln. Fish buyer—Employed casuals: closed. Fish processor—staff reduced by 4. Prawn fishing—Young owners, in no financial difficulty, selling boat as they consider there is no economic future in the industry. Tuna fishing—five boats for sale, owners unable to meet commitments.

These are random examples that were quoted to me when I visited Port Lincoln during the recent campaign. The Minister must be concerned about the situation. I accept that he has a busy portfolio and has to cover areas as far apart as Port Lincoln and the South-East. The member for Flinders and the member for Alexandra face those problems, too. The member for Alexandra has many fishermen in his district. I have discussed with people on Yorke Peninsula the problem of trawlers fishing through whiting grounds, and whiting fishermen finding that their catch drops to almost nothing for a couple of weeks.

These matters must be investigated by the Fisheries Department, which must have its own Director and its own officers so it can formulate policy. I in no way criticise the Acting Director of Fisheries, Mr. Olsen, who is expert in his field. However, he cannot expect in an acting capacity to run the department at top level. I am sure the Minister will take up that matter with Cabinet. In the Liberal Party policy speech we stated we would set up a court to look into the fishing licence situation and would remove that responsibility from Ministerial or political control. We also gave a firm and positive undertaking that we would make available for fisheries a research vessel. Our policy was accepted by the fishing industry and received full marks.

Recently I raised in the House a question concerning Bimbadeen Development Proprietary Limited, which set up business in South Australia about three or four years ago. Acting in good faith, some of my constituents (and is all very well to say, "Let the buyer beware" or "*caveat emptor*") even in these days of consumer protection were badly let down by this company. These people paid a

10 per cent deposit when signing contracts, and a housing kit was to be delivered and constructed on site. As time went on houses were not arriving and people became rather aggravated. In about 1974, the company went into liquidation and some of my constituents were badly caught. They were asked for money when the company must have known it could not meet the deadline and provide houses. Although the house buyers had contracted to buy houses there was, likewise, an obligation on the company to deliver the goods. The company must have known it could not deliver the goods, but it still extracted money from people. That is why I raised the matter with the Premier and why I intend to pursue it further.

Unfortunately, we cannot do much, because the horse has bolted, but legislation should be introduced to bring this type of operator to book. There are people all over the State who acted in good faith; some people spent their life's saving on what was to be the house of their dreams. Instead, all they got was a vacant block of land full of weeds. Their money has gone and there is no hope of their getting a house. Bimbadeen Development Proprietary Limited was a house-providing company, but was known in South Australia as Bisley Homes (Distributors) South Australia. That company has much to answer for in the way it treated my constituents and, indeed, other constituents in this State. I intend to pursue the matter further in Parliament to ensure that a full report is made on the matter. It is obvious that one cannot get blood out of a stone, but I believe the company's administration was foolhardy. At least these days we have consumer protection legislation, which is certainly needed. In a recent newspaper article National Parks and Wildlife Director, Mr. R. Lyons, said, under the heading "Illegal Fauna Trade Stops":

Fauna trafficking in South Australia is under control, a Federal Parliamentary Subcommittee inquiry was told in Adelaide today. National Parks and Wildlife Director, Mr. R. Lyons, said illegal trafficking which occurred before 1972 had been largely brought under control . . . that native fauna was a multi-million dollar industry in South Australia and there was constant threat of illegal activity. Some of my constituents approached me earlier this year about the keeping of the golden-shouldered parrot by aviculturists as a form of conservation. They were told by the department that it did not consider any bird or animal bred in captivity as a form of conservation. These birds are today almost extinct in the wild. A letter published in *Habitat* of June, 1973, states:

According to Queensland wildlife authorities the total golden-shouldered parrot population would be no more than 100. However, they are still being trapped and are being taken south or sent out on prawn boats for the eastern American and European markets. Soon it will be too late.

The following statement was published in a paper from the Queensland Ornithological Society, the main interest of which is in studying birds and their environment in the field:

The Q.O.S. supports aviculture because of:

- (a) continued need to study birds in confinement;
- (b) continued development of techniques for the successful propagation of cage birds;
- (c) aviculture needs to be prepared to breed species that are near extinction in the field.

In February the National Parks and Wildlife Department in this State issued notices to eight breeders of the golden-shouldered parrot stating that they had 28 days in which to dispose of their birds outside the State. Complying with that notice would mean that the birds would be put back in their environment and smugglers would probably trap them. Most of all, the birds in this State would be aviary bred. The question arises: what happens in New

South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania and Western Australia, which have similar legislation, and how long will it be before these birds become extinct in Australia? Some of the aviculturists are in my district and some are in the Gouger District. This gave rise to representations and arguments, but we did not get much satisfaction from them. The Minister for the Environment wrote the following letter to the member for Gouger on August 4:

The golden-shoulder parrot (*poephotus chrysopterygius chrysopterygius*) is one of the species included in the eighth schedule (rare species) to the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972-74. The Act provides that not only is it an offence carrying a penalty of \$1 000 or imprisonment for six months (section 51 (a)) to take such animals from the wild, but in order to have such animals in one's possession it is necessary to have a rare species permit (section 55). This section provides that I may grant such a permit where I am satisfied that: (a) it is in the interests of scientific research; or (b) it is desirable for the sake of conserving animals of a rare species to do so.

The golden-shoulder parrot is not a species native to South Australia but is endemic to the Cape Yorke Peninsula area of Northern Queensland. However, in keeping with the far-sighted conservation objectives of this State, the Act affords protection to all Australian species of mammals, birds and reptiles. Because of its rarity and its attractive appearance the golden-shoulder parrot has been the target for considerable illegal trapping which is considered to have been responsible for the depletion of the species in the wild.

The aviculturists in my district were given a period within which they had to get rid of their golden-shouldered parrots, which command a very high price. Two pairs were sold in Victoria for \$200 a piece and they found a ready sale. Because they had been aviary bred, if they had been let out in the wild they would have been easy prey for hawks. The Minister's letter continues:

Recently the Queensland Parliament has passed legislation affording very stringent protection to this species and it is understood that as soon as a suitable facility can be prepared all golden-shoulder parrots held in captivity in Queensland will be forfeited to the Crown for scientific research into the protection and continued conservation of the species. The South Australian approach can be considered to be complementary to the Queensland legislation and has full support and approval of the Queensland fauna authorities.

So, it seems that the South Australian Government is ahead of Queensland in this respect. However, I am doubtful about the department's attitude to aviculture. The Minister's letter continues:

At the time of the passage of the South Australian amending legislation there were eight people in South Australia keeping in captivity a total of 37 golden-shoulder parrots. These were being held under permits granted under the principal Act and were current until June 30, 1975. On the expiry of these permits it would have been necessary for these persons to apply for rare species permits in terms of the amended Act; that is, they would have to satisfy me that it was desirable to grant the permit: (a) because it was in the interests of scientific research; or (b) because it was desirable for the sake of conserving the species.

When that Bill came before Parliament, no reason was given for including the species in the legislation. The rub comes here for the aviculturists, and I am sure they will not be too happy about the following statement in the Minister's letter:

It is perhaps necessary to point out at this stage that aviculture of itself has little to contribute to the conservation of the species. To have even a chance of being effective aviculture must be accompanied by habitat protection and enrichment of that habitat.

One of the major problems besetting the aviculturist or for that matter any other animal breeder is to ensure the diversification of genetic material to prevent the undesirable effects of inbreeding. The easiest and simplest way of obtaining hybrid vigour of course is to introduce fresh wild-bred stock—which, in the case of golden-shoulder parrots, is wholly undesirable.

Of course, only 100 golden-shoulder parrots are left on Cape Yorke Peninsula, so that is completely irrelevant. It is an absolute insult to aviculturists in this State. When this letter goes to the aviculturists, all hell will break loose because of the department's attitude to them. The late Mr. J. D. Hood, an aviculturist, who died in England only a few weeks ago, made an enormous contribution to conservation and aviculture, and the Minister's statement is an insult to the late Mr. Hood. I point this out forcibly to the Minister and to those people who are using the golden-shoulder parrot to further their goal of conservation. The Minister's letter continues:

The second problem with aviculture is the inherent tendency of the aviculturist to select for the unusual, the ornate or the bizarre, to improve on nature, and to produce something that no-one else has.

That is a pack of lies and an insult to people who give up their time for their hobby. The Minister will be hearing much more about those remarks. His letter continues:

It is probably needless to point out that such activity has no part to play in the conservation of the species and release of such stock into the wild could conceivably totally upset the equilibrium in remaining wild populations.

The department, the Director and the Minister will be hearing more about this issue, which has been triggered by that gracious little bird the golden-shoulder parrot. The Woolumbool national park has been plagued by kangaroos. A fortnight ago there was an accident that was nearly fatal when a 1.8 metre kangaroo jumped in front of a lad on a motor cycle; the lad is now in pieces in Naracoorte Hospital. The real problem lies in the fact that there is no fence and there is thick scrub extending to the edge of the road. True, there is some clearing between the scrub proper and the scrub that is adjacent to the carriageway. We have had representations made to the department, and I have been told in a letter, on behalf of the father of the boy concerned in the accident, that the matter will be looked at. However, I do not know who is going to do this work, but the scrub will be cleared.

The Premier has said that if one does not like a law one should break it and put up with the consequences. I have been told that this scrub will be cleared. There is scarcely a family in the area that has not been involved in an accident with kangaroos in the Woolumbool reserve. This problem also occurs on the Pinnaroo road where a break cleared for 30 metres would minimise the chances of future accidents occurring. Certainly, the Director of National Parks and Wildlife will be hearing not only about the golden-shoulder parrot but also about this problem from the member for Mallee and the member for Gouger. Kangaroos in these circumstances represent a traffic hazard, and from a practical viewpoint, they must be viewed in that light. I take much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I take this opportunity of expressing my condolences to the families of the late Sir Norman Jude and Mr. Densley. Both these gentlemen were members of another place, who served their State well, and their passing is a considerable loss to South Australia.

In opening this Forty-Second Parliament, His Excellency made specific reference to country railways. He said that legislation dealing with country railways would be brought before us. That is now history and we know the outcome of that legislation, which was considered by this House and passed both in this House and in another place. However, I can still not work out how the Premier determined that he had a mandate for this move. It must be remembered that we were dealing with country railways.

The Premier claims that the people of South Australia, in returning his Government, gave him a clear mandate to proceed with that measure. South Australian voters living in the metropolitan area, to all intents and purposes, indicated by their vote that they were not especially concerned one way or the other about whether the Premier handed over our country railways to the Commonwealth Government or not. On the other hand, country voters clearly indicated, without shadow of doubt, that they wanted the railways to be retained by the South Australian Government. That matter is now history and only time will tell whether or not the transfer was in the best interests of this State. In paragraph 11 of his Speech, His Excellency made the following statement:

My Government has proposed that the River Murray Waters Agreement should be renegotiated to include amendments giving the River Murray Commission additional responsibilities related to water quality control and enabling it to perform its functions more effectively.

I cannot agree more with that statement. It has been five years since the Gutteridge, Haskins and Davies report was presented and made available to the people of South Australia. That report includes many of the measures and actions that will have to be undertaken to control salinity and pollution and to upgrade the quality of the Murray River. As I said, that report was presented five years ago, and many people in South Australia are upset that even now nothing positive that they can see has been done. The Deputy Premier, in his capacity as Minister of Works, has said many times that they are working through various committees. It all amounts to further investigations, one investigation following another. However, there are no tangible results. This is why I believe the blame for the inactivity rests fairly and squarely with the South Australian Government, because we in this State have far much more to lose than has any other State.

As I said yesterday, it was put to the Prime Minister on April 18 that he should call the three States and the Commonwealth together to try to make progress on this overall problem of water quality in the Murray River. At that time he said he believed it was the responsibility of the South Australian Premier to make the move. We received a lengthy reply from the Minister of Works yesterday when he stated once again that there were many committees and reports on which the Government was waiting. However, there was no constructive evidence of any action being taken to solve this problem. The establishment of a Murray River waters authority is the logical answer. Such an authority should have adequate powers to enable it to encompass the whole Murray River system. In this respect, I refer not only to the River Murray Commission rivers, the Murray, Mitta and Kiewa, but also to the tributaries in Victoria and New South Wales that eventually flow into the Murray River. If they are not under the control of an authority responsible for water quality and reducing the present level of pollution, there is no chance whatsoever of improving the quality of the water in the River Murray Commission rivers.

We in South Australia are dependent on our entitlement under the River Murray Waters Act. If it was not for that Act, we in South Australia would have no guarantees of any supplies, and in a dry year we would have absolutely no water. The authority which I have suggested would have power to examine and control all rivers in the Murray River system. I said yesterday that the Victorian Government was considering spending \$40 000 000 on a plan to remove 350 000 tonnes of salt annually from the Goulburn Valley, and that the River Murray Com-

mission believed that 40 per cent of that quantity of salt would have no outlet other than down the Goulburn River into the Murray River system and through South Australia. Many times I have referred to the salt that is put into the Murray River not only in Victoria and New South Wales but also in South Australia as a result of the evaporation basins sited on the banks of the Murray River. A good example of this is the Dishers Creek evaporation basin at Renmark. The Gutteridge report states that, at full capacity, that basin contributes about 300 t of salt a day to the Murray River, because of seepage back into the river.

Until we have an overall authority that can take into account all forms of pollution, the quality of South Australia's water will not improve. Not only are we faced with the normal pollution problem of salinity but also the risk of the introduction of water hyacinth into the Murray River has become more evident. We had a small outbreak many years ago that was brought under control but, presently, there is a large area of this pest in New South Wales. I was interested to hear about a proposal to spend about \$1 000 000 in an effort to eradicate this pest by drying up the area in which it is growing. However, once again this is only a proposal, not a definite undertaking. This suggestion has been put forward but, unfortunately, no positive action has been taken.

We find exactly the same attitude time and time again: plenty of suggestions and reports, but no positive action. Until it is brought under one powerful authority, we will not make any progress. The biggest problem we face concerning the river system is that, going back to the creation of the States as sovereign entities, all the rivers and tributaries within the bounds of those States became the sovereign property of the State concerned. This has created major problems in the management of the river system because, after all, no river system recognises State boundaries.

We cannot take away one tributary and say that the Darling River is not part of the Murray system. The only reason the Murray is the river it is today is that the tributaries, when combined, make it what it is. The commission has control only over the Murray, Mitta and Kiewa, and even though it is unlikely that Victoria and New South Wales will relinquish further control to an overall authority, I believe that the rivers could be brought under one authority for the control of pollution and water quality. This would be a major step forward, even if it is not the ultimate step: the ultimate is that the complete river system from beginning to end should be under the control of one authority. I find it difficult to work out how this could ever really be achieved because, as I have said, the tributaries, apart from the Murray, Mitta and Kiewa, are the sovereign property of the State concerned. That is unfortunate, but it should not stop us from forging ahead with a Murray River authority to control pollution and water quality.

Mr. Jennings: There's only one answer to that—abolish the States.

Mr. ARNOLD: Do you advocate abolition of the States?

Mr. Jennings: Although it's not my Party's policy, it's my policy.

Mr. ARNOLD: That is an interesting statement and I shall certainly have more to say about that later. The point I have been stressing is that insufficient action has taken place during the past five years, so that the people of South Australia, particularly those who depend entirely on water from the Murray, are becoming sick and tired

of continual delays and lack of action to solve this problem. Although much of the saline pollution occurs in South Australia, we could take effective means to control it but, once again, it must be done with the co-operation of the other States.

No doubt members will recall that, immediately following the most recent flood, considerable saline built up in the Murray that caused severe damage to horticultural plantings at that time. I introduced a deputation to the Deputy Premier, who agreed at the time to release water from Lake Victoria to try to reduce the salinity level in the river. Authorities in South Australia believe that, even if this were done, it would reduce the salinity level in South Australia only by about 50 e.c. units. It was argued by other people well versed in this subject that it would reduce the salinity in South Australia by anything up to 500 e.c. units. I pay a tribute to the Deputy Premier for agreeing to release the water from Lake Victoria at that time, if for no other reason than to prove a point: whether or not it would significantly reduce the salinity level in South Australia, and it did reduce that level by about 500 units.

The only unfortunate thing was that, having reduced the salinity level to that extent, the water from Lake Victoria was switched off, causing a worse situation than had been the case before the water was released, because in switching off the outlet from Lake Victoria the inlet was opened and most of the stream coming down the Murray River from the Eastern States was diverted into Lake Victoria to make up the deficit of water that had been used to dilute the saline conditions in South Australia. This was a tragic event for South Australia, because at the time Lake Victoria was switched off rain had already fallen in Queensland and northern New South Wales, and the majority of that water had to come down the Darling River system into the Murray River. The Menindee Lakes were already at full capacity and that water had nowhere to go except to come into South Australia.

The sensible operation at that time would have been to leave Lake Victoria wide open, to have reduced the contents and the capacity of the lake by the maximum possible volume, because the quality of the water coming down the Darling River was better than that being held in Lake Victoria and being diverted into the lake prior to the flush coming down the Darling. That is why I believe the establishment of a water resources council in South Australia is essential. It would give the Minister advice, on the one hand, from his departmental officers and, on the other, from people appointed to the council, people who really had something to contribute in a practical way.

Had that council been in existence before the end of the 1975 flood we would not have been faced with the problems of salinity that eventuated. We all know it is a natural phenomenon that, at the end of every high river, the natural drainage back into the river system from the flood plains of the Murray River, particularly in South

Australia, brings back into the main stream enormous quantities of highly saline water. There is no way of stopping that, and the only possible way of controlling this natural build-up of salinity in the main stream in South Australia is with a substantial dilution flow. This is one of the first things that must be negotiated with Victoria and New South Wales: the need for additional dilution flows in the Murray River immediately following a major flood in order to reduce the natural saline in-flow back into the river and to push the saline water through the river and out to sea, the only place where it is out of the way and can do no further harm.

I look forward to the Government's efforts being increased so as to improve the water quality not only in South Australia but in the whole of the Murray River system throughout South Australia, Victoria, and New South Wales. The Cooltong and Chaffey area is vitally affected by the quality of water in Ral Ral Creek. The solution to this problem is one of a practical nature. Evidence given to the Public Works Standing Committee before the new pumping facilities were approved and erected on Ral Ral Creek was given by practical people from out in the field. They stated that by the time the pump was completed and was operational the quality of water in Ral Ral Creek would be too poor for horticultural usage. What they said has been proved correct this year. The pump was brought into operation and, after running for a short time, was shut down because of the poor quality of water in Ral Ral Creek. I introduced a deputation to the Minister of Lands about the quality of water in this creek and suggested that the only possible solution was to install a large pipe from the new pumping station, across the flats and to the river proper so that irrigators in the area would at least receive water equal to that available in other irrigation areas.

To this stage I have received no reply from the Government. The problem cannot be ignored; the Government cannot just run away from it. Water pumped to the Cooltong and Chaffey area during the past summer was of a totally unacceptable quality. If that type of water is supplied to them in the forthcoming growing season the district has little hope for the future. Action must be taken now, not in six months, otherwise enormous horticultural investments, plantings and headworks in that area will be lost. The Government will lose money in the area, too, and the personal efforts and life savings of many growers that are utterly tied up in the area will be lost. The whole matter depends on and revolves around water quality, so I once again call on the Government to get on with the job and determine what are the needs of the area and see that they are carried out. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.54 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 19, at 2 p.m.