

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, July 28, 1976

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

PETITION: EDINBURGH AIR BASE

Mr. GROTH presented a petition signed by 269 residents of South Australia, praying that the House request the Government not to provide housing and other amenities for any increase in the number of squadrons at the Edinburgh Air Force Base.

Petition received.

PETITION: DENTAL TECHNICIANS

Mr. WHITTEN presented a petition signed by 616 residents of South Australia, praying that the House urge the Government to introduce legislation to bring dental technicians in South Australia into the same position as those in Victoria and Tasmania, in regard to registration, enabling them to deal directly with the public.

Petition received.

PETITION: NAIRNE ROAD

Mr. WARDLE presented a petition signed by 210 residents and road users of Nairne and districts, praying that the House request the Minister of Transport to urge the Highways Department to assume control of the detour road off the Princes Highway near Nairne.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: SEXUAL OFFENCES

Mrs. BYRNE presented a petition signed by 56 electors of South Australia, praying that the House reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest or to lower the age of consent in respect of sexual offences.

Mr. EVANS presented a similar petition signed by 32 electors of South Australia.

Mr. JENNINGS presented a similar petition signed by 46 electors of South Australia.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS presented a similar petition signed by 29 electors of South Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE presented a similar petition signed by 211 electors of South Australia.

Mr. DEAN BROWN presented a similar petition signed by 257 electors of South Australia.

Dr. TONKIN presented a similar petition signed by 324 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

CROYDON PRIMARY SCHOOL

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Croydon Primary School upgrading.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTIONS

MONARTO CHAIRMAN

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say what were the terms of the terminating clause of Mr. Ray Taylor's contract as Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission, and what was the formula used for determining the sum of \$100 000 paid to him on his resignation? The early retirement of Mr. Ray Taylor from his position as Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission, because he stated there was no job for him to do, caused a great deal of comment in the community. The amount paid to him, which was announced yesterday, has caused even greater comment and public concern, and has once again highlighted in the minds of many people the present position of Monarto. Most people in the community are appalled at what to them seems to be a most extravagant golden handshake, and they are unable to understand why the Government should pay such an enormous sum to a man who has resigned his office because apparently he believes the position is unnecessary and the whole Monarto project an expensive flop. Obviously, this is just another aspect of the Government's total error of judgment in relation to the whole Monarto project.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Taylor has never said that the Monarto project is an expensive flop, and the Leader knows that, as he knows that by putting that kind of remark into Mr. Taylor's mouth he is being untruthful. The provisions for termination of Mr. Taylor's contract were the normal provisions applying to the termination of any other contract for persons who are employed by the Government. As his contract was terminated by mutual agreement earlier than the time at which it would normally have ceased, provision was naturally undertaken for compensation to him for any loss he would be occasioned thereby.

Mr. Millhouse: It is a very large amount, though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was a large amount which was calculated on the basis of what his prospective entitlement under that contract was and the cost to him of its early termination, as advised on by the Crown Solicitor. That is exactly the position, as I have previously stated it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Premier believe that the payment to Mr. Taylor was excessive, in view of the fact that Mr. Taylor's contract would have expired in just over three years? What are the normal terms in contracts such as this for a resignation? Mr. Taylor's salary was \$30 000 a year, and his contract was to expire in three years. As he was paid a lump sum of \$100 000, it appears he is better off, having resigned, than if he had continued working for the commission.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was over three years and, in fact, there were numbers of other benefits to Mr. Taylor, under the terms of his contract, than those merely of salary. The compensation was negotiated and advised by the legal officers of the Government.

Mr. Millhouse: But Cabinet surely took the final responsibility.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course it took the final responsibility, and so it should have.

Mr. Millhouse: Why do you keep on referring to this advice?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Simply because that is exactly how it happened.

Mr. Millhouse: You have to stand up to your responsibility.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course we take responsibility.

Mr. Millhouse: You should not be hiding behind a public servant.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member believes that the decision was improper—

Mr. Millhouse: No, I don't, but I believe you should stand up and not keep on referring to the Crown Solicitor.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member had better get off the fence and stop putting his mug on one side and his rump on the other.

Mr. Millhouse: That sort of abuse is no answer.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Obviously the barbed wire on which the honourable member is sitting is spiking him.

Mr. Millhouse: You stand up for your own responsibilities and don't refer to the Crown Solicitor again in this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the contrary, I shall refer to the Crown Solicitor because, of course, his advice was perfectly proper. The Government has taken his advice just as the Government, on most occasions, takes the advice of the Land Board as to compensation that needs to be paid to people in relation to recommendations made to the Government by the board. We have accepted the advice given to us, we take responsibility for it, and we believe it is proper. After examination of the submissions that were made as to the cost to us of any other course, this was the proper course to take.

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Premier say whether it is correct that some months before his actual resignation Mr. Taylor intimated to the Premier that he wanted to resign? Is it also correct that the Premier urged Mr. Taylor to reconsider and remain in his position for a further 12 months for the benefit of the Monarto project?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There were discussions with Mr. Taylor before the date of his resignation about that resignation, but I do not remember offhand the precise dates.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Within 12 months?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not remember exactly the time period, and I am not sure what the honourable member is trying to establish. There were discussions for some months before Mr. Taylor's final resignation as to that resignation, but I cannot say that there was a previous period when negotiations were terminated. The negotiations lasted some time.

Mr. Allison: Did his resignation jeopardise the Monarto project?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The resignation in no way jeopardised the Monarto project. The reasons for the change in administration have been published. The Chairman of the commission, after Mr. Taylor's resignation, was the commission's General Manager, and no extra money has been paid to him for the chairmanship; he has taken the place of the Chairman and the three members of the commission still operate. Money is to be committed to Monarto during this year, and discussions with the Federal Minister concerning an umbrella agreement, including Monarto, are now taking place.

Mr. GUNN: Does the Premier believe that the State Government received value for its money from its appointment of Mr. Ray Taylor, since it has in effect paid the salary of the Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission for three years without receiving any benefit from it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member intends to use this House for an attack upon the personal competence and probity of Mr. Taylor, then—

Mr. Mathwin: That was not the question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it was, because that is what is implied in the question. The honourable member asks whether we have received value for the services of Mr. Taylor. The obvious implication is an attack upon Mr. Taylor's competence in giving his services, and I reject that implication utterly.

Mr. RUSSACK: As Mr. Taylor did not complete his term as Agent-General in London before he became a commissioner of the Monarto Development Commission, can the Premier say what payment, if any, was made to him when he relinquished his position in London? I assure the House that the purpose of this and all previous questions this afternoon is not a personal attack on Mr. Taylor, but they are to ascertain the extent to which this State's finances have been mismanaged by this Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The provisions of Mr. Taylor's contract as Agent-General were that, if he were to be returned to South Australia during that period, he would go to a position in South Australia that was commensurate with the kind of remuneration he received as Agent-General. He agreed to come back to South Australia to this particular post, if with the provisions he would have a similar remuneration to that which he had had as Agent-General. There was no reason to compensate him for shortening his term as Agent-General, because alternative employment was provided to him under the same conditions. That is not mismanagement: it is perfectly proper.

PENSIONERS' CONCESSIONS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Transport state the present position relating to motor vehicle registration concessions for pensioners? Many pensioners in my district are worried that they may be required to pay the recent increases in motor vehicle registration charges. Because of his concern for the wellbeing of pensioners, I am sure the Minister will have made some concessions. I should therefore appreciate receiving full details of the position of pensioners in this regard.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When the Government considered the report regarding the necessity to increase registration fees because the Federal Government had reduced from \$12 000 000 to \$3 000 000 the additional funds that would be made available for roadmaking purposes, it followed the line that it has always adopted in its concern for pensioners. Since the Government was elected to office it has consistently provided for a rebate for pensioners equal approximately to the increase in registration fees, the net result of which has been that the fees payable by pensioners today are about equal to what was paid when this Government came to office six years ago. No other Government in Australia has a record of consideration for the pensioners that comes close to equalling the record of the South Australian Labor Government. Our attitude has been reflected not only in motor vehicle registration fees but also in drivers' licence fees, water rates, land tax and council rates. Obviously, this Government has displayed its concern for the pensioners. That concern is reflected in the present decision regarding registration fees. Whilst we regret sincerely the necessity to raise additional funds because of the failure of the present Federal Government to provide the funds that South Australia is justly entitled to—

Dr. Tonkin: Humbug!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It might be humbug for the Leader, but the Fraser Government is humbug as far as Australia is concerned. The only person who gives unqualified support to that Government is the Leader of the Opposition. The fact of the matter is that very few people would be willing to give to this rotten Government in Canberra the blind support that the Leader of the Opposition gives it. The reduction in funds has meant we have had to increase the registration fees for motor vehicles in South Australia, but we have not permitted that increase to be extended to the pensioners.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: KANGAROO ISLAND SETTLERS

The SPEAKER: I have received from the honourable member for Mitcham the following letter dated July 27, 1976:

Dear Mr. Speaker,

I desire to inform you that on Wednesday, July 28, it is my intention to move that this House at its rising do adjourn until 1.30 p.m. on Thursday, July 29, for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely:

That notwithstanding the recent reference to the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement both the State Government and the Federal Government should immediately acknowledge publicly that no soldier settler on Kangaroo Island will be obliged to leave his holding, except voluntarily, that is with his own consent.

Yours faithfully,
Robin Millhouse
State Parliamentary representative
of the New Liberal Movement
and member for Mitcham

I call on those members—

Mr. CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is it proper to proceed with the matter raised by the honourable member, a matter that is now before Parliament? The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Land Settlement has been commissioned to investigate and report to the South Australian Parliament on the financial problems of war service land settlement lessees on Kangaroo Island. That committee is now undertaking that commission. Proceeding with the member for Mitcham's motion could unduly influence and restrict the fair and proper process of that committee. Therefore, the matter should be considered *sub judice*; in fact, it would be improper to proceed with the motion. I am deeply concerned about the happenings on Kangaroo Island, and am also concerned that this action could be detrimental to the best interests of the island settlers themselves and would be against the basic principles of British Parliamentary justice. Finally, I draw to your attention and that of the member for Mitcham section 20 (2) of the Land Settlement Act, which provides:

If any person—

(d) interrupts the proceedings of the committee; . . . he shall be guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine of not more than \$200.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is not upheld. I should like to point out that the Land Settlement Committee is appointed by the Governor under the provisions of the Land Settlement Act, 1944-1974, and not by the House. The committee investigates matters referred to it by the Government. At page 362 of Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*, it is stated:

A matter awaiting or under adjudication by a court of law, should not be brought before the House.

It was ruled in 1970-71 that matters referred to a Royal Commission should not be brought before the House. The Land Settlement Committee cannot be regarded as a Royal Commission, and, because I am unaware that this matter

is before a court, I rule that the honourable member for Mitcham's letter may be discussed in the House, if he can muster the required number of members to rise in support of his motion. I now call on those members who support the motion to rise in their places.

The member for Mitcham having risen:

Mr. Millhouse: Well, the sincerity of the Liberal Party certainly shows, especially from you, Mr. Chapman.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: They come into the House and talk about—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order.

Mr. Millhouse: I beg your pardon, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Because the motion has not been supported by the requisite four other members, as prescribed by Standing Orders, it cannot be proceeded with.

QUESTIONS RESUMED

PORT ADELAIDE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister for Planning say when a final report will be available concerning the redevelopment of the central business area of Port Adelaide? Can he also indicate what will be the Government's financial commitment for this redevelopment?

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many private conversations. The honourable member for Price.

Mr. WHITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There has been much discussion in Port Adelaide regarding an interim report that was brought down by the Monarto Development Commission relating to the redevelopment of Port Adelaide. It has also been stated that a marquee will be set up in Port Adelaide to display the proposed plan. I would appreciate any information the Minister may be able to give.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The redevelopment of the Port Adelaide area is being investigated by the Monarto Development Commission, acting as an agent for the State Planning Authority. As I am not sure from memory when the commission is due to present its final report, I will inquire, and tell the honourable member of the detail. Regarding the extent of any financial commitment the Government might make, I cannot give a precise answer now. To some degree, it will depend on the period over which the objectives of any plan are to be achieved. It may be that a particular plan is put forward which, if it is to be achieved in three or four years, is out of court on financial grounds. On the other hand, it may be possible to develop such a plan over a longer period and with a greater degree of provision of funds from private sources, in which case the same plan may well turn out to be financially feasible. I will check that matter also, and see whether I can furnish any additional information to the honourable member.

COMMUNITY WELFARE PAYMENTS

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say how much financial support his department provided for people in need in South Australia during the past financial year? I ask my question because I do not think that the public generally realises how much direct financial help the Community Welfare Department provides, in

addition to its other services, some of which seem to attract more attention from the news media, and the Minister's reply could be informative.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I shall try to make the reply informative, as requested by the honourable member, who was kind enough to let me know the wanted information on this matter and, because of that, I am able to give fairly accurate figures. Although they will be somewhat less detailed than those appearing in the annual report, nevertheless they will be of interest to all members and to the public generally. I trust that members opposite will allow me the courtesy to provide a reply for the member who is sufficiently interested to ask the question. The total amount paid out in 1975-76 was nearly \$12 000 000, over \$2 750 000 more than in the previous year. The financial assistance to deserted wives, unmarried mothers, and other eligible persons required nearly \$5 500 000. Subsidies to foster parents, guardians, and others totalled \$876 000; grants to voluntary bodies and welfare agencies amounted to \$587 000; and rebates on property taxes for pensioners and others amounted to more than \$5 000 000. I do not think it is generally known that the cost of remitting property taxes, as they are loosely called, is met by the Community Welfare Department. Of the figure I have just given, nearly \$2 500 000 was for council rates and more than \$2 300 000 for water and sewerage rates. The public of South Australia can at least feel confident that the Labor Government of this State is not going to abandon those who are in need, at least in South Australia, which is more than can be said for the present Commonwealth Government.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Premier provide a complete list of all Government employees who are employed on contract; will he say whether any other Government employees on contract have had their contracts terminated in a way similar to that in which Mr. Taylor's contract was terminated?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will try to get a list of contract employees for the honourable member. As to Government employees on contract who have had their contracts terminated previously, offhand I can think only of Mr. Currie, whose contract was terminated by the Hall Government, not without some payment of compensation.

ELECTRIC BLANKETS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy discuss with the Electricity Trust of South Australia the question of the safety aspects of electric blankets? In a recent issue of *Choice* magazine, an article states that, despite nearly 40 years of production and sale some models still leave something to be desired in terms of electrical safety. Despite the introduction of a revised Australian standard and stricter electrical authority requirements, a high rate of failure was found in electrical safety tests, involving 16 out of 37 blankets reported on in *Choice* in June, 1970, and 11 out of 28 in the present report. The article further states that, when contacted, the Electricity Authority of New South Wales reported that, over the 2-year period of 1973-1974, 123 electric blanket failures had occurred in New South Wales resulting in scorching, charring, or fire from an estimated 2 000 000 blankets in use. That proportion may be low, but nevertheless when we find that faulty blankets are likely to create fire, with

the danger involved, and when the report has stated that after 40 years use the failure rate is high, I believe it would be of interest to the community to know the opinion of the Electricity Trust, as well as any suggestions for safety that could be implemented.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will be happy to discuss the matter with the Electricity Trust. I was pleased to hear that the information on which the honourable member based his question came from *Choice* magazine, and not from any shocking experience that he had had.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. HARRISON: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to make any adjustments to the South Australian Prohibition of Discrimination Act, 1966-1975, and whether the provisions of that Act in any way conflict with or duplicate those contained in the Australian Racial Discrimination Act passed in October, 1975? In the light of any overlapping, can the Attorney assure me that he intends to take action to rectify the anomalies involved? While the Australian law has adopted the provisions of the United Nations Convention against all forms of discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin, and while the South Australian Government has had a law prohibiting racial discrimination since 1966, it remains obvious that this kind of discrimination still surfaces all too frequently within the community: not only against Aborigines, but against many other individuals and groups of ethnic origin or descent. I refer to a letter in the *Advertiser* about two months ago in which a reader used the phrase "Mediterranean back" as a term of abuse and derogation towards our Southern European migrant population. This is one example that comes to mind. Discriminatory behaviour and the use of such verbal slurs are of great concern to me, and must be of considerable concern to any responsible member of the community. I ask the question because of the apparent powerlessness of some of the provisions of these laws and because it seems, at any rate in South Australia, where this law has been operating for 10 years, that entrenched prejudices held by some within our community are not in reality being changed for the better.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I thank the honourable member for his question, because he has raised a matter of considerable interest to the people of South Australia and an important matter generally. The question has been of concern to this Government for some time, and I have initiated action at two levels. I agree with the honourable member that neither the South Australian Prohibition of Discrimination Act nor the Australian Government's Racial Discrimination Act goes far enough. The South Australian Act has existed since 1966, and anomalies have become apparent in the legislation. The Australian Government Act was passed during the term of the Whitlam Government, but unfortunately, although the original Bill was a good piece of legislation, it was so watered down by the Senate that the Act that finally went on to the Statute Book does not go nearly far enough to right the wrong it sought to right. I do not intend to comment on the provisions of the Acts in detail except to point out that the power is not given to enforce or produce documents in any of this legislation. It seems to me that it is important that that power ought to exist, and it is apparent that a law that does not have such powers cannot work satisfactorily. In South Australia several legal actions have been instituted under the Prohibition of Discrimination

Act, in particular the case of *Port Augusta Hotels Pty. Ltd. v. Samuels* in 1971. As a result of Mr. Justice Hogarth's judgment in that case, I have instructed Parliamentary Counsel to prepare amendments to the State Act to eliminate the deficiencies and anomalies, which have become apparent as a result of that judgment and otherwise.

The second level on which I initiated action concerned the overlapping areas between the Federal Act and the State Act, and I think this is a matter of some importance in which members will be interested. Under provisions of the Racial Discrimination Act, 1975, a National Community Relations Commission has been established, representative of all sections of the community, especially ethnic and Aboriginal groups. I understand that a community relations council will be established in each State and territory to monitor the needs and attitudes of racial and ethnic groups, and to serve as a focal point for complaints in the States.

Mr. Becker: How about handicapped people?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If the honourable member wishes to ask questions about that I will be happy to answer them. I have intended to take action in South Australia to set up a State council whose functions would be similar to those of the National Community Relations Commission, but the existence of two such bodies would be undesirable. I hope that, through negotiations with the Federal Government, the State Government can enter into an arrangement with the Federal Government that will enable us to use the facilities of its commission for the purposes of complaints and associated matters that arise out of our legislation.

I concur with the honourable member in condemning the usage of the expressions to which he referred such as "Mediterranean back". Many times I have criticised the use of such terms that are far too commonly heard in the community, and the sooner those terms go out of currency the better will be the society in which we live. I intend to investigate these matters generally, and find out whether this kind of verbal or written expression is a widespread problem in South Australia and whether, in fact, they are expressions of real attitudes on the part of people in South Australia. When I have conducted those investigations, I will advise the House accordingly.

NORTHERN RAILWAYS

Mr. VENNING: It is so long since I have asked a question I am not sure of the right procedure. My question is—

The SPEAKER: I trust the honourable member is not reflecting on the Chair.

Mr. VENNING: Not at all, Sir. Can the Minister of Transport state the Government's policy concerning the future of the northern railway lines of this State, especially the Gladstone to Wilmington and Quorn to Peterborough services? During the past few days there has been some renewed publicity about the possible closure of the lines mentioned. I am well aware that these services were included in the \$10 000 000 Commonwealth take-over deal in South Australia but I believe that they cannot be closed without the agreement of the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments. I also believe that if the Commonwealth insisted on the closure, contrary to the attitude of the South Australian Government, the issue would then go to arbitration. Many electors in my district are concerned about the rumour, although it is more than

a rumour now, because a railway union officer has been in the area speaking and holding meetings with railway workers. Electors in the district are saying that they should have a public transport system. They are not concerned about how many air-conditioned buses run in the metropolitan area, but they believe they are entitled to the continuation of the railways in the North for the movement of grain, wool, and other commodities. It is also interesting to note that a stationmaster's new residence at Wilmington will be ready for occupation in three weeks, and that a stationmaster's new residence is being constructed at Ororoo.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I should like to do something that I rarely have a chance of doing, and that is to congratulate the honourable member for his appreciation of the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Bill. Regrettably, the person he lauds as Prime Minister of Australia and the person I think he also lauds as the Federal Minister of Transport have not got the same appreciation of the legislation as has the honourable member. They believe, and they have stated it publicly to me and to the Premier, that nothing can be done in South Australia about line closures unless they get the agreement of South Australia. I hope the honourable member will use his relationship with Mr. Fraser and Mr. Nixon and repeat to them what he has told the House: that is, if the South Australian Government does not agree, then the matter can go to arbitration.

Mr. Venning: Do you agree? Answer my question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think that is a real plus for the member for Rocky River, and I am happy to have it recorded that I congratulate him on his appreciation of the legislation.

Mr. Venning: Do you agree?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am getting to that. The honourable member raised many aspects when he asked his question. Since July 1, 1975, we have been engaged in what has been called the interim period as provided in the legislation that this House supported. The Upper House supported it, although we had to have an election to encourage it to appreciate the wisdom of the legislation, but people of South Australia soon told it where it was going. The important point is that recently the Australian National Railways Commission, under instruction from Peter Nixon, has required a person whose name happens to be Lynch (and I feel sorry for him, because I know he is not a relative of the fellow who is the Treasurer) and who is an economist (and I say that with due respect to my very good friend the Minister of Mines and Energy) to investigate these lines, and I understand that he has recommended to the Australian National Railways Commission the closure of those lines.

Mr. Venning: That is on an economical basis.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have seen the report. I do not know what basis it was on: I simply have been informed that he recommended to the Australian National Railways Commission the closure of those services. To the credit of the commission (and I believe here I should give full marks to the South Australian representative on that commission, and full marks to the Premier, who insisted that we have a person appointed by the Government for 10 years), our representative (Mr. Flint) opposed it. The report has gone to the Federal Minister. No decision has been made, to the best of my knowledge. It is now in the court of the Federal Minister, and I would urge the member for Rocky River to use his endeavours with the Federal Minister for Transport, who is, I believe, a colleague of his—

Mr. Venning: That's true.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —to make sure that the services to the farmers whom the member for Rocky River represents continue. There will be no opposition from the South Australian Government on that score. The first test is in the hands of the member who has asked the question to convince his colleague, Mr. Nixon, that the service should be retained. I can assure him that, if Mr. Nixon agrees it should be retained, it will be retained.

CHRISTIES BEACH SHOPPING CENTRE

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister for Planning say what are the names and addresses of the consultants and contractors engaged by the Housing Trust on the proposed Christies Beach civic and shopping centre and what is the estimated cost of the consultant's fees for the feasibility study, the specification and plans? I believe there is a multi-million dollar project in the throes of being put into train at Christies Beach. I am told that the architects for the project are from Western Australia and not from South Australia. There is a shortage of work in South Australia for architects. For every \$1 000 000 that consultants receive to draw up feasibility studies, plans and specifications, about \$100 000 goes to the consultants. That money, if possible, should be kept in this State, in the opinion of the people who made representations to me. They are interested, as am I, and I am sure the House is also interested, to know what the total cost of that project will be, what buildings will be involved in the total project planned, and when construction of the project is likely.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will take up the matter with the Housing Trust and see what information is available at this stage that can be made available to the honourable member.

EMPLOYMENT OF HANDICAPPED PERSONS

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry state the names of the persons and organisations who will be represented on his committee to investigate employment opportunities for handicapped persons, and whether such a committee will call for submissions from organisations representing handicapped persons? It has been mentioned in the press recently, following the return of the Minister from his trip overseas, that he would like to investigate and legislate to have handicapped persons more readily accepted in employment. I inform the Minister there is a committee in South Australia known as the South Australian Liaison Committee for the Australian Council for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled. As a member for that committee, I would like to see that committee represented on the Minister's committee, because this body, Australian Council for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled, represents all forms of handicapped organisations in South Australia and is Australia wide. It has been in operation for a number of years. Because of the tremendous interest and concern in this field, I ask whether the Minister would be prepared to give ACROD an opportunity to be represented on, and all organisations a chance to make submissions to, his committee.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I thank the honourable member for the question. There is a tremendous interest in the community in this proposition which not only have I considered but on which I have presented a paper to the

State Ministers' Conference in Kununurra two or three weeks ago. That conference was ready to accept the paper, and it has been recognised that it should now be discussed at the Federal conference in Adelaide in September. I have made a press release about establishing a committee. I think it would be quite unfair at this stage to name members of that committee, because people have been contacted and they have not given an answer on whether they are prepared to serve on the committee or not. In those circumstances, I am not prepared at this stage to release details of the committee. As soon as I am able to make a statement, a press statement will be made on the matter. I thank the honourable member for bringing to my attention that organisation. I was aware of the organisation, because I have had some contact from it. I will consider the situation with regard to placing someone from that organisation on the committee, but what I am trying to establish is a committee without too many specialists on it, because I think this can create problems. I am trying to get laymen and a couple of specialists. Nevertheless, I will give the honourable member's suggestion every possible consideration. Regarding the final part of the honourable member's question, when he asked whether everyone will have the opportunity of submitting information, the answer is an unqualified "Yes".

NARACOORTE MEATWORKS

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture in another place, say when the Naracoorte meatworks is likely to be reopened? There is a wide and vested interest among South-East people in when these meatworks will reopen. Whilst I am not privy to the discussions that may be going on with the company and the Government, some local matters concern the people in the district. Of course, they are accentuated by the drought conditions prevailing at the present time. Large numbers of stock are going out of the district when it is thought they could be slaughtered on site in quite a modern works, which is standing there with grass growing around it. At the time of the closure (of which the Minister will be aware) there was a need for considerable capital expenditure on the works. Quite a big housing programme was entered into, and I understand about 50 per cent of those foundations are still there awaiting housing, so that part of the necessary infrastructure is there. Also, the works provide a balance of employment the district sorely needs. I am aware that private companies are involved in this matter, but the Government has shown an interest in the matter, for which the district has been grateful. There is an overwhelming interest to have these works reopened, and I should be pleased if the Minister could say when this is likely to happen.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the honourable member's concern in this matter. I do not know of any moves, of late anyway, in which the Minister of Agriculture has been involved. I will certainly refer to him, the comments made by the honourable member. I want the honourable member and the people of Naracoorte to know that the Government is extremely concerned about the future of these works. In fact, the Government has a vested interest of about \$300 000 in them. That is not the Government's own interest, of course; it also has an interest to see that the works, as they have been constructed, are utilised. I am afraid that I do not have any information now that I can give to the honourable member, but I will take up the matter

with the Minister of Agriculture and ask him for an up-to-date report on any moves or negotiations that he may have undertaken with the companies involved to see whether there is a way to get the works operating again.

OFF-ROAD VEHICLES

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister for the Environment say what steps have been taken to consult the public concerning the proposed off-road vehicle legislation? It was stated in a press report on July 26, that more than 800 people attended a protest rally over the proposed legislation to control the use of off-road vehicles. The rally in the south park lands attracted more than 400 vehicles. The report stated that the vehicle owners wanted to be consulted over the legislation, which they feared would restrict severely off-road vehicle activities.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The impression given by that press report is quite incorrect. I am not blaming the press for that, because I think it has reported fairly accurately the incorrect statements made at that rally. In 1973 my predecessor (Hon. G. R. Broomhill) asked the Environmental Protection Council to inquire into and report on damage caused by motor vehicles to beaches and sand dunes and to suggest methods of control. In fulfilment of that request, the Environmental Protection Council, with his approval, called for reports from various Government departments, advertised widely in the press inviting organisations and individuals to place their views before the council, wrote to all local government authorities with a coastal boundary within the State requesting advice on the existing problems and possible ways of overcoming them, spoke to members of at least one dune buggy club, and observed their vehicles in action.

The Environmental Protection Council then presented a report to my predecessor. That report was handed over to the department for it to investigate the matter. In June, 1974, the Recreation Vehicles Co-ordinating Council (the body referred to in the press report) was formed. The initial membership consisted of the South Australian Dune Buggy Club, Tailem Bend Dune Buggy Club, Auto Cycle Union (representing motor cycle sports and the mini-bike clubs), Toyota-Landcruiser Club, Off-Road Vehicle Club, Australian Motor Cycle Trailriders Association, and Auto Buggy Association. The Land Rover Owners Club did not exist at that time. I think Mr. Tose, the man mentioned in the press report, is a member of that club. Two officers from the department attended the inaugural meeting of the co-ordinating council, and also attended several other meetings held by the council in 1974. Therefore, that body was consulted as long ago as two years from the time of its formation.

The Recreation Vehicles Co-ordinating Council presented to the department in January, 1975, a comprehensive submission entitled "Recommendations on control and management of recreational vehicles in South Australia". The department proceeded with its investigations, and eventually a report was prepared by Miss Anne Welsh, who did an extremely good job. The report was published in October last year for public comment. The closing date for public submissions was initially December 31, 1975, but it was extended twice to May 21, 1976. About 500 copies of the report have been distributed or sold, and about 70 submissions have been received. The release of the report was announced in the *Advertiser* on October 31, 1975.

References have been made to the report in the *Advertiser* on November 26 and 28, 1975, December 16, 1975, March 10 and 11, 1976, April 27, 1976, May 14, 1976, May 25, 1976, May 27, 1976, and June 4, 1976. Many letters to the Editor have been written regarding the controls on these vehicles, and those letters have been published in the *Advertiser*. Between January and May, 1976, the following groups held discussions with me regarding the proposed controls on recreation vehicles:

March 16, 1976—Mini Bike Association.
March 24, 1976—Motorcycle Industries Association.
April 21, 1976—Recreational Vehicles Committee (Motorcycle Sports).
June 9, 1976—Motorcycle Distributors.
June 16, 1976—The member for Florey introduced a deputation from the Levis Motorcycle Club.

I have spoken to meetings at Nuriootpa and Mount Gambier on the same matter. Miss Welsh has appeared on television and has spoken to many public meetings.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It was not a public meeting at Nuriootpa: it was a Labor Party meeting.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: True, but there were people present who were not members of the Labor Party. Recently the Government became aware of circulars that were being sent around advertising the rally to be held last weekend. It was not possible to ascertain until early last week who wrote the circulars. When it was ascertained that Mr. Tose was associated with them, he was invited to come into the department so that he could be informed about what was happening, because it was obvious from the comments in the circular that he did not know. On July 21, 1976, the organisers of the July 25 rally (including Mr. Tose and representatives from the Land Rover Owners Club and the Toyota-Landcruiser Club), discussed, at the department's invitation, the proposed legislation with two officers of the department. I do not believe it is accurate to say that there has been no consultation with the public on this matter.

The guidelines for the legislation, which I announced last week and which were reported in the *Advertiser* on Monday of this week, provide for a Government trust to acquire special areas for off-road vehicles. The trust that will be set up will include not only Government representatives but representatives of user groups. They will be party to the acquisition of land and the management of that land. There are several other aspects of the press release, but I draw it to members' attention rather than read it now. It is interesting to note the final comment in the press report, which states:

Mr. Tose said off-road clubs realised some form of control was needed to prevent country areas being wrecked by vehicles. "But we believe there should be more consultation with vehicle users," he said. These guidelines going to the Parliamentary draftsman would be difficult to enforce against the few irresponsible individuals who cause the damage.

I differ emphatically from Mr. Tose on the point that he has not been given ample opportunity to put forward his point of view. A few days ago the *News* stated that interested parties took their time to respond to our call last year to let us hear their views on the problem and how it could be overcome. In the past few months we have received many submissions from those clubs. I believe the legislation is reasonable and will commend itself to the House.

CENSURE MOTION: MEDIBANK STRIKE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable forthwith debate on the following motion to be proceeded with:

That this House condemn the dictatorial action of the Trades and Labor Council in imposing a black ban upon the Bus and Tramways Division, State Transport Authority, and endorse the right of any particular union democratically to decide to work according to the award, and in addition this House condemn the Premier and the Minister of Transport for failing to deal with or condemn the current action of the Trades and Labor Council.

THE SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, Sir.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Standing Order 483 clearly specifies that I must, in debating the motion for suspension, stick purely to the reasons for seeking that suspension, and that is exactly what I shall do. The first reason for seeking the suspension is that the motion of which I gave notice yesterday is a matter of extreme emergency in the State and, unless Standing Orders are suspended now, the first occasion on which the motion can be debated and voted on would be August 11; of course, the crisis is such that a vote must be taken in this Chamber well before August 11.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Who told you it was August 11?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: That, fairly obviously, is about the first sitting day on which we will have any private members' time. I emphasise the urgency of the present crisis so that we may immediately take action, if the House decides it is necessary, against the Trades and Labor Council. The second reason for seeking the suspension is that the Government has not yet publicly stated whether it supports or condemns the council's action. I suspect that the Premier and the Minister of Transport would support this decision and, in fact, any decision or action of the council.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member referred to the Standing Order that covers this matter and said that he would explain only the reasons, and stick to the Standing Order in giving his explanation. However, he is now proceeding to canvass his suspicions about what the Premier and the Minister of Transport may or may not believe, and he is therefore out of order.

The SPEAKER: I tend to believe that that is the direction in which the honourable member is heading. I was watching closely, and I was on the point of calling him to order. I remind the honourable member for Davenport that he must confine his remarks to the reasons why he has moved his motion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the Minister had been patient and had listened to my second reason, he would have known what it was. I will reiterate it for the Minister, who seems more intent on trying to waste the 10 minutes I have than on hearing the reasons to be put. The second reason (I put this specifically for the unintelligent Minister) was that the Government, particularly the Premier or the Minister of Transport, has not as yet stated whether it supports or condemns the council's action. On such an important occasion and issue it is vital for the people who supposedly govern our State at least to express where they stand and, through this motion, for which I want Standing

Orders suspended to enable it to be debated, they will be able to say exactly whether they support or condemn the council's action.

The third reason for seeking the suspension (and I hope again that the Minister is listening) is to determine who governs the State: whether it is the Trades and Labor Council or this Parliament. I suspect, on the history and evidence that have been presented to me, that it is the council. A suspension of Standing Orders to debate the motion will give the House the occasion to decide whether or not it is the Government or the council. I even suspect that, secretly, the Premier has abrogated his responsibility as Leader of the Government and has now given that responsibility to the council.

Dr. Tonkin: Who is its representative here, though?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Its representatives are the silent faceless men on the back bench and, of course, some on the front bench: they are the silent faceless men who depend on the council to put them in this place. The fourth, and extremely important reason, in moving for the suspension to debate the motion is that I, and I am sure the public of South Australia would like to know what action, if any, the State Government has taken or will take to lift the ban on the State Transport Authority.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How are you sure the public will want to know?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Simply because the public, through the press and other media, has been crying out for some sort of responsible Government in this State; yet we see the Minister rudely interjecting as a puppet of the council and making a mockery of the ban that has been imposed on the State's public transport services. The Minister and other Cabinet members by their action have come out today and condoned the action of the council. They have almost officially supported, it would seem, the ban that has been imposed.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must warn the honourable member that he is getting away from his motion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologise, if in any way I have transgressed Standing Orders. I was giving the fourth of the most important reasons why the motion should be debated by the House. I know that the Government would like to bury its head in the sand on this issue, hide from the public, and not express what it believes.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must remind the honourable member for the last time that, if he continues in this vein, I shall be forced to put the question.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I reiterate the four reasons I have given, the first of which is the urgency of the matter and the fact that there will not be an occasion on which to take a vote until August 11. Secondly, I ask who governs the State—is it the Trades and Labor Council? Thirdly, I ask what action has been taken by the Government, and fourthly, whether or not the Government supports it. Once again, I will repeat the important motion, to move which I am seeking a suspension of Standing Orders to debate:

That this House condemn the dictatorial action of the Trades and Labor Council in imposing a black ban upon the Bus and Tramways Division, State Transport Authority, and endorses the right of any particular union democratically to decide to work according to the award and in addition the House condemn the Premier and the Minister of Transport for failing to deal with or condemn the current action of the Trades and Labor Council.

I seek the support of all members for the suspension so that this important matter may be debated.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I assure the honourable member that he will not get the support of Government members.

Mr. Dean Brown: Don't you think it's an important issue?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reason is clear, and it has been stated in the House many times. The Leader and the member for Davenport know it very well.

Mr. Dean Brown: Obviously, as I have said—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You could have moved an urgency motion today.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The suspension of Standing Orders to depart from the normal process of business before the House is granted for what is genuinely a no-confidence motion. The Government has made clear that it will not treat as such a motion of no confidence a general motion on a matter that a member wants to discuss and to which he then adds as an addendum that he condemns the Government for something in relation to it. That is a palpable device to use a no-confidence motion for some purpose other than what is genuinely a no-confidence motion, and the Government has made that perfectly clear. We also require, naturally enough, that honourable members, if they want support from the Government for the suspension of Standing Orders to change the order of business, should communicate with the Government to obtain its consent: that was not done by the honourable member.

Mr. Dean Brown: I gave notice of motion yesterday.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member did not give any notice to us that he proposed to move for the suspension of Standing Orders. There was a motion in relation to today's business from a private member. There is not any necessity whatever for a member to move for a suspension of Standing Orders, because members proceed to put motions on the Notice Paper in relation to private members' business in order to get priority, and then postpone them to a day on which private members' business is debated. The honourable member knows that perfectly well: if he wanted to get the suspension of Standing Orders he should have had the courtesy, normally accorded to the Government, to seek the Government's support. The honourable member did not do that, and he did not do it, I suspect, because he had no intention of getting the suspension of Standing Orders today but merely, debating the matter at this stage of proceedings. The further thing about this—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has said that this matter cannot be debated except in this way, but he knows that that is untrue. If he had wanted this matter debated and some reply from the Government made about it, he could have moved an urgency motion.

Mr. Dean Brown: There is no vote on an urgency motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows that a vote on this matter is not going to defeat the Government. There would be no change in relation to a vote. If he wanted a reply from the Government (and that is what he said he wanted) he could have proceeded to an urgency motion. The honourable member could have incorporated it in that extraordinarily time-wasting procedure that was gone on with yesterday in the no-confidence motion, which was granted to the Opposition at its request, but he did not do that. He has the Address in Reply debate now proceeding in which any member of the

Opposition can raise this matter immediately. He has ample avenues to proceed with this matter before the House, and what the honourable member proposes to do is to take Government business out of Government hands. The Government will not consent to that procedure. We have to get the business of this House through, and the circumstances in which the Government will allow the suspension of Government business have been clearly stated. The honourable member knows perfectly well that he is transgressing the mode of operation of this House under every Government of every complexion previously in this place, including Governments of which there are members opposite and which have been supported by members opposite. He knows perfectly well that no Government will do what he asks, and this Government does not intend to do it, either.

The SPEAKER: The question is "That Standing Orders be suspended." For the question say "Aye", against "No". There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division. Ring the bells.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown (teller), Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Arnold. No—Mr. Keneally.

Majority of one for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 27. Page 219.)

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): When the House adjourned yesterday evening, I was referring to the Government's performance in this State and to the growing secrecy with which its operations were clouded and its increasing sensitivity to criticism. Unwarranted and vicious attacks on a number of journalists in South Australia have been made by the Premier and his Ministers. Indeed there has been a saga of press bashing on a grand scale.

Mr. Chapman: Do you think that reflects a division in their ranks?

Dr. TONKIN: I have already mentioned the obvious divisions developing in the Labor Party, and this is obviously symptomatic of those divisions. To clarify the present Commonwealth-State financial relations and to sort out some order from the confusion that has been deliberately created by the State Government, I have listed certain cardinal points, which I will now summarise. First, this State Labor Party is firmly and absolutely committed to the policies that were so disastrous for Australia under the Whitlam Government. Because of that, this State Government is absolutely dedicated to opposing any policy decision made by the present Federal Government and will attempt to blame it for anything.

Secondly, the proposed Federal-State financial relations will provide funds by way of general revenue for the States to make their own decisions on how and where those sums will be spent. Thirdly, the Whitlam Government overspent by about \$3 600 000 000, and this deficit would

have been \$4 500 000 000 if the Government had run its full term. Thus, the Federal Government is not in any position to give the large handouts and the sums to the States that this Government demands. The blame for this shortage of funds lies fairly and squarely with the Whitlam Government. Fourthly, this State is in a better position than any other State, because of the railways and Medibank arrangements, to maintain its programme of State services. The continual complaints of the Premier and his Ministers are not based on fact and indeed are ridiculous and causing them to become the laughing stock of the people of South Australia. Instead of grizzling, instead of wanting to live in the past, instead of trying to pretend that if they wish hard enough the Whitlam Government would be still in office, they should face reality and get on with the job of governing South Australia. The attacks they make are in fact attacks not on the Federal Government but on the whole concept of the federalism policy, the situation where the autonomy and independence of the States is guaranteed by the Federal Government.

The present Federal Government, in stark contrast to the former Federal Government, recognises States' rights and States' responsibilities. This State Government does not: it is totally and absolutely dedicated to destroying States' rights and responsibilities. It wants to sell out to Canberra, and it has made no secret of the fact. Therefore, its public utterances, on financial matters particularly, must always be viewed in this light by the people of South Australia, who must view the Government utterances therefore with grave suspicion. The financial position of this State was made quite clear by the June figures, which were released recently. One of the most astounding things that came out of those figures was that \$13 000 000 more than was expected, more than had been budgeted for, was obtained from stamp duty, land tax and succession duty revenue, yet the State Government and the Treasurer of this State have the temerity and the audacity to say that this State is not being overtaxed.

The stamp duty situation is particularly severe, but land tax follows closely behind. Part of the Australian dream involves owning one's own house, and until recently that had been possible. However, more and more young people now find that they are unable to afford building costs that have soared, and the dream they once had has now become an impossible one. Figures given to me by Australia's largest firm of quantity surveyors show that the cost of building an average 13-square house in Adelaide last September was \$22 685 compared to \$18 800 in Perth and about \$21 500 in Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane. The increases in building costs are certainly mainly due to inflation and the resulting excessive wage demands, but because of the high cost of labour the costs are depressing the building industry and the workers who should be benefiting from the wage increases that have been obtained for them are now finding it more and more difficult to find work. In other words, the union officials whose job it should be to look after the welfare of their workers are rapidly pricing those workers out of employment. Be that as it may, it is the consumer who pays in the long term, and he pays dearly.

Whether it is a new cottage, unit, or an existing one, any change from a residence would involve increased State charges. If people move to a smaller property because of the charges, they will pay stamp duty on the transfer. Wherever they are, they will be paying greatly increased amounts of land tax and council rates, and more money for less water under the present system of water rating, all of these charges being based on valuations that have

been grossly increased by inflation. Even with a move to a smaller property or unit, these charges have increased so sharply over the last few years that many people on fixed incomes have been forced to consider moving yet again, because they cannot afford to stay in their chosen house. Certain pensioners have some concessions, but superannuants do not, and, if a further move is contemplated because of these charges, once again stamp duty must be paid. It is a vicious cycle and one which the present Government appears not only to tolerate but also to encourage, simply because it does not believe in the principle of house ownership. It is totally unsympathetic and unaware of the security that house ownership offers the individual. I should have thought that in their concern for the workers, members opposite would have been actively supporting the principle of house ownership. Certainly, land tax payments may be deferred and charged against an estate, but this is of scant comfort in most cases. Succession duties, too, have been increased greatly because of inflation, even though the rate has been adjusted and allowances made for an exemption on an "average-size" house. Unfortunately, this does not take into account the position of those people who, because of their occupation, may not own a house at the time of death.

Earlier this year we announced our Party's policy of complete exemption from succession duties on that part of an estate passing to a surviving spouse, together with a more realistic restructuring of the overall rates payable. We believe this is a just and humane attitude to take, believing that peace of mind and sense of security not only for oneself but also for one's lifetime partner is something beyond price. There is no question that State taxes and charges have increased remarkably over the past few years, despite efforts that have been made by the Premier and the Government of this State to obscure the issue. There is no doubt that people on fixed incomes have been more brutally hit than has anyone else in the community.

Revenue collected in 1970-71 was \$58 744 000 000. The estimated revenue to be collected in 1975-76 is \$275 483 000 000, an increase of 368 per cent since 1970. This means that for every \$1 of tax paid to the State Government in 1970 we are now paying \$4.68. The Premier has the cheek to say that this is not a significant increase. As I have outlined, this income has been exceeded by \$6 000 000. Figures supplied by the Parliamentary Library research service show that South Australia had the second highest level of State taxation a head in 1967-68 under a Labor Government, the second lowest in 1968-69 under a Liberal Government, and now, with the most recent announcements, the second highest. Whatever the Premier might try to do to fiddle the figures he cannot get away from those points, and the people of South Australia are labouring under a heavy tax impost indeed. The present Government, in trying to obscure the position, has announced increased charges for water rates, car registrations and licence fees in advance of the State Budget, hoping that perhaps they will not be noticed or will not count at the time. Where the Premier gets his figures from I am not quite sure; he seems to have three or four different sets he can pull out at the drop of a hat. What I do know is that the present rates of increase are hurting the people in South Australia, and those increases are totally unjustified when this State still has surplus funds. At a time when we are desperately trying to control inflation, it is the height of irresponsibility for the Government to increase charges unnecessarily and is, in

fact, in its turn deliberately inflationary. Obviously it is intent on maintaining a large surplus of funds, for what purpose we can only guess at. It may even be Monarto. I repeat that this Government is in a perfect position to stop politicking and get on with the job and do the best it can for the people of South Australia in all the circumstances that apply. It is time it got on with the job.

There will be much reference, I imagine, in this debate to the present situation with the trade union movement. That issue will be debated very fully. I believe the Party opposite is prostituting its principles when it insists on compulsory unionism—call it what it will. I have said before, and it will be said again in this place, that the Labor Party subscribes to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, (or so it says), and it subscribes to I.L.O. Conventions (or so it says), but in both those significant documents there is a clear statement no-one shall be forced to join an association. Yet, while subscribing to those high sounding and very high principle statements, this Government turns around and does quite the reverse, as it is about to do what it can to force people to join associations whether they want to do so or not. To get to the despicable level that has been reached where people wishing to take part in unemployment relief schemes administered through local government are required to join a union is about as low as anyone can get. It is absolutely despicable and disgraceful. This, together with compulsory worker participation (which, although the Premier has backed away from, we are still going to have), is keeping industry away from South Australia. There is no point in having the most generous conditions for workers if their jobs are being destroyed.

The people of South Australia may have approved and admired what this Labor Government has achieved in the past. Perhaps the quality of life has improved, but quality of life is not really possible if we cannot afford to maintain it and if it costs too much. New restaurants add to the quality of life, but they are of no value if penalty rates make it impossible for the restaurateur to charge prices the average man can afford and, indeed, if those penalty rates make it impossible for the restaurateur to remain open. So much for the quality of life.

The possible approval and admiration of the past are now turning to concern and disenchantment. The dreams of yesterday are turning into the cold, hard realities of today. Excessive controls of the Labor Government by the dictatorial left-wing officials are factors which are destroying our true quality of life, our freedom to choose and our chance to move in freedom. Liberalism stands for the freedom of the individual and of everyone in the community. With that freedom that one accepts for oneself, one must accept the responsibility for preserving the freedom for everyone else, and that is the basis on which this Party is founded. This is what the Liberal Party will offer the people of South Australia, and this clearly will be the choice of more and more South Australians in the future. I am quite confident that, despite any electoral advantage the Labor Party may expect to obtain from the redistribution, the next Government of South Australia will be a Liberal Government. Freedom is something that everyone wants. Everyone wants to be able to exercise freedom of choice. Everyone wants to have Australia remain the great and the free country that it has been until now. The only way to achieve this is to destroy the oppressive elements of socialism that are now plaguing this State. Liberalism will win the day for South Australia at the next election, and the next Government will be a Liberal Government.

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): I support the motion so ably moved by the member for Florey and seconded by the member for Semaphore, and I associate myself with the expressions of condolence to the families of former members. I also agree with the Leader (and perhaps the Leader may be surprised that I ever agree with him) about the choice of the present Governor. It was a wise choice, and I believe the Leader was right in sounding his praises. I also believe a wise choice was made in appointing the next Governor of South Australia. Pastor Douglas Nicholls will do equally as good a job as Sir Mark Oliphant did.

I congratulate the Government on its programme for the second session of this Parliament, and especially on the Governor's reference to the proposal to remove the present limitations on the Industrial Commission to provide for absolute preference for members of trade unions. The Commonwealth courts have had this power for many years, and it is time the workers under State awards also had this privilege. Many of the workers in South Australia are subject to Federal awards, and this Government intends to provide workers under State awards with the same conditions as prevail elsewhere in Australia. This is not compulsory unionism, as the Opposition would like us to think. It is complete preference, and preference alone, to members of trade unions.

Dr. Tonkin: Could you explain the difference to me, please?

Mr. WHITTEN: The Opposition has always endeavoured to split workers, and it will always continue to do so. Its objective is to split and weaken the trade unions, whether physically or financially, and any wedge it can drive it will continue to keep driving. The Opposition supports the freeloaders who are not prepared to pay their union dues so they can obtain the conditions they have obtained in the past and will continue to have.

Dr. Tonkin: Do you think a man should be paid because he is a member of a union, or because he works?

Mr. WHITTEN: I say he has to be paid because he works under an award gained by a union that covers his trade or calling, and those who will not pay union dues or opt out are, I believe, freeloaders. I have no time for them. I make no apology for that, either.

Mr. Becker: You want them to starve.

Mr. WHITTEN: They are bludgers on their mates.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WHITTEN: The A.L.P. has a policy of preference to unionists: it is not compulsory unionism. I support that policy. I recognise the democratic right of any person not to join a union, but I also recognise the democratic right of any worker to refuse those freeloaders and bludgers who will not join a union.

Dr. Tonkin: We have heard that before. Who is right?

Mr. WHITTEN: The Leader is extremely right—right off the track altogether. During the last session of Parliament some members of the Opposition continued with their union bashing, as they have done in the last couple of days. Most of it comes from the member who has come to be known now as Ocker the Knocker. Only yesterday he said, "I will continue to knock, and knock when I see fit." No wonder he is getting that name. The objective is to destroy the trade union movement and restore the conditions that existed before the birth of the unions. They want to go back to the time of the Tolpuddle martyrs, who, because they wanted to be organised and not exploited, suffered seven years transportation to the colonies. That is what members opposite would like to see happen.

Unfortunately, the member for Davenport has left the Chamber, but during the recent three-day session he said that trade unions were created out of the exploitation of labour. There is no doubt about that. What members opposite and the people they represent would like to do is destroy and cripple trade unions in whatever way they can see fit.

Mr. Becker: What utter rubbish!

Mr. WHITTEN: This afternoon the so-called left-wing members of the trade union movement were referred to, in particular, the Trades and Labour Council. During that short session certain unionists were named. The member for Davenport named John Scott, Secretary of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union, and George Apap, Secretary of the Storeman and Packers Union. He lumped them together with Ken Collins, Secretary of the Clothing and Allied Trades Union. If members opposite had any idea of the internal workings of the trade union movement they would not make such utterances.

I can understand the Leader of the Opposition being concerned about the member for Davenport. I would be the same if I had him breathing down my neck. The member for Kavel, too, has been extremely vocal in his endeavour to smear the Trades and Labour Council. He referred to John Scott, who is Secretary of the union to which I belong. John Scott has the complete support of his members. Each time a ballot is conducted, he wins easily, with never a suspicion of corruption in those elections. George Apap and Ken Collins were the other unionists smeared recently in this Parliament. The member for Kavel called Ken Collins a standover merchant.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I did not mention him. I've never heard of him.

Mr. WHITTEN: He is Secretary of the Clothing and Allied Trades Union. He could never be referred to as a standover merchant.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Certainly not by me.

Mr. WHITTEN: A milder man one could never meet.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I don't know him. Get your facts straight. I wouldn't know him from a bar of soap.

Mr. WHITTEN: The member interjecting has said that he gets most of his information about trade unions from the press. I can understand that. That should make the people of South Australia realise just what little knowledge the member for Kavel has in that regard. We have heard sufficient about reports that go to the press. The criticism relates not so much to reporters (who I believe do a good job) but to editors and sub-editors who get hold of a story and put their slant on it.

Dr. Tonkin: What a disgusting example of press bashing.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WHITTEN: I have perhaps denigrated members of the Opposition. Perhaps I could give some of them praise, because they are not all union bashers. I have never heard the member for Gouger unionbashing. In fact, he thinks so much of the trade union movement that he advertises in the trade union press. *Scope* was referred to yesterday as being a left wing paper; however, the member for Gouger is willing to advertise in that publication. One of his advertisements that appeared in the February issue this year stated:

Gifts for all occasions from Russack the jeweller in Graves Street, Kadina.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot exhibit a newspaper; he can read from the paper but not exhibit it.

Mr. WHITTEN: Members opposite cannot say that *Scope* is an extreme right wing publication, by any stretch of the imagination. *Scope* is published in Melbourne and distributed throughout Australia to the trade union movement. The member for Gouger advertises in it because it has such a wide circulation and is read widely by union members. He does not mind to whom he sells goods. In fact, most of his customers would be trade union members. I now turn to what I call the malfunction of the Fraser Government. It is no wonder the Prime Minister's popularity is at such a low ebb. A recent Gallup poll showed that only 30 per cent of the people surveyed had any confidence in him.

Mr. Evans: Who conducted the poll?

Mr. Goldsworthy: Ernie Crimes?

Mr. WHITTEN: It was conducted last month—

Mr. Evans: Where, in Ireland?

Mr. WHITTEN: Mr. Fraser has broken every election promise he made at the election held after the *coup d'état* of November 11. The coalition Government in Canberra has axed the living standards of Australians by delaying increases to pensions, thus depriving them of \$29 000 000. The Prime Minister should be ashamed of himself. I have no doubts why Labor wore the button saying "Shame Fraser, shame!" during the election campaign. Increased chemist dispensing fees and cutbacks in legal aid services have disadvantaged people on lower incomes. There has been a cutback of \$400 000 000 in housing and community development. The attack on Medibank is part of the policy to reduce the real standard of living for people in the work force. The announced Medibank charges will increase the inflationary trend in Australia and will goad unions into seeking higher increases in wages to compensate for the way they have been robbed and burgled by this Government. In today's *News* it is stated that the private health funds will be able to cut at least 10c a week off what Medibank is offering.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Look at what Jack Egerton says in his article in the *News* today.

Mr. WHITTEN: The Government is trying to foster the private funds to the detriment of a scheme that was working well.

Mr. Becker: Rubbish!

Mr. WHITTEN: Not only are workers expressing their concern about the maladministration of the Fraser Government but also are those pillars of liberalism, such as the Associated Chambers of Manufactures of Australia. In last month's *Industry News*, the Director-General of the Associated Chambers of Manufactures of Australia said:

What next? Broken electoral promises and vacillating industry policies mar the present Government's genuine efforts to stimulate business recovery. The savage cutback in export development grants which caused an angry reaction from manufacturing exporters is a direct contradiction of the coalition Parties' pre-election promise.

That quote comes not from *Scope* or the *Herald* but from *Industry News*. Mr. Henderson continues:

If Government continues to act in a manner contrary to stated pledges and promises, its credibility will be under question and recovery will be stalled.

In that same publication, Mr. Taplin, President, International Trade Division of the Chamber of Manufactures of New South Wales, states:

Australian manufacturing exporters reacted angrily to the Government's decision of last month to cut back on an already inferior export incentive scheme . . . The fact that the Government has apparently not only completely rejected our scheme but cut back on the existing grants is a blatant rejection of a firm pre-election commitment to encourage the export of manufactured goods by restoration of a profit incentive scheme. Unless the Government

reconsiders its cut-back proposal, Australia's export activity will be reduced to negligible proportions with further domestic repercussion in the form of further unemployment and higher prices.

That is what it seems that the Fraser Government is trying to do. The present Federal Government is totally bereft of any policies to restore any confidence. The policy adopted can only create additional unemployment, because it seems that unemployment is Fraser's cure for inflation. One example of the creation of further unemployment is seen in the building industry, which was referred to again this afternoon. At the recent Housing Ministers' conference, held in Sydney, all State Housing Ministers, both Liberal and Labor, called on the Federal Government to increase funds for house building by at least 20 per cent, but that plea fell on deaf ears. The States have been restricted to the same sum for housing for 1976-77 as they were granted in the previous year; so, we are faced with the situation that fewer houses will be built, thereby creating additional unemployment.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Yet the Leader of the Opposition says that we're getting a fair deal.

Mr. WHITTEN: Yes. The Leader decries and knocks the State but, at no time, does he knock the Fraser Government, which is where he should be putting the responsibility. Whilst more than 20 000 people in South Australia have been waiting for several years for Housing Trust houses, this "Mal-Government" not only refuses to assist the State to the extent necessary to enable lower-income earners to be adequately housed, but it also increases the number of people out of work. Contrary to the election promise to retain Medibank, the "Mal-Government" has set about dismantling it. It will cost a person up to \$9.90 to obtain full cover, and the prime objective is to destroy Medibank and help private funds to recover. If the controversy had lasted much longer, the private funds would have gone crying to the Government for additional subsidies.

In 1974, the coalition Parties voted against the 1.35 per cent levy to finance Medibank, hoping to wreck it. However, they were not successful then, but have said now that they would include a 2.5 per cent levy for the basic provisions only. This will create a demand from the unions to employers for this sum, which has been rifled from their pay, to be restored by the employers or through cost-of-living adjustments. It will create further inflation whatever happens. The Monarto Development Commission, to which the Governor referred, has been of great assistance in the study for the redevelopment of the Port Adelaide central business area. The stage 1 interim report has generated considerable comment in Port Adelaide, and that is why I asked the Minister today when the final report would be available.

When the report is displayed in a marquee being erected by the Port Adelaide council, the people of Port Adelaide will be able to study the plan and comment on it. Urban renewal, which is necessary in Port Adelaide, is an extremely costly venture, requiring co-operation between the Government and private enterprise. Valuable land in the central business area of Port Adelaide is lying idle and should be developed, but this must be done on a planned basis, and I believe that the Monarto Development Commission and the State Planning Authority should be able to do the job really well. Port Adelaide retail traders consider that a final plan is urgent, because many of them have not upgraded their business establishments in the past few years because they believed that it was necessary to have a plan to take care of the whole redevelopment of the Port Adelaide area.

Who can blame them for not spending money, when they do not know what the future will be? Whilst the development of Monarto is extremely important, so that the urban sprawl may be contained, so is the redevelopment of Port Adelaide, and only by the Federal Government's recognition of this fact and by its supplying the necessary finance can this be achieved. Another point regarding the cut-back on finance relates to South Australia's universities, particularly Flinders, which has had a freeze, so that no additional new library books can be purchased for some time, because finance is not available.

Mr. Evans: They don't know what they'll get until the Budget is brought down.

Mr. WHITTEN: The university cannot provide for its future budget, because it believes that \$300 000 less will be made available. The university requires 30 new academic staff, but they cannot be employed. The present staff is restricted to level 6 with no increase in salary, because the university is afraid of what the Fraser Government will do to universities. The academic staff at Flinders may have to be reduced, and perhaps 30 cleaners and gardeners may have to be sacked, because the Fraser Government will not tell the university how much money it will receive. An article under the heading, "Freeze on uni staff listing", appearing in the *News* of July 14, states:

Adelaide and Flinders universities have frozen all staff appointments because of possible cutbacks in Federal Government funding . . . Up to 30 academics and non-academic jobs at Flinders could be affected by the freeze, while as many as 50 jobs are involved at Adelaide university.

I believe that the Fraser Government is doing its utmost to create additional unemployment. It seems that the only answer the Liberals have at present is to cause further unemployment to try to counteract high inflation. The Leader of the Opposition said that, whenever an election is held, he feels sure that South Australians will elect a Liberal Government and throw out the socialist Government. I have said before (and I do not apologise for being a socialist) that I will always fight to stop the exploitation of labour throughout Australia.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the motion and, before referring to matters raised by Government speakers, I shall make some remarks in a vein similar to that of preceding speakers, not to be repetitive, but because I think we should speak about those former members who have served the State and who have died. Like most other members on this side, I did not know Mr. Hogben or Mr. MacGillivray, but I did know Jim Ferguson. He was one of the senior members on this side when many of us were elected, and we knew him as a personal friend and senior colleague, always appreciating greatly the kindly interest he took in new members and the wise counsel he gave us. I am sure that members on both sides will regret his passing.

It is true to say that some people had reservations when the present Governor was first appointed. I think perhaps that is true of any Governor, but I firmly believe that anyone who had such reservations has had them dispelled during Sir Mark's term of office. He has not always had public approval for everything he has said, but he certainly has had general public recognition of the honesty with which he has made his statements. In his role as Governor, he has been like a breath of fresh air to the State, and members on both sides appreciate his directness and frankness. He has served the State well indeed. The Governor's Speech, of course, is written for him by the Government, so any criticism I make of his Speech

can in no way be construed as a criticism of the Governor, because he is acting in this exercise as the Government's mouthpiece.

I turn now to the speeches made so far in this debate by Labor members. The three who have spoken have sung basically the same song, and they have made two points. I did not hear everything the member for Semaphore said, but it was a fairly low-key speech. However, I heard most of what the member for Florey said, and most of what the member for Price has said, and they have both taken the same tack. First, they dealt with the question of unionism, leaving us in no doubt as to their stance on that subject. The Premier tried to tell the House earlier that the Government was not interested in compulsory unionism. Under questioning in this place during the brief sittings in June, the Premier was at great pains to point out the fine distinction between compulsory unionism and what the Government was intending. Obviously, that distinction has been quite lost on back-bench Government members, because the three Labor speakers in the debate have made no pretence at all that the Government is interested in anything but compulsory unionism. We have had the song that the scabs and people who share the benefits should be in unions.

The other line is to attack the Federal Government, and in that they have been persistent if not convincing. They say that members on the Opposition benches are knockers. We always know that, when Government members get irritable, thin-skinned and sensitive, we are getting under their skin; that what we are saying is hurting them, and that in fact it is the truth. We are not knocking South Australia. We are interested in the welfare of the State, but we are knocking the people who are fast messing it up, the members of the Labor Government. If they do not like that, that is too bad. We are proud of the State, but not of the direction in which it is being steered by the present Administration. We are not union bashers, but we say that some union leaders are not doing their members or this country any good. Someone has quoted from the *News*, and I would like to quote from yesterday's *News* in which an article about Sir John Egerton was illuminating. The alternative to the present Government in Canberra was dismissed from office convincingly at the end of last year.

All members in this House can do is to denigrate Fraser and the present Administration, but what is the alternative? Jack Egerton has had something to say about that, and also about left-wing union leadership. Sir John Egerton was highly respected for many years in the Labor movement. He was a powerful figure in Queensland, but because he was fed up with the show and accepted a knighthood he is suddenly on the outer. We must remember that Whitlam is still the Leader of the alternative to the present Government in Canberra. In the report Sir John Egerton states:

"I think I had my guts knocked in when Labor got defeated last year," he says sadly.

Mr. Whitten: He is still pretty big in that gut you are talking about.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Someone criticised me because I admitted that I get most of my impressions of trade union leaders from the press. I have always had a high regard for the moderate and sensible statements Jack Egerton used to make. I was speaking of that in this House the night before the announcement of his knighthood. I had no knowledge of that, of course, but he has always appealed to me over the years.

Mr. Max Brown: But he was one of the trade union leaders you are knocking.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not knock him.

Mr. Max Brown: But your colleagues did.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Let me return to the debate. The distinction I have been making is that some union leaders do have the interests of their members at heart and seem to the public to be reasonable people, and Jack Egerton was one of them.

The quotation continues:

I did work very, very hard and it was distressing for me that after a magnificent victory in 1972 which the Labor Party deserved, it was defeated in 1975, which again it deserved. There isn't any doubt they were incompetent, no doubt at all. We didn't get the rewards for our toils, not personal rewards, but we were entitled to have the Labor Party in power a lot longer and they were entitled to introduce a lot more reforms. There isn't any doubt that they did a good job in some directions and the clock can't be put back on these. Much of the fault lay in the arrogance of Whitlam and his inability to work with his team. He hated a large number of his Cabinet and they reciprocated that particular feeling. Cabinet meetings were a shambles.

That is the alternative Government; Whitlam is still the Leader. The quotation continues:

The reports coming through now are that Whitlam very often interpreted decisions without a clear vote.

Some of the Ministers say that some of the alleged decisions were never properly made by Cabinet.

It was an incompetent Government, one that made no attempt to settle down to the task of government. It surrounded itself with bloody eggheads and academics. People like Clyde Cameron and some of the old-timers of the Labor Party completely lost their influence and the power fell into the hands of a very narrow vocal minority. It's the same authority now which further degrades the Labor Party introducing violence into demonstrations. They'd rather sit down in the middle of Collins Street and throw stones at the Governor-General than go about the job of planning the welfare of Australia.

In today's *News* a report states:

Egerton is disillusioned with facets of the Labor Party and its leaders, the trade unions, and some of its leaders. I quote this passage to support the point we have been making for some time that some union leaders are moderate and reasonable but others are causing much damage to their members and this country. The article continues:

He claims a volatile super Left has emerged which is not good for the country.

"One of the tragedies in Australia is the fragmentation of the Communist Party," he says.

When the Communist Party was a composite group, when it was a unified organisation, you could talk to the Communist leaders.

You could reason with them—you knew who to talk to. But now with so many versions of the Communist Party, with each one sparring to be more militant than the others—they're actually anarchists now—you don't know who to get to.

The Communist leaders in the unions bamboozle their members and treat them like pawns and they never really call on their members for proper endorsement.

By smears and innuendoes and slanders the far Left has killed off any challengers to their position.

If you oppose anything which emanates from Communist Party sources you're a Right-winger, a grouper, a reactionary, a revisionist. It's the old, old story.

It lends weighty support to our contention that many union leaders in this country are damaging this country. We have referred many times to disputes that have occurred during the building of the Gateway Inn that were caused mainly by differences between two wings of the Communist Party. It ill behoves Government members to say that we are union bashing. All we are doing is pointing out that many union leaders are doing a good job for their members,

but that many others have far too much power in relation to the number of their members, and have the ability to dislocate this country. They should not have this power, because they should exercise responsibility.

We can dismiss the speeches of Government members in this debate as being the doctrinaire material we would expect them to churn out. The member for Florey went to no pains at all to make any fine distinction about the Government's intention. The Premier is trying to say that the Government does not believe in compulsory unionism, but the member for Florey says that that is the Government's intention. The member for Florey will let us know in no uncertain terms what it is all about.

Mr. Wells: That is my opinion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am glad you acknowledge that. I only wish the Premier was as direct as is the member for Florey, who tells us what the Government is about. It is about compulsory unionism.

Mr. Venning: He is unequivocal.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: And so are other Government back-benchers. If the Premier did not try to mislead the public, the issues would be clearer. It has been suggested that the Government intends to remove the rights of citizens to take action for damages in civil courts in relation to union action, and that the Government intends to introduce compulsory unionism into South Australia. These matters were referred to early in the Governor's Speech. The Minister of Local Government has sent a letter to councils relating to employment. The Minister persists with the fantasy of giving preference to unionists, when we know that it is compulsory unionism. The letter sent out by the Minister states:

Unemployment Relief Scheme—Preference For Unionists
Councils are advised that the State Government has implemented a policy of preference in employment with Government departments and authorities to members of unions as set out in the attached Industrial Instruction No. 464.

It is pointed out that if State Government funds, now allocated to local government authorities for unemployment relief etc. were used in departments, preference would be given to the employment of union members.

The Government has therefore determined that future allocations of money be made to councils on the condition that they conform with the policy of the State Government, as set out in the attached Industrial Instruction, as far as expenditure of such moneys is concerned.

The instruction, which was reissued on April 20, 1976, reads as follows:

Industrial Instruction No. 464

Department of the Public Service Board
Adelaide

Preference to Unionists

Permanent Heads are informed that Cabinet has varied the provisions relating to preference to unionists by including a requirement that employing officers obtain an undertaking in writing that a non-unionist will join an appropriate union within a reasonable time after commencing employment. Accordingly, the following provisions will apply in lieu of those prescribed by Industrial Instruction No. 464 issued on November 27, 1973.

A non-unionist shall not be engaged for any work to the exclusion of a well-conducted unionist, if that unionist is adequately experienced in and competent to perform the work. This provision shall apply to all persons (other than juniors, graduates, etc. applying for employment on completing studies and persons who have never previously been employees) seeking employment in any department and to all Government employees. However, before a non-unionist is employed the employing officer shall obtain in writing from him an undertaking that he will join an appropriate union within a reasonable time after commencing employment. Cabinet also desires that, where possible, present employees who are not unionists be encouraged to join appropriate unions. It is not intended

that this instruction should apply to the detriment of a person who produces evidence that he is a conscientious objector to union membership on religious grounds.

In fact, no-one will get a job if he is not willing to join a union or is not already a union member. The Government is disbursing taxpayers' funds, not union funds, and I suggest that many people in this State would completely oppose compulsory unionism. We as Australians are basically opposed to compulsion in any form unless there is some good reason for the compulsion. I believe that the measures foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech will lead to much heated debate in this House, because we feel strongly about this matter. In a free country (and the United Nations charter acknowledges this) people should be free to choose what they will or will not join. We do not force people to join a church or a sporting club. Government members have referred to the analogy of belonging to a sporting club, but we do not force people to join sporting clubs. The Government is to force people into joining associations on which their livelihood depends. That will not strike a responsive cord within the thinking of most of the people of this State.

Members opposite referred to the incompetence of the Federal Government. The Minister of Labour and Industry announced in the press today that Cabinet had decided to extend baking hours, but I understand that this afternoon he has had a hurried press conference to announce that that arrangement is now off. The Government has run into trouble within hours of making a firm announcement that it intended to legislate for baking hours to be extended. What an example of competence is that? We know perfectly well whence the pressure came. We know the Government cannot govern without getting the sanction of the Trades and Labour Council.

The position in South Australia in the rural areas is mentioned in the Governor's Speech, which, it must be remembered, was given one month ago. It was acknowledged that the rural community was suffering at that stage and anxiously awaiting rain and that, if rain did not come, conditions would get worse. Conditions are now vastly worse than they were over a month ago when this Speech was delivered. After a particularly inept statement by the Minister of Lands, who took a brief car tour through the Mallee areas and said all the stock he saw looked fat and there was no drought—

Mr. Venning: He had a pair of green glasses on, didn't he.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think they must have been rose coloured. After that particularly inept statement, the Government at last realised that conditions in the rural area were desperate. If we get a loss of income of about \$300 000 000 in the rural community, South Australia as a whole, including those people who reside in the metropolitan area, will feel the effect, so the situation is desperate. I hear that today some rain has fallen in areas of the South-East, so there is relief there, but we have had no reports of rain falling in widespread areas of South Australia, so things are quite desperate. It was put to me by one landholder in my area that the restriction the Government put on the transport of stock (that only the transport of breeding stock would be subsidised) was not particularly realistic, because the only other alternative for, say, wethers, steers and male stock was to keep them on the property or slaughter them, so there could well be a shortage next year. If the farmer decided that it was worth transporting male stock, wethers or steers, it would be his decision; he would be taking a risk and paying half the freight cost,

but in the long term it could be a wise decision for South Australia to subsidise the transport of that stock if the farmer was prepared to take the risk.

If this stock has to be slaughtered on the property there could well be a shortage in six months' time. It was put to me by the producer that it did not seem a particularly realistic approach for the Government to offer to subsidise the transfer of breeding stock. I put that to the Government. I do not think it would involve the Government in a great deal of expense, and it could be a very sensible move for South Australia in the future. If the farmer is prepared to take the risk of shifting this stock, he could well lose money on it, but that would be the risk he took. The other alternative is simply to shoot the stock, which will mean that there will be a great shortage in the fairly near future.

I was interested to read the Minister of Agriculture's statements regarding vine improvement. I think that even the front bench officers must acknowledge that the Minister for Agriculture has certainly not been one of their stars. I think that probably he has been as inept as any of the Government Ministers. I do not know who has caused the Government more embarrassment—the Attorney-General or the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister of Agriculture has certainly gone over like a lead balloon in country areas. His brand of socialism does not strike a very responsive cord in the breast of the rural people in this State. I can give one instance where he was invited to open the annual conference of the Women's Agricultural Bureau and to speak on the future of the family farm. I was there with one or two of my colleagues. The family farm did not rate a mention; that was too difficult for him. His brand of socialism has not sorted out what is likely to happen to the family farm. He told the women present that they were lucky they were not like their city sisters, who were running around having nervous breakdowns. He said they should not be baking lamingtons for the Friday stall but that they ought to be busy out on the farms helping their husbands. I think that was a most inept and inappropriate effort. I believe one of the most serious charges that can be levelled at a Minister is that he is incompetent.

Mr. Venning: Who else can they put there?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister of Lands certainly drove around in his car through the Mallee with his eyes shut. He was not the last gasp when it comes to Ministers of Agriculture.

Mr. Langley: I'll bet he has had more experience on the land than you had.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Maybe he has put a fair bit of time in England and picked up a few fancy ideas.

Mr. Langley: He had a farm around Peterborough.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am sorry, I thought the honourable member was referring to Mr. Chatterton. I said the Minister of Lands was streets ahead of the present Minister of Agriculture, and that was not saying much! I was pleased to note that reference was made to vine improvement in the Governor's Speech. There is operating, at the viticultural research centre at Nuriootpa, what is called the Vine Improvement Society, which is a society of growers in the district who have co-operated with the Government at the research centre on a very good programme of vine improvement. The former Minister acknowledged that this was a co-operative effort that should be encouraged. I was involved in making approaches to the former Minister to acquire some more land so this activity could be expanded.

I hope that that reference in the Governor's Speech to the vine improvement programme will indicate that the present Minister intends to proceed with that programme and that we can see that work prosper in the future, because it is a really good example of co-operation between private growers and Government. They have a dispersal of stock at reasonable prices annually, and I believe the work they are doing is first class.

I have already mentioned that the members on the Government side who have spoken were very sensitive about the fact that the left wing was now in control of the Trades and Labor Council and, indeed, we know that the left wing has become more dominant in the Parliamentary Caucus, but it is obvious that the left wing is calling the tune; this is shown from the fact that the legislation to which I have referred is to be introduced. What the Government wants to do is not simply to give the unionist and union leaders a fair go but to make them a privileged class. I well remember emergency legislation coming into the House whereby action could be taken by the Government to control anyone in this State except a unionist who happened to be on strike. There was no way in the world that the Government could control them, and that was a specific exclusion from that piece of legislation. If that does not indicate that the Government intended to make union officials a privileged class, I do not know what does.

This current legislation smacks of the same sort of situation. What was the Premier's answer to the Port Adelaide steel strike. He said, "Now we are going to outlaw civil actions", but after months of haggling over steel that had piled up on the wharves at Port Adelaide, he said, "Well, when the owners want to take civil action I will not stand in their way." We got the song week in and week out: "There is no action we can take, it is a Federal matter". It was a row between the waterside workers and transport workers, but the Premier had no answer. The Premier washed his hands of the matter, just as members opposite are keeping their heads down over the decision that no fuel will be supplied to the Municipal Tramways Trust by the Trades and Labor Council. When pressed, the only solution the Premier had was to say that, if the employers were to take this matter to Court, he would encourage them—he did not go quite as far as saying he would encourage them, but he said he certainly would not discourage them. That course will not be open to them now, because of this legislation. The Government intends to remove the right to take unions or union officials to court in civil actions. The Premier indicated to me earlier that he believed it would be useful to have such a right on the Statutes, but he now intends to exclude it. That is an issue on which there will be vigorous debate. When this year's Budget is introduced on, I think, September 7, we will hear the Treasurer singing the same song he has sung for the past few years. He will say, "We are proud to announce that we have not had to increase rates and taxes this year".

Mr. Venning: He's done it already.

Mr. Allison: He does it now by regulation.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He has done the same for the past two years. He now has his media boys whipped into top gear releasing press statements saying, "We are proud that we do not have to increase rates and taxes in our Budget." No, because the Government has been doing so in preceding months. We have just had a steep increase in motor vehicle registration fees. Government back-benchers are not backward in blaming the Federal Government for its policies, but State motor

vehicle registration fees increased by about 20 per cent recently. In the past week or so steep increases in water charges have been announced. I do not doubt for a moment that, when the Budget is introduced later this year, the Treasurer will throw out his chest and proclaim to the public of South Australia, "We are the greatest. We are able to bring down a Budget without increasing charges and taxes." That is all poppycock! Last year the Government increased stamp duty on a whole range of transfers and on motor vehicles. Transfer fees were introduced in relation to mortgages, too. The Treasurer still has the effrontery to say, "We are not increasing taxes and charges."

The Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries has foreshadowed measures to control hobby farms. The member for Heysen will deal with that matter more fully. He and I have in our districts what the Government probably calls "hobby farms". Perhaps the member for Murray, and certainly the member for Light, have similar farms in their districts. I did not like too much the tone of what was announced in the press some time ago when initial recommendations were foreshadowed in the Lewis report pertaining to this matter.

In my own area there is a group of people who have banded together and live on small holdings; they would be classed as hobby farmers by the Government. Those people are concerned about their future. The basic problem faced by landholders in the Adelaide Hills is escalating costs and static or diminishing returns from produce. The Government has made a substantial contribution to cost increases in this field. If the Government is really concerned about people trying to leave the highly productive Adelaide Hills and surrounding areas it should address its mind to doing something about the level of taxes these people are paying. We on this side have said many times that land tax is not levied in other States. It is levied here.

Dr. Tonkin: And how!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Valuations in the Adelaide Hills are climbing. The idea promoted in the initial article is that the price of land should somehow be controlled. That will not solve the problem. The only escape for producers in the Hills is to sell their land at a reasonably high price so that they can buy property elsewhere to re-establish themselves. People in this category in my district are trying to buy land in the South-East. If the Government wants to control the price of land so as to block out hobby farmers and depress land values generally, they will trap people there. If the Government still levies exorbitant rates and taxes, it will condemn these people to a life of penury and poverty. That is what the Government's action will amount to.

No-one can claim that the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries has had much success in his portfolio. The Government should not get any fancy ideas about doing anything until it has had a good look at the problem and has consulted with landholders and hobby farmers in the Hills. Some of my neighbours are hobby farmers. They have come into the country to live because they believe it is a congenial place in which to live and raise their families. The people I know keep their properties in good order. In blocking these people from coming onto the land, the Government is at the same time disadvantaging people engaged full time on the land by controlling the price of land and by trying to depress values.

His Excellency referred to education in his Speech. The Minister of Mines and Energy recently acknowledged

what is the major problem facing this country when, in a Melbourne newspaper article, the headline of which stated "Inflation is the enemy of education" he was reported as follows:

"Inflation was a major enemy of educational advancement," the South Australian Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Hudson, said last night. Mr. Hudson was addressing the annual conference of the Australian College of Education at the University of Melbourne. He is a former Minister of Education. He said, "Inflation ate into the real value of additional funds provided." Mr. Hudson said, "The major part of the school building programme was taken up with providing new schools in areas of expanding population."

That is the first acknowledgment that I can find by a Government member, let alone a Minister, that inflation is the major problem facing this country. The Minister had to go to Melbourne to say it, but he said it. We still get members opposite castigating the Federal Government for cutting back expenditure. I ask those members how on earth a country can continue to run up a national deficit of about \$4 500 000 000 with a rate of inflation of about 20 per cent? How can any Government come to terms with that situation without cutting expenditure? I can see no other way. A senior Minister of the Government has acknowledged that inflation is the major problem facing education. It is really the major problem, as Government members know, facing this country. Members opposite talk about expenditure cuts and Medibank, but Medibank is still there: all the Commonwealth Government has done is try to find the funds to finance it. The Whitlam Administration did not have funds to finance anything in the end.

Mr. Whitten: Because the Senate would not allow it, that is why.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I was pleased to see at last an acknowledgment by a Minister of this Government that inflation was a major problem. I do not intend to deal at any length with education, because the member for Mallee is the Opposition member responsible for that subject. I will now refer to something which I have mentioned previously in the House and which I do not apologise for mentioning again. We are spending vastly increased sums on education, and we have become very innovative by national standards. Indeed, we have become innovative by world standards, as I know from my experience of three years ago when visiting many overseas schools. However, I believe that the time has come when some real research should be done into the alleged benefits of the large open-plan secondary schools, in particular. I visited such schools overseas and encountered a whole range of opinion, but in no place I visited did I find that the administration had gone into open-plan education at the secondary level on the scale that applies here.

I went to Stockholm, which was a much vaunted haven of socialism (go there and you live in a Utopia), but people forget that the average worker there pays more than half his salary in taxes and that university education is not free. There are many other aspects of their lives that we would not think very desirable. In Stockholm there was only one open-plan primary school, but no open-plan secondary school. There was an air of informality in the secondary schools, where the pupils did not wear uniforms, and the schools covered a wider age range than do ours. The academic achievement in those schools was high, but they had no plans for this kind of school. Benefits can be derived from teachers working in team teaching, by working together and pooling their

brains but, when there are 12 or 15 teachers in a large open area, who is to organise the activities of the 200 to 300 students? Life becomes complicated.

I am unable to say that that system is preferable to a more traditional approach or a half-way approach, but there are grave doubts in my mind and in the minds of others that it is time some real research into and appreciation of this system were undertaken so that we could make a sensible decision. The proponents of this kind of education claim that all kinds of benefit accrue, but no-one seems to have examined the students from that system or made any real assessment of the alleged benefits. We are spending millions of dollars on and going flat out with this development. The member for Fisher, who has returned from his oversea study tour, has found that some of the ideas held for many years to be sacrosanct (not the school-leaving age) have, as a result of research, been found to be invalid. It is high time we had some real investigation done by competent people into what is being achieved by some of our innovations into which we have gone in a big way in South Australia in the name of pace-setting in education.

Mention is made in the Speech of decisions to be made regarding power supplies for South Australia, and Mr. Huddleston has announced that there is a great degree of urgency in making these decisions. Future power needs in South Australia would indicate that fundamental decisions must be made within the next year or two on where our future power supplies will be generated in South Australia.

I now refer to the Premier's final statement in the Governor's Speech which is, of course (and as one would expect) self-laudatory, as is the case in all such Speeches; it states:

The management of the fiscal affairs of this State in the forthcoming financial year will to a considerable extent be conditioned by the development of the Commonwealth Government's financial policies in relation to the States generally. In this area my adviser's fiscal policy in the immediate past may, at least in the short term, place us in a better position than some of the other States.

The Governor's adviser is the Treasurer, who is asserting that in the short term we will be in a better position than some of the other States will be. We are in a better position in the short term, because we sold the country railways in a deal that was certainly more than advantageous to South Australia. The deal seemed to me to be quite unreal; nevertheless, it was to our advantage. I stress, however, that it is a short-term advantage, because the cost structure in South Australia and the level of taxation are now the second highest in the Commonwealth. So, the position in South Australia is only temporary and will soon catch up with us so that we will no longer be in any better position than the other States.

One feature of this Government's Administration that is only too readily apparent under any Labor Administration is the growth of the public sector to the detriment of the private sector. This was one of the features of the Labor Administration in Canberra. It is one of those activities which are spectacularly apparent at that level, and it has happened in South Australia, perhaps not so spectacularly, since Labor came to office. Growth in the public sector in South Australia has far outstripped that of any of the other States. It was claimed in the press some weeks ago by the Hon. John McLeay (Minister for Construction in the Federal Government) that we could save money in South Australia if more work was given out to private contractors.

Mr. Evans: No-one would argue against that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Government would.

Mr. Evans: That's foolish.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The tenor of the article was that work was being denied the private sector in South Australia because the Government was intent on having many of its major projects carried out by a permanent work force of day labour. One thing I discovered recently while in other States was that far more work was done by Government day labour in South Australia than in any of the other States. I visited all of the Eastern States. The Board of Works, in Melbourne, is responsible for all water, sewerage and planning in metropolitan Melbourne (an operation that would be somewhat larger in area and scope, although probably no more difficult than in metropolitan Adelaide), yet about 90 per cent of its work is done by private contract, whereas the reverse applies in South Australia. More than 80 per cent of the work in South Australia is done directly by Government departments. The nature of the operation makes the problem difficult for the Government. An attempt will be made to say that we are trying to denigrate Government workers, but that is not so. A large permanent Government force is difficult to organise and to keep operating profitably. Every State acknowledges that there must be a permanent day labour force attached to all construction departments in Government, but the size of the force and the work it undertakes are the points of controversy and seem to be a point of difference between the two sides in this House. The position in South Australia is just the opposite from that in the Eastern States. When referring to what Mr. McLeay had said, the article states:

He suggested the South Australian Government should do the same. He said the Federal Government recently had compared the cost of a construction project on a day labour basis and on a contract basis. We proved we could save one-third of the cost to the Government by letting the work out to tender.

The Minister of Works, in replying, said that any decision taken by the South Australian Government between day labour and private industry was on the basis of economics. I should like the Minister to support that statement with any evidence he can produce.

Dr. Tonkin: He can't; he hasn't got a hope.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not believe he can. Having got the labour force established on a permanent basis, it is more economical to have it doing something than doing nothing. However, whether it is doing anything economically as compared to the private sector is the question to which we are addressing ourselves. It is not a choice between whether that labour force does something or does nothing; the choice is whether it can do the job more economically. The Minister claimed, in reply to Mr. McLeay, that the decision was made on the basis of economics. He said that whichever sector offers the cheapest and most efficient service gets the job. When I was a member of the Public Accounts Committee, we investigated some of the Government departments. When we investigated the Engineering and Water Supply Department, for instance, there was no way in the world in which we could find out the cost of a job. We got the computer print-outs on some jobs. Perhaps we were looking at small operations, but there was no way of ascertaining what the job had cost.

I do not accept the Minister's statement. If we are to get efficiency, we must make our departments accountable; they must be competitive with the private sector. That is the situation in Melbourne. The Board of Works in Melbourne has its maintenance force and it knows what jobs will cost, but that is not so in South Australia. Matters

looming large as issues in South Australia are tending to confuse the public. We are seeing some activity by the left wingers (although Government members earlier today tried to deny that left wingers are active) in relation to Medibank, and we even hear people advocating that the Medibank levy should not be paid. Things are coming to a pretty pass when unions start telling their people that they should not pay what they would legally be obliged to pay once the Government passes the legislation.

Dr. Tonkin: The unions will not let their members work if they want to.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is so. I had such a case in my district in connection with the Medibank strike, a disgraceful episode if ever there was one, where the stand-over tactics of some of these unions have been only too evident. I turn now to the proposed inquiry into the use of marihuana, a matter which has excited much public interest and attention. I was sent a copy of an article appearing in the *Australian G.P.* in May, 1976. The article is scientifically based and shows the deleterious effects of marihuana, pointing out that the damage that is done persists. Marihuana is not, like alcohol, dissipated by bodily processes in a relatively short time, although one acknowledges that alcohol in excess can do permanent damage. Marihuana has a cumulative and a harmful effect, and that is borne out by scientific evidence. I urge Labor members to read this article, a copy of which was sent to me from Darwin by a person who was most concerned.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That would be all the more reason to have an inquiry, wouldn't it?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If members opposite read this report they would not entertain the idea. We know that the pressure came from people who want it legalised. If the Labor Party is able to resist that pressure and is willing to consider the matter on a scientific basis, its members will come to only one conclusion: the law should not be changed to allow the consumption of marihuana. I hope that subsequent Government speakers who may contribute to this debate will not take up the song that was sung by the previous three speakers—

Dr. Tonkin: Class warfare.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, class warfare, compulsory unionism. The first and second verses have been the same in each song. The first is compulsory unionism, class warfare, and the second relates to kicking the Federal Government. Let us hope for something more constructive from Government members still to speak in this debate.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): In supporting the motion, I express my deep sympathy to the families of the three former members of this House referred to by His Excellency in his Speech in opening the second session of the Forty-Second Parliament. I thank His Excellency for the Speech in which he said that, in the ordinary course of circumstances, it would be the last occasion on which it would fall to him to call us together for the dispatch of business. South Australians have been most fortunate in having had the services of this distinguished gentleman and I, with my colleagues, wish him and Lady Oliphant good health and happiness in the future.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition criticised previous Government speakers for singing the same song. I think he did a good job of joining in that chorus, but I shall attempt to inject something a little different and, I hope, a little more constructive, for his benefit.

Whilst it is true that South Australia is doing a bit better than the other States are doing in relation to unemployment in Australia, the figures are rising and the prospects for the future seem to be grim. Recently, the Premier predicted that unemployment could reach 6 per cent or 7 per cent by the end of this year. Overcoming this unemployment is the greatest immediate challenge before us, and the State Government's development and legislative programme goes a long way towards meeting that challenge. In addition, the State Government's sizeable contributions to the unemployment relief scheme has provided extra jobs for many hundreds of workers, accounting for an improvement in this State's level of unemployment. However, alone the State Government cannot solve this problem.

It is a national problem that requires national and State action. The figures released by the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations (Hon. Tony Street) on the national intake of apprentices are a disgrace. The national intake of apprentices reached an all-time record of more than 42 000 in 1973-74 under the Whitlam Government, but this year's figure of 32 000 represents a drop of about 25 per cent. This is clear evidence that many employers have failed to recognise their responsibilities, and it is obvious that by 1980 there will be a serious shortage of skilled workers in this country.

Presumably, the Federal Government's economic policies are designed to improve confidence, but they are likely to have the opposite effect once the effects of the policies are apparent. If there is really to be a substantial reduction in public expenditure, it is likely that increased unemployment will occur before the end of the year, particularly in industries such as the construction industry. The measures will ultimately be deflationary and have no positive effect on confidence, with the result that the economic recovery will be either slowed down or aborted with unemployment increasing sharply. The unfortunate effects will be felt most deeply in the outer suburbs because of the cutbacks in transport, urban development, and assistance to local government, and depending upon any other budgetary measure, the general effect is likely to be deflationary because of unemployment in key industries and the lack of consumer confidence.

The Australian economy must generate sufficient new jobs for the unemployed, newcomers to the labour force, and those displaced by automation and technological changes and declines in individual industries. Long-range plans to spur economic activity in local communities, prepared by local citizens and approved by State Governments, is also necessary. The creation of new job opportunities through loans as incentives to employ the unemployed and to retrain the jobless are essential measures if we are to get on with the task of eliminating unemployment, which can only cause hardship and poverty, and no-one in this House would want that to happen.

As a member of the South Australian Branch of the Committee of the Productivity Promotion Council of Australia, I should like to see much more co-operation and action from State and Federal Governments, employers, and employees. Higher productivity provides opportunities for a rising general standard of living in the community. Governments have the responsibility to create conditions favourable to higher productivity through a balanced programme of economic development and appropriate economic and social policies. Primary responsibility, of course, lies with management, but the active co-operation of all parties, including the trade unions and their representatives, is indispensable, particularly in today's inflationary circumstances. Five or six trade unions are

represented on the South Australian committee and it is pleasing to report that the Secretary of the South Australian United Trades and Labour Council has attended one or two recent meetings; but, because increased productivity allows wages to rise faster, working hours to be diminished faster, and our social welfare programmes and public spending to expand faster, more trade union and management participation is required.

I commended the report of the Australian observer at the 1975 meetings in Washington of the European Association of National Productivity Centres (Mr. V. J. White) who is Assistant Secretary of the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations. In Mr. White's summing up of what he learned overseas is a chapter headed "Implications for Australia" and Mr. White stated:

Union support is a must: A productivity movement which does not have the support of the trade union movement at all levels might just as well go fishing as attempt to make real gains on the productivity improvement scene. Support must not be nominal, it must be real and continuing. If this support is not there, it is the productivity movement which must change, not try to expect the trade union movement to change.

He also referred to the need for improved union/management co-operation, indicating that that is the key. He also stated:

In today's world a productivity organisation which attempts to improve productivity without first attempting to improve the industrial relations climate is only playing with its task. The real gains must come through improved union/management co-operation at plant level. A productivity movement which ignores this central fact is just like a boy playing with a toy rather than getting down to the real business of the matter.

Productivity advisory bodies and the full-time productivity staff in the department must get closer to the industrial relations expertise that is available in the department. Put another way, the I.R. support from within the department is essential to the success of the productivity movement.

I recommend that all members try to obtain a copy of that report, because it is most interesting. It is extremely unfortunate that, for the average unionist, productivity is a dirty word, and a vast programme of understanding is essential if the co-operation of the workers is to be won. Management has a responsibility to prove its sincerity, and that there is something for everybody in higher productivity. Indeed, workers want to know what is in it for them. Trade unions are not opposed to the concept of productivity; its importance is recognised, but thousands of individuals see it as a means for working harder and, therefore, the suspicion remains.

Mr. Mathwin: You don't like incentive schemes, do you?

Mr. ABBOTT: I have an interesting article entitled, "Productivity, a union view", written by the Commonwealth President of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union, Mr. R. T. Scott. It appeared in the March, 1976, bulletin of the Productivity Promotion Council of Australia. In my opinion it is an excellent article, which clearly illustrates the many problems confronting the trade union movement in trying to get the productivity message over to their members. In his article, Mr. Scott refers to the history of productivity and its inglorious beginnings in the United States of America in the form of Taylorism. For many wage earners pushing spot-welding guns in the industry today Taylor's ghost is ever present. In industry the operator of a process is not involved in the making of decisions about the kind of capital goods that would be most suitable to his job.

Managements often have very fixed ideas about how, when, and in relation to which issues the employee will be permitted to use his brain. The point here is that the arbitrary term of what are managerial decisions and the exclusion of the wage and salary earner from any involvement in the making of them, are now not acceptable and, in the opinion of trade unions, could have significant effects on productivity. Mr. Scott refers to investments, decisions, the working environment, and concern with issues such as the manufacturing industry in Australia being characterised by many small businesses which for financial and other reasons, are finding it increasingly difficult to keep pace with technological change and are unable to make the capital investments needed to remain competitive against the large domestic producers and multi national corporations. I have briefly referred to that article by Mr. Scott, and I appreciate that under Standing Orders I am not allowed to have it included in *Hansard*.

Mr. Evans: You can read it all.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ABBOTT: I consider the article too lengthy to read, but I would recommend the bulletin to members. The involvement of the trade union movement in proposals to increase productivity is contingent upon three very important conditions: the workers through their unions should be consulted in advance about plans to increase productivity; the fruits of increased productivity must be shared equitably; and adequate provisions by way of retraining or relocation be made for any worker displaced by the implementation of these methods. Any change or new method must take place without unemployment or disadvantage to the employees. I believe that, if improvements can be achieved in productivity, improvements will be achieved in many other areas, including the question of inflation, and this leads me to the next matter to which I shall refer.

I have previously expressed my concern, especially in my district of Spence, in relation to the availability of low-cost housing and rental accommodation. Whilst it is extremely encouraging to note that during the year the South Australian Housing Trust expects to continue its role of providing a wide variety of accommodation throughout the metropolitan area and the State, it is impossible for the trust to meet the enormous demands made on it. At the same time, fewer and fewer young people can obtain loans and the security of their own house. I read with much interest the article in the *National Times*, "An answer to the housing Crisis", in which Mr. Hugh Stretton outlines a radical proposal to give the average family a housing loan. This followed a meeting chaired by the Minister for Planning, (Hon. Hugh Hudson) who asked the banks and building societies that lend for housing in South Australia to explore a radical proposal to change the nature of lending for house building. The high interest rates are beyond the means of many working families, and this fact automatically stops poorer people from buying a house.

Recently, in the Bowden and Brompton area, I visited houses and cottages, many of which are in an appalling condition and certainly not fit to live in. I said at the time that tenants should be paid to live in them. Some owners refused to repair those houses and, consequently, people suffer and many families are now quite desperate. It is vital that action be taken to protect such people. These substandard houses in which they are made to live should be made liveable, and more low-cost housing should be made available.

All we seem to hear from the Opposition is criticism of the trade union movement. If members opposite are not criticising the leadership of various trade unions, militant action, control by left wing unions, and blackmail and threats, they are criticising the democratically elected officials, the method by which they are elected, secret ballots, closed shop agreements, and any other matter that they can dream up or latch on to. The Opposition does not want a good trade union atmosphere in the fear that it will lose further ground and run out of something about which to talk.

During the June session the Leader of the Opposition quoted clauses from the standard form of agreement that exists between employers and the Vehicle Builders Employees Federation of Australia. The agreement is commonly known as a "closed shop agreement" and, for the Leader's information, the same kind of agreements have operated for the past 35 years or more. Moreover, the agreements have worked exceptionally well for trade unions and employers. It is not surprising that, when the Leader quoted the agreement, he quoted only those clauses that suited his case. I therefore intend to quote several other clauses. The Leader did not quote clause 2, which provides:

The following employees are excluded from this agreement, and are not required to join the federation: staff, foreman, subforeman, watchman and gatekeepers.

Clause 6 provides:

Notwithstanding anything elsewhere contained in this agreement an employee or an applicant for employment whose conscientious beliefs do not allow him to be a member of an organisation which is an association of employees and who signs a statutory declaration to this effect, and such statutory declaration shall include an undertaking that the employee will contribute from time to time an amount equal to the subscription payable by a member of the federation to charity mutually agreed between the employee and the federation, may be employed without being required to be or become a member of the federation. In this clause "conscientious beliefs" has the same meaning as that set out in section 47 (7) of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904-1973.

Clause 8 provides:

The federation agrees that its members shall work in harmony with members of other organisations employed by the company and that its members will not be permitted to cease work or restrict the extent of their work without the consent of the federation and/or its Executive.

Clause 9 provides:

(a) If any dispute arises in connection with any of the company's operations the matter or matters complained of shall without delay be brought to the attention of the senior officer nominated by the company in the plant concerned to negotiate industrial matters on its behalf. If the dispute is not immediately resolved the parties shall forthwith confer thereon with a view to its settlement.

Clause 12 provides:

This agreement is to be read and applied subject always and in all respects to the provisions of every law for the time being in force having reference to industrial disputes or industrial matters and to every industrial award, order or determination binding upon the company.

They are some of the clauses that the Leader failed to quote. These agreements are exactly what they say they are; they are agreements between two parties. However, they are not all the same. Some of them vary considerably depending on the agreement reached with a certain establishment and the management of that establishment. Unions believe that every worker receiving the benefit of an award gained by the relevant union in a sector of the community shall join and actively participate in that duty.

I agree totally with the remarks of the member for Florey when he said that trade unions conduct their affairs

in a completely democratic manner, including the election of officials. Rule 14 of the Vehicle Builders Union, a rule registered with the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission and approved by it, provides:

ELECTION OF PAID OFFICIALS

The paid officials (General Secretary, Assistant Secretary and Organisers) shall be elected by secret ballot from the whole of the financial members of the branch and sub-branches. The Executive Committee shall call for applications from financial members of the branch and sub-branches who in the case of the General Secretary have had at least five (5) years' continuous membership and in the case of Assistant Secretary and Organisers who have had at least three (3) years' continuous membership . . .

(a) Only financial members shall be entitled to vote and the Returning Officer shall have access to all records appertaining to membership.

(b) The Returning Officer shall post a ballot-paper and envelope for the return of a postal vote to the last known address of every financial member. A system of business reply envelopes shall be used to pay return postage.

(c) Not less than 21 days before the closing of the ballot the Returning Officer shall secure a postal box at the G.P.O. and the envelopes referred to in paragraph (b) shall be addressed to the Returning Officer at this box. The same day on which the Returning Officer receives the keys of the post office box he shall, in the presence of any scrutineers who wish to attend, deposit the keys in a sealed envelope with the branch's bank with an instruction that they are to be held until the day of the closing of voting.

There is nothing unfair or undemocratic about that rule. If I managed a business, the first thing I would do would be to work in with the appropriate trade union to ensure that each employee joined that union, because the objects of all employee organisations is to maintain, preserve and advance the trade, interests, and rights of employees engaged in the trade, business, or calling. If there were greater co-operation all round, we would see an improvement in the industrial relations aspect and, consequently, improved productivity and an improvement in other matters to which I have referred.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): It gives me much pleasure to support the motion as moved by the member for Florey and seconded by the member for Semaphore. Unfortunately, I cannot agree with some of the remarks expressed by these members. I have now been a member for about nine years, and would say that there are more inaccuracies in their speeches than in any other speeches I have heard since I have been a member. I also declare my allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. We are expecting a visit from Her Majesty early next year, and I think that most South Australians are eagerly looking forward to her visit. His Excellency Sir Mark Oliphant, in opening the second session of the forty-second Parliament, said that it would be the last occasion on which he would be officiating in such capacity. No doubt most members and many members of the public are sorry to know that His Excellency is retiring at the end of his current term. I feel sure that he has endeared himself to all those people who have had the pleasure of meeting and working with him. I have had the pleasure of spending two or three days with him in the Far North, and I assure members that he is a very homely gentleman and most approachable, and I enjoyed his company on that occasion.

I, together with other members, refer to the passing of former members since the opening of last year's session, namely, the late Mr. Hogben (former member for Sturt), the late Mr. MacGillivray (former member for Chaffey), who were unknown to me, but I have heard glowing reports of their services to the State. The late Mr. James Ferguson (former member for Yorke Peninsula and for Goyder) was known to all present members. Although

he was a man of few words (a man after my own heart), whenever he spoke in the House his remarks were listened to attentively, and I think that, despite the fact that he did not speak often, most of his remarks were invaluable. He was a member of the Parliamentary bowling club, an above-average bowler, and I think that all of those who associated with him on the field of sport admired his sporting capacities. Towards the end of his Speech, the Governor said:

In the ordinary course of events, this will be the last occasion when it will fall to me to call you together for the dispatch of business . . .

I am in a similar position, because this could be the last opportunity I will have of speaking in an Address in Reply debate. As most members know, I have announced my intention of retiring at the end of my present term. Many people agree that there could well be an election before the due date; the election could be early next year, in which case this will be my last opportunity to speak in an Address in Reply debate, so I am taking the necessary precaution of making any relevant remarks now in case I am deprived of that opportunity next year.

In 1968, when I first became a member, in my maiden speech in the Address in Reply I said that I was a man of few words. The present member for Ross Smith interjected and, although I looked it up in *Hansard*, it was not recorded, but I still recall it. I think he contradicted my statement about being a man of few words, but I am sure he now believes what I said on that occasion. First, I make clear that the reason I am retiring is the one vote one value issue, which will have the effect of making all country districts much larger and, irrespective of where the commission draws the boundaries, all country districts must get much larger. I believe that it is physically impossible for a member to represent such a huge area (a larger area than I have represented in the past). To represent it as I have done hitherto would be impossible for one person. Therefore, I do not intend to carry on, because I do not believe I could do justice to the job.

I have made clear to my constituents that, if the boundaries remained the same, I would be willing to carry on for another term. However, I shall be 67 years of age at the end of this Parliament and it would be foolish for a person of that age to try to represent an electorate larger than the one I represent at present, which covers 38 per cent of the area of the State and, in all probability, will become even larger in the future.

I have enjoyed the work in representing my constituents, who have been magnificent and who have helped me on most occasions, and I have appreciated that. I have always been accepted by all people, irrespective of their political views; this is something of which I am proud, because I have always said that I represent everyone in my district irrespective of their views. I suppose that much of the work that I do is connected with constituents who do not support me at election time. I am there to represent everyone and, fortunately, my constituents are aware of this. They come to me and ask me to do work for them, and I am happy to do it.

Mr. Venning: Have you been happy with your local member?

Mr. ALLEN: Yes, I have been well represented by my local member. The work is most rewarding, although many people in the community are unaware of the happenings of Parliament and the procedure to be followed in solving their problems. The member has access to various Government departments and is able to help people, sometimes with considerable effort and sometimes with little

effort. This is much appreciated by the people concerned, even if the member is unsuccessful in obtaining help for them; they appreciate that the member has tried and has done his best.

I refer now to the assistance which the wife of a member gives to him in his duties as a member of Parliament. I always feel that the wives are the unsung heroes of political life. Apart from keeping the home fires burning, they are expected to attend social engagements; furthermore, they attend them with the member and usually give him a kick in the shins if he speaks for too long or says the wrong thing. The telephone must be answered at all times, particularly as country members are away overnight so frequently. Wives endure loneliness when the House is sitting and the member is away, and must bear the criticisms levelled at members of Parliament on both sides. Sometimes they are subjected to this, and I believe that their lot is certainly not a pleasant one. I will leave this place with many friends. I have enjoyed the work and the associations.

Paragraph 3 of His Excellency's Speech refers to the state of the season in South Australia, saying that dry conditions were prevailing. His Excellency made those remarks on June 8 (about seven weeks ago), since when we have had very little rain in the northern part of the State. The position there is becoming critical, as has been pointed out in the House over the past two days. The situation on Kangaroo Island and in the South-East is good, also conditions in the Far North of the State are quite good. This is particularly pleasing in view of the fact that, had we been experiencing droughts in the Far North and with the present low beef prices, it would have been necessary for people in the Far North to destroy their stock rather than send them south to markets. At present, the freight on stock from the North is such that the prices that would be obtained for stock as stores would not reimburse the station owners.

Fortunately, we have had three excellent seasons in the Far North, and the stock are fat. We will be relying on the Far North for fat stock to keep our markets supplied for the local trade. We are fortunate in South Australia in that regard, but the Government will have to pay more attention to the drought situation than it has in the past. I understand that the Minister of Lands made a fleeting trip to the Murray Mallee recently to investigate the situation and, on returning, said that there was no appearance of a drought there. That was the statement of the year, because people in the Murray Mallee were incensed at it. I am sure the Minister will live to regret that statement.

The Government's action in making available a subsidy of half the freight on fodder and cartage of livestock is only touching the tip of the iceberg. The Government will have to make a greater effort than it has in that regard. The solution to the problem is to pay 50c for each sheep and \$5 for each head of cattle to destroy the stock on the property and to have them disposed of in a healthy way. At present, the freight costs and slaughtering costs are prohibitive. The only way to overcome the problem is to do what other States are doing—paying the price to have the stock destroyed on the property. It is a pity that we are having a drought now, because the price of grain is excellent and the price of wool has improved considerably. Our small seeds market, particularly in the Middle East, has built up to a lucrative business. The only dark spot at present is in relation to the low prices for beef. It is therefore a pity that we are having a drought at a time when this State could benefit from such

lucrative prices. Last evening, the North received a few isolated spots of rain; Quorn, Hawker, and Orroroo received about 30 points; and isolated parts of the Mallee and the South-East received some rain. However, we are a long way from being out of the woods. Unless general rain falls in the next 10 days to 12 days, we will be in for a bad time.

Paragraph 18 of His Excellency's Speech says that expenditure on roads in this financial year will be \$92 000 000. I was hoping that the completion of the Eyre Highway next September would mean that much more money would be available for roads in the "inside" areas of the State. Unfortunately, on reading the schedule of proposed Highways Department works, I find that this is not the case. Many roads urgently needing attention in the Mid North and Upper North have again missed out on worthwhile grants. However, the road from Port Pirie to Port Augusta is being proceeded with, and the South-Eastern Freeway is still progressing. In two years time, when these projects are completed, we could see much more money being allocated to the Mid North.

In my maiden speech in 1968 I drew the attention of the Hall Government to this situation. At that time, I pointed out that various roads in my district needed attention. The Burra-Spalding road, which is part of the main road from the Eastern States to Western Australia, passes through Booborowie. I said then, and I still maintain, that Booborowie would be the only township in South Australia that does not have a sealed road leading out of it. Actually, there is not a sealed road within 16 km of the township. This is one of the most fertile districts in South Australia, producing much lucerne seed; it is the centre of the stud merino breeding industry, and it is a good agricultural district, yet it has never been served by a sealed road. This is a reflection on the State.

At that time, the then Minister of Roads (Hon. Murray Hill) made an effort, and the preparation for sealing of the road, as well as other roads, was commenced. Councils were given debit order grants of about \$30 000 with a view to their doing the sealing. They would do about 1 km of road a year. This excellent idea was accepted by practically all district councils, and the work actually proceeded for two or three years. However, with the advent of the Labor Government, the work started to slow down, and it has now ground to a complete halt. It is no good the present Minister of Roads and Transport blaming the Fraser Government, because this work halted two years ago, resulting from the Whitlam Government direction that most Federal money had to go on national routes; this is where most of the money is going at present. So, we will have to wait for another two years before we get more allocated to main roads in the inner areas.

The tourist road from Wilmington to Quorn is used not only by caravanners and tourists but also by heavy transports whose drivers are not willing to negotiate Horrock Pass. They go down through the Pichi Richi Pass, because the road is wider and not so steep. This road carries a volume of traffic, and I have made many representations to the Minister in this connection, but so far without effect. It seems that this road has again not been provided for. The Terowie-Peterborough road is in the same situation. It was commenced a few years ago, with district councils doing 1 km of work a year, but this work, too, has ground to a halt. Only yesterday I posted to the Minister a petition from 1 200 residents of

Peterborough and Terowie asking for more consideration. His Excellency also said:

A major task facing my Government in the rural area will be the restoration of roads damaged by floods, particularly in the Far North of the State.

I am pleased to say that in this financial year more money has been allocated to the Far North division of the Highways Department than has ever been allocated before—\$6 250 000. When we consider the great distances in this part of the State, the previous condition of the roads, and the number of watercourses to be kept in repair, such an amount is certainly needed. The roads are in better condition than when I went into the district about seven years ago. Although I do not take all the credit for that, I do take some credit, because I have consistently worried the Minister of Transport. I think it is because of those approaches over the years that this area is now receiving some consideration.

The road from Hawker to Hookina is being sealed. It will continue to Leigh Creek, 160 km north of Hawker, a coal-mining centre vital to the welfare of South Australia. In the past this town has claimed to be sadly neglected by the Government. With the road progressing fairly slowly, at about 7 km a year, the time will come when the town will have a sealed road south. At present, the people of Leigh Creek have only two ways of travelling to Adelaide. The first is by the Ghan, travelling through Leigh Creek once a week and taking 14 hours between Leigh Creek and Adelaide; the second is by air at \$120 return, a fare beyond the means of many people in the area. When the road is sealed, they will have a route to the south and will be able to drive to Adelaide in four hours, a great boon. It may well be eight years or nine years before the road is completed, but so long as the work continues to progress the people of Leigh Creek will be happy.

His Excellency said, in paragraph 16, that a measure providing for the establishment of recreation trails would be put before the Parliament. I am sorry that the Minister for the Environment and the Minister for Planning are not in the Chamber, because my remarks concern them in their portfolios. An article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on Monday, May 3, 1976, under the heading "First part of Heysen Trail opened", refers to a law planned to extend the trail. The article, which is by Kym Tilbrook, the conservation writer for the *Advertiser*, states:

The South Australian Government will legislate to establish the remainder of the Heysen Trail.

Later in the article, the following remarks are attributed to the Minister for Planning:

Do we provide for the Recreation Trails Authority or for the State Planning Authority the right to acquire land compulsorily in order to develop the whole trail? Ultimately we will run into the situation where private landholders will not want to give up any part of their land.

Further down, Sir Mark said that he hoped that landholders would provide a right of passage across their property as landholders did in England and Europe. He said he saw this as part of the solution to the problem facing the Government and said that he would rather see it that way. I cannot agree with those remarks, because one cannot compare conditions in Europe and England with those in South Australia. In England and Europe it would be impossible in most years to start a bush fire if one tried. I believe fires are occurring at present, but that is something that happens once in 100 years. The climate is quite different from ours. In our climate bush fires in summer are a real hazard and a great worry to landowners.

We have droughts occurring occasionally, excessive rains, or hail storms, but fire is the biggest problem of any South Australian landowner. When the Minister for Planning talks of compulsorily acquiring land for the Heysen Trail, this is the problem he will create in the farmlands of this State.

I understand that the trail starts at Cape Jervis and continues to a location north of Adelaide. I suggest it should run from Cape Jervis to a point near Gawler and that the Mid North should have no trail until one reaches the Flinders Range. The range is so rugged that few people would try to traverse the Heysen Trail in that area. The numbers negotiating the trail would be small. Instead of a trail running through the Mid North and up through the Flinders Range, I would like to see a walking trail created in the Flinders Range National Park. The park has a total area of 78 426 hectares, a tremendous area. It is 38 km long and 35 km wide, giving a perimeter of 146 km. Some of the country is extremely rugged and most walkers, at the end of that 146 km distance, would find their enthusiasm dampened; there would be many blisters and sore feet, and that distance probably would satisfy them. There could be loss of life, not only the lives of people walking on the trail but of people out searching for those who were lost. People in the area fear that this could happen. Last year, in Wilpena Pound, a person wandered from a party, was lost in the Pound, and has never been found. If that could happen in an area frequented by people, what would happen in the range?

Last summer we had a fire at Wilpena Pound. I was in the area at the time, as was the Minister for the Environment. I say to the Minister that he cannot have it both ways. Is he to have some tracks made into the area so that fire units could get in and extinguish a fire, or will he have no tracks at all so that any fire breaking out will burn out thousands of hectares of land in the area?

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

Mr. ALLEN: Referring to the fire dangers that always exist in the Flinders Range, especially in national and conservation parks, I draw the attention of members to an incident that took place in May, 1976. The very dry season had resulted in a fire hazard existing in the area as late as May. A report, under the heading "Pound fire burns big area", appeared in the *Advertiser* on May 3, 1976, and states:

A four day old fire at Wilpena Pound has burnt more than 1 500 hectares of largely inaccessible country. The manageress of the Wilpena Pound Motel (Miss M. Murphy) said last night the motel, chalet and caravan park were still open to visitors.

The report concluded:

Weather changes had made the fire burn haphazardly but there were no stock or buildings in danger.

It was most unfortunate that this article appeared in the press only a few days before the Monday public holiday in May, as the proprietors of Wilpena Pound Chalet and the Blinman Hotel had expected a large influx of visitors. They had stored supplies to meet the expected demand, but to their dismay the number of visitors was far less than they had expected, and they believed that the reduced numbers resulted from the fire report which discouraged tourists from visiting the area. Later, another article appearing on June 15 in the *Advertiser* under the heading "Wilpena Pound plan misunderstood", states:

The proposed South Australian Government sponsored scheme for Wilpena Pound was being misunderstood, Mr. K. S. Rasheed said yesterday. The Minister for the Environment (Mr. Simmons) recently announced a

\$600 000 facelift for the Pound which is one of South Australia's top tourist attractions. The Government plans substantial expansion of facilities for both long and short term visitors.

Local people, me included, and most tourists welcomed this announcement. Such a project is necessary, as it will upgrade facilities in the area. The report continues:

The Nature Conservation Society of South Australia says the wilderness quality of the Pound is threatened and that upgrading a fire track into the Pound may lead to regular vehicle access.

The Nature Conservation Society cannot have it both ways: it cannot have protection for the Pound in case of fire or any other emergency (when people get lost and when it is necessary to bring ambulances into the area), without having an access track. The report continues:

Mr. Rasheed said the problem appeared to be the highly publicised access road to the Pound proper. He said the track had been used many times in the past 15 years in emergency situations.

I can vouch for that fact, and that Mr. Rasheed would use the track only in the case of an emergency. The report continues:

It was a "horror stretch", however, and excessive damage had been done to vehicles. A section had recently been cleared of obstructions and levelled so that vehicles and personnel could reach a recent fire which could have resulted in "almost complete destruction of Wilpena Pound". "The fire, incidentally, was an act of gross carelessness," Mr. Rasheed said, "Regretfully it will be repeated and so will minor injuries and people being lost become more prevalent." "Thus the necessity to reach the floor of the Pound quickly become very real."

Are we to have an access track in order to combat a fire or will we have Wilpena Pound and the adjoining Flinders Range burnt out? I have believed for some time that some of our national parks and conservation parks are perhaps too large, especially in relation to the fire hazard existing in Australia. Members will recall that in 1968 the Government purchased Oraparinna Station and made it into the Flinders Range National Park. The park was then immediately cleared of all livestock and, as a result of the wonderful seasons experienced in that area in recent years, there has built up a reserve of dry grass and other material that constitutes a grave fire hazard.

Only last December a dry thunderstorm crossed this area and lightning caused a fire on the western side of the Wilpena Pound to Blinman road. It was fortunate there was also a westerly breeze, which blew the fire to the main road and this acted as a fire break, with only about 4 050 ha of national park being destroyed. Not only were young trees with regenerated growth destroyed, but the fire destroyed many of the native pines that had been growing in the area for nearly 100 years. If the fire had crossed the main road, it could have burnt out the whole of the Flinders Range National Park, and that would have been a tragedy.

Perhaps a possible solution to this problem is to fence strips across such areas and lightly graze these narrow strips in order to provide fire breaks. This same solution could be applied in another area that has been purchased recently by the Government in the District of Chaffey near the New South Wales border. I believe the Government has purchased Hyperna and Canopus Stations and intends to create a conservation park in order to conserve the black oak that is native to this part of the country. Again, I warn the Government that, if this country is cleared of livestock and even if people are not allowed access to it, the day will come when there will be a build up of flammable material. Dry thunderstorms cover this area, and irrespective of how careful people are

with campfires and the like, there could be a fire and much of the black oak could be destroyed.

I maintain that we should have smaller areas as national parks and graze them lightly in order to reduce the fire hazard. More damage can result in these parks through fire than can result through a minimum stocking rate. I am not opposed to conservation parks: in fact, I like to see them, and I would like to see more private conservation parks established. I know of several landowners who have fenced off small areas on their properties to create conservation parks.

One such area is in my district where about 10 years ago a run-down farm was purchased. It had been over-cropped and over-grazed. In fact, it had been grazed so heavily that the owner said that he thought he would put his sheep on the road so that the sheep could eat the bark on the other side of the fence posts. The new owner of this farm fenced off about 5 hectares of non-arable land consisting of stone reefs and tussocks. He went to the trouble of putting wire-netting around the area to keep out rabbits and hares and today, 10 years later, this area is well worth the trip required to visit it. Native plants are growing there that were never known to exist in the district before.

Also, in the North-East of the State, landowners, with these last three or four excellent seasons they have had there, have seen the regeneration of many thousands of sandalwood trees, and some owners have gone to the trouble of fencing off small areas where many hundreds of young sandalwood trees have germinated. They are keeping stock off this area, and it is worth while inspecting it and seeing what can be done in small areas. It would be far better to have more of these small areas as conservation parks as they can be policed, instead of having large areas subject to bush fires.

In conclusion, it has been obvious since the House met yesterday that there is a Government campaign to knock Fraser and knock the Leader of the Opposition. This is obvious from the remarks that have crossed the House and have been made so far in this debate. We know that there is a very old saying that the best form of defence is attack. The Deputy Premier would know this: he is an ex-Army officer and knows that this is taught to all Army personnel, and the Government is on the defensive at present.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And there may be another advance from another direction.

Mr. ALLEN: Yesterday, in the uranium issue, the Government was certainly on the defence, and there were some red faces on the other side of the House. So, it is obvious that to get out of its trouble, being on the defensive, the Government is going to attack, and the method of attack is to knock Fraser and knock the Leader of the Opposition. I support the motion.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): First, I join with previous speakers in their expressions of sympathy to the relatives of those members who have passed away in the past 12 months. I also pay special respect to the late Jim Ferguson. I knew him when he was in this House, as many other members knew him, too. Although he was not of my political colour, he was at all times a respected gentleman whom we could always approach and, although conservative, he would always listen and be willing to look after the interests of his constituency.

It was also sad for me to hear the member for Frome say in his speech that he was possibly speaking for the last time in an Address in Reply debate. I feel a little

hurt about it, because I have had some dealings with him. As late as last week we visited Kangaroo Island, as most of us know, and I believed that at last I was imparting my superb knowledge of the rural industry to the member for Frome. Unfortunately, he is leaving us and possibly he will not be able to have a complete knowledge of the rural industry now that he is leaving the House and leaving me personally.

I come now to an important matter, and deal with members opposite. I want to do that, because the Leader of the Opposition has been barn-storming around the State of South Australia giving the impression that he has colleagues on his side of the House who would be a born Government for the State. Let us consider the idea. They are a motley and crude lot. I remember the Leader of the Opposition at one time was a Liberal Movement man. He appeared on television, as we all remember. Then we saw the member for Davenport who, before he came into this House, was making press statements that the Young Liberals had to take over the destiny of the Party. Then we had the member for Alexandra, who used to park his car in front of Parliament House before he was elected with a Liberal Movement banner on it. Do members remember that? It was illegal, as the Minister is well aware.

Then we had the member for Glenelg appearing on television, too, and so we go on. Overnight, they left the member for Mitcham like a shag on a rock and, incidentally, since the member has had that afforestation put in his face, like two shags on a rock. Be that as it may, I express my grave concern at what the Opposition has done for the member for Light. In my humble opinion, when he was Leader of the Opposition he was doing a very fine job. What do we find now? They put him on a bench so far back that, if he stood up and took one step backwards, he would be in the other House.

Look at what they have done to the member for Torrens, the only member of the Opposition who has any idea of industrial relations, and they ban him. That is a terrible disgrace, to say the least. I deal now with one or two constructive points, and I was deeply hurt when the Deputy Leader in his remarks attacked my colleagues, and probably will attack me, because what I say is practically what they said. The members of the Opposition have attacked us on the basis that we are continually harping on industrial matters. We have to harp on industrial matters, because the cold hard facts are that the Opposition continually attacks the trade union movement.

Mr. Olson: So does Fraser.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That goes without saying, of course. I now deal with the proposals of the Opposition, particularly as the member for Glenelg is looking at me like a stunned lobster.

Mr. Mathwin: I am listening with interest.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I know; you ought to, too. I have always been impressed by the fact that the Opposition in this House in its attacks on the trade union movement believes seriously that the solution to industrial unrest is secret ballots. The member for Glenelg suggested this proposition, and now we find that recently Fraser, through his henchman Street, has decided that the solution to industrial unrest is secret ballots. Let us consider them: let me take one industry as an example of secret ballots—the big industry in my own area, shipbuilding. I do not know whether members opposite are aware of it (I do not think they are), but there would be about six to eight awards in the shipbuilding industry. There would be about 15 trade unions. I point out, too, that there are two distinct

awards, one on a State basis, and members of the Federated Ironworkers Association are covered by two awards, one State and the other Federal. Members opposite say they want a secret ballot in the shipyard. There are all sorts of disputes, but let us consider an overall dispute.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MAX BROWN: The member for Glenelg in his proposals is considering secret ballots on a State basis. Let us consider secret ballots on that basis, covering State awards. If we were conducting a secret ballot at the Whyalla shipyard before we had a dispute, half the members of the Federated Ironworkers Association would be involved in it before they went out, and the other half would not be involved. I also ask the member for Glenelg how the secret ballot would be conducted through the court procedures of applying to the court two or three weeks beforehand to conduct that secret ballot. Further, would it be a secret ballot of members affected by the dispute, or of the overall membership?

Mr. Mathwin: It would be entirely in the hands of the union.

Mr. MAX BROWN: What the honourable member has said is rubbish. Further, what I have said is not the end of the matter, because ultimately there must be a return to work, and do we have another court ballot to return to work? Members opposite, who have no industrial background, have no idea of what it takes to keep industrial peace. On that basis, they are extremely dangerous.

Mr. Mathwin: You just don't want to understand it. That's your problem.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I point out to the member for Glenelg that many cases of industrial unrest are spontaneous. Any member on this side who has been a trade union leader will tell you, truthfully, that many times members of the union have telephoned him saying that the members were outside the gate and asking the union leader to come and see them because something had happened on the job. Would the member for Glenelg or any other member opposite believe that a trade union official would go out and say that the men should have a court controlled ballot? I would not like to be around when the trade union leader said that.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It would be one o'clock in the morning sometimes.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is right. The members would throw me in the drink if I was involved when that happened. This afternoon the Deputy Leader of the Opposition tried, in his crude and snide way, to imply that trade union leaders were thugs, stand-over tacticians, bashers, and all this sort of thing, and that they continually kept the members of the unions outside the gate. The members for Price, Spence, Semaphore, and Albert Park, as well as me were all trade union leaders before we came here, and not one of us would have stood over his members and said, "Come out to the gate."

Mr. Mathwin: But you will admit that it has been done?

Mr. MAX BROWN: The member for Glenelg is talking a load of absolute garbage.

Mr. Mathwin: What about Barry Cavanagh?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He's not here to defend himself. You're a coward. In coward's castle you can do anything.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I say that 99.9 per cent of trade union leaders realise that disputes or other matters of industrial unrest cannot be overcome other than by conciliation.

Dr. Tonkin: Oh?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Members opposite would overcome them with the gun.

Mr. Olson: That's the point I made last evening. Think of 1929.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Whyalla has the floor.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The Leader of the Opposition obviously has got the gall this evening to suggest that, in a dispute, the trade union leader does not consider the financial losses to the members throughout the State. Of course he considers that. Who wants any workers to be outside the gate, losing money, when he can solve the problem? I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that the quickest ways to create industrial disputes are to formulate policies of penalties in awards (he is well aware of that, and so are his Federal colleagues) in an arbitrary way, to demand that something happen, and to have a non-union system.

Dr. Tonkin: No.

Mr. MAX BROWN: They are the three quickest ways to create industrial unrest. I suggest to the so-called shadow Minister of Labour and Industry, who is not in the House now but ought to be when I am speaking about him, that he seriously consider the policies that he has been expounding in this House. I say that because if, by some slender chance, the present Opposition becomes the Government of this State and he carries out those policies—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He'll be an old man by then.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That probably is correct but, if he did what I have suggested, there would be some of the biggest industrial unrest that we have even known. When I am referring to conciliation—

Dr. Tonkin: You're not.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am, because I believe that is the ultimate solution to any industrial unrest.

Dr. Tonkin: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAX BROWN: The Leader says that, but he does not carry out that policy: he expounds the theories to which I have just referred. I will deal now with a major dispute in which I was involved before coming here. It was a bad dispute about something which happened in Whyalla and which created much loss in money from the industry and employer points of view. I am referring to the big fire on the *Amanda Miller* when it was on the slipway. That ship had been partly built, when a large fire occurred on it and much damage was caused. At that time the company held an internal conference of officers on the industrial side and people responsible for carrying out the company's policies, and it was decided that certain things be done.

In fact, there was in existence a claim on the *Amanda Miller* for repair work costing \$50, yet we had to go to a 24-hour stoppage, appear before a conciliator, and wait another two hours before we got the \$50. The company was carrying out a policy of arbitrary decision and we were trying to carry out conciliation. I will deal now with a very old friend of mine to whom the Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred this afternoon. I refer to Sir John Egerton, whom we all know. I knew him more than 20 years ago, and he always said, "Just call me Jack." What is funny about the situation is that the Deputy Leader this afternoon said that he was a good fellow who could always see both sides of a question and was

a good conciliator. John Egerton was a wellknown left wing trade union official. If one looks through past editions of the *Brisbane Courier Mail* over 20 years one would see that this man's name would have been taken in vain in that paper more often than the name of anyone else in Brisbane, yet the Deputy Leader says, "What a fine joker he is!" I will not say that he has also turned dog on the workers!

I now turn to what I consider is an important matter—the shipbuilding industry. I have spoken about that industry in this House, in Whyalla, in the press and anywhere else I could raise it. The current slump in that industry has probably hit Whyalla harder than anything else that I can remember. In the past two or three months the attitude of people in Whyalla has been one of despair. I am concerned about that industry, even though I have information that might throw some light on the situation. Despite the growth of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited steelworks and other subsidiaries, the shipbuilding industry in Whyalla (and I am not talking about the indirect side of the matter) still directly provides employment for about a third of the total population of that city—about 10 000 people. I was hostile about the Leader of the Opposition's recent visit to Whyalla.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I thought he would have been an asset for you and won votes for you.

Mr. MAX BROWN: He was the greatest liability that has ever come to Whyalla. I have pointed out the gravity of the problems facing the shipbuilding industry. What did the Leader do, though? He barnstormed around and made a press statement in the *Whyalla News* which made headlines on Friday, June 18, and which was headed "Criminal waste to close shipyard. Liberals will fight, says Leader."

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're not serious?

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is the headline. This report, which is most interesting, states:

"The Liberal Party of South Australia will fight to keep the Whyalla shipyards open," its leader, Dr. David Tonkin, said in Whyalla. Speaking at a press conference during a two-day visit this week, Dr. Tonkin said he was concerned about the future of the shipyard. A tremendous asset had been built up. Time and money having been spent, it would be a criminal waste if it were allowed to close down. Dr. Tonkin said during his visit he would be talking to people in the city. He wanted to leave with a far greater understanding of problems facing Whyalla.

This is the important part. Asked whether, if the shipyard closed, the State Government would have a responsibility to find Whyalla something to replace it, Dr. Tonkin said, "Yes".

Dr. Tonkin: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAX BROWN: Good. The report continues:

"I think we as a State Government—

and he is talking about the possibility of his becoming Premier—

would do everything possible to keep Whyalla as prosperous and viable as it should be."

When asked what would replace the shipyard, Dr. Tonkin said that he did not know. What a gem of a press statement! It continues:

Dr. Tonkin said the Liberal Party had a decentralisation policy—

no-one knew what it was, but it had a policy—

with incentives for industry to decentralise. He said it was just as important to maintain Whyalla in its present state as to develop other centres. Asked about future growth of Whyalla, Dr. Tonkin said he envisaged that the city would grow.

That is fair enough. In the next paragraph he said he did not know whether it could grow by itself or in association with the Iron Triangle.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What a profound statement!

Mr. MAX BROWN: Have you ever heard such a thing?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Did he say that he was going to see Fraser?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am coming to that—the Minister is jumping the gun. Later, the report states:

If a Liberal Government were elected, there were matters Mr. Dunstan had introduced which would be maintained. In other words, the Leader came to Whyalla, told the people nothing, did nothing and left.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: No wonder the other Brown is getting over the top of him.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes. The Federal member for Grey (Mr. Wallis) went into print in an article headed, "Claims sound hollow, Wallis says of Tonkin". I could not agree more. The report is as follows:

The State Leader of the Opposition, Dr. Tonkin, should have plenty of scope to use his influence on behalf of the shipyard at Whyalla, said the member for Grey Mr. Laurie Wallis. Commenting on a broadcast statement by Dr. Tonkin, Mr. Wallis said, "Reported statements by the Leader of the State Opposition that he will fight like hell to retain the shipbuilding industry at Whyalla sounds very hollow when it is realised that the main hurdle in the way of achieving this is the attitude of his Lib-CP colleagues in Canberra." He suggested that if Dr. Tonkin felt like fighting for this objective he should "head off to Canberra as fast as possible".

I could not agree more; in fact, he should not have come back. I want to point out some of the problems within the industry that the Leader could learn about. I made a statement that went into the press in Whyalla. I will not read it all, except to point out the needs of the shipbuilding industry. There are four points. First, I said that management was far too overburdened with administration and that there would be, in some cases, what I call one boss to three employees. In that case only two-thirds of the work force produces. Taken to the extreme of 1 500 men employed in the yard, only 1 000 would be producing.

That is the state of affairs. Let us consider the gimmicks involved in that situation. We have what we call the bosses who are in charge of a number of people. Let us consider the safety bonuses about which B.H.P. brags. The bonuses are offered for a certain number of accident-free workdays in a certain group. There may, for example, be six groups. There would be a leading hand in charge of each group, a sub-foreman in charge of that leading hand and probably another foreman supervising the sub-foreman, and then we get to the engineer. If a safety bonus is paid to any of the six groups, all the foremen also receive safety bonuses. A competent foreman supervising sufficient men might receive six safety bonuses at any one time. Some people might say that that is not such an extraordinary sum for industry to worry about.

Mr. Dean Brown: Don't you think he should get a safety bonus?

Mr. MAX BROWN: He should get one safety bonus, not six. All that these gimmicks do in the final analysis is to add to the industry's cost, yet no-one points these things out: it is always the workers' fault!

Mr. Becker: How much would this cost?

Mr. MAX BROWN: The honourable member can do an exercise on it.

Mr. Becker: But you're the expert—you're trying to convince us.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am not trying to convince the honourable member. I also pointed out that the B.H.P. Company ought to study the problem on the basis that

it has no fewer than seven owned or chartered ships trading to and from Whyalla. I said that the company should take stock of this position. Sir Ian McLennan's answer to this was that the company had no moral obligation to look into this matter, and that as from Christmas he would lay off 50 men each month. It did not come as a shock to me, because the company has no morals. I also pointed out the question of the subsidy. Everyone runs around with the idea that the workers are looking for an added subsidy. The subsidy is simply an industry practice followed to varying degrees all over the world. It does not matter where one goes in the industry, it would be there, even in Japan. The subsidy should be paid to the shipbuilder, and not to the shipowner, so that it could be closely scrutinised by the taxpayer each year. Then there would be a difference in the subsidy.

Mr. Gunn: Do you support a subsidy for superphosphate?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I do, provided that it is given to deserving farmers, but not the likes of the member for Eyre. Tell me the case of a poor farmer in this State who is receiving a subsidy for his superphosphate?

Mr. Gunn: What are you talking about?

Mr. MAX BROWN: In the press, I said that the unions had something to answer for, and I do not apologise for saying that. The trade union movement must take steps to reduce the number of unions and the number of awards in the yard. Demarcation must be done away with, but we must bear in mind that, when we tried to do away with demarcation by amalgamating unions, the henchmen of the member for Eyre in Canberra opposed us. He should not talk about demarcation to me. I emphasise the final remarks I made, as they are important. I believe that, if the shipyard in Whyalla is closed, not only will the city's future be at stake, but the whole future of Australian shipbuilding will be in doubt, and this might leave Australia open to ransom on the high seas by any country in the world. It is all very well to talk about subsidies and what it costs the Australian taxpayer to subsidise shipbuilding, but the hard cold fact is that (and this is the calamity of the situation), if the shipyard were closed down, it probably would never reopen; that is the point at issue. Even if we had to subsidise the industry, the question of any country's defence is of prime importance. The yard should be kept open, if for no other reason, for defence, and that is why it was originally built.

Mr. Gunn: Have you looked at overseas trends in countries such as England?

Mr. MAX BROWN: Of course I have. I am fully aware of overseas trends in the industry. Regarding wage indexation, I said some time ago that industrial peace could largely be brought about in many areas if the unions, employers and powers that be accepted wage indexation. Unfortunately, since the Fraser regime came to power it has interfered in this field, but I hope that it does not continue to interfere. Despite the acceptance of the wage indexation formula by the trade union movement, it is acceptance with a deal of suspicion, and it would not be very good for anyone to upset the situation.

If wage indexation is interfered with in any way it could lead to future industrial unrest. I also point out that, before wage indexation was agreed to by the trade union movement, many wage anomalies appeared in certain awards. I point out only one, namely, the metal trades award covering the metalworkers, who lodged a claim long before wage indexation, for an increase of \$20 a week. They withdrew their claim in exchange for wage indexation. Already we are aware that a tradesman in

the metal industry is probably one of the lowest paid tradesmen in Australia. I would even seriously suggest that a barman would get more money, and I do not mean to reflect on the barman. So, the anomaly exists.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much interjecting.

Mr. Gunn: What are your views on inflation?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre will have his opportunity to speak later in the debate.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Unfortunately, you are correct, Mr. Speaker. Regarding the sittings of the Electoral Commission, it has come through the grapevine that submissions were made to the commission at Port Lincoln on the basis that I, as member for Whyalla, would not have sufficient knowledge and experience of rural industries to represent areas such as Cowell, Cleve and Kimba.

Mr. Venning: That would be correct.

Mr. MAX BROWN: It is not correct, as the honourable member should know, as he represents an area where I was born and bred—a rural area. I take exception to the submission made to the Electoral Commission. Actually, I know a great deal about rural industries, as evidenced by the fact that the Government sent me to Kangaroo Island to investigate the rural industries. Not long ago my eldest son bought a horse, but something happened to it. I thought to myself, "I will find out what is wrong with it." I sought out the leading Opposition member associated with rural industries, the member for Victoria, who gave me advice. After I had passed on the advice to my son, the horse died. If the Opposition seriously believes that it is an alternative Government, it ought seriously to have another look at itself. I support the motion.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I express my sympathy to members of the families of the three ex-members of Parliament who died during the last session. I extend good wishes to Sir Mark Oliphant and Lady Oliphant in connection with their retirement. I was pleased to hear the member for Frome comment on the orchestrated attack (although it was a relatively poorly orchestrated attack) on the Liberal leaders, Mr. Fraser and Dr. Tonkin. It seems that Government members have concluded that the only way they can overcome this Opposition is to have a go at it; it is obvious that the Opposition has made an impression on the Government.

This afternoon no-one mentioned that at the Federal level the Prime Minister took office at the worst possible time, in the midst of the worst political situation in Australia's history—a situation that made the task of the early settlers seem light. Mr. Fraser took office at a time when there was a \$3 500 000 000 deficit, and his Government followed a Government that had a record of corruption and deceit that is well and truly documented. It is equally obvious that the barbs coming from Dr. Tonkin and the Opposition are striking home in the Government's ranks. Some Government members are embarrassed that they have been instructed to keep having a go at the Leader of the Opposition; some of them sit down looking embarrassed when they have had their little say. I doubt the sincerity of some of them; they are not really as bad at heart as they make out to be. In fact, I do not think they could possibly be, because some comments from the Government side have incited class hatred; the member for Semaphore proved to be adept at this yesterday.

It seems to me to be impossible to think that in this day and age, when we have relatively good relationships between employers and employees, we should be

harking back to the days of the Marxist theory of 1841, when class relationships were at their very worst. What he was saying just could not be true. If he was that sort of union leader, I am not surprised that he is out of union affairs and in another place. He was obviously out of touch. I cannot help thinking that the Government seems to think that it has a lien on people who work for a living. I spent the first two years of my working life as a storeman, and the next five years in the iron and steel industry, going through the forge, the foundry, ring rolling mill, magnet shop, nitriding, heat treatment, and the rest. That was until 1955. So, I know the inside of the iron and steel industry pretty well.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: To which union did you belong?

Mr. ALLISON: They did not force people to join unions just after the war. The matter was never brought up. I was a member of the staff union, because they were training me to be an export sales representative.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: To which union did you belong?

Mr. ALLISON: The clerical workers union, founded in the early 1950's in Great Britain, probably before you had it over here.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You said that you were not in a union.

Mr. ALLISON: I did not have to join the Steel Workers Union or anything like that, but I worked alongside these men even though I was ostensibly a staff member.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: But you were not a union member?

Mr. ALLISON: For the last 16 years I have been a member of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, which voted four to one against the Medibank strike. I have not heard of a single unionist who deliberately kept his kids away from school to punish the teachers for that recalcitrant behaviour! They still sent their kids to school for the baby-sitting. I am becoming addicted to *Scope*, an article in which states, "Wednesday's planned national strike to save Medibank was effectively sabotaged by the A.C.T.U." That is an admission from the Labor Party that all is not well. I was pleased to see that another responsible union, the Public Service Association, voted against joining the Trades and Labor Council, another responsible move. I repeat that I am not against unions, which are absolutely essential. Anyone who has had to negotiate his first salary will say that it is good to have a union on one's side.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Do you like the wages they win, but not the subscriptions?

Mr. ALLISON: I was pleased to be a member of a union that runs itself, not the country. I was glad to be in a union that looked after my affairs.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: As long as you had a body to look after your interests, you were perfectly happy.

Mr. ALLISON: I have also been independent all my life and have looked after my own interests.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Read it in *Hansard* tomorrow and see what the other meaning is. You could not care less about—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much cross-interjection. The honourable member for Mount Gambier has the floor.

Mr. ALLISON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry that I am annoying Government members so much that they will not let me get on with the business. That is the way of life: if you tread on the tail of a snake the head comes around and bites you. I was interested to hear

the member for Price commenting on the housing situation, and I thought I would check on the performance of the Housing Trust over the past few years. First, however, referring to private housing in Australia, the figures fell from \$400 000 000 in December, 1972, to \$320 000 000 in June, 1975. One must remember that a 25 per cent a year inflation rate occurred in the building trade, so that to keep pace in the three years of Australian Labor Party Government the expenditure should have risen to more than \$750 000 000 instead of decreasing to \$320 000 000. That was only the private sector, and it was Australia wide.

In South Australia the Housing Trust, in 1973, according to the trust's report, built 869 single units; in 1974, 812; and in 1975, a massive lift to 1 118 single units. In 1971, the figure had been 1 396; in 1970, 1 299; and going back to 1965, 1966, and 1967, the average had been more than 2 400 units a year. That was not in the days of the Labor Government. The figures for double unit housing in 1960, 1961, and 1962 were 1 596, 1 574 and 1 394 respectively, coming down in 1973, 1974 and 1975 to 417 houses, 281 houses, and 269 respectively. The latter was the lowest annual total since 1942, when only 204 houses were built. If the member for Price is wanting to point to a difficult housing situation, let him not try to lay the blame entirely at the feet of the Federal Government, which has been in office only for the past eight months. I sympathise with anyone who has housing problems. We have them in Mount Gambier, and the situation is world wide. In Australia there is a need for concentration on housing, and the building industry generally is one of the first indicators of a recession or a picking up. Currently there is a picking up.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You want some extra funds to stimulate the building industry?

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Have you written to the Federal Minister?

Mr. ALLISON: I will not tell the Minister to whom I have written. I do not deal only with South Australian Ministers. In mentioning the inflation rate, members opposite did not point out that the highest inflation rate in history and the greatest deficit in history were both under the A.L.P. regime, or that inflation eroded the value of our money under the Whitlam Government. Inflation was only 5 per cent under the previous Liberal Government.

Members interjecting:

Mr. ALLISON: These figures are from the records of the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics, from the Parliamentary Library. They are Federal Government statistics. It reached 17 per cent in June, 1975. The State Labor Government allowed up to June, 1976, for an 18 per cent inflation rate in the Budget. Under the Hayden Budget allowance was made for a 20 per cent inflation rate. Members opposite completely ignore the fact that the inflation rate this year is down to a little more than 12 per cent. They ignore the fact that the State has already benefited from 6 per cent or more in salaries and wages and other expenditure which was budgeted for but which is part of that handsome surplus which is claimed to be a result of good management by the Premier, as he told us in his address in June, but which is largely the responsibility of the Federal Government in reducing inflation and giving the State a welcome bonus. We have expended less money than we budgeted for. The Minister of Transport need not laugh, because he knew about it before we did. It was camouflaged as good housekeeping, but it was good Federal housekeeping.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The Federal Treasury doesn't know what it's missing in not having your services.

Mr. ALLISON: I agree wholeheartedly. This morning I heard an interesting broadcast report from London. It was an O.E.C.D. report praising Australia for its classical approach in bringing down the inflation rate.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Who made the statement on behalf of the O.E.C.D.?

Mr. ALLISON: An Australian working in London.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Who was he?

Mr. ALLISON: I do not know his name. Perhaps the Minister could tell me. He could keep me informed. The Australian gross national product has grown 3 per cent during the past year. The report stated that employment was increasing steadily and the inflation rate was falling, and Australia was praised for its classical approach to a difficult problem.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Did that fellow represent one of the Australian banks and now is overseas?

Mr. ALLISON: I do not know. The O.E.C.D. is completely independent, so it does not really matter.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: We remember some index figures from that source on another occasion just before an election. They were completely independent, too!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ALLISON: We have had comments from the other side about the Medibank levy. Members opposite forget that several Federal Bills were stopped by the Senate. They were the Health Insurance Levy Bill, the National Health Bill, the Health Insurance Levy Assessment Bill, and the Income Tax International Agreement Bill, which, combined, would have given the then Labor Government an open-ended arrangement for financing Medibank with no set financial commitment. Let us remember, while we are slamming the Federal Government, that the architect of the Medibank scheme was quoted originally in July of last year as saying that it would cost \$50 000 000. That was when he asked for his first levy. Subsequently, when he was promoted as the third or fourth Treasurer in a few months, he said it would cost \$450 000 000, a 900 per cent increase. He was Treasurer then! Now the cost, on reliable estimates, is \$1 000 000 000.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Whose estimate is that?

Mr. ALLISON: This is what we are quoted from the total estimate at Federal level. It must be the Federal Government's estimate, just as Hayden's two estimates were. Let us not ignore that the architect of Medibank and the subsequent Treasurer has had so much trust placed in him that he has been promoted to the position of Shadow Minister for Defence—and I think he has a lot to defend. The present Federal Government is quite firm about the commitment. The \$9.90 quoted as being an exorbitant sum covers every single thing for private individual wards with a patient's own doctor in a private or public hospital.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are you happy to pay that?

Mr. ALLISON: I reckon I will stay in the Medibank scheme.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Are you happy to pay \$9.90?

Mr. ALLISON: I think I would be.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You are not sure.

Mr. ALLISON: I would be happier to pay the \$9.90 than to think the country would have to drift into a \$3 000 000 000, \$4 000 000 000 or \$5 000 000 000 deficit. I am one of those people who have been advocating for some time that we never get anything for nothing and that at some time the bill is presented. We cannot go on forever accumulating a massive deficit, printing money and increasing the inflation rate. It must stop, or we get the

chaotic situation referred to by Dr. Cairns in his *Quiet Revolution*, and anarchy ensues. That is not the way for Australia. Even Dr. Cairns said that. He said that we were not ready for the advanced socialism he had been advocating. He is a man with common sense, and he is a more sincere and a more honest socialist than most.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why did your Party oppose the levy two years ago?

Mr. ALLISON: It opposed the levy because it opposed the principle of Medibank, which Mr. Hayden said would cost \$50 000 000.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It opposed the levy then, yet now it wants a levy. Why was there a change of mind?

Mr. ALLISON: My Party appreciated that no national health scheme could be implemented for \$50 000 000. The public was told that the scheme would be free.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why did your Party oppose the levy two years ago?

Mr. ALLISON: It was opposing the Medibank scheme. It assumed that, if the levy was not charged, the Minister for Health would have done what was only common sense, revise the scheme, and produce more accurate estimates.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: The present bloke has had eight goes in six months.

Mr. ALLISON: He has been under the same pressure as was Mr. Hayden.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: The *News* states that people can still not understand the scheme.

Mr. ALLISON: My sympathy lies with both those men. Members opposite and their colleagues shopped Hayden, the Treasurers, and the Labor Government by rushing through the Medibank scheme, and lots of other things. It was indecent haste in that instance, and that is the story behind the rise and fall of the Whitlam Government.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Is this London economics?

Mr. ALLISON: No, it is just Australian common sense. I never went to a university, because I had to leave school and work for a living. We could not afford to go to a university.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Is that before you joined the union?

Mr. ALLISON: I left school to go to work. I did my university work as an external student, and I had no attendance at university. The Minister of Transport pointed out that the United Kingdom did not have Mr. Fraser, but it does have a socialist Government and it levies handsome charges for its health scheme. In the British Information Service publication released through the British Consulate in Australia this week that I suppose all honourable members receive if they are on the mailing list, it was pointed out that Britain was now instituting fees for universities. That matter also arose this afternoon in relation to Flinders University. Things are not so bad in Australia under Fraser after all. Things are not so bad over here. Certainly we have not reached anywhere near the crisis stage that has been reached in the U.K. The Australian Assistance Plan, in which the Minister of Community Welfare is so interested, has not been abandoned by Senator Guilfoyle as we have been told. The current commitment—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: When did you last speak with Senator Guilfoyle?

Mr. ALLISON: The Minister's department is sending out figures but the latest information is that the \$3 000 000 sought for 1976-77 will be available and that the States have to decide in 1976-77 whether to continue at State level or to revert to Commonwealth control. The decisions

have not been made. The plan has not been scrapped, and I assure the Minister that we in the South-East are working on the principle that we are needed down there, that the scheme is needed, and that we would like to see it continued.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I will send a copy of that to Margaret tomorrow.

Mr. ALLISON: The Minister is more than welcome to do so. I refer to inconsistencies in statements made by honourable members opposite. At a press conference the Premier has predicted a 30 per cent unemployment rate next year, an abysmal depth, yet the member for Semaphore and another honourable member opposite today predicted a modest 6 per cent unemployment rate next year. Yesterday the Premier reassured us that the South Australian unemployment level was the lowest of any State in Australia. He said it was 3.4 per cent, and the implication implicit in his statement was that South Australia's good management was capable of controlling that 3.4 per cent unemployment. One cannot have it both ways: either we are headed for chaos or our good management will contain that unemployment rate. In 1972, only 1.8 per cent of the work force was unemployed. In 1975, by the end of the Whitlam regime, 5 per cent (that is, 300 000 people) was unemployed.

Mr. Dean Brown: Did not the Labor Party claim it would control unemployment?

Mr. ALLISON: Claims are only claims. The Commonwealth Labor Government claimed in 1972 that it would increase employment and contain inflation, yet by 1975 its record spoke for itself.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: In 1949 Bob Menzies—

Mr. ALLISON: Times change. We heard the member for Semaphore say that sales statistics were gloomy. I refer to a report of July 13, 1976, concerning retail sales statistics for May. Revisions and changes to the series complicated interpretation. However, the 1.6 per cent increase in May, not a decrease, and the increase of more than 4 per cent in the three months to May, followed a small increase in real personal consumption in the March quarter. When combined with undisputed buoyant motor vehicles sales data for the last quarter they strengthened the view that consumer demand had been picking up in recent months. The export trade was hammered this afternoon. Figures for June, released late last week, showed that export receipts were at a record level. Everyone was told this. This information was made an issue of in the news. It is clear that the demand for Australian exports has been increasing strongly. Job opportunities in the latter half of 1975 had fallen. This decline had been arrested, and the number of jobs available, from Commonwealth statistics, is again on the increase.

On July 14, 1976, there was a statement on present estimates that the States would receive about \$93 000 000 more in revenue sharing this year than they would have received under the arrangements of the previous Government. This information does not bear out the gloomy predictions expressed by the Premier and backed up by the orchestrated attack on the Fraser Government by members opposite. The Premier said that about \$30 000 000 of this sum was the result of a Commonwealth Government decision made on July 14, in answer to the States' requests. The Premier was one who requested that this decision be made.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They tried to wriggle out of the \$30 000 000, though.

Mr. ALLISON: You got it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It took a fair bit of pressure to get it, though.

Mr. ALLISON: Still, you received it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: One has to make sure that the Commonwealth Government does not welch out on its decisions.

Mr. ALLISON: On present estimates the States would receive an increase of almost 21 per cent in general revenue assistance above the sum received last year (that increase is greater than the 12 per cent inflation rate over that period), plus the surplus that has been set at various figures in recent weeks but which is still a considerable surplus. It means that the State's finances do not warrant that outcry made by the Minister of Transport on the eve of the mini-Budget, even before Bob Hawke had had time to assess the report. The Minister stated that road charges and licence charges would have to be increased. That was determined even before the ink was dry on the mini-Budget. The Minister of Works said that E. & W.S. rates would have to be increased. The State Government had its statement prepared before the mini-Budget was presented, and it was disappointed that the mini-Budget was not as bad as it expected. Nevertheless, the State Government came out with that inept statement, which embarrassed the Premier, who was overseas and who had to come back to set things right. It made a similar statement here about the \$20 000 000 put aside for housing to offset the Loan Council deficit. That was only a 5 per cent increase. True, we did have a deficit there. However, the \$20 000 000 was ready and waiting here and it was announced on the floor of this House, when the Premier was in Canberra, that we were going to have a deficit. The wires were crossed somewhere: what was said here did not conform to what the Premier had said. It was poor co-ordination on the Government's part, but truth will out.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The States are getting a worse deal now than they did under Labor. That is what the Liberals are saying.

Mr. ALLISON: I come to personal income tax. The federalism policy means that the States must do their own housekeeping. Our State Government is bemoaning the fact that the Commonwealth Government is not making funds available for certain things. It is completely ignoring the fact that the moneys made available under the federalism policy place the responsibility fairly and squarely on the State Government to do its own housekeeping and, more importantly, to establish its own priorities—not to bemoan the fact that the Federal Government has not set priorities but to spend that money on its own priorities.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You have been brainwashed all right, haven't you?

Mr. ALLISON: Not at all. This is where the money is coming from. We shall get more in personal income tax next year; there will be an increase of 21 per cent in general revenue next year. The Federal Treasurer has pointed out that State expenditure has advanced considerably over the past five years. It has increased on average by over 20 per cent a year for the last five years. I think I have said before in this House that we should not be overly concerned at being asked to put the brakes on, if only for a year, and to try to manage our housekeeping a little better.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You are saying we should cut back expenditure at Mount Gambier?

Mr. ALLISON: I thought you had already done that.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: No, we have not. You are now saying that we should do that?

Mr. ALLISON: I think the general cutback should be right across the whole community, not singling out one community. I shall be asking for a few things at Mount Gambier shortly, because Mount Gambier has a considerable proportion of the State's population and, if the Government is going to look after it on a per capita basis, as it deserves to be looked after, it will do well; but, if the Government starts neglecting it, people in the South-East will recognise that and treat the Labor Government accordingly. It wants the seat back in the South-East; I came into Parliament only to make sure that the Government gave the South-East plenty of attention. If it gets the seat back at the next election, good luck to it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We will.

Mr. ALLISON: It doesn't really make a lot of difference. Life is too short to worry about things like that.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You are advocating tonight reduced expenditure in Mount Gambier?

Mr. ALLISON: I am telling the Minister that the Government has more money to spend within this State than it is laying claim to.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is not true.

Mr. ALLISON: I will move temporarily away from finance. Before I get down to the local issues I point out that the member for Henley Beach took a few minutes off last night to insult our Olympic athletes. As one who spent a considerable amount of time running up and down the roads training for athletic events I can sympathise with any athlete who is pilloried for doing his best, setting his own and Australian best times, then to be told that he is a failure. This is just not on. Furthermore, to suggest that the Federal Government by reducing sporting loans over the last eight months has affected the Olympic athletes' performances is another insult to the Olympic athlete who trains for years with tremendous personal dedication.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why did Mr. Fraser say what he did?

Mr. ALLISON: He recognises that there is a need to do something. I think the debate last night was purely a political issue to try to point the finger at the Federal Government. I do not even think that three years of Australian Labor Party Government was responsible for this failure. I know that the 1956 Olympic Games, which I attended, showed Australia off in such a tremendously good light that from that date onwards the Americans, the Russians, and the Germans set out on a 20-year plan to win gold medals.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: In Bob Menzies' day.

Mr. ALLISON: Yes. Since then, the Americans have been training their swimmers since they were seven or eight years old. Brian Goodell and the rest of the team, and Kornelia Ender, the East German girl, have been training since they were six, seven or eight years of age. One man was singled out for special notice as being a newcomer to the Olympics, and that was Jim Naber, who won four gold medals. They were marvelling that he had reached that standard of proficiency after three or four years training as a university freshman. That gives us some idea of the length of time it takes to train an Olympic athlete.

Mr. Mathwin: Yet the member for Henley Beach was blaming the present Australian Government.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It is good that Mr. Fraser has ordered the inquiry; he has acknowledged the weakness.

Mr. ALLISON: I think any Prime Minister would have acknowledged that. That would have happened irrespective of who was in power. There is obviously a need in all capital cities for better sporting facilities if a select few athletes are going to take advantage of that, attain world standards, and set a national image. What we have to decide as responsible members of our Australian community is whether this priority is the prime one; are we going to spend many millions of dollars to bring a few people up to a peak of perfection to compete with the wealthy countries (the United States, Russia, and East Germany)? We have to decide as a nation whether it is worth it. I enjoyed my sporting days and do not regret them, but I never had that sort of facility, and never got far. I do not know whether I would have done, because, coupled with these magnificent sporting facilities, we have to have something else—a tremendous amount of personal dedication lasting not days and weeks and months but years. That is something that is given to very few. Right up to the last minute it is essential. That, I understand, is being criticised not by the Ministers but by the people managing our team.

I was telephoned a couple of nights ago by a South-Easterner who preferred to remain anonymous. He brought up the matter of marihuana, and asked whether I had an hour in which to discuss the matter with him. I said that if he gave me his name I would, but I did not talk in anonymity. I said I would like to know who he was. He threatened to withdraw support at the next election unless I came out openly in favour of legalising marihuana. I do not know who he is, but here is as good a place as any to say I do not agree with the legalisation of marihuana.

The essential part of marihuana is a residual poison that stays in the fat bodies within a person; it is not expressed in any way. It can permanently impair the brain. These findings are the result of clinical examinations. There is a host of evidence to show that just smoking the dried leaves of marihuana does not have much effect on people but, of course, marihuana is available in many forms, including the refined juice from the flowers, and it all depends on what we talk about legalising and what the effects will be. Generally, we already have enough to cope with, with alcohol and smoking, which in moderation are probably quite harmless; but why introduce another poison? If we legalise marihuana, we give a man the right to decide whether he smokes it or not; we also give him the right to go out on the roads and kill, because one unit of alcohol plus one unit of marihuana is, I am told, equal to six units of intoxication. It is said by some that people who smoke marihuana do not drink. How we can make a generalisation of that sort I do not know. I do not know whether that is a result of the clinical findings. I do not favour putting yet another menace on the Statute Book and legalising it. If the report is commissioned, I shall be prepared to say so, but, for the benefit of the anonymous few in the South-East, who obviously want my opinion, I say that I am not convinced that marihuana is harmless, and it will take a lot to convince me, because I have done much research, including the Solomon papers, which were an almost complete resumé of marihuana findings up to 1969. I know that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has some papers on the matter. I have also been asked many times in the past few weeks whether I agree with the Mitchell report, the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee report on rape and other sexual offences. Yes, I am in favour predominantly, but there are sections of the report with which I cannot agree. Any teachers involved with children 12 or 13 years of age, particularly girls, and any parents of such children (in fact, any concerned parents and any other people

who still have any vestige of moral standing—and there are many of them in Australia from what I have heard) would be concerned about the move to reduce the age of consent when the children concerned are consenting with someone less than five years older than themselves. The range would be from 14 years to 19 years.

It means that there is a basic assumption that sexual intercourse between people between the ages of 14 years and 19 years will be legal and, whether parents or teachers like it, the young people can engage in that. It would set the norm and that is the danger. Perhaps that is good from a legal point of view and perhaps it would keep some people out of the courts, but I do not think that the legalistic point of view has had regard to psychological and physiological developments: that a 14-year-old can be five years younger in medical and physiological aspects, or a 19-year-old can be five years older. The age discrepancy could be much wider, and I do not think many parents of girls 12 and 13 years would like to think that, within a few months, their children could be importuned by persons 19 years of age, who could find it easy to work on impressionable youngsters.

When we see the way in which youngsters follow the pop groups around and absorb everything that comes to them at that impressionable age, I think we should be far more fearful than the Mitchell report indicates. I think I would be supported in that opinion. I notice that, in considering the draft Criminal Code for the Australian Capital Territory, Paul Duffy S. J.—when addressing the Twenty-seventh National Conference of the Australian Council of Catholic Women on October 21, 1975, when discussing the then draft Criminal Code for the Australian Capital Territory, which dealt with such matters as the Family Law Act, the projected Human Rights Bill, and the Superior Courts Bill, was introducing measures such as those which have been introduced in South Australia and which are recommended in the report to which I have referred—Monsignor Duffy said that a Mr. W. B. Fisse, Senior Lecturer in Law at the Adelaide University, had been called on by the then Senator Murphy to co-ordinate the work on the new Criminal Code for the A.C.T. Monsignor Duffy said:

Some people might find it curious that Senator Murphy found it necessary to go to Adelaide to find a law lecturer to draft a code for the A.C.T. They might wonder why use was not made of the professors of law at the National University here in Canberra and their resources in the various departments of law at the undergraduate and graduate divisions of the A.N.U. After all, this surely is one of the functions of graduate departments in a National University. Presumably, Senator Murphy could have found a professor of law here at least as competent as Mr. Fisse in the matter. No-one seems to know why Mr. Fisse was chosen for the job. No-one seems to know what particular qualifications he has for the task. Senator Murphy, if he does know, has never let us in on the reasons for his choice. Among all the people who presumably worked on the draft, only the solitary name of the unknown Mr. Fisse is revealed to us.

That draft Criminal Code for the A.C.T. was then largely criticised at that meeting. I will not go through the whole matter, but a copy is available for anyone who wants to look at it. It is significant that, on opening the report of the South Australian Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee, we see, "Consultant, W. B. Fisse, Esq." Perhaps the guinea pig laws that were rejected in the A.C.T. will be imposed in South Australia. Monsignor Paul Duffy questioned whether the laws being recommended were taken *in toto*, they did not represent a massive attack on family life, on morals generally, and on religion. I cannot answer that, but it is an interesting proposition. It was no small gathering that he chose to

address, yet in South Australia we are faced with similar laws, with an identical consultant. That deserves closer consideration. Several matters in His Excellency's Speech I should like to take issue about, although they probably are not as important as the matters I have previously discussed. His Excellency stated:

My Government is continuing to give effect to its intention to maintain and improve the public transport system within the State, in order to provide an alternative to the use of the private car and achieve a better balance between public and private means of transport.

I should like to think that the Government is sincere in that matter, not only in relation to the metropolitan area but also in relation to country areas, and I should like to think that subsidies may be made available, not necessarily to local government but possibly to private contractors who may wish to give a better local bus transport service than is available now. In my own city several bus service proprietors have had difficulty in trying to maintain a much needed service, and that is one area in respect of which a subsidy could be considered. At least, there is ground for discussion. I was interested in paragraph 20 of the Speech, regarding the Woods and Forests Department. His Excellency stated:

Significant progress is being made towards overcoming the problem of a slightly lower growth rate in the second rotation of pines in South-East soils.

That understates the case, and the slightly lower growth rate is still a significant growth rate, amounting probably to between 15 per cent and 20 per cent, and the significant progress probably could be applied also to new plantings on previously unplanted soils and still produce the same increase in growth. The difficulty has not been solved, because the same applications applied to old and new plantations would produce proportionate growths. The log mill at Mount Gambier is being modernised, and I understand that this is routine replacement. One matter that concerns me is whether this means extra staff or whether there will be more automation and fewer staff, and I understand that timber production in the South-East may have reached plateau production, or nearly so. Therefore, automation will mean little extra employment in the timber industry in the South-East, unless we can get some other manufacturing industry there.

I can refer to the Modulock industry mooted for Mount Gambier, which I should like to have there for personal and local reasons. Although that matter is contentious in Adelaide in regard to whether other companies in the housing industry may be affected, I represent the South-East and I must look after the interests of that area.

I am concerned that the Electricity Trust operations in Mount Gambier have been phased out quietly. Between 60 and 80 jobs have involved retrenchment of staff, but that retrenchment means that those men have gone into jobs made available through redundancy of other workers. We have lost between 60 and 80 jobs in Mount Gambier, and have lost between 60 and 80 families, and that is a retrograde step. It has been done quietly with little fuss. Electricity in Mount Gambier was being produced a little more expensively than elsewhere in the State but, nevertheless, those jobs have been lost to the South-East, and that is a prime concern of mine. Unemployment in the South-East is running at a relatively high rate with more than 900 people registered for work.

The sewage system needs to be extended and improved in Mount Gambier and district. I raised this matter in last year's Budget debate, and I still hope that something will be done in this year's Budget about that problem, because the water resources of the South-East are extremely

precious. At present raw effluent is being discharged into the sea where a fishing resource could be endangered. There is obviously a need for some ponding or settlement tanks as Mount Gambier grows. Many houses are being built by the South Australian Housing Trust, which is helping to meet the need for new housing. The housing problem is becoming more acute as the waiting time for rental and purchase housing is extended. I believe it is now about a two-year wait for a rental house or flat in Mount Gambier.

Among other problems I have brought to the attention of Ministers in the past session is, in particular, a matter on which I am still awaiting Ministerial reply at State and Federal level and it concerns the provision of regional optical and hearing facilities for pensioners. There are long delays in visits from the National Acoustics Laboratory to Mount Gambier and other country areas because of the cash shortage. I find increasingly that the old and infirm cannot travel to Adelaide where facilities are available. I know that appointments would be made for them at short notice, but those who are seriously inconvenienced cannot take the time, because of their infirmity, to travel to Adelaide for attention. With hearing aids costing about \$250 to \$300 each because of service charges for an aid that costs between \$25 and \$50 on the wholesale market, it is more important that pensioners are provided for. I have been assured that the matter is being investigated, but it is almost a year now and I still have no news.

I am also interested in the matter referred to recently by the Minister for Labour and Industry, who has drawn public attention to the need for the handicapped to obtain employment. I hope there will be dialogue between the Minister and the Heritage Workshop in Mount Gambier, because any move to provide work at the expense of Heritage could further embarrass that organisation, which is now employing handicapped people in the South-East and is doing so at an annual deficit this year of about \$20 000. If the Government could make available contracts for sheltered workshops, that organisation would probably not run at a deficit, which would be another way of keeping these handicapped people in employment.

I have studied the interim report commissioned, I believe, by the Minister of Community Welfare, dealing with the care and accommodation of the mentally and physically handicapped in the South-East of South Australia. The report is undated, but I received it in June, 1976. A conclusive comment is that there is also considerable concern over the lack of transport facilities in the area with which to move the handicapped around and also to get them to and from their places of work, whether it be at Heritage or in "open" employment. I assume that that employment would be at the Fletcher Jones factory or the Softwoods factory, both of which have arrangements for the employment of handicapped people in open employment. Another conclusion is that it would seem that there is need for more accommodation, more recreational facilities, and more professional services in the South-East. The area seems to be adequately catered for educationally. Although some areas need improving and extending, the general area of domiciliary care also seems to be adequately catered for.

It has recently been pointed out to me that a group involved with the mentally and physically handicapped is concerned about the need for a fourth stage in Mount Gambier. The three stages we have are at Cooina hostel, the Derrington Street special school, and the Heritage workshop. The Derrington Street school caters for the handicapped until they reach the age of 20; the Heritage

workshop can cater for those physically able to work; but there are those who are too old to attend a special school, too handicapped to attend work, and are therefore faced with the prospects of leaving the South-East and coming to Adelaide for special care at great expense to the State and Federal Governments. Alternatively, they could be housed at home and accommodated in a special activity centre in the South-East at far less expense and with far greater human consideration for their condition. I should like to believe that that fourth stage might be considered by both the State and Federal Governments and it is an issue I shall discuss with both of them.

Another area of concern is the rather rapidly growing section of north Mount Gambier. The area to the south of Mount Gambier has stabilised. We have a dual problem in schools at Mount Gambier and districts. Smaller schools just outside the city tend to be losing some of their students to the city area, but the area to the north of Mount Gambier is expanding. The Housing Trust is building increasingly larger estates in that area, so I look forward to the report now being investigated by the Minister of Education on the number of students who will attend Mount Gambier north school and the MacDonald Park school, both of which tend to be approaching the overcrowded stage. Decisions should be imminent whether to extend those schools or whether to consider building another school in the northern area. I know that the Minister has been made aware of the matter by the parents and friends organisations and by school staff, as well as through personal correspondence. I certainly look forward to receiving that report when it is completed. That summarises my concern at the national, State and local levels. I support the motion.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): In common with other members I extend my condolences to the families of members who have died since the previous Address in Reply debate. I should like especially to express my sympathy to the family of the late Mr. Ferguson, whom I knew very well because he was a member of this House at the same time I was a member. He was a kindly man and I am indeed sorry that he did not enjoy a long retirement. I regret that this was the last Speech of His Excellency the Governor, and I wish Sir Mark and Lady Oliphant good health and a long retirement. I consider the Governor to have been an outstanding Governor; one who has made a notable contribution to the State.

Personally, I like his style, and like the way he has commented on public issues, thus showing leadership and courage, and making the general public conscious of subjects that must be faced. He is a brilliant man in other than scientific fields, and I am indeed proud that he is a South Australian by birth. I am pleased that I had the chance to know him, because some of his opinions will be quoted for many years. I also extend goodwill to his successor, whom I do not know, except by repute, and I look forward to making his acquaintance and that of his wife.

A previous speaker said that we had been instructed to attack the Leader of the Opposition, but I want to say that that is not the case. If it seemed to him that the attack was not spontaneous, I assure him that it was. Previous members have referred to the Leader of the Opposition, but none of us knows what any other member will say. It was not by design or instruction. Concerning the legislative programme outlined in the Governor's Speech, it is not possible to comment on all the proposed legislation but I will refer to the legislation in which I am especially interested.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Keep off the unions and Fraser, Molly, and you'll be right.

Mrs. BYRNE: I will not discuss trade unions, although I am a member of a union. I have always been a member of the Federated Clerks Union and will continue to be a member until I retire.

Mr. Goldsworthy: But you aren't a clerk.

Mrs. BYRNE: I am not, but once I was, and it is for that reason that I continue my membership of the union. One of the measures which interests me and which was referred to by His Excellency deals with noise pollution. It is intended that a measure will be introduced this session to deal with this problem. Noise, that is, unwarranted sound, has become a major environmental and social problem. There is no serious argument about the damage it does to human health and well-being, and there is much scientific literature that adequately documents the case for noise control when it becomes a nuisance. However, it is realised that effective noise control legislation is not easy to produce, as what annoys one person can be accepted with equanimity by another person (the difference is in sensitivity), while others can bear high levels of noise without discomfort.

In common with other members I have received my share of complaints about noise nuisance. The present trend towards light-weight building structures, the enlargement of traffic highways, and the gradual reduction in house allotment sizes have made it more difficult for people to retreat into private quietness, and that trend is continuing. The noise complaints I have received fall into such categories as complaints about air-conditioners, discotheque amplification, playing of musical instruments (such as drums and electronic organs), bands, noise from heavy trucks and road traffic especially late at night, mini-bikes and hot rods, model aircraft, motor mowers and tools and machinery in minor trade zones. Again, the complaints are mainly about noise late at night caused by motor mowers and private parties and this will make some members smile: I have even received complaints about barking dogs and crowing roosters.

As most members know, the basic unit of sound is one decibel, which represents the least change in intensity the ear can detect. Once public noise reaches between 50 decibels and 60 decibels, complaints are to be expected; therefore, this legislation is welcome. I only wish that the legislation could solve all of our noise problems, but I am realistic enough to realise that that would be impossible. Paragraph 18 of the Speech states:

At the present time a review is being conducted of the longer-term transport needs of the north-eastern segment of the Adelaide metropolitan area. This review will, for the first time, seek major public participation in the transport planning process not only from the potential users of any transport system eventually proposed but also from those who may be affected by its construction and operation. I will now explain the general background to this study. In 1968 the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study (MATS) recommended construction of a freeway in what has become known as the "Modbury Transportation Corridor". The freeway was to be part of a network, linked via the North Adelaide Connector and the intended Hills Freeway to the city and the remainder of the metropolitan area. In the MATS report, provision was made for buses to run on the proposed freeway to meet public transport needs of the north-eastern suburbs. Since the MATS report, successive reductions and limitations have been placed on the freeway network proposed by MATS. The most critical of these limitations was the abandonment

of the suburban section of the Hills Freeway. The Government also placed a moratorium on the construction of all freeways for a period of 10 years.

This means that construction of a freeway along the "Modbury Corridor", or any other parallel alignment, is now uncertain. Consequently any decision to reject the freeway fails to satisfy the demand for transport facilities that led to its recommendation in the first place. In particular, it does not provide for a high-standard public transport link to the north-eastern suburbs. Consequently, an examination of alternative proposals to meet this need is to be undertaken. The Director-General of Transport proposed in a September, 1973, Report on Public Transport in the Adelaide Metropolitan Region that the "Modbury Corridor" be used for a rapid transit electrified railway. However, several other systems and location possibilities that may meet the needs of the north-eastern area do exist.

Attitudes of both the community and the transport planner have changed very significantly since MATS was undertaken. MATS was based almost solely on road transport and technical evaluation procedures. Transport planners now recognise that, in addition to these factors, it is necessary to assess social, land use, and environmental implications to ensure that major transport plans will meet the needs of the community.

There is reference in His Excellency's Speech to the north-east area public transport review, and this is proceeding. There is a need for this study; for instance, the Metropolitan Development Plan is now under review and future public transport planning proposals form an important part of that review. Nevertheless, I point out to the House and to Minister of Transport that there is still a need for the immediate transport needs to be met, as well as longer-term transport needs to be reviewed.

The Tea Tree Gully area is continuing to develop and, with the opening of new subdivisions and the continued increase in population, additional pressure is being placed on existing bus services, so that extensions and improvements to the public bus services are required. I refer to the Carinya Heights service, the Modbury Heights service, the Tea Tree Gully service to cater for the Fairview Park area, and the Redwood Park service, all of which need to be extended. The extensions depend on the provision of new buses and, in some cases, the provision of adequate roads.

It is obvious to me and probably to other members who represent developing areas that future town planning must consider the provision of adequate roads to take heavy vehicles such as buses. In addition, representations have been made to me for the provision of public transport along Smart Road, Modbury, and for the provision of a service along the entire length of the Lower North-East Road. I know that the Minister of Transport is sympathetic to the transport needs of the Tea Tree Gully area. I again point out that the area's immediate transport needs must be met, as well as the longer-term needs, which require reviewing.

In a developing area such as I represent, the community's needs are almost inexhaustible, because of the continuous increase in population. Census figures show that there were 21 314 people in the Tea Tree Gully local government area at June 30, 1966; 41 200 people at June 30, 1972; 45 600 people at June 30, 1973; 50 600 people at June 30, 1974; and 54 300 people at June 30, 1975. Of course, another census has been taken since then, but the figures show that population increases result in a need for additional services. The census figures show that the area has a disproportionate number of persons

in the "14 years and under" age bracket and in the "25 years to 34 years" age bracket. About 5 880 persons, 15 per cent, are of pre-school age; 39 per cent is aged 14 years and under; and 21 per cent is aged between 25 years and 34 years. In other words, the area shows the typical age population structure of an outer suburban, newly developed or developing area. As against this, only 4 per cent of the population is over 60 years of age—again, a great variation from the proportion in the metropolitan area.

Statistics also show that the number of working wives is about 34 per cent of the total female population—just below the Australian average. However, the age structure shows that a disproportionately large number of working wives are in their child-rearing years. In this connection, the need for child-minding facilities for younger and older children in the area is obviously only partially satisfied. To meet the needs of the increasing population, new schools are continually being provided. For example, St. Agnes Primary School, Fairview Park Primary School, Holden Hill North Primary School, and Modbury South Special School have been opened since I last spoke in an Address in Reply debate, making a total of 16 primary schools in my electoral district, as well as two high schools and a private high school.

The Modbury Heights High School is well advanced, and it will cost more than \$4 000 000. It will assist in easing the pressure on nearby existing high schools. However, as more schools will be needed, the Education Department has purchased land for this purpose. Additional educational needs associated with the provision of new schools result in further requirements, such as school crossings, school bus services, and ancillary needs. Pre-schools and play groups are operating in some primary schools. There are play groups and privately operated kindergartens in other buildings, as well as kindergartens under the jurisdiction of the Kindergarten Union. Again the need is only partially satisfied and, with the continuing increase in population, the need will grow. Roads such as the Lower North-East Road and Grand Junction Road must be reconstructed and widened. Although traffic lights have been installed at some intersections, they are still required at intersections such as the intersection of North-East Road and Hancock Road. Roundabouts are sometimes substituted, but this all involves the authorities in expense, in the interests of road safety.

Fortunately, Modbury Hospital is right on our doorstep, and a community health centre has been established at St. Agnes. Community medicine is directed towards caring for the total health of everyone in the family, taking into account all medical, social and economic issues that every family faces. An important part of community medicine is preventive medicine. This branch of medicine must be concentrated on in the future. I pay a tribute to the founders of the St. Agnes health centre, Dr. Gill and Professor Murrell. We are very fortunate that the centre has been established in our area.

A headquarters of its own being required for the Community Welfare Department, land has been acquired for this purpose at a cost of \$195 000. The buildings should be available in two or three years, when they will replace the existing office, which is housed in leased premises at Ridgehaven. An office at Modbury of the Motor Registration Division of the Transport Department has also been mooted.

In the past, I have received continual requests for sewerage services but, thanks to the present Government, these needs have been almost fulfilled. The same position applies regarding water supplies. From time to time complaints are received about the quality of water. As a result, a water treatment plant is being established at Anstey Hill; it will serve a large part of the Tea Tree Gully area. The estimated cost of this plant is \$15 800 000. A new library and resource centre complex near the civic centre has been opened. This represents a major improvement for the city. The Further Education Department is housed in this building. At the expiration of the 10-year lease, the department will no doubt be expected to move into its own building, involving additional expense.

Over the next five years there will be a marked change in the population structure. By 1980 the largest age groupings will be in the teenage years and in the 40's. If the community's needs are to be met at that time, there will have to be a concentration on such facilities as youth clubs, halls, meeting rooms, social clubs and spectator sports. Local government, of course, is involved, but the State Government can expect to be approached for grants and subsidies. The State Government is already taking action, and it has approved grants and subsidies to the Tea Tree Gully Council to assist in the provision of land for use as parks and gardens and for a toilet block.

The Dernancourt swimming centre has been purchased by the Tea Tree Gully Council with the aid of a substantial grant from the State Government. The Kuradinga complex, which is being established principally for youth activities, has also received financial assistance from the State Government. This centre, which will be opened next Sunday, is certainly needed. The Tea Tree Gully youth club received some small financial assistance when its building was erected, and community welfare grants have been made to some church, girl guide and scout groups. The need for community recreation centres is obvious; three are required now and the local council has applied for grants for them. The area could provide a suitable location for a sports stadium.

In catering for the social needs of the area it is my opinion that, in their planning, there must be in future closer liaison between local government and State Government than has been the case in the past; the present trend seems to be in that direction. There is no sense in having a duplication of facilities that can be shared by constituents and ratepayers who, after all, are the same people. The community use of school buildings and facilities has shown the wisdom of this policy. However, in referring to our own needs, we should consider others and think of the world as a whole, where millions of people are starving and suffering from malnutrition and ill health, or are without housing. It is important to mankind as a whole that the standard of living of these people be raised, as this will make a substantial contribution towards world peace, which we all want. The principal cause of the suffering is greed on someone else's part. We cannot continue indefinitely to look upon ourselves selfishly and in isolation because, if we do, we may have to face the consequences of our indifference. I support the motion.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I join other members in paying my respects to the kin of the deceased former members of this House, Mr. Jim Ferguson, Mr. Hogben, and Mr. MacGillivray. I also wish Sir Mark and Lady Oliphant every happiness and good health in their well-earned retirement. His Excellency has contributed much to the State of South Australia. His frankness and willingness to speak his mind have been welcomed by all

good South Australians. One of the subjects about which Sir Mark has been outspoken is the necessity to preserve the Adelaide Hills. In his Speech, His Excellency said:

The subdivision and hence removal from production of some of the best agricultural land in the State for "hobby farms" and rural living areas is causing my Government considerable concern, not only because of possible losses in production but also because of the possibility of environmental damage. This trend is viewed with alarm by all concerned with rural economics and my Government is considering ways in which the undesirable aspects of this form of development may be dealt with.

Sir Mark has often come out in support of the preservation of the Adelaide Hills. He suggested what he believed to be several remedies for the situation, one of which involved the turning of the Mount Lofty Range into a park. A recent newspaper article states:

Making the Mount Lofty Range into a national park could be the answer to the problems of the Adelaide Hills, the Governor said last night. "In this way land use in the Hills would be controlled by a single authority in the interest of the people of South Australia and indeed of Australia as a whole," Sir Mark Oliphant said.

He said he was interested in a plan for the preservation of the amenities of the Mount Lofty Range. Since he took over as Governor three years ago his early optimism for the protection of the Hills had been "severely battered". The continued desecration, apathy and lack of interest of the public and the greed of landowners had changed his original enthusiasm. However, he had not lost heart.

On another occasion, Sir Mark spoke out strongly against the effect of Rundle Street hobby farmers, as he called them, on the Mount Lofty Range. He said:

Rundle street farmers with investment desires were slowly eating into the Adelaide Hills, the Governor (Sir Mark Oliphant) said last night. Such people "slowly eat into their surroundings, destroying the very amenities they seek by their demands for reticulated water and sewers, electricity and better roads," Sir Mark said.

"We human beings are members of a strange race which seems devoted to the destruction of the whole surface of the planet," he said. Sir Mark said the rape of the Hills was the result of the people who had moved in, and the greed of their descendants who subdivided the orchards and levelled the "vermin" ridden bush to keep another sheep or cow.

Sir Mark said he was not advocating that no-one live in the Hills. "What I do believe is that they should not be dotted all over the countryside but should be grouped in small villages widely separated by regenerated bush and open areas. The necessary reforms will take time," he said.

"They cannot be implemented by temporary members of government or local authorities, but only by the establishment of a single authority or trust, divorced from politics and vested interest, to control the development of the whole area. Continuation of the present haphazard approach may delay the day of complete disaster, but cannot prevent it."

I do not intend to speak on Federal matters or on Federal-State relations, but I will raise a subject that I hope will interest the Minister for the Environment as much as it interests me; it is a matter that concerns all South Australians. I wish to discuss a paper on problems and possible solutions that was recently released by the Agriculture and Fisheries Department. It was prepared by Mr. Ian Lewis of that department and concerns rural-urban land use conflicts in the Adelaide Hills. In his introduction, Mr. Lewis comments:

The Mount Lofty Range, and in particular, the Adelaide Hills, are one of South Australia's greatest natural assets. Apart from their outstanding natural beauty, they are a valuable source of food, timber and minerals and a major source of water; they provide outlets for recreation and places for people to live. As well, they contain important pockets of bushland with flora and fauna unique to the area.

Mr. Lewis goes on to say:

The preservation of agricultural land and the maintenance of a viable agriculture in the Mount Lofty Range are considered essential to ensure the conservation of the rural character and natural beauty of the range along with their continued maintenance as an important food source for Adelaide and the new city of Monarto. Increased urbanisation of agricultural land in the Mount Lofty Range is threatening the region's rural character and natural beauty, its agricultural viability and its food producing potential. The issues involved are complex and the time is urgent for appropriate action if present trends are to be reversed.

I congratulate Mr. Lewis on the effort he has put into this paper. It is realistic and hard-hitting and, although I do not agree with everything in it, I believe many of the comments are worthy ones. Mr. Lewis continues:

Of late there have been increased community awareness and discussion on the issues of preservation of land in Adelaide's rural-urban fringe, especially that used for wine grapegrowing, market gardening and orchards. The Adelaide Hills have been a particular focal point. It is hoped that this discussion paper will aid in public debate and decision making. This paper reviews the present situation and outlines circumstances that are mitigating against the preservation of agricultural land and the maintenance of a viable agriculture. A number of solutions are proposed to reverse this trend while accommodating the increased residential demands being made on the region.

The point made by the author, that the paper will be used for the purpose of discussion and debate in relation to decision making is worthwhile. It is heartening to know the number of people using this paper as a basis for debate. Recently, I formed a committee comprising people interested in the Hills. The committee has been meeting for some time, but unfortunately I cannot tonight give complete solutions as to how we can best preserve the Mount Lofty Range.

One thing we have learned is to appreciate the complexity of the preservation of the Adelaide Hills. In my comments I will be referring to the Adelaide Hills area of the Mount Lofty Range. My committee has found this matter to be complex. The members are people who are involved in agriculture in the area, people who have recently moved into the area, people who have lived there all their life, and others who live outside the area but who have an interest in it and who are willing to assist the committee.

It has emerged that it is impossible even for agriculturists, those who have been in the area for many years, to provide a simple solution to the problems. The complexity of the situation has been proved by the differing situations encountered in the area by, say, horticulturists, and the grazing community, and the different situations encountered by people living close to the Adelaide metropolitan area and those who live farther out.

The Government, through its policy administered by the State Planning Authority, has made clear through its development plans that it believes agricultural, horticultural and bushland areas should be preserved. These points are made in both the Metropolitan and Outer Metropolitan Development plans within the Mount Lofty Ranges, but nowhere in any of these plans is it said how these aims are to be achieved or where they are to be achieved.

I hope that some of the points I raise tonight will be of assistance in making these determinations regarding the future of the Hills. Some of the questions we need to ask regarding this matter are as follows: How are we to preserve the Mount Lofty Range? What do we want of the Adelaide Hills? Is it possible to keep agriculture viable in the Adelaide Hills? Do we want the Adelaide Hills area for its agricultural assets or purely for its aesthetic value? I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Minister for the Environment) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): A comment by an American visitor to Australia some years ago was that living in Australia was like living in a gymnasium, and that there was always someone training or practising for some event. Doubtless, this remark was made at a time that might have been regarded as the halcyon days of Australian sport. Perhaps that was a succinct way of summing up our obsession in relation to participation in sport. In 1956 at the Melbourne Olympic Games Australia won 13 gold medals, and in Rome in 1960 Australia won eight gold medals.

At the Commonwealth Games, Australia had success in swimming, athletic and other events. Australians have won 18 Wimbledon championships, and we have had 16 Davis Cup victories since the end of the Second World War. However, recently something in the gymnasium has gone wrong, and numerous sports writers, press editors and former Olympians have expressed disappointment at the results of our representatives in Montreal. They are all advancing remedies, hoping to restore our national prestige in international competition. The fact is that, over several years, a general decline has occurred in our sporting achievements at an international level. This has been caused by several factors, some of which are best expressed in a report that has been made available to the Federal Parliament by the Australian Sports Institute Study Group. It states quite clearly that in sports where sophisticated skills and expert coaching are needed, Australia is lacking in comparison to other nations.

In addition, the report instances neglect of first-class training facilities, and states there is not one indoor athletics track, or cycling track, or indoor swimming pool of international standard. The report also proposes the establishment of a national institute operated jointly by Government and sports and education authorities. The institute also suggests that this organisation could provide the necessary financial aid, and scientific coaching methods and facilities to improve our performances generally. However, despite this report, in April of this year the Federal Government decided to cut out all spending on sport and recreation facilities.

Mr. Evans: That is not true, you know.

Mr. SLATER: The statement by the present Minister in charge of community development, following the Prime Minister's visit to Montreal, about an inquiry into Australia's performance at Montreal is, to me, entirely hypocritical. The previous report by Professor John Bloomfield, dealing with other aspects of sport and recreation, part of which was being implemented by the former Labor Government, has now been cast aside, and the member for Henley Beach last evening referred to this report. Earlier this year, I was fortunate to be chosen to undertake an overseas study tour, the subject of which was the provision and financing of sporting and recreational facilities. I do not want to use this debate to submit that report: a written report will be available to all members later. From what I observed overseas in the United States, Canada, Britain, and Europe, the facilities available to people interested in sport are far superior to anything we have in Australia. They are fully used, not only for specific training purposes for international competition but also by the community generally.

Sport is a telling reflection of national life. The American people and colleges adopt a corporate approach to it, the Europeans organise it ruthlessly and monolithically from the centre, the British try hard in smaller group activities, and the Australian attitude generally has been more individualistic, with not much organisation, and some improvisation and luck. Over the years a combination of those factors has produced famous athletes, such as Landy, Elliott, Dawn Fraser, and Shane Gould. By their dedication, discipline and determination they achieved international acclaim.

This era seems to have passed. At Montreal this year our representatives are not individually to blame for their performances, many of which a few years ago would have been sufficient to win gold medals. Nevertheless, competition has stiffened and the more scientific approach by other nations has overshadowed the performance of our athletes. Our present methods are not satisfactory in international competition, and the approach in sport must become more scientific.

However, oversea methods do not entirely fit our national character, and we probably need a combination of approaches. Sporting facilities should not be made available for only the sporting elite: they must be made available to all participants, whether they are potential champions or otherwise. The exact level of physical fitness of Australians generally has not been determined thoroughly. We have had random tests by physical educationists and sports medicine doctors, and they show that Australian children and adults have fitness levels similar to those of North Americans and levels probably a little lower than those of Europeans. That is not a particularly good level.

I have not time to quote from the report by Professor Bloomfield on the need for the development of recreation in Australia, but it sets out clearly the problem in respect of Australians and the international myth of the bronze athlete of magnificent proportions. It is just as important to improve the general fitness of the community as it is to win medals in international competition. Sport is not only an enjoyable activity to play and watch: it is also a sociable and socialising activity. Sport promotes physical fitness for people of all ages, and this is of tremendous importance in these days of sedentary occupations. It is a valuable antidote to boredom. For all those reasons, it is necessary to reach all in society. Certainly, sport and recreation deserve better treatment and a better priority than is currently afforded by the present Liberal and National Country Party Federal Government, which must stand condemned for its recent action in cutting out the availability of funds for these purposes. That action is jeopardising the welfare of sporting organisations and the welfare of the community in general.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I draw to the attention of the House the problems that large areas of South Australia are suffering because of the extremely dry conditions being faced this year. Unfortunately, a large part of South Australia is facing severe drought conditions. Unless we are fortunate enough to have rain in the next week or 10 days, the situation will deteriorate even more. The problems facing farmers in drought affected areas will flow on to other sections of the community in a short time. In many cases, many thousands of hectares of country has been prepared for seeding and if rain does not fall the crops will not hold the land and South Australia could face severe drift problems, which I sincerely hope does not happen.

The most pressing problem relates to what these people should do with their stock. In this morning's paper we are told that Samcor intends to offer 40c a head at Gepps Cross and Port Lincoln abattoirs. That is a step in the right direction but, unfortunately, that assistance will be limited to a small section of the community.

Mr. Rodda: How do you get stock to the abattoirs?

Mr. GUNN: That is the problem. How do people living in Ceduna get their stock to Gepps Cross or Port Lincoln for 40c? It would cost more than \$1 a head to get stock from Ceduna to Adelaide, and about 70c to get them to Port Lincoln. It is not an economic proposition for anyone to transport that type of stock to those abattoirs. It will assist people living near Port Lincoln, but they are the areas that are not in as bad a plight as those further around the coast. I understand that an offer has been made in relation to cattle, too, but the same problem will apply in relation to freight costs. The Government should seriously consider adopting the Victorian scheme: yesterday, the Victorian Minister of Agriculture announced that the Victorian Government would pay \$10 a head to producers for any cattle unsuitable for sale slaughtered on their property.

The South Australian Government should discuss this matter with the United Farmers and Graziers organisation and with other interested bodies to ascertain whether they consider there is such a need. This need could exist in future. A payment should be made to producers to destroy on their property stock that are unsuitable for sale. Producers could probably use district council facilities for providing suitable pits in which to bury cattle, because, after all, no-one wants thousands of head of slaughtered stock lying around unburied. I was contacted by a council in my area that is concerned about this matter. It was suggested to me that perhaps soon it could be necessary for the Government to make grants available to councils so that they could employ people on construction work to earn an income.

Many people employed on farms, and some farmers, too, will need an income. If farmers do not have crops and must quit most of their stock, obviously they cannot continue to employ their employees. This situation highlights clearly the need for the Commonwealth Government to introduce legislation to set up a rural bank so that when funds are required next year by farmers and other producers it can be borrowed at a realistic rate of interest. Farmers will have enough trouble trying to borrow money to sow next season's crop. If they have not had an income this year they will not be in a position to do that unless funds are made available at a reasonable interest rate.

The Commonwealth Government should also take immediate steps to implement the recommendations of the Industries Assistance Commission regarding income equalisation. Last year, many people affected by drought had to use most of their ready cash to pay tremendously large income tax bills. This year, when they will receive only limited incomes, they will be short of cash for that purpose. If there is any justice in the system, they ought to be able to spread out those incomes. If we had a system such as the one suggested by the I.A.C., it would alleviate some of the problems. I hope that the Commonwealth Government will act on these recommendations soon. Other State Governments are looking into the situation, and I am pleased to say that this Government has followed their lead, because it has granted subsidies for freight and for the provision of fodder. However, as I

pointed out earlier, where will people send their stock for agistment? Only a few areas in South Australia are able to receive stock, so the problem is what they are going to do with it. I do not believe that agistment will be readily available. I do not think that any primary producer will be able to buy fodder for another 12 months. In the areas of this State through which I have travelled during the past few weeks, such as Ceduna and Wirrulla in my district, the situation is grim, as it is in other areas.

I have been up in the Riverland and I am afraid that what I saw there gave me a completely different view from the one Mr. Casey gained as a result of his trip up there. It is unfortunate that, before a Minister goes into an area such as the Riverland, where people are having problems, he does not do his homework and that, when he leaves the area, he is careful not to make what seem to be irresponsible statements.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Did you see the protests against the Federal Liberal Government?

Mr. GUNN: I will speak about those problems next week and I shall be pleased to answer any interjections. I am pleased to discuss any of those matters. When a so-called responsible Minister visits drought areas where people have problems, he ought to let people know that he is coming, and be willing to discuss their problems with them and offer assistance instead of making a statement that inflamed some people. I was surprised that the Minister made that statement because, of all the Ministers in the Cabinet, I should have thought that the Minister of Lands (someone who claims to have had some experience in rural affairs) would have been able to make a better assessment than he did. I hope that this does not happen again. I am most concerned about the dry season that South Australia is currently experiencing, and I can only stress again that, if it does not rain during the next week or 10 days, we will have a very serious situation.

I hope that the State Government will give its serious attention to the problems. I do not want to enter into a political slugging match over this matter, which I believe should be above Party politics, because the situation will affect employment in machinery manufacturing. Workers will have to be put off because there will be no market for their products. The producers will have to meet certain inbuilt costs, and next year they will have to buy large quantities of fuel. This year many primary producers have spent thousands of dollars sowing a crop, but many of them will not reap it. Many of them have spent considerable sums on superphosphate and will have to buy seed. As the member for Mallee pointed out in his excellent speech, it will cost about \$100 a tonne.

We have had much criticism over the past few days of the Fraser Government, but we have not yet heard anything from the member for Albert Park. During the past few weeks when doing some research I came across some interesting facts. I was perturbed that a grave injustice might have been done to the member for Salisbury, because in the 1973-74 volume I of *Hansard* his name has been omitted. I should be pleased if you, Mr. Speaker, would take the necessary action to ensure that a grave injustice has not been perpetrated against that honourable member. I notice that the member for Albert Park made only one contribution, and that was by asking a question.

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

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): I am fortunate enough to represent a very salubrious and politically conscious district. There is not one subdivision in it where I do not

get a resounding majority. However, there is one corner of my district of which I am not particularly proud—an area called Wingfield, which is not salubrious. Actually, it is a noxious trades area. Unfortunately, many people who initially buy cheap land and build houses in this area are unaware that it is a noxious trades area. Later, they are astonished to find, on completing the building of their house, that a tannery or equally obnoxious building is established alongside them; such an undertaking is entitled to be established there.

Twice recently I have been right through the area; even before reaching the start of the noxious trades area, one sees discarded motor cars alongside the road. In the area surrounding Simsmetal and similar businesses, there are hectares and hectares of discarded cars that have been stripped of their rubber components and are waiting to go into the crusher. There are so many of them that a neighbour of mine who runs cattle there for fattening purposes finds that he cannot keep his fences up, because every day, if he has just repaired a fence, cars are thrown over it, and his cattle wander off. Now, he has to spend 24 hours a day riding herd over his cattle.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: It is good to know that there are primary producers in your electoral district.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. I have taken up this matter with the police and with the appropriate Minister, who told me that he would get in touch with the police; of course, I had already done that. I can only suggest that the police may take more notice of the Minister than they did of me; I hope so. In any case, I do not think it is reasonable to expect the police to wait there for 24 hours a day. The point is that this area was declared a noxious trades area when Wingfield was considered to be about 100 kilometres from any residential area. However the growth of the metropolitan area has completely

altered this situation. An area that was once right out in the open is now virtually incorporated in the metropolitan area.

The situation has deteriorated to such an alarming extent that the last time I went there, only three weeks after my previous visit, my driver (who knows a lot more about the geography of South Australia than I do; otherwise, we would never get home at night) would not believe that we were going to the right place. If I criticise, I am supposed to suggest some alternative, but I find it extremely difficult to make such a suggestion. Obviously, there should be a noxious trades area somewhere far from the metropolitan area.

Mr. Rodda: In a rural district?

Mr. JENNINGS: No matter where it is put it will soon become a built-up area. I think we have to grasp the nettle now and shift the noxious trades area from the position it occupies—get it out of my district, anyway. We should, for the time being, ask the local government body in the area to explain to builders of domestic houses, before granting permission, that they are building in a noxious trades area and might have in future beside their house some extremely noxious neighbour. Indeed, from the recent complaints I have received, I am inclined to believe that we might be doing a great service to the people if we do not allow any domestic buildings in this area. This is a very vexed question that has been worrying me for some time. I hope the Minister will have a good look at it to see whether something constructive can be done. With those illuminating few remarks, I will conclude.

Motion carried.

At 10.21 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 29, at 2 p.m.