

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 3, 1976

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

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I notice in the gallery members of a visiting French Senate delegation in the persons of Senator Leon Jozeau-Marigne, Senator Jean Bac, Senator Jacques Eberhard, Senator Paul Pillet, and Monsieur Alain Delcamp. I invite Senator Leon Jozeau-Marigne, as leader of the delegation, to take a seat on the floor of the House, and I ask the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to escort the honourable gentleman to a seat on the right-hand side of the Speaker.

Senator Leon Jozeau-Marigne was escorted by the Hon. D. A. Dunstan and Dr. Tonkin to a seat on the floor of the House.

PETITION: DENTAL TECHNICIANS

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON presented a petition signed by 56 electors 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: AGE OF CONSENT

Mr. CHAPMAN presented a petition signed by 95 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.

Petition received.

PETITION: MOTOR CYCLE SPEED LIMIT

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON presented a petition signed by 144 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government urgently to introduce legislation to increase the speed limit for a motor cyclist carrying a pillion passenger to 110 kilometres an hour on the open road.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON presented a petition signed by 102 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would amend the Succession Duties Act to abolish succession duty on that part of an estate passing to a surviving spouse.

Petition received.

PETITION: CAPITAL TAXATION

Mr. WOTTON presented a petition signed by 116 citizens of South Australia, praying that the House pass legislation to ease the burden of capital taxation and to make it apply equitably.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: BREAD INDUSTRY

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Much confusion is being generated by some of the ill-advised statements that have been made by persons interested in the bread industry.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Do honourable members want to hear the statement or will I merely have it inserted in *Hansard*? It is time a clear statement was made as to the Government's position in this matter. The facts are as follows: the Government constituted a Bread Industry Inquiry Committee comprising representatives of the employees, employers and the Government, with an independent Chairman. This report, which was intended to be a report only to the Government, was presented towards the end of April, 1976. It contained seven main recommendations. Much consideration was given to the implications of these recommendations by me, as Minister of Labour and Industry, and subsequently I made certain recommendations to Cabinet. I did not feel that the total recommendations of the inquiry committee would be in the best interests of the public of South Australia. I therefore did not recommend to Cabinet that all of the inquiry committee's recommendations be adopted.

Cabinet did not make a quick decision; it deliberated for some weeks, because each Cabinet member wished to consider very carefully the recommendations of this committee and the impact they would have on the general public and on the employees and employers in the industry. As a result of this consideration and my recommendations, the Government took a middle course between recommendations in the report and the present chaotic condition of the industry. As I said in the House on July 29, 1976, in reply to a question by the member for Kavel, all sections of the industry were consulted and were also placed on a bread inquiry committee. The union and employer representatives all had the chance to make submissions to the committee. I said at that time that I was not satisfied with this report.

Cabinet agreed with that, and I do not resile from that position. I said last Thursday, and I repeat, that some of the unions involved complained to me that they were not pleased with the report, either. This complaint came from unions represented on the inquiry committee. They had every chance to make a minority report, and if they did not agree with the report's recommendation that is what they should have done. I did not really expect employers to agree with all of the recommendations, and this became evident in my subsequent discussions with employer representatives who admitted that they had a vested interest in seeing the recommendations brought into operation. The Government was of the view that a roster system similar to that recently agreed in the retail industry for shop assistants could have been considered.

It was not intended, and has never been intended, arbitrarily to increase the number of hours worked by employees in the bread industry. Rather, the Government wished to respond to a demonstrated public demand for fresher bread at weekends with a greater variety of product choice available. It held the view that some of the smaller metropolitan bakeries would be able to fill this demonstrated need and remain viable, without the larger bakeries threatening their very existence by

trying to pick up some of the weekend trade. The Secretary of the Bread Manufacturers Association of South Australia threatened that the employers would quickly move towards automation in bread making which would make redundant many of the employees in the bread making and bread delivery sections of the industry. He also put to me that the larger employers would immediately cease home deliveries if the Government went ahead with its plans to acknowledge public demand. Employers also told me that substantial price rises of about 6 cents a loaf were certain if the Government proceeded with its plans. I am sure that most members of the general public would be prepared to pay a few cents extra for the convenience of having a greater variety of freshly baked bread available at the weekends, but it would be unreasonable to expect the public to bear the substantial increases postulated by the employers.

In view of the strong opposition that has been demonstrated to the Government's initiatives, mainly from vested interests in the bread industry, as well as from the ill-advised statements appearing in the press from time to time, it seems appropriate that I should release to Parliament the contents of the Bread Industry Inquiry Committee's report, and I do so. All members will then be able to see the restrictive nature of the recommendations of the Bread Industry Inquiry Committee, since, for example, they recommended a total ban on weekend baking throughout the State with increased penalties for breaches of that ban. In my view and in the view of Cabinet such recommendations cannot act in the interests of the majority of members of the public of South Australia. I repeat that, on the evidence that the Government has before it, there is a considerable body of public opinion seeking a liberalising of the laws regarding the supply of basic and popular commodities such as bread.

I recommended that the Government should go somewhere towards meeting this demand by taking a middle course to that suggested by the Bread Industry Inquiry Committee, but all of the reasons set out above (such as the possibility of a substantial increase in the price of bread to the consumer, accelerated automation leading to redundancy in the industry, the threat of the cessation of home deliveries, and an unreasoned fear that there would be an increase in hours of work) have led the Government to revoke its original very reasonable decision. This means, of course, that no change will be made to the existing baking delivery arrangements.

QUESTIONS

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

ROAD TAX

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Has the Government any plans to abolish the ton-mile tax, and if not, why not?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I submitted an alternative scheme to the existing road maintenance legislation to the last meeting of the Australian Transport Advisory Council, on July 9, 1976. The other State Ministers and the Federal Minister expressed interest in the proposal, and all agreed to examine the matter with a view to determining the whole question at the next meeting of A.T.A.C. to be held in February, 1977.

ABORTION

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Is abortion on demand Government policy?
2. What action does the Government intend to take in relation to the report of the abortion investigation committee which was tabled in Parliament on June 10, 1976?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. The recommendations relating to special clinics at the teaching hospitals are being implemented when space facilities permit. Investigations by the special committee appointed to make recommendations on the future use and distribution of gynaecological beds in South Australia are well advanced but have not yet been concluded. Day patients are currently being admitted to the Family Advisory Clinic, Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The notification of abortions by hospitals in addition to notification by medical practitioners concerned would require additional legislation as would the mandatory reporting of all complications. The Government has no immediate plans to introduce further legislation. The reopening of legislation could be undertaken by any individual member of Parliament. A further report on the social welfare aspects of abortion is in preparation.

TARCOOLA TO ALICE SPRINGS RAILWAY

Mr. GUNN (on notice): It is proposed to stop further work on the Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway line until an environmental impact survey is completed and, if so, why?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: State Government received advice on May 20, 1976, from the Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser, that the Federal Government proposed to review the construction standards and costs of the Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway project. The State Government has not received advice that the present Federal Government proposes to conduct an environmental impact study. However, I have been informed, but not officially, that the Australian Government is currently considering the deferment of the Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway line project for a period of at least 10 years. If and when the Federal Minister advises me of his Government's intention, it will give me much pleasure to pass that information on to the honourable member.

SAMCOR CHARGES

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What action is the Government contemplating to reduce the present charges of Samcor?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The South Australian Meat Corporation Act, 1936-1974, empowers the corporation to fix charges for the treatment of stock at the Gepps Cross abattoirs, and the Government has no authority in this matter. The Board of Samcor is continually seeking improvements and economies in its operating procedures with the object of containing and, where possible, reducing its charges.

PAY-ROLL TAX

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Will the Government immediately give pay-roll tax exemptions to private decentralised industry such as the canning industry, along the established areas of the Murray River and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government is about to consider a report on the question of pay-roll tax exemptions to industry.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. When did the Government receive the Guthridge report into salinity in the Murray River valley and what action has been taken to control salinity within the Murray River since the tabling of this report?

2. Is it still the policy of the Government to construct the Chowilla dam and, if so, when is it expected work will start, and what would be the benefits of the dam to South Australia?

3. Has the South Australian Government had any discussions with the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria and the Commonwealth Government, into providing more storage in the upper reaches of the Murray system similar to that of the Dartmouth dam and, if not, why not?

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

1. 1970. All schemes for salinity control works as proposed by the consultant for the mitigation of the salinity problem in South Australia have been the subject of further investigations as clearly recommended in the report. As the consequence, approval was given for the construction of first stage works at Lake Victoria and Renmark reservoirs, both of which are substantially complete.

2. The Chowilla dam is still an approved work in the River Murray Waters Agreement.

3. The River Murray Commission is conducting a study into the next stage development of storages on the Murray River systems, which includes Chowilla and storages in the headwaters of the Murray.

STATUTES

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What stage has been reached in the consolidation of the Statutes, and when is it likely that the first volume of the consolidation will be released?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The cut-off date for the consolidated edition was fixed as February 3, 1976. This means that all Acts passed prior to that date will be included in the new consolidation. Work is proceeding on the revision and updating of all Public General Acts; this is being done in alphabetical order of the short titles of the Acts. It is anticipated that material for the first two volumes will be ready for printing by the end of this year, and that the first volume will be available by the middle of next year and the second volume two or three months afterwards.

TELEPHONE CHARGES

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Has the Minister of Agriculture made representations to the Federal Government in relation to the increased telephone charges which the Emergency Fire Service will have to pay?

2. Did the Minister make representations to the Whitlam Government which was in office when the increases were announced and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.

OAT MARKETING AUTHORITY

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Does the Government intend to introduce legislation to set up a statutory Oat Marketing Authority in this State and, if so:

(a) when; and

(b) who will be the body administering the scheme?

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

(a) & (b) Discussions are still in progress with the several sectors of the industry on this matter, and no decision has yet been made.

PORT LINCOLN WHARF FACILITIES

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What action does the Government intend to take to guarantee that the new wharf facilities at Port Lincoln will operate?

2. What has been the cost of this project?

3. How many people will be employed on the new facilities when they are operating?

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

1. No action is necessary.

2. \$11 000 000.

3. Departmental employees actually engaged on bulk loading plant will number seven, the same as at the present installation. Also, the number of other departmental employees at the port will not vary because of the new facilities.

WEEVIL CONTROL

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

Does the Government intend to legislate for compulsory inspection of farms for the control of weevils and if so:

(a) why; and

(b) what are the envisaged advantages of this proposal?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No; a voluntary system of on-farm inspections is being considered in consultation with the industry.

F.A.T. CITY COMPANY

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Did F.A.T. City Company make any financial contribution to the upgrading of the Samcor works and, if so, how much?

2. What guarantee was given by F.A.T. City Company to protect Samcor against any loss before contracts were called for the upgrading of the works at Gepps Cross?

3. Who made the approach to Samcor regarding the F.A.T. City Company contract, and was the approach verbal or in writing?

4. Will the Minister table the contract or agreement between F.A.T. City Company and Samcor and, if not, why not?

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

1. No.

2. None.

3. F.A.T. City directors held long discussions with Samcor before heads of agreements were signed.

4. No. Samcor has many customers operating in an open competitive situation, and the confidentiality of their business and commercial contracts with the corporation must be preserved.

(c) Based on a simple calculation of the number of prisoners divided into payments, the average annual cost per prisoner was \$9 117·84.

(d) \$1 623·98.

COMMUNITY WELFARE CENTRES

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What was the average daily number of children accommodated and the cost a child for children in Community Welfare Department centres during the financial year, 1975-76?

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

Name of centre	Average daily number of children	Cost per child day \$
Brookway Park	27·58	79·13
Lochiel Park	22·36	34·47
McNally Training Centre	77·95	51·85
Vaughan House	25·05	56·73

RESEARCH GRANTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. To whom and for what amounts were research grants paid for the financial years ending June 30, 1974, 1975, and 1976 respectively?

2. To whom and for what amounts will research grants be allocated this financial year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The questions are so broad that it will entail an enormous amount of work to compile the material sought. If the honourable member has a specific area of inquiry we will try to answer him.

REVENUE ACCOUNT

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What are the total amounts due and unpaid on Consolidated Revenue Account for the financial year ending June 30, 1976?

2. How do the amounts for each account compare with the previous financial year?

3. What is the accumulated total due on each account?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The amounts due and unpaid on Consolidated Revenue Account are published in the report of the Auditor-General. In the report for the financial year ended June 30, 1975, they are to be found at pages 15 and 16. Information in respect of the financial year just ended is now being collated. The report, containing this information, is expected to be tabled on September 7 next.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What were the:

(a) total payments and receipts;

(b) average daily number of prisoners;

(c) average annual cost a prisoner; and

(d) increase in cost a prisoner over the previous year; of the Correctional Services Department for the financial year ending June 30, 1976?

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

(a) Payments	6 501 018
Receipts	683 835
(b) 713.	

INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the total amount of investment of the State Government Insurance Commission?

2. With whom has the State Government Insurance Commission invested the funds, what are the terms of investment and what are the rates of interest being received?

3. Of the \$20 000 000 made available for home finance, how many applications have been received and what are the highest and lowest amounts granted, the average amount, the rate of interest, the terms and the current waiting list?

4. What has caused the build-up of reserves?

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

1. As at June 30, 1976—\$73 880 000.

2. (a) Short-term money market—fully secured \$1 200 000—interest rates 8·5 per cent per annum to 10 per cent per annum.

(b) The banks in South Australia on certificate of deposit—mainly for 12 months at ruling bank interest rates at time of placement ranging from 8·5 per cent to 9·75 per cent per annum—total \$52 800 000.

(c) Commonwealth bonds—\$100 000—interest rates 10·5 per cent per annum.

(d) South Australian semi-government authorities \$14 200 000—term 5 years—interest at ruling Loan Council rates at time of placement—range 5·7 per cent to 10·3 per cent.

(e) Secured first mortgage debentures in South Australian public listed companies \$2 500 000—interest rates 12·75 per cent per annum to 13·125 per cent per annum.

(f) Housing loans on first mortgage \$3 100 000—interest rate 12 per cent per annum.

3. (a) 469 applications received to June 30, 1976.

(b) Maximum loan \$18 000, the lowest being \$9 000.

(c) Average loan \$17 116.

(d) Interest rate 12 per cent per annum.

(e) The term of the loan is until the State Bank of South Australia's loan is available.

(f) There is no waiting list—loans are settled as required by applicants subject to the time required to value the property and process the documents.

4. Reserves are accumulated in two main areas:

(a) Provision for unearned premium which now stands at \$23 500 000.

(b) Provision for outstanding claims and claims incurred but not reported \$56 700 000.

THIRD PARTY INSURANCE

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What are the findings of the committee of inquiry into third party insurance premiums?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: See my reply to the Question on Notice the honourable member asked last week on this matter.

BRIGHTON ROAD LIGHTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What is the time phase of the lights at the intersection of Brighton Road and Anzac Highway and in particular the phasing of the lights from red, orange and green for right-hand turns from Anzac Highway to Brighton Road and Brighton Road to Anzac Highway?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: These signals are traffic responsive, that is, the length of each phase varies from cycle to cycle depending on the traffic automatically counted on each arm of the junction. If no traffic is counted approaching an arm of the junction during a traffic signal cycle, that phase will be omitted from the cycle.

Phase A: Through traffic on Anzac Highway: The green period can vary from about 15 to 60 seconds.

Phase B: Right-hand turn from Anzac Highway into Brighton Road: The green period can vary from about 15 to 50 seconds.

Phase B: Right-hand turn from Brighton Road into Anzac Highway: After each phase the amber period is set at 3 seconds, and the all-red clearance period at 2 seconds.

FOOTBALL POOLS

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Has further consideration been given to a State-run football pool scheme or acceptance of the national football pools scheme and, if so, what is the result?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We will need to be convinced that there is a strong and genuine demand for football pools before permitting their introduction into South Australia.

STATE LOTTERIES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the percentage of deduction from X-Lotto and ordinary State lotteries respectively?

2. How much interest was earned on the money held from the first receipt of the Adelaide Cup lottery moneys until drawn?

3. Where was the money invested and at what rate?

4. What happens to that income?

5. What was the cost of promotion of the Adelaide Cup lottery, and how does this cost compare with other normal lotteries?

6. Has there been a slowing down of applications and drawing of regular State lotteries and, if so, why and how does this compare with other States?

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

1. X-Lotto—Deduction for prizes 61 per cent. Lotteries—Deduction for Prizes 61.25 per cent average.

2. The Act provides that the commission transfer all receipts to the Lottery Fund held at the Treasury, which has complete control over this fund. These receipts are transferred twice weekly from the Bank of New South Wales, Rundle Street, Adelaide. This money cannot be invested by the commission; consequently, no interest is earned.

3. Answered by 2.

4. Answered by 2.

5. The 1976 Adelaide Cup lottery advertising expenditure was \$14 729.98 over 12 weeks. The advertising plan allows for flexibility so that the allocation can be used to best

advantage. For instance, if a lottery is selling ahead of schedule, advertising for that lottery is reduced and transferred to one which is selling slower than usual.

6. The \$1 and \$2 lotteries are fairly static in South Australia: however, there is evidence of these lotteries having declined in New South Wales and Victoria in favour of larger prize lotteries.

CASINO

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many applications, submissions, or requests has the Government received for the establishment of a casino in South Australia during the past five years?

2. What locations have been suggested and capital investment proposed?

3. Is the establishment of a casino now or in the future in South Australia essential to our tourist potential and, if so, why?

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

1. About 15 inquiries in various forms have been received. Of these, at least four applications were of a substantial nature.

2. Among locations suggested have been Victor Harbor, Mount Gambier, Wallaroo, and Andamooka, while capital investment proposed varies between \$15 000 000 and \$20 000 000.

3. It is completely unrealistic to suggest that the establishment of a casino in South Australia is, or will be, essential to South Australia's tourist industry. Naturally, one would, however, expect benefits to accrue to certain sectors within the industry.

VIETNAMESE ORPHANS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the situation surrounding the delay in adoption of Vietnam war orphans?

2. When will it be resolved?

3. What action is the Government taking to avoid further delays?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. At present the drafting of such amendments as may be necessary to the Adoptions Act to overcome any possible difficulties in the adoption of orphans from foreign countries is being held over pending the holding of a meeting of officers of all States and the Commonwealth to be held shortly. As soon as that meeting has been held and the results of the meeting are known, the Government will take action to remedy the situation. It is the Government's opinion that uniformity is most desirable and, if at all possible, we will be seeking to pass legislation uniform with that to be applied in other States and the Commonwealth.

2. See 1.

3. See 1.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT ACCOUNTING

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What improvements to achieve a higher standard of accounting have been undertaken in the Education Department during the past financial year?

2. What savings have been achieved and what was the total amount saved?

3. How many times has the systems review group met?
4. Who are the members of the group and what are their positions?
5. Will the group continue?

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

1. (a) The computerised pay-roll system has been upgraded by the provision of an on-line inquiry service within the Education Department. Thirteen visual display terminals have been located within the Accounts Branch and staffing area of the department.

(b) The Education Department has introduced a new system of payment of accounts that expedites payment to suppliers.

(c) Staff training within the accounts branch has been expanded, coupled with the provision of additional staff to cope with the work load increase.

(d) Major systems development has not occurred because of the system review which is being undertaken; however, minor modifications are constantly being implemented wherever possible.

2. The level of service has been improved but, in a situation of increased work load, it is impracticable to quantify savings.

3. The systems review group comprises officers who are seconded for full-time or part-time duty, and work together as a team.

4. Mr. A. G. Anderson, Regional Director of Education (Co-ordinator); Mr. J. Neuling, Lecturer (Research), Further Education Department; Mr. K. R. Reedy, Investigating Accountant, Education Department; Mr. A. J. Walter, Controller, A.D.P. Services, Education Department; Mr. G. F. Wheadon, Accountant, Education Department; Mr. M. F. Whinnen, Investigating Officer, Public Service Board Department, together with a group of supporting staff of programmers and systems analysts.

5. It is contemplated that the group will be restructured as the developmental phase moves towards implementation.

SCHOOL FUND ACCOUNTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Has the Education Department increased accounting or audit staff to enable all school fund accounts to be audited each financial year and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: No. It is intended that an Internal Audit Section be established in the Education Department during the 1976-77 financial year. This section will incorporate the present school accounts inspectors. Three additional internal audit staff are to be appointed during this period, and that will improve the frequency of visits to schools.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Were any tiles which were laid and stored for tiling the new mortuary building at Flinders Medical Centre damaged in June?

2. If such damage occurred:

- (a) how many and why were the tiles damaged;
- (b) what was the total cost of the damage and replacement;
- (c) was the damage due to an industrial dispute; and
- (d) was the matter reported to the police, and, if so, what were the findings and, if not, why not?

3. Have there been any other similar incidents at the new mortuary building?

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

1. No.

2. See 1 above.

3. On May 11, 1976, an area of tiles in the hearse bay of the mortuary at the Flinders Medical Centre was damaged. At the time this area was under the control of the principal construction contractor.

LAND PRICE CONTROL

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. How many transactions have been reported to the Commissioner of Land Price Control from the commencement of the Urban Land (Price Control) Act to June 30, 1976?

2. What number of transactions were approved and, of those not approved or given only conditional approval, what were the reasons for non-approval and what was the nature of the conditions applied?

3. How many transactions has the Commissioner investigated that were not officially reported to him but of which he has become aware?

4. Has the Commissioner analysed the value of individual parcels of land (subject to his approval) which he has approved, and what average percentage profit applies to the sales?

5. What maximum percentage of profit has been permitted and what criteria for approval have applied to transactions where the profit permitted has exceeded "the prescribed rate of interest" *vide* section 15 (4) of the Act and its application to section 15 (3) (m) (iv)?

6. Is the legislation deemed by the Government to have worked satisfactorily, and have there been any parts of the Act that have proved difficult to administer?

7. Are any amendments to the Act contemplated during this session and, if so, what is their nature?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. The number of applications from November 29, 1973, to June 30, 1976, for consent submitted for approval under the Urban Land (Price Control) Act, 1973 are: (a) newly created allotments, 348; subdivisions or resubdivisions comprising 13 014 allotments; (b) resale of single existing allotments, 660.

2. Number of allotments within applications (transactions) approved up to March 31, 1976: (a) newly created allotments, 7 281; (b) resale of existing allotments, 395. Number of allotments NOT approved: (a) newly created, 2 817; (b) single existing allotments, 140. Reasons for refusal of granting consent to applicants' proposed prices, in the case of newly created allotments, were invariably because the prices sought were in excess of a reasonable profit margin and/or above the level of the comparable controlled considerations being obtained on those transactions, where the Act applied. On single allotment resales always when the contract price exceeded that which is allowable under Section 15 (3) (m) of the Act. With the exception of a standard condition on all consents, viz., "subject to all selling agents' commission being paid by the vendor", the only occasions where further conditions are imposed are when some additional factors are taken into account in arriving at the controlled price, e.g. "soil test to be given to an intending purchaser", "suitable access to be provided without additional cost to the purchaser", etc.

3. 127 transactions investigated, of which a proportion related to incorrect certification on transfer documents, and others of a more involved nature.

4. It is assumed that this question relates to subdivisational land. Each subdivisational application is subjected to a close scrutiny of the price paid for the land, holding charges and development costs in order to arrive at a well based decision of the level of the controlled prices of the allotments so that a fair margin of profit is provided for the applicant.

A reasonable average percentage profit would be in the range of 17½ per cent to 25 per cent on the total costs involved.

5. Under section 15(4) of the Act the prescribed rates of interest have been:

	per cent
November 29, 1973, to July 8, 1974	9.5
July 9, 1974, to January 31, 1976	11.5
From February 1, 1976	10.5

For arriving at the controlled price for single existing allotments, the provisions of Section 15 (3) (m) of the Act are rigidly applied, the rate of interest being compounded annually at the rate applicable as in force when the contract is executed by the purchaser. Any improvements on the land (excepting a dwellinghouse), which add value to the land, are allowed in addition to the calculated controlled price.

6. The administration of the Act has worked satisfactorily, especially keeping land prices at a reasonable level in comparison to the general inflation level, and also eliminating speculation on residential land.

Overall, the Act has been, to a certain extent, difficult to administer, but, over the period of operation, most of the difficult and troublesome areas have been overcome and made workable. One portion of the Act needs strengthening. Where investigations of suspected infringements are undertaken, and no application is made, the Commissioner has no power to demand documents or other information from the parties to the transaction. This is essential to arrive at a proper decision on the matter.

7. Two amendments to the Act are contemplated this session: (a) extension of the Act until December, 1978; and (b) the powers of investigation (as mentioned in the preceding question).

BIRD TRAPPING

Mr. ARNOLD (on notice):

1. Does the Environment Department trap birds for sale to the public and, if so, on what basis?

2. If birds are trapped for sale to the public, through whom are the birds being sold and is the revenue received being deposited in the Wildlife Conservation Fund?

3. Does the department distribute trapped birds through the "illegal bird trade" for the purpose of securing convictions for offences against the National Parks and Wildlife Act?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, in particular, areas where certain species have increased to such a degree that extensive damage to crops has occurred. Species are presently limited to the Adelaide rosella, eastern rosella (an artificially introduced species to the Adelaide Hills occurring in small but increasing numbers), rainbow lorikeet and musk lorikeet. The programme has been approved by the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council. The programme is aimed at reducing damage from birds to cherry and other fruit orchards. Damage to cherries is considered to be in excess of 30 per cent of the total crop. Damage occurs at the bud, flower and fruit stage. The department is now monitoring damage,

and to July 22, 1976, approximately 10 per cent of all buds have been destroyed on properties monitored. (This is made up of a much higher percentage of the Williams favourite variety and a much lower percentage in the other varieties.) Further bud damage can be expected. The department considers trapping preferential to shooting the birds (under section 53(1)(c) permits). The department has commenced a monitoring programme to determine trends in bird numbers of the birds being trapped. It is intended to continue this monitoring programme while birds continue to be trapped by the department. This programme will ensure that the overall population of the birds being trapped will not be endangered in any way.

2. It is expected that the birds will be sold by public auction through the State Supply Department to persons who have or are prepared to obtain a permit to keep protected animals as provided in section 58 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972-1974. This action has been the practice with previous stock held at the Para Wirra Reserve. Revenue received will be deposited into the Wildlife Conservation Fund.

3. No.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What has been the total annual workmen's compensation payment paid to State Government employees for each of the last five financial years, respectively?

2. How many individual workmen's compensation claims have there been in each of these years respectively?

3. During the last 12 months, how many State Government employees received workmen's compensation payments for a continuous period greater than three months?

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

For State Government employees (excluding railways):

1. 1971-2, \$1 042 022; 1972-3, \$1 436 170; 1973-4 \$1 908 550; 1974-5, \$3 851 190; 1975-6, \$5 205 388.

2. 1971-2, 5 743; 1972-3, 5 842; 1973-4, 7 276; 1974-5, 7 939; 1975-6, 8 382.

3. 358.

For Railways employees:

1. 1971-2, \$525 688; 1972-3, \$555 442; 1973-4, \$823 781; 1974-5, \$1 301 705; 1975-6, \$1 683 134.

2. 1971-2, 1 235; 1972-3, 1 283; 1973-4, 1 419; 1974-5, 1 583; 1975-6, 1 724.

3. 138.

UNLEY TRAFFIC HAZARD

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Is the Minister aware of the traffic hazard that exists, particularly for students of Unley High School, at the intersection of Fullarton Road, Claremont Avenue and Kitchener Street, Netherby?

2. Has the Minister received any requests for the immediate installation of traffic lights at this intersection?

3. What action will the Minister take to reduce the danger at this intersection and when will this action be taken?

4. Will this action be a satisfactory method of reducing the accident risk to students crossing from Claremont Avenue to Kitchener Street, whether these students be pedestrians, motorists or riding bicycles?

5. When is it proposed to install traffic lights at this intersection?

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

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Pedestrian warning signs have been erected. It is also intended to construct a pedestrian refuge in Fullarton Road in the near future.
4. This action is taken in the best interests of overall safety.
5. 1977-78.

DOGS ACT

Mr. CUMBE (on notice): Has the Minister of Local Government received submissions from the Metropolitan Town Clerks' Association seeking amendments to the Dogs Act and, if so, is it the intention of the Government to introduce amending legislation in the present session?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes. The submissions are being examined, but it is not expected that amending legislation will be introduced in this session.

WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. What are the names of the persons recently appointed to the South Australian Water Resources Council?
2. What are the names of those nominated for consideration by the Minister as being persons experienced in irrigated horticulture or viticulture and what recognised primary producer organisations do they represent?
3. What are the names of the two successful nominees of the Minister and what are their particular qualifications for representation on the council?

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

1. The appointment of the following as members of the South Australian Water Resources Council was published in the *Government Gazette* of July 1, 1976:

Mr. K. W. Lewis (Chairman)
 Mr. H. L. Bowey
 Mr. D. W. Barkley
 Mr. C. W. Branson
 Dr. K. F. Walker
 Mr. R. G. W. Coats
 Mr. K. M. Sawers
 Mr. B. P. Webb
 Mr. J. C. McColl
 Dr. W. G. Inglis
 Dr. P. S. Woodruff
 Mr. G. P. Roe

2. Organisations that submitted names were:

United Farmers and Graziers of S.A. Incorporated
 S.A. Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Association Incorporated
 S.A. Dairymen's Association Incorporated
 Stockowners' Association of S.A.
 Lower Murray Private Irrigators' Association
 Riverland Fruit Industries Liaison Committee
 South Australian Murray Irrigators
 Australian Dried Fruits Association

The names of those nominated by each organisation are privileged information.

3. Mr. R. G. W. Coats—experienced in irrigated horticulture. Mr. K. M. Sawers—experienced in primary production.

SUPERANNUATION FUND

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What was the most recent valuation of the South Australian Superannuation Fund?
2. When was that valuation made?
3. If no valuation has been made within the last year, why not?
4. When will the next valuation be available?

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

1. As at June 30, 1970.
2. Report issued to Superannuation Fund Board on September 19, 1972.
3. Completion of the valuation as at June 30, 1973, has been delayed by the illness of the Public Actuary, and the difficulty of obtaining other actuarial services.
4. The date of completion of the valuation will depend upon the recovery of the Public Actuary, or the availability of other actuarial services.

PLYMPTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. On what day and at what time will the Minister meet me and members of the Plympton Primary School Council at the school to inspect the grounds and buildings?
2. If the Minister does not intend to inspect the school, why not?

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

1. An inspection will be arranged in due course. The honourable member is ill advised in his attempt to obtain a commitment from me under duress.
2. See 1.

RAIL PASSENGERS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): How many new passenger cars were put into service on the South Australian Railways in 1974 and 1975, respectively?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The details are as follows:
 1974—nil; 1975—nil.

RU RUA NURSING HOME

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Is the Minister aware of the statement made by Mr. N. J. Hayes, Chairman of the Management Committee of Ru Rua Nursing Home, at the foundation meeting of the Association for Totally Dependent Persons of S.A. on May 5, 1976, that the Government would double the bed capacity at Ru Rua and establish two further centres for totally dependent persons in Adelaide, one in the northern suburbs and one in the southern suburbs?
2. What progress has been made in each of these three projects?

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

1. Yes.
2. Ru Rua Nursing Home now has a capacity of 45 beds. Through a series of structural alterations, it is expected that an additional 60 to 63 beds can be provided and these alterations commenced in May, 1976. Establishment of total dependency care facilities in the northern and southern suburbs are in the planning stages.

HOSPITAL SECURITY

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What action has been taken to improve security and ensure the safety of nursing and other staff and of patients at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, following the sexual assault on a nurse at the hospital on June 20, 1976?

2. Does the Government now consider the security position at the Royal Adelaide Hospital in all respects satisfactory and, if not, what further measures are intended and when will they be put into effect?

3. Is the security of every other Government hospital in the State considered satisfactory and, if not, what measures are intended and when will they be put into effect?

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

1. Since the incident of June 20, 1976, increased security measures have been introduced at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. It would not be in the best interest of those we wish to protect to give details of measures taken.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

PORTER BAY SLIPWAY

Mr. BLACKER (on notice):

1. Does the Government have any plans for extending the slipping facilities at the Porter Bay slipway, Port Lincoln; if so, what are those plans?

2. Is it intended to provide a fitting-out berth near the slipway to be used in conjunction with the existing facilities and, if so, when is it expected that this berth will be built?

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

1. No.

2. There are no immediate plans to provide a fitting-out berth at the slipway.

PORT LINCOLN WHARF

Mr. BLACKER (on notice):

1. When is it expected that the bulk-loading wharf at Port Lincoln will be completed?

2. Has there been a delay in the completion of this wharf and, if so, have any unforeseen circumstances been responsible for the delay, and what are those circumstances?

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

1. November, 1976.

2. There has been a delay of about 12 months in the completion of the bulk-loading plant being constructed on the wharf. The three principal reasons for that delay are:

The limitation of Loan funds available during the financial years 1972-73 and 1973-74.

The delivery of some of the heavy structural work associated with the plant, which was supplied under subcontract, was about six months behind schedule.

There has been a delay in completion of the ship-loader because of minor structural problems.

ROCK LOBSTER BOARD

Mr. BLACKER (on notice):

1. Who are the members of the Rock Lobster Advisory Board?

2. What are the terms of reference of this board?

3. How regularly does the board meet, and what have been the sitting dates over the last two years?

24

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

1. Mr. A. M. Olsen, Chief Fisheries Officer, (Chairman); Mr. P. H. Harvey, South End; Mr. R. M. Guy, Carpenter Rocks; Mr. V. K. Perryman, Port MacDonnell; Mr. D. M. Miller, Robe; Mr. A. T. Whittle, Port Lincoln; Mr. G. T. Rumbelow, Victor Harbor; Mr. T. O. Wilkins, Port Vincent.

2. The committee's terms of reference are to:

(a) Inquire into and report to the Minister upon any matter referred to it by the Minister in relation to the crayfish fisheries.

(b) Advise the Minister on questions relating to the management, control, protection, regulation and development of these crayfish fisheries, and may make such recommendations as it thinks fit in relation thereto.

3. The last meeting of the committee was held on September 18, 1974. Before that it met on average, twice yearly.

PORT LINCOLN MARINA

Mr. BLACKER (on notice):

1. What plans has the Government for the construction of a marina for fishing vessels at Port Lincoln?

2. If a marina is to be constructed, is it expected that the old bulk-loading wharf at Port Lincoln will be used as a basis from which a marina could be built?

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

1. None.

2. *Vide* 1.

WEST COAST ROADS

Mr. BLACKER (on notice): What is the expected construction programme for the building of:

(a) the western approach road into Port Lincoln;

(b) the Bratten Way; and

(c) the Cleve-Mangalo, Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows: Subject to the availability of funds:—

(a) Work is planned to commence in 1977-78.

(b) At present this work is not on the Highways Department advanced works programme, but there is a possibility of commencing it on completion of the Talia to Streaky Bay section of the Flinders Highway in 1978-79.

(c) The work is not on the Highways Department advanced works programme, and is not likely to be included before 1980-81.

LAND ACQUISITION COMMITTEE

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. When was the committee to investigate alternative means of dealing with land acquisition and rating disputes appointed, vide paragraph 8 of the Governor's Opening Speech for this session?

2. What are the terms of reference of this Committee?

3. Who are the members of the committee, and what area of experience do they bring to the committee?

4. Has the committee made a report, or is it intended that it will make interim reports, and is it intended to make these reports public?

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

1. The committee was appointed on February 26, 1976.
2. Precise terms of reference were not laid down: the committee was established to consider practical alternatives to procedures which govern compulsory acquisition of land under the Land Acquisition Act.

3. The committee comprises:

Mr. L. D. Diercks (Chairman), who is Chairman of the Land Board and a member of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers.

Mr. M. W. Bowering, a legal practitioner, who is an Assistant Crown Solicitor in the Crown Law Office.
Mr. C. King, a surveyor, who is Right-of-Way Officer in the Highways Department, and responsible for the administration of that department's land acquisition programme.

Mr. L. Maidment, a member of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers, who is Property Officer of the E. & W.S. Department, and responsible for the administration of that department's land acquisition programme.

The Chairman and Messrs. King and Maidment are experienced in land acquisitions for construction and other works, and work daily with land and valuation matters. Mr. Bowering acts as legal adviser to departments involved in land acquisitions and represents them in the Land and Valuation Court when necessary.

4. The committee has submitted a progress report to me, but it is not intended to make interim reports. It is expected that a final report will be submitted before November. A decision will then be made as to whether the report will be made public.

TRANSFER OF PRISONERS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): What progress has been made, following the decision of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General at their meeting in Hobart last March, in examining the feasibility of a scheme for the interstate transfer of prisoners for rehabilitation purposes?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: A scheme for the interstate transfer of prisoners has been considered by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General on several occasions both before and following its meeting in Hobart last March. Not only is the standing committee considering a scheme for the interstate transfer of prisoners for rehabilitation purposes, but it is also considering questions in relation to the transfer of prisoners from one State to another where charges are pending in another State that can now only be dealt with when the term of imprisonment has expired in the first State. Before the Hobart meeting of the standing committee, officers of that committee had discussed both these questions with officers from the Correctional Services Departments. Broad guidelines were adopted by the standing committee at its March meeting, and a small working party has been set up to consider the legislative implementation of these guidelines. Several problems will arise in such implementation, not the least of which will be that it will be most desirable, if not necessary, for uniform legislation throughout Australia, in order for such a scheme to operate efficiently.

LAND TENURE

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Does the Government support the recommendations contained in the final report of the Else-Mitchell Commission of Inquiry into Land Tenures and, if so why?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government is still in the process of reviewing the recommendations contained in the final report of the commission of Inquiry into Land Tenures.

COOBER PEDY LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What action has the Government taken to ascertain the views of the people of Coober Pedy towards establishing local government at Coober Pedy?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Following agreement by the Coober Pedy Progress Association, action will now be taken to organise a poll to determine whether or not local government is desired in the area.

STUART HIGHWAY

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What stage has been reached in plans to seal the Stuart Highway?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A study of the various alternative routes for a new alignment for the national highway from Port Augusta to the Northern Territory border has been completed under the direction of a steering committee comprising representatives of the Commonwealth Department of Transport, the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads, and the S.A. Highways Department. The steering committee's report is undergoing final editing and will be available shortly. The final decision as to what route should be adopted is a matter for both State and Commonwealth Governments, and has not yet been made. The rate at which the selected route will be sealed largely depends on the funding for national highways made available by the Commonwealth Government. This is unknown, as the present Commonwealth Act relating to road funds expires at the end of this financial year, and the State has had no indication of the funds likely to be made available.

PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Does the Government consider the Public Service to be overly bureaucratic, inefficient, and clothed in secrecy, and, if so:

- (a) what has brought it to this conclusion; and
- (b) what action, if any, does it intend to take?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government believes there are some aspects of the operation of the Public Service that call for improvement. It established the Committee of Inquiry into the South Australian Public Service, and is now proceeding with evaluation of that report and the progressive implementation of some of its recommendations.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Does the Attorney-General consider those departments of the Public Service under his Ministerial control to be overly bureaucratic, inefficient, and clothed in secrecy, and, if so:

- (a) what has brought him to this conclusion; and
- (b) what action, if any, does he intend to take to improve the efficiency of such departments?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: See the reply to the previous question.

ONKAPARINGA RIVER

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What action, if any, is intended to save the Onkaparinga River estuary from further destruction, and why and when will such action be taken?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Considerable action has been taken, is being taken, and will continue to be taken to control so-called destruction of the Onkaparinga River estuary. The significance of the general estuarine area was recognised in the authorised development plan for metropolitan Adelaide that shows it as a proposed regional open space. As one part of implementing that plan the State Planning Authority, over recent years, has been acquiring the land and now owns most of the estuary. Further, the area originally proposed has been increased by the acquisition of land south of the Port Noarlunga oval, and by purchases from the South Australian Housing Trust to the east. To establish the best way in which the area could be developed as open space, a hydrological study of the estuary was carried out by consultants in 1974, followed by a State Planning Office study in which it was proposed that the estuary be treated as three areas:

Area 1: A township park area, along Gawler Street and including the former rubbish dump, which is in the ownership of the district council and is subject to a development scheme to be agreed between the council and the State Planning Authority.

Area 2: A conservation area extending from the sea to east of Goldsmith Road extension. This area will be retained under the control of the State Planning Authority and is intended to be restored where possible to its natural condition. It includes the sand dunes, mud flats and samphires of the lower estuary which are important for bird and fish life. The prime aim is conservation, with a secondary aim of quiet recreation such as fishing and canoeing.

Subsequently, Areas 1 and 2 were further examined by the Environment Division of the Environment Department. The report which was produced proposes some changes in the boundaries of these areas and contains recommendations for future action. This report has been made available to the public for comments, and there is a copy in the Parliamentary Library.

Area 3: A recreation area extending from east of Goldsmith Road extension to the D. V. Fleming Bridge at Noarlunga. This will cater for a range of active recreation needs such as horse trails, golf course, field sports etc., whilst maintaining environmental protection of the flood plain and the immediate river banks. The planning and design for this area is a high priority of the State Planning Authority.

Another proposal on which concern has been expressed by some members of the public is the proposed road and rail crossing southward from Goldsmith Road. A working group drawn from the State Planning Authority, the State Transport Authority (Railways Division), Highways Department and the Environment Department has been set up to examine this problem and recommend on the design of a combined road and rail crossing. All this action has been, and is being taken by the State Planning Authority, with the Environment Department, the council, and the Southern Districts Environmental Group to resolve the complex problems which arise in ensuring that the Onkaparinga River estuary is developed and protected for the people of the State.

MEDIBANK STRIKE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Did the Government support the general strike in connection with Medibank on Monday, July 12th, 1976, and if so, why; and, if not, why not?

2. Did members of the Government go to their work on that day and, if so, why?

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

1. Yes, for reasons published at the time.

2. Yes. As was pointed out at the time, it is not possible for Ministers to strike: they are inevitably servicing the public, whether in their offices or not. To put themselves as closely as possible in the position of those who sacrificed pay to take part in the national stoppage, Ministers donated their pay for this day to the Commissioners for Charitable Funds.

DRUNKENNESS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it intended to introduce legislation to abolish the offence of public drunkenness and, if so, when and why?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The South Australian Government intends to introduce legislation to abolish the offence of public drunkenness, and will do so as soon as legislation has been prepared. The Government has adopted the recommendations of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee that the offence of public drunkenness be repealed and that sobering-up facilities be established to receive and, where necessary treat, persons who are drunk in a public place. The Government considers that drunkenness and alcoholism is a welfare and medical problem in our community and should be treated as such rather than invoking the sanctions of the criminal law: it considers that prisons are not the appropriate places to hold and treat persons some of whom are alcoholics. I am drafting instructions to Parliamentary Counsel in collaboration with the Minister of Health and the Minister of Community Welfare to establish holding and treatment services for alcoholics who are found drunk in a public place.

VICTORIA SQUARE HOTEL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What stage has been reached with the proposal for an international hotel to be built in Victoria Square?

2. Has any decision been made for the building of such a hotel and, if so:

(a) by whom is it to be built;

(b) when; and

(c) what assistance, if any, will be given by the Government for this purpose?

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

1. The stage reached with the proposal for an international hotel to be built in Victoria Square is at present exploratory. There are three firm inquiries, one of which has progressed to the extent of architects' plans and designs. The other two are at the stage of inquiry and feasibility study.

2. No decision has been made as yet for the building of such a hotel and the inquiries received are being dealt with by the Victoria Square International Hotel Committee, which will report to me upon each proposition in respect of all aspects, including any recommended assistance by the Government, in due course.

TOW TRUCKS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is an inquiry into the operations of tow-truck operators being carried out and, if so:

- (a) by whom;
- (b) what are the full terms of reference; and
- (c) when is a report expected and will it be made public?

2. If an inquiry is not being carried out is such an inquiry intended and, if so:

- (a) why;
- (b) under what terms of reference;
- (c) when; and
- (d) by whom?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

- (a) A committee chaired by Mr. G. C. Strutton, Registrar of Motor Vehicles, and comprising representatives from the Automobile Chamber of Commerce, R.A.A., Police, and the St. John Ambulance Brigade.
- (b) The committee will consider tow-truck problems in general, with particular emphasis on the methods now employed by operators when attending accident scenes.
- (c) The committee will submit its report as soon as possible, but until the problems have been identified and ways and means examined in an endeavour to eliminate the problems, it is not possible to say when the report will be submitted to the Government.

2. Not applicable.

TRANSPORT BAN

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Was the Government aware of a ban imposed by the Trades and Labor Council on July 23, 1976, on all services and facilities to the State Transport Authority?

2. What services and facilities were affected by such ban?

3. Did the Government take any, and, if so what, action as a result of the ban?

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

1. Yes.

2. Very few.

3. All possible action was taken to minimise the effect of the Trades and Labor Council's decision.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. On what conditions is money allocated to councils under the unemployment relief system?

2. Has any instruction been given to such bodies to give preference in employment under the system to unionists, and, if so:

- (a) by whom has such instruction been given;
- (b) what are the full terms of the instruction; and
- (c) why has it been given.

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

1. Funds are allocated to those councils with high unemployment rates for the purpose of carrying out projects of benefit to the community. Projects are required to contain a minimum labour content of 50 cents in the

dollar, except where programmes of special worth are involved. Grants are made available for approved projects on a reimbursement basis.

2. Yes.

(a) Minister of Local Government.

(b) In the allocation of funds provided for the unemployment relief scheme by the State Government, councils have been requested to conform with Industrial Instruction, No. 464, reissued by the Public Service Board on April 20, 1976.

(c) To accord with Government policy.

SPEAKER'S TRIP

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Did the Government pay for the visit in June, 1976, of the Hon. the Speaker to the Cook Islands, and, if so:

(a) how much was paid; and

(b) why?

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

- | | |
|-------------|-----------------------------|
| (a) \$1 560 | air fares and accommodation |
| 27·28 | life insurance |
| 10·50 | baggage insurance |

\$1 597·78

(b) To attend a conference of presiding officers of Australian and Pacific Parliaments, arranged in Darwin in June, 1974. The Speaker together with the President of the Legislative Council represented the South Australian Legislature.

FINGERPRINTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Are the fingerprints taken of persons arrested for alleged offences and if so:

(a) why;

(b) is it proposed to continue this practice and, if not, what is now proposed and why and when; and

(c) is a record of such fingerprints kept and for how long?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

(a) Yes, except in certain circumstances. They are taken to aid in the identification of the person arrested.

(b) Yes.

(c) A convicted person's fingerprints are maintained until the person is deceased. A person not convicted of the offence may have his record destroyed on application.

MARIHUANA

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Does the Government propose to have an inquiry made into the question of legalising the use of marihuana in this State and if so:

(a) when;

(b) by whom;

(c) what are to be the full terms of reference of such inquiry;

(d) when is it expected that the report of such an inquiry will be made;

and

(e) will the report be made public?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Government has made no decision on the question raised.

WORKER PARTICIPATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What stage has now been reached in the proposals for worker participation in the South Australian Housing Trust?

2. What further action, if any, is proposed by the Government to introduce a scheme of worker participation in the Housing Trust?

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

1. A proposal for worker participation was circulated to all employees in the Housing Trust and their comments were invited. A large number of employees took the opportunity to submit written comments to the Minister. The Government is currently considering these comments.

2. The Government, through its Unit for Industrial Democracy, has initiated discussions between management and trade unions for the best means of conducting discussions and seminars on worker participation for all interested members of staff.

MONARTO CHAIRMAN

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. For what term had Mr. R. C. Taylor been appointed as Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission and when did it commence?

2. What, respectively, were the annual salary and the other emoluments paid to him as Chairman?

3. How was the figure of \$100 000 paid to him as compensation on resignation arrived at?

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

1. Mr. R. C. Taylor was appointed Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission on January 17, 1974, for a period of six years.

2. The salary paid to Mr. Taylor as Chairman at the date of resignation was \$31 374 a year. Other emoluments being paid were:

	Per annum
	\$
Entertainment allowance	1 000
Rental (housing)	1 365
(based on 37½ per cent of rent on present housing).	
Telephone (home)—	
Rental	70
Plus official calls	—
Insurance	3 137·40
(based on a premium of 15 per cent of annual salary paid to Mr. Taylor of which 10 per cent was paid by the Government).	
Motor vehicle—one car as purchased by the Government on April 11, 1974.	
Registration and insurance	350
Running expenses	1 000 (estimate)

3. The \$100 000 paid as compensation for early termination of Mr. Taylor's employment was determined from within the range of \$85 000 to \$138 000 as estimated as minimum and maximum by the Premier's Department. The Crown Law Department considered that this approach was not inappropriate. The actual sum was determined by negotiation, bearing in mind inflation.

AYERS HOUSE RESTAURANT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Does an examination of files of Ayers House Restaurant Proprietary Limited at the office of the Registrar of Companies show that Peter Bardon Fairweather was at

one time a director or secretary of this company and if so, is he still a director, or secretary, or shareholder of this company?

2. If Peter Bardon Fairweather was at one time a director of this company and is no longer a director, on what date did he resign as a director, and does the Government know the reasons for his resignation and, if so, what were they?

3. On what date was the liquor licence to the Stormy Summers restaurant cancelled and was Peter Bardon Fairweather a director of the company that operated this restaurant?

4. Was Ayers House Restaurants ever registered as a business name and is it still registered, and if not, when was the name cancelled?

5. Is Ayers House Restaurants Proprietary Limited listed as trading during 1974-75?

6. During 1974-75, under which company or business name were the operations at the restaurant of Ayers House, North Terrace, Adelaide, carried on and did this company operate as a legal identity?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. An examination of the file of Ayers House Restaurants Proprietary Limited at the office of the Registrar of Companies shows that Mr. Peter Bardon Fairweather was a director, and the Secretary of the company from the date of incorporation of the company on July 2, 1974, until May 22, 1976, on which date he retired from both positions. He became a shareholder in the company on the date of incorporation and was still a shareholder on December 31, 1975, being the date at which the last annual return of the company was made up. The Companies Act does not require companies to file notice of transfers of shares with the Registrar, so that it is not known whether Mr. Fairweather still holds a share in the company.

2. It is not known why Mr. Fairweather resigned as a director. The Companies Act does not require companies to notify the Registrar of the reasons why a director has retired from office.

3. (a) The restaurant which was known as the Stormy Summers Restaurant was licensed as the Surabaia Restaurant, the licensee being Marcel Spiero; this licence was cancelled by the Licensing Court on January 9, 1976. The new name of Stormy Summers was never submitted to the Licensing Court for approval.

(b) Mr. Peter Bardon Fairweather was appointed a director of Stormy Summers Restaurant Proprietary Limited on August 28, 1975. The directors' report, which forms part of the annual return of the company made up as at December 31, 1975, and filed in the office of the Registrar of Companies, states that the company did not carry on business during the financial year ending on June 30, 1975. The records of the Companies Office do not show whether business has been carried on by the company since that date.

4. The business name Ayers House Restaurants was registered under the Business Names Act on August 22, 1973. The registration was cancelled on July 2, 1974, being the date on which Ayers House Restaurants Proprietary Limited was incorporated under the Companies Act.

5. The directors' report, which forms part of the annual return of Ayers House Restaurants Proprietary Limited made up as at December 31, 1975, and filed in the office of the Registrar of Companies, states that the company did not carry on business during the financial year ending on June 30, 1975. Further, a note at the foot of the balance

sheet of the company made up as at June 30, 1975, states that the company has not traded since the date on which it was incorporated.

6. The liquor licence held in respect of these premises has been held by Philip Harold Cramey in his personal name since April 30, 1973. Mr. Cramey is the lessee of the premises.

MONARTO

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say whether the Government will now finally call a halt to the development of Monarto, in the light of all the adverse reports and opinions that have accumulated regarding the project over the years and, if not, why not? Considerable controversy has raged over the development of Monarto since it was first proposed, and many people have expressed the view that the decision to proceed should never have been made. In spite of a number of adverse reports regarding the site, including soil and salinity, difficulties in attracting an industrial base, changes in original population projections, and the drastic Whitlam Government cut-back in funds (all of which matters have been ventilated in the House), the Government has pressed ahead with the project.

So far, over \$16 000 000 has been spent, but this is a relatively small sum compared to the sum of \$600 000 000, which was quoted in a Government report as the total cost of Monarto up to 1958. All of these adverse reports on Monarto were available to Mr. Ray Taylor when he decided to step down from his position as Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission. It has been said that, if Mr. Taylor could recognise the reality of the situation so soon after his appointment, the Government should do so, too, and no longer try to hide the facts. It has been put to me most strongly, as a result of considerable concern in the community, that we do not need and cannot afford Monarto at this stage.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must remind the honourable Leader that he is now debating the matter. He must ask the question, and explain it briefly.

Dr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am simply quoting what has been said to me by way of community concern; namely, that the Government should cut its losses by calling a halt to what has become nothing more than a political obsession.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader does not quote the many reports he says exist that are unfavourable to the development of Monarto. In fact, the environmental impact statement on Monarto makes clear that Monarto is a better site for a city than is Adelaide itself.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I refer to the latest report we have, because it will show how inadequate is the Leader's research into this topic. A clear expression of support for the development of the new city of Monarto has been given by the State's Environment Protection Council. The council, established in 1972, consists of four Government and four non-government members. Its establishment followed the publication of the Jordan committee report on the South Australian environment. Professor Jordan is a member of the council, which recommended that the development of Monarto should continue "at the fastest practicable rate",

and that every effort should be made to contain the size of metropolitan Adelaide "to, or near to, its present area". The Minister for the Environment has said that the council had noted with concern some recent criticism of Monarto. The council made it evident that it wished to draw people's attention to the section of the Jordan committee report stating that a serious attempt should be made to restrict the population of Adelaide to 1 000 000 (it is already more than 900 000), and that a start should be made on at least one major submetropolitan regional city. It is vital to the planning and future of Adelaide that Monarto be developed. The Government does not intend to withdraw from what is a vital project for the welfare of South Australia because the Opposition does nothing more than try to play politics with the future of Adelaide. The Government is committed to Monarto, and is certain, on all the examination it has made of the planning for the future of Adelaide, that the development of a submetropolitan regional city is vital.

Dr. Tonkin: Will you make all those reports available, including the ones that have been suppressed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are no suppressed reports, but I will make available to the Leader and the House the report on what the Environment Protection Council has had to say about the matter.

Mr. Evans: All of them, and the others, too?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know what the honourable member is talking about. Can he specify something to me?

Dr. Tonkin: The ones that don't suit you.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable Leader is unable to specify anything. If he specifies a report to me which he says is suppressed I will examine that request, but it is no use his referring to some report which I do not know about but which he knows about but does not know what it is. The Leader is pursuing the normal course he follows in South Australia of making an allegation which he says he cannot support, and then calling on me to disprove it.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And so does his mate Goldsworthy.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member has any evidence he should cite it, and not just fulminate in his usual fashion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say whether the agreement entered into by the Government and Mr. Ray Taylor included a condition or conditions requiring a measure of secrecy or confidentiality in relation to Monarto and, if so, what was the condition or conditions? I believe it is obvious, even to the Government, that many people are seriously disturbed at the size of the payment made to Mr. Taylor, and many questions are still not being answered in relation to the Monarto Development Commission. The House was told last year that the annual salaries for the commission would be about \$920 000 a year. I think that figure is recorded in *Hansard*. The Government now intends to spend \$120 000 on an independent survey of the Adelaide Hills, a survey in which the commission would be an interested party. Mr. Taylor is reported to have said that he left his job with the commission, because he did not have enough work to do. The implication is clear: there are probably many other people in exactly the same position working in the commission. Can the Premier therefore say whether there was a requirement for confidentiality and whether the excessive payment is in the nature of what many would call "hush money"?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I regard that as a disgraceful imputation, I do not intend to say anything more about it.

Mr. GUNN: Because of the Premier's refusal to reply to the question asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition about the confidentiality of the contract between Mr. Taylor and the South Australian Government, will the Premier now, in the public interest, table the contract entered into between the South Australian Government and Mr. Taylor? Further, if there was a separate agreement in relation to the termination of that contract, will the Premier also table that document? The Premier would be aware that, as the Deputy Leader correctly pointed out, this matter has caused wide discussion, because of the large amount involved, and it is understood that this payment will attract very little income tax. Therefore, I believe that, in the public interest, the information should be tabled.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will examine the matter of tabling the document regarding Mr. Taylor's original contract. I do not recall whether there was a further document, but I will examine that matter. However, I certainly will not reply to questions in this House when the explanation of the questions makes a gross imputation, with the member concerned using the privilege of this House to say something scandalous and defamatory. What has been said this afternoon is a disgrace to the member who has said it and it is a disgrace to the House that he should use this place in that way, and I do not intend to answer questions of that kind in the House. However, I will examine the matter that the member for Eyre has raised.

INSURANCE REFUNDS

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Transport say whether refunds of registration and third party insurance charges could be made simultaneously, as registration and insurance fees are paid simultaneously? Upon the cancellation of the registration of a vehicle the owner can apply to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles for a refund representing the monetary equivalent of the remaining period of registration. An owner can also apply to the State Government Insurance Commission for a third party insurance refund. However, this can be done only after the Registrar has cancelled the registration and authorised the cancellation of insurance.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This is a reform that the Government has been considering. Happily, I can say that, in about two or three months, this procedure will be a fact of life. At present, if a person wishes to cancel his registration, he can go to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, obtain a refund, and then trot up to the State Government Insurance Commission and obtain a third party insurance refund. It must be borne in mind that no private insurance companies are willing to write third party insurance.

Mr. Becker: They're not allowed to.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is a complete untruth. Every private insurance company served notice on the Motor Registration Division of the Transport Department that it would not write third party insurance for the South Australian public.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about Lumley's?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Lumley's was the last out of the field: they all opted out. If South Australia had not had a State Government Insurance Commission, goodness knows where the people of this State would have obtained third party insurance coverage when private companies refused to provide it. Be that as it may, the member for Hanson will realise that he follows some strange paths, as he was with Peter Nixon and his promise about no Concorde aircraft coming to West Beach which he knows is wrong, anyway. Arrangements are being completed whereby a person, if he wishes to cancel his registration, can get back from the Registrar both the remainder of his registration fee and his third party insurance charge.

ROADS FUNDS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the announcement I heard last evening on radio by the Federal Minister for Transport that \$20 000 000 would be available for national roads in South Australia means a change of attitude in this regard by the Australian Government? It surprised me to hear that \$20 000 000 would be available for national roads in South Australia, because of cuts being made elsewhere by the Australian Government. If there has been some new acceptance of the needs of the State in this regard, and as the Minister, because of previous drastic cuts in this finance, was forced to provide some increase in registration fees, does this indicate that he will now be able to re-examine the situation?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I would be delighted to say that we were getting another \$20 000 000, but in fact the \$20 000 000 Mr. Nixon referred to last evening is the same \$20 000 000 included in the roads legislation enacted by the Whitlam Government when Mr. Jones was Minister. The same \$20 000 000 seems to be announced over and over again. Last night's announcement referred to the Canberra approval to enable South Australia to undertake the work that previously South Australia had decided on for itself. The new federalism policy we are hearing so much about (I think it is called co-operative federalism) means that the Federal Minister (Peter Nixon) decides where the money will be used and how it will be spent, and the State must co-operate by following his instructions.

LANDS DEPARTMENT

Mr. RODDA: Because of concern being expressed in country districts that the Lands Department at present has a serious shortage of money (said to be between \$500 000 and \$1 000 000), can the Premier assure the House that the Minister will have adequate finance to enable his department to carry out its administrative programmes?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am at a loss to understand what the honourable member is talking about, but, if he would let me have details of what he says is a deficiency in funds, I may be able to help him. Where did this deficiency occur?

Mr. Rodda: Lack of funds.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Does the honourable member mean that the department is not getting under the Budget everything it is asking for?

Mr. Rodda: Yes, it is short of money.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am afraid the honourable member will have to be a little more specific before I can give him a reply.

FOSTER CARE

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare indicate the future of foster care for children in South Australia? I have been told that a seminar on foster care is to be held in Adelaide soon. Does this indicate faults in the present system, and are any marked changes contemplated?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I think the honourable member has posed two question. No immediate changes are planned to foster care in South Australia either by me, as Minister, or by the Government. However, since foster care is the major form of substitute family care prevailing in South Australia, I think the honourable member will agree that the need for some changes might become apparent if the matter were examined, and a seminar, such as the one to which he referred, could be useful. The seminar will be held in the Adelaide University Union Building on Saturday, August 14, from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. It is being jointly sponsored by the South Australian Council of Social Service (known as S.A.C.O.S.S.) and the Community Welfare Department. A most comprehensive discussion paper has been jointly prepared, and I thank S.A.C.O.S.S. publicly for its enthusiastic and active interest. It is another good example of co-operation between Government and non-government agencies in an area of care that is most important. The keynote address, entitled *Future Directions for Foster Care in South Australia*, will be given by the Rev. Keith Seaman, who is well known for his interest in this matter. It is hoped by me and by people concerned that the seminar will make recommendations or initiate action in the development of new ideas and practice in foster care at the State, regional, and local levels. After the seminar, a S.A.C.O.S.S. task force will prepare the final report on its investigations into foster care in South Australia. At present, the Community Welfare Department is fostering about 800 children in 600 foster homes, with a subsidy and other payments totalling about \$1 000 000. As these figures indicate how important the subject is, such a seminar could well prove to be of benefit.

NORTH-EASTERN SUBURBS TRANSPORT

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Transport indicate what progress has been made on the North-East Area Public Transport Review? Earlier this year, the Minister announced that planning would be undertaken into a proposal for road and possibly rail transport requirements covering the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide. As my district would be vitally affected by any such study and proposal, can the Minister indicate what is contemplated and, more particularly, what stage these studies have reached, especially following local inquiries and local involvement?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not think we announced when the study was launched that we were to consider what sort of roads we would build; rather we were to consider what form of transport was most suitable and acceptable for the area. When we announced the study of the North-East Area Public Transport Review (or N.E.A.P.T.R.; as part and parcel of any of these things one must first coin a proper name), it was expected that it would be a long and involved process, that much data would have to be collected, and that much public involvement would be necessary to determine the views of the people, not so much on the basis of willy-nilly asking

them loaded questions, but rather to involve them in in-depth questioning surveys to determine what was most desirable and most acceptable. Part of the study is to determine the population content, the travel patterns, and so on. The study is progressing satisfactorily, as we have a small but important team conducting the survey. Apart from those generalities, I cannot, off the top of my head, give further details. As a result of the honourable member's question, however, I shall ask the leader of the study team whether there is more pertinent information that can be provided: if so, I shall bring it down for the honourable member.

BUSTARDS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister for the Environment any up-to-date information about inroads being made into the State's scanty population of scrub turkeys, more accurately known as bustards? I understand from a press report that there has been some recent activity concerning this matter.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: There has been recent activity. My department has had reports of illegal shooting of these birds in the Far West and, knowing that the birds are an extreme rarity, has been taking action. The ranger at Streaky Bay, with two other officers from the wildlife division of my department in Adelaide, has been on the Nullarbor Plain in the past few days. These officers have had success in tracking down people who, they believe, have been breaking the law. They also believe, according to a telephone call to my office a few hours ago, that the problem has been partly caused by the good prices being paid for fox pelts and the many foxes in that area. What seems to have been happening is that all kinds of people, many from other States, have been going after foxes but have been blazing away at anything else that moves, bustards and wombats included. One party of five shooters will be receiving summonses (none has yet been served) for shooting bustards. Another party of two shooters, from another State, was found to be shooting wombats without a permit. The national parks officers noted considerable evidence that other parties had been feasting off bustards. This evidence was contained in bones and feathers littering several old camp fires. One further point reported to me today was that these illegal shooters have been using rifles of unusually small calibre (I believe .171 calibre, air-gun size) apparently because the smaller bullet does less damage to fox pelts. My officers are following further leads in the region, and are expected back to base later this week. I assure the honourable member that, whenever they can be sustained by evidence, charges will be laid. We cannot accept depletion of the few remaining specimens of this quite rare species just to satisfy the greed of unthinking shooters.

MARDEN HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. SLATER: Will the Minister of Education say whether Federal funds still are being made available for school library resource centres, as they were made available by the former Federal Labor Government? I ask the question in relation to Marden High school particularly, as a reply given to me earlier indicated that a priority list was used in regard to these library resource centres. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether Federal funds still are being made available in the interests of education in South Australia.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Specific funds will no longer be made available for library resource centres, so any project such as the one referred to by the honourable member would have to be financed from general capital moneys, either from our State Treasury under the Loan Council agreement or on the basis that moneys were still available from the Schools Commission in an untied form. I will discuss the matter with my department officers to find out what we may be able to do in regard to Marden High School from what capital moneys are available to us, but the moneys would not be made available on the basis that obtained previously.

BASIC EDUCATION

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Education say what is his attitude and the attitude of his principal officers to the growing unrest (I think that would be a suitable term to use) on the part of parents regarding the basic instruction of children, particularly primary schoolchildren, in the three R's as they are normally termed? I was not aware of the number of parents concerned until the Minister recently reopened a school that had been remodelled. The school concerned has served the district well, and it has been remodelled at a cost of \$1 300 000. That work was a good example of what can be done with an old building. At the opening of the school, it was disturbing to see how many parents asked questions about what was the attitude of those concerned with the educational system towards what the parents considered to be a deficiency in regard to this basic training. When I am travelling in my motor car, as I and many other members do so much, I listen to talk-back programmes on the radio. Whilst by and large I am not enchanted by those programmes, it is amazing to hear how many people refer to the instruction of children, particularly primary schoolchildren. I should like the Minister to give his opinion and what he believes to be the attitude of his officers regarding this matter.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I should like to genuinely thank the honourable member for asking the question, because I think it gives me a chance to place on record what I believe the present position to be. I preface my remarks by saying that there is not, and never can be, any cause for complacency in any education system about the standards of the education being provided. Certainly, there is no complacency on the part of my officers. I believe, from the contacts I have with teachers, that there is no complacency amongst most teachers, and we always must strive to improve our standards, particularly in imparting basic skills of literacy and numeracy, which remain the core of studies not only in primary schools but also in secondary schools. Having said that, I must also say that, having considered the matter in some detail, as all other State Ministers told me at a recent Australian Education Council conference in Queensland that they have done, I can find no evidence of any significant deterioration in standards of literacy and numeracy in regard to children coming out of our schools. The recent survey, which was used by the *Bulletin* as the basis of much speculation, indicated that the standards being achieved by our 10-year-old and 14-year-old children are quite comparable to, if not slightly better than, those being achieved in the United States and the United Kingdom, which countries, despite the improvement in resources put into education in Australia in recent years, still apply a higher percentage of their gross national product to education than we do. So, with a lesser effort we are achieving comparable standards. At the recent Australian Education Council

meeting in Queensland, the Queensland department gave information to us that was based on a reading comprehension test, which is given to their year 7 children before they go into high school. This is a test that has been applied since just after the Second World War. Obviously, it is impossible to keep such a test uniform over such a long period, but there have been some reasonable attempts to maintain the standard of the test during that period.

The results show that, if anything, there has been an increase in performance of year 7 children in that test since it was introduced soon after the war. If this is the state of the situation, so far as can be ascertained from cold hard figures, we must ask ourselves, "What is the source of the disquiet which, admittedly, is around the place?" First, of course, the *Bulletin* article is a beat-up. I believe it is a shot in a campaign to try to reduce the commitment of resources to education throughout the country: it is softening up the electorate for whatever might come next. I am not suggesting that this is some gigantic conspiracy mounted by Mr. Fraser or anybody else with the Federal Government, even though I have evidence that a reduction of commitment on education expenditure is in its sights. I do not believe the conspiracy theory, but I am sure there are those people in this country who would welcome this type of attempt by the Federal Government and who are assisting it in whatever way they can by a softening up process through certain parts of the media. I certainly hope the Federal Government will not be impressed by this sort of process. That is one source of concern.

Another source of peoples' concern is that, admittedly, and for sound educational reasons, education methods and teaching practice change from time to time, and I can well understand the confusion of a person who was educated in a classroom where all activity was centred on the teacher and where people sat in rows of desks, with 15 ink wells separated by distances of 18 inches. I can well understand people being brought up in that classroom environment being somewhat bewildered on walking into an open space system school. There are many ways in which there are equivalent things going on as between the old system and the new system. I am sure there are those who, probably, are rather confused because they do not understand the philosophy behind it and they do not really see the results. Thirdly, there are those employers who are no longer able to attract students at the level at which they were able to attract them 10 or 15 years ago, because these students now go on to higher education. So, typically, those employers get people who have a lower standard of achievement. They, of course, can judge only by the standards of the people who are coming to them, and they either deliberately or otherwise (and I do not want to put an unfortunate construction on it, so I will say otherwise) judge the school system by the standard of the people coming to them, totally forgetting that the higher achievers they used to get now go on to higher education. I am not complacent: I would urge at all times on all people in the education community that our standards have to improve. I can see no evidence of a decline, however, and therefore no need for panic.

WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAMMES

Mr. BOUNDY: Will the Minister of Education reconsider the recent determination to curtail work experience programmes in secondary schools because of the inability

to provide adequately for workmen's compensation? I can explain my question best by reading a letter from the Maitland Area School, as follows:

The Maitland Area School has conducted for some time a works experience programme. This programme enables students to work at various places of employment in the Maitland area for a period of one week. It has now come to our notice that the Education Department will not accept any responsibility should one of the student workers be injured whilst they are at that place of employ. The employer cannot cover the student worker under workers compensation because no payment is received by the student. The only alternative left is for separate individual insurance coverage to be effected. The Parent's Council of the above school feels that this situation is entirely unsatisfactory and it has asked me to write to you to complain. They feel that the Education Act should be altered in such a way as to enable students throughout the State to participate in a works experience programme, thereby gaining valuable exposure to a job situation without having to worry about where and how compensation will be paid should an unfortunate accident take place.

The Maitland Area School is not the only school that has approached me on this matter: Minlaton High School, too, has sent me a letter. Members of these councils consider that this is a further manifestation of the ridiculous lengths to which this Government will go in interpreting the Workmen's Compensation Act.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will turn the other cheek to the final two sentences of the honourable member and simply say that I, too, have received correspondence on the matter, and it is being considered at present. It is not something that I believe I shall be able to resolve in isolation from my colleagues, but I hope to have a reply for the honourable member soon.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Attorney-General consider issuing members with an up-to-date list of justices of the peace in their area? In the Unley District (and I suppose other districts) several justices of the peace have either died or have changed their addresses, and this causes hardship for constituents. I believe there may soon be an age limit for justices, and I wonder whether a refresher course as well as a correspondence course under the guidance of Judge Marshall could be instituted soon to keep up with trends in court work?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I shall be pleased to consider the matter of supplying members with lists of justices in their districts. However, it will be a considerable task for my officers, and I favour the practice of the past in which individual members have, from time to time, sought lists of justices from the Attorney-General. These lists have been supplied. Recently, the Minister for the Environment sought such a list, and I was able to supply him with details. It is a very difficult job to keep lists of justices up to date on the basis of electoral districts.

Mr. Jennings: The electoral districts might well change soon.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The electoral districts might well change soon, but there is great difficulty in doing this, because there is not an obligation on justices to inform the Attorney-General's Department or the Government of their change of address, so in many instances we find justices residing in areas and at addresses different from those where they resided when they were first appointed justices. This is a considerable problem. I will look into the matter and see whether it is possible to provide all members with lists of the justices living in their area. I bring to the attention of members the

facility that is available: if they particularly desire to have a list of the justices in their area, I shall be happy to supply that list to them on request. Another matter raised by the honourable member was the question of the age limit for justices. This matter has again come to public attention as a result of a comment I made in answer to a question at a justices seminar at Port Pirie over the weekend. You, Sir, were present and will be well aware that the comment I made on that occasion was not correctly recorded in the press. I said that the Government's policy (which was the policy of my predecessor) was that justices over the age of 70 years would not sit in courts in South Australia unless it was absolutely essential for them to do so. This is being continued, and it has been the policy of the Government for some years. This policy was based on the fact that, under the legislation of this Act, Supreme Court Justices are now required to retire at 70 years of age. It is the Government's view that no other judicial officers should sit if they are over 70 years of age, where this can be avoided, although there are cases where it is necessary that this be continued. Generally, it is our policy that such people should not sit in South Australian courts, and I made that clear at the weekend. However, the Registrar of the Justices Association commented on what he understood to be my remarks, and I think that that was unfortunate. I had a telephone conversation this morning with Mr. Guy, President of the Justices Association, who expressed regret that the matter had been dealt with by the Registrar in the way in which it was dealt with.

I will now deal with the question the honourable member raised concerning the matter of training courses for justices, because I think it is important, certainly to the proper functioning of South Australian courts, that the justices on the quorum called on to sit on the bench are properly trained. I know there has been some delay in holding further courses, caused by the necessity to upgrade the magistrate's handbook. However, that task has now been completed and the handbooks are available from my office on application by any justice. The handbook was updated by his Honour Mr. Justice Marshall (as he now is), and I compliment him on the work he has done in this field for a long time, and particularly on the work he has done in upgrading the handbook. He has told me that a further correspondence course for justices will be held within two or three months. A further aspect of this matter is that the Government, recognising the important contribution that justices make to the administration of justice in South Australia, has arranged for the Further Education Department to hold in-service courses for justices, so that they will be able to avail themselves of more detailed training than has been available through the correspondence course. I am sure that, through justices attending at these courses to be run by the department at, I think, Panaroma and Port Augusta, the standard of work done by the justices on behalf of the people of South Australia will be even higher than it has been in the past.

SAMCOR SPORTING COMPLEX

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier say whether, in relation to the Samcor proposal for a sporting complex, Pooraka is the only site being assessed and, if it is, why the Wayville showgrounds site has not been considered? The *News* of Monday, December 22, 1975, contained a report stating that Samcor was having an assessment made of developing a sporting complex on land it owns at Pooraka. The article

also explained what facilities were being assessed (and there were many), and stated that it would be a wonderful complex, if established. I ask whether Wayville is being considered, as it is a multi-purpose centre, being flexible in having a convention centre, and would still be able to be used for agricultural shows; it has a sporting complex, and it could be used at the same time as an exhibition centre but could be updated from the present form of centre it is. Included in the complex could be a trade mart. Hassell and Partners, according to the report, were given the task of assessing the Samcor project.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has not committed itself to the proposal for the development of any complex of this kind, and I am unaware that Samcor has sought a feasibility study on it.

Mr. Venning: Has anyone?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It certainly has not come to my desk that this feasibility study has been underway. However, I will inquire about it. There is no commitment by Government to the establishment on any particular site in Adelaide of a large sporting and convention complex.

Mr. Evans: Has Wayville been considered?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If we are to proceed with the development of a large entertainment and exhibition complex, obviously Wayville would be one of the sites considered.

AYERS HOUSE RESTAURANT

Mr. DEAN BROWN: My question is consequent on the reply to a Question on Notice given today. Will the Premier tell members whether Peter Bardon Fairweather was acting as a director and shareholder in the company Ayers House Restaurants Proprietary Limited on behalf of Abraham Gilbert Saffron, and whether Ayers House Restaurant or Ayers House Restaurants Proprietary Limited is in any way, directly or indirectly, related to the operation of the Government-owned restaurants at Ayers House? The Government owns the Ayers House complex and the restaurants involved, and I understand that \$480 000 was spent by the Government in restoring that building and the restaurants. Recently, the Full Bench of the Licensing Court found that Mr. Fairweather was not a fit and proper person to be a director of a company holding a liquor licence, and I think evidence is well known on that score. In replying to a Question on Notice today, the Government indicated that Mr. Fairweather was both a director and Secretary of Ayers House Restaurants Proprietary Limited, although I understand that he resigned from both of those positions on May 22, after the initial court case involving various other restaurants in which he was involved.

However, as filed in the Companies Office on December 31, 1975, one can only assume, until seeing the next report, that Mr. Fairweather is still a shareholder holding 50 per cent of the shares in that company. I notice that the telephone directory lists the restaurants as Ayers House Restaurants, even though that is no longer a registered business name. I hope that members will understand the conflict that could arise. It is strange that the lease is held by Mr. Cramey. We have the registered company, which, according to the reply given earlier today, did not trade during the past financial year, and we have the other business name (Ayers House Restaurants), which is listed in the telephone directory but which is no longer a registered business name, having been cancelled on July 2, 1974. I believe that, because it is a Government-owned restaurant, the Government has

an absolute obligation to Parliament to inform members whether in any way Mr. Fairweather or Mr. Saffron (commonly referred to as Mr. Sin in Sydney) is related through the directorship, ownership or in any other way with the restaurants operated at Ayers House.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Obviously, the honourable member has looked at some company documents but has not done his whole homework on this matter. The position is (I am not certain of the dates, but I will verify them) that some time ago now, the accountant in my department, after an investigation of the rental situation conducted on behalf of the Ayers House Management Committee, reported that Mr. Cramey faced some liquidity difficulties and that he should be able to bring into the restaurant someone else who could provide him with extra liquidity. I understand that a company was then proposed. It could be the one to which the member for Davenport refers. It was proposed to bring in Mr. Fairweather and some liquidity. It was then proposed that the Ayers House lease be transferred to that company. It was at that stage that the matter came to the Crown Law office: I think I was the Attorney-General at that time, and I immediately ordered an investigation. It was apparent from that investigation that Mr. Fairweather was associated with Mr. Saffron. In fact, it was the first investigation that was made by Government in relation to Mr. Saffron's and Mr. Fairweather's association. When that became obvious, the Government refused to sign such a lease. Mr. Cramey was told that there would be no relationship between the Government and any organisation that included Mr. Fairweather.

Mr. Dean Brown: You realise that Mr. and Mrs. Cramey are apparently now listed as directors of that company?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member must be aware that that company has not traded: it is not operative.

Mr. Dean Brown: I said that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member must realise that, in these circumstances, there is no active participation by Mr. and Mrs. Cramey with Mr. Fairweather. The honourable member cannot make something out of nothing with this matter. When it was established through the Inspector of Companies that that was the case, it was brought to Mr. Cramey's attention, and he ceased his association with Mr. Fairweather.

Mr. Dean Brown: Why do you think Mr. Fairweather resigned so quickly on May 22 of this year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no idea why he resigned. I have no personal association with Mr. Fairweather, and he certainly did not discuss the matters with me. In fact, I have not seen him. Suffice to say that, when I received the report from the Inspector of Companies relating to the investigation I had ordered, I made it clear that in no circumstances would Mr. Fairweather or his business associates have anything to do with any property in which the Government had an interest. The matters that came out of that investigation were then available to the Attorney-General's Department for the subsequent action that this Government took in relation to licences involving Mr. Fairweather. That is the position.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS BRANCH

Mr. ALLISON: Can the Attorney-General say whether there is a high priority for establishing a consumer aid office in Mount Gambier and whether there have been many complaints from people in that area, or whether the Mount Gambier office is still on a low priority (as stated

previously by the Attorney)? In any event, can the Attorney say when it is likely that the branch will be opened at Mount Gambier?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am somewhat surprised to learn that I am alleged to have made a statement that the Mount Gambier branch had a low priority. That is completely incorrect. The establishment of country branches of the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch is proceeding according to the proposals approved by Cabinet. That is in accordance with the Premier's announcement in the policy speech made before the State election in July of last year. I expect that the first branch (at Port Augusta) will be opened before Christmas and that other branches will be opened soon thereafter. Although I cannot state accurately, I expect that the Mount Gambier branch will be opened during the first three months of next year.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST

Mr. VANDEPEER: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy, as Minister in charge of housing, take up with Cabinet the question of allocating more finance to the South Australian Housing Trust, specifically for repairs and maintenance to housing trust rental houses? Many trust houses in Millicent have damp walls, which cause mould to develop on the inside of those walls. Clothes, shoes and other clothing, as well as the undersides of mattresses, become mouldy rather quickly, and this creates an unhealthy atmosphere in the houses. The consequent health problem is being investigated by health officers, but finance is needed to seal walls and carry out other insulating processes to correct the unhealthy atmosphere.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In the past few years the trust has spent increasing sums on maintaining and upgrading its rental houses. From memory, I understand that about 60 per cent of its rental properties have been upgraded. I will check with the trust to see what is the position in Millicent and also to ascertain how much of the extra work done over the past two years has been carried out in that area.

Mr. Vandeppeer: I would be surprised if it was 60 per cent.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall bring down what information I can for the honourable member to let him know what is the position and, if a problem remains, what can be done about it.

ROAD PROGRAMME

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Transport say what is the programme for that portion of the Main North Road at Gepps Cross that takes a single lane of traffic over a bridge where duplication has taken place for some years? I apologise to the member for Salisbury for asking the question, as I believe the road is in his area. For some time there has been a bottleneck in this area regarding the movement of traffic from Adelaide and the north. I think the area is known as Cavan. I ask the Minister what is the department's programme in relation to this area of road activity.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is not intended to build a bridge at Cavan in the foreseeable future, certainly as far as I know. The department is building bridges at Dry Creek over the railway line.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You said Gepps Cross.

Mr. Venning: North of Adelaide.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's the one he means.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I suggest that the honourable member look up the question asked by the member for Salisbury during the June sitting (a question he asked because this road is in his area). I told him that the department was programming that the bridge would be operating within three years but that the construction of that bridge depended on (as do all these jobs) the approval of the Federal Minister. I do not believe the Federal Minister will hold up this project like he has held up the Tapley's Hill Road project so that he can put the supersonics in there.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

GOLD BUYERS ACT REPEAL BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from July 29. Page 319).

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The credibility of the State Opposition and of the Federal Government has been constantly under attack by the Government of this State. It is a pity that the Minister of Mines and Energy is not remaining in the Chamber to listen to what I am saying, because his credibility is under challenge, too. The Minister made a statement recently on the Australian Broadcasting Commission. At a news conference on Tuesday, July 27, he was asked what were the reactions to the report he had carried abroad, referring to the environment report on the uranium enrichment plant, and he said:

I think they were interested in the extent of the work which we had carried out so far on uranium enrichment, but may I make it clear that I only had a couple of copies of that particular report, and I did not go around peddling it all over the place.

A few hours previously, however, the Minister had stated that he had had only one report: so much for the credibility of the Minister of Mines and Energy. The Minister stretches the imagination a little, but he is not going to get away with it.

Mr. Coumbe: But he is an economist.

Mr. BECKER: One of the worst type: he has never practised; he was only a theorist and was never given a chance to put his theories into practice. We know that he was removed from his previous portfolio, because we find that, in his report, the Auditor-General was not impressed with the conditions of finances of the Education Department. If the Minister had been any good, he would have kept the finances of the department in ship-shape order.

Another Minister whose credibility comes under attack from time to time, and who is also leaving the Chamber, is the Minister of Transport, who has often attempted to frighten people with various statements, and who has completely misunderstood the federalism policy of the Federal Government. He cannot grasp anything to do with finance. I would not trust him with the petty cash of the Liberal Parliamentary Party: we do not have any, so at least he could not get us into debt. On July 27, a report in the *Advertiser* states:

The South Australian Government is concerned that Adelaide may still be used as an alternative landing site for the supersonic Concorde airliner. The Minister for the Environment said last night that the fate of a South Australian submission to the Federal Government was still not known.

On that day, the Minister for the Environment replied to a question I had placed on notice. It is quite strange that a reply, or part of it, appeared in the newspaper before we received the reply in the House! I am accustomed to that, because it is the type of treatment we receive from time to time. I asked the Minister a question, as reported on page 186 of *Hansard*, as follows:

1. Has the State Government received any assurance from the Federal Minister for Transport that the Concorde aircraft will not use Adelaide Airport as an alternative landing site?

2. What were the noise level readings obtained for the Environment Department during the last proving flights of the Concorde to and from Tullamarine Airport, Victoria?

The Minister said that he had not received that assurance, but his press statement was based on the reply to my question, and obviously had come out the previous day. As to the credibility of the Minister of Transport, I asked him a question about Tapleys Hill Road. The Minister and his department seem to be bound to a long-term plan to upgrade that road. On that part of Tapleys Hill Road between Anzac Highway and Anderson Avenue is a beautiful avenue of Norfolk pines, yet the Highways Department is still acquiring about two metres of property on either side of the road. If it is not to upgrade the road, it would not need the property, but one section was acquired quite recently. I asked the Minister the following question:

When will Tapleys Hill Road between Burbridge Road, West Beach, and Anderson Avenue, Glenelg North, be upgraded to a four-lane highway, and if not, why not?

That was asked because the road is a four-lane highway up to Henley Beach Road. It comes into my district at Burbridge Road, coming back to Anzac Highway and then to Anderson Avenue. That part of the road runs along the western boundary of the Adelaide Airport. The second part of the question was as follows:

What plans and details has the Highways Department prepared to link Military Road with Tapleys Hill Road, Glenelg North?

The Minister replied:

Commonwealth Government approval for the duplication of Tapleys Hill Road has been refused by the Federal Minister for Transport in his letter to me dated May 26, 1976. Mr. Nixon states he is not prepared to approve my request for permission to duplicate this road until the investigations of the advisory committee studying airport facilities has been completed. It seems that Mr. Nixon desires to retain the option for providing facilities at West Beach for the landing of Concorde supersonic aircraft, notwithstanding the fact that the State Government has repeatedly declared itself in favour of a policy that the airport facilities will not be permitted to be extended beyond the present boundaries of the airport property.

It is reasonable to say that the Government's action to prevent any extension of the runways at Adelaide Airport

came only after considerable intervention on my part. The Government was second cab off the rank, as usual. The reply further stated:

Until Federal Government approval for the duplication of Tapleys Hill Road between Burbridge Road and Anderson Avenue is given, it is not possible to provide the information sought regarding the linking of Military Road with Tapleys Hill Road.

I contend that the Minister does not want to do it, because it is a decision he would have to make, but we must bear in mind that he said that the Federal Government had refused permission to widen Tapleys Hill Road. Let us consider the facts, and ascertain whether the Minister was telling the truth when he replied to my question on July 27. The Federal member for Kingston (Mr. Chapman, M.H.R.) has received the following telegram from Peter Nixon, Federal Minister for Transport, dated July 29, 1976:

I refer to your telephone call to my office yesterday concerning the answer given to a question in the South Australian Parliament by Hon. G. T. Virgo, State Minister of Transport, concerning the proposed duplication of Tapleys Hill Road in the vicinity of Adelaide airport. I understand the thrust of Mr. Virgo's answer was that the proposed duplication was not approved because the Commonwealth intends extending the airport for operations by Concorde. In a letter to Mr. Virgo on May 26, I suggested to him that the project should be deferred until both the Commonwealth and State Governments have had an opportunity of examining and assessing a report expected shortly from the Joint Government Committee which has been looking into the future airport needs of Adelaide. I emphasise that I have not at any stage informed Mr. Virgo that the proposed duplication of Tapleys Hill Road has not been approved.

That deals with the first part of the reply. The telegram continues:

As to the assertions that the project could not go ahead because of airport extensions associated with Concorde operations, this statement could not be further from the truth.

That is part two of the misleading answer I have received from the State Minister of Transport.

Mr. Coumbe: Why do you think he's making these statements?

Mr. BECKER: He is trying to panic the people. He is trying to create a little issue because he is frightened of the boundaries redistribution. The facts concerning Concorde and Adelaide are already a matter of public record. On May 26 it was stated in the *Guardian* and also the *West Side Newspaper* that I had spoken to the Minister for Transport, and the paper added the following rider:

Mr. Becker has conducted a long campaign against any expansion of the airport and its possible use by Concorde as a prime alternative to Tullamarine Airport, Melbourne.

Mr. Nixon had told me that the Concorde would not be landing at Adelaide Airport unless there was an extreme emergency. Since then the policy has changed, and if members opposite listen they will hear the truth for a change. The telegram goes on:

As to the assertion that the project could not go ahead because of airport extensions associated with Concorde operations, this statement could not be further from the truth. The facts concerning Concorde and Adelaide are already a matter of public record. It is true that British Airways has nominated Adelaide as one of a number of possible alternate Australian airports for use by Concorde in the event that Melbourne is not available because of weather or for other operational reasons. However, it is also equally true that British Airways has stated publicly that, if Melbourne is closed to Concorde operations for any reason, the airline proposes to hold the flight at Singapore until such time as Melbourne is available for a landing. It has also been stated that the probability of Concorde ever having to land at Adelaide is extremely remote.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What if it happens on the way?

Mr. BECKER: If it happens on the way (and remember the speed at which the aircraft flies), once it left Singapore something drastic would have had to happen at Melbourne for the aircraft to be diverted, and it would be to Alice Springs, not Adelaide.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: This is a lot of nonsense.

Mr. BECKER: The Minister for Transport's telegram continues:

I would not be doing my job as a responsible Minister if I were to approve expenditures of large sums of public money on extensions to the airport to permit Concorde operations in circumstances where I have already been advised that the probability of the aircraft ever having to land at Adelaide is remote.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He is making a fool of you.

Mr. BECKER: We know who is twisting the facts. I will come back to the letter, dated September 1, 1975, I received from Charlie Jones, the Minister for Transport in the former Federal Government. At least I have been fortunate enough that I can write to Ministers in Canberra and receive a reply sometimes far more quickly than I receive replies from Ministers in this State. I have received courtesy from both sides in the Commonwealth sphere. The letter I received from Charlie Jones states:

I refer to your telegram dated August 7, 1975, regarding the use of Adelaide Airport for Concorde flights. The proposal is to operate Concorde into Melbourne Airport on a basis of three flights a week between 1500 and 1800 hours, and Adelaide Airport would be used as an alternative landing site only if Melbourne Airport is closed to arrivals because of adverse weather.

That was the policy under the recent Labor Government. The letter continues:

A recent analysis indicates that during the last three years Melbourne Airport was closed for a total of 49 hours 16 minutes and, for the periods between 1400 and 1900 hours each day, it was closed for an average of 1 hour 15 minutes per year. Based on this analysis it seems likely that Concorde could be diverted on average about once in every nine years. If Concorde were to be diverted to Adelaide Airport, the main North-East and South-West runway would be used and existing noise abatement procedures strictly observed.

Adelaide Airport was chosen as an alternative landing site as there is no suitable airfield in a less densely populated area that is within the range capacity of Concorde. Any flights into, or out of, Adelaide Airport by Concorde would be made at subsonic speeds and acceleration or deceleration through Mach 1 would take place over the Great Australian Bight. A full report of the Concorde sonic boom and noise measurement programme will be published by the end of October this year.

The previous Federal Labor Government knew all about the Concorde, and no-one can deny that there had been some previous arrangement. Charlie Jones said:

The probability of its being diverted to Adelaide is once in every 9 years.

Now, we have information from the Federal Minister for Transport, who says the aircraft will be held in Singapore and that he is not prepared to spend money upgrading the Adelaide Airport to permit Concorde operations. It would be foolish for any Government to spend any amount of money on Adelaide Airport when the probability is that the Concorde aircraft may arrive once in every 9 years; therefore, there is no known reason for the Government and for the Minister of Transport not to go ahead if he wants to upgrade Tapleys Hill Road. The challenge is here. Does he intend to do it? Does he want to do it, or is it still political suicide to upgrade Tapleys Hill Road? Once he upgrades it from Burbridge Road to Anderson Avenue, what will he do between Anzac Highway and Anderson Avenue? Will he remove all the Norfolk

Island Pines on Tapleys Hill Road? I can assure the Minister that no way will I or my constituents allow anyone to touch any of those trees on Tapleys Hill Road. It is no use the State Minister of Transport blaming the Federal Government. We have the stupid incident, 24 hours ago, of Dr. Jim Cairns denigrating Australian servicemen in Vietnam and saying, "I am not attacking the Australian serviceman; I am attacking the Australian Government." How damn silly can you get? This is the sort of nonsense and the sort of credibility we have come to expect from Ministers of this Government, members of the Labor Party, who constantly belt the Liberal Party (whether it be State or Federal), so their credibility is weak. There is no credibility when it comes to this State Government.

I remind the Minister of Transport that his department is still acquiring land on either side of Tapley Hill Road between Anzac Highway and Anderson Avenue for the so-called purposes of road widening. It is high time that he was prepared to make a decision and to tell the people once and for all what the Government intends to do, instead of hiding behind the guise of constantly abusing the Federal Government which is doing a good job. Unfortunately, the Minister of Transport, like some of his colleagues, simply does not understand the policy of federalism and is not prepared to accept it.

Let us now look at the water and sewerage rates, situation and at the supervision of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which is under the control of the Deputy Premier. My comments in this area are made not because Eric Franklin had a few words to say in his column last Saturday morning but because, unfortunately, I did not have time to get around to this part of my speech. The latest 15 per cent increase in water and sewerage rates will mean that those rates have increased 60 per cent over the past four years. What worries me is that the income from rates and excess water in the year ending 1968-69 was \$23 100 000. In 1971-72, the income was \$34 300 000 and, in 1974-75, it was \$46 000 000. For water supplied to Commonwealth and State authorities at cost, in the financial year 1968-69, \$252 414 was paid. In 1971-72, they contributed \$282 045. The Auditor-General's Report shows that, in 1973-74, they paid only \$177 558 and, in 1974-75, they paid \$294 747. Between 1968-69 and 1974-75, there has been an increase of \$42 000 in contributions for water supplied to Commonwealth and State authorities, at cost, yet the income from rates and excess water doubled. In 1968-69, total income in that department was \$23 729 000, the loss on country services was just over \$6 000 000, and the surplus on metropolitan services was \$1 300 000. Interest on capital was \$13 800 000, resulting in an overall net loss of \$4 600 000. In 1971-72, the department's total income was \$35 000 000, the loss on country services was \$8 100 000, the surplus on metropolitan services was \$4 700 000, interest on capital had jumped to \$18 900 000, and the loss was \$3 300 000.

In 1974-75, total income was \$47 300 000, the loss on country services had climbed to \$13 800 000, the surplus on metropolitan services was \$640 000, interest on capital had reached \$25 200 000, and the loss was \$13 200 000. We are not aware of what the loss by the department this year will be or whether it will end up in credit, but the point is that people in the metropolitan area are objecting to having to pay such high prices for water and sewerage, and they object particularly to their rates. They also object to the method used by the Government, namely, the valuation of properties, as the annual value is being

used for water and sewerage rates (the cost they have to pay), and that is the unfair part of the system. Even though the size of the family and the type of the property are identical and the same quantity of water is used, the differential in rates between a house at Bowden and another at Glenelg could be considerable. It is an unfair system in many respects.

Another point is that a tremendous loss is involved in operating country services. We realise that, because of the geographical dimensions of the State, it is expensive to supply water to certain country areas. My information is that the State does not receive a special grant from the Federal Government towards these costs, and I consider that, under the policy of federalism, assistance should be considered for the metropolitan ratepayer. When we consider that the loss on country services has jumped from \$6 000 000 in 1968-69 to \$13 800 000 in 1974-75, we realise that something drastic will have to be done to ease the burden on the metropolitan ratepayer and, of course, the State's Revenue Account. The challenge goes out to the State Government in that respect.

One could not be blamed for assuming that the valuations used or the method of assessing properties was nothing but an educated guess, because the relativity between the valuations of property is difficult to appreciate fully. There has been much discussion among many dissatisfied people about the assessments made on their properties. Whilst most people make an honest attempt to assess the value put on their property, the real impact does not hit home until they receive the new water and sewerage ratings or their land tax valuation, the latter of which is assessed on unimproved value. This is a real problem, and it is time that the Government took a good hard look at the whole system of capital taxation in this State.

If we look at the results of the 1974-75 financial year, we find that the Government ended up with a surplus of \$2 200 000. As I have been saying that the Government should present a balanced Budget, I must admit that a \$2 200 000 surplus is a reasonable result, but it must be remembered that a considerable sum of money was spent just before the end of the financial year. It seems strange to me that any Government would want to spend \$20 000 000 on an urban transport project, particularly on buying air-conditioned buses for use in the metropolitan area. If that \$20 000 000 were put into the Loan Account to supplement capital programmes, there would be no complaint about spending money on unemployment relief. I would rather see money spent other than on buying buses. What affects the average taxpayer in the State is that he reads that the Government estimated that it would receive \$19 300 000 from land tax, whereas it actually received \$19 800 000, and it also received \$9 900 000 above estimate from stamp duties.

This means that the Government has continued to benefit from inflation; it has not reduced its rates, but it is fully capitalising on inflation in relation to indirect taxes. The worst penalty for thrift is imposed by succession duties, on which the Government budgeted to receive \$16 500 000, whereas it received \$19 077 000. They are the main areas that have been hit. This Government (which has been called a democratic socialist Government by the Honourable Mr. Sumner in another place, and he says he is proud of it) has done much over the years in an enormous range of social, consumer, and welfare legislation, and support for the arts, but the State's taxpayers have been hard hit over the past year as a result of the Government's still benefiting from inflation. When the Budget was brought down, 16 per cent was provided for inflation in 1975-76,

whereas the inflation rate in that financial year was only 12.5 per cent; so, the Government benefited. Whether or not it was good housekeeping, I believe that the Government has taken this State's taxpayers down, and it is high time that the Government was told that it must live within its means and the means the taxpayer can afford.

I come now to further areas in relation to the Government's credibility, the next of which is tourism. The *News* of February 20, under a bold headline "New Director of South Australian Tourist Bureau known", states:

A senior executive of the Australian Tourist Commission, Mr. Beresford, is the new Director of the South Australian Tourist Bureau. His appointment was announced today.

It does not say by whom, but continues:

Mr. Beresford, who is the commission's director of marketing, will replace Mr. Perc Pollnitz, who retired recently after 17½ years in the job. The new Director has had a major role in the shaping of Australia's tourism policy. He is currently working in the commission's Melbourne office. Tourism in South Australia has developed into one of the State's biggest revenue raisers. Recent surveys show that people spend \$84 000 000 a year on one-night or more stopovers in South Australia. In the Public Service Board notice of February 18, 1976, appeared the following:

Nominations and recommendations: Vacancy 1300. Director of Tourism, Tourism, Recreation and Sport. D. C. Beresford. Outside the Public Service.

On Tuesday, July 27, I asked a Question on Notice in relation to the appointment of the Director of Tourism. It is reported at page 179 of *Hansard* that 23 persons applied for the position of Director of Tourism and that six applicants were interviewed. The Minister in his reply stated that an appointment had not been made because none of the candidates was acceptable to the Government. What a strange turn of events. After the Government had called for applications, the Public Service Board notice set out the nomination of a certain person, yet the Minister replied that an appointment had not been made because none of the candidates was acceptable to the Government. What a waste of time, money and energy.

Two days after Mr. Beresford's nomination in the notice a press release was issued. I do not remember reading anything to say that that release was incorrect. Still, months later we do not have a Director of Tourism; instead, we have an Acting Director, and it is not known when a permanent appointment will be made. So much for the Government's concern and interest in tourism in this State.

I suppose there would be no part of the metropolitan area more tourist conscious than Glenelg, where much effort and work is put into the promotion of tourism. A recently established travel agency, working in conjunction with Glenelg Tourist Coaches, believed it would be a good idea to conduct day and a half-day tours from Glenelg to the Barossa Valley.

Mr. Mathwin: That's when they struck trouble, isn't it?

Mr. BECKER: It is. The agency rang the appropriate authority and asked what were the chances for private bus or mini-bus operators applying for approval to operate such tours. The agency was told. "You have no hope. Forget about it." As a result, no-one applied. So much for the Government's interest in tourism.

Two weeks before that time the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport attended a ball to announce Miss Glenelg Tourist Industry. Glenelg is in a position to promote tourism, as it wishes to provide facilities for oversea and interstate people staying there to go to the

Barossa Valley. Glenelg Tourist Coaches runs tours to various areas, including the South Coast, yet it is not allowed to go to the Barossa Valley.

What is so sacred about the Barossa Valley? Which individual or organisation is being protected there? Glenelg is being disadvantaged, and the Minister did not mean what he said at the Glenelg Town Hall about doing anything he could to help Glenelg and tourism in that area. The Minister has not bothered to appoint a Director of Tourism; certainly, he will not appoint the man recommended to him. What is the Minister up to?

Mr. Evans: Do you think he really has a say?

Mr. BECKER: I do not believe he has a say at all. In fact, I believe that someone else is lined up for the job and that the Government hopes that all will go quiet so that some "Billy the Goose" can be nominated. I cannot see anything wrong with the Acting Director. Government members are continually belting the Liberal Party, yet their Ministers' credibility does not stand up particularly well when it comes to tourism.

The Government did not like it today when it had to reply to a few more of my Questions on Notice. In fact, the Government will not even reply to some of them. That shows the arrogance of the present Government. So much for the open Government in South Australia about which we hear the Premier talk.

Let us now consider finance for housing for young people, especially the case of a young couple who were fortunate enough to buy a Housing Trust home at Novar Gardens. They applied and were accepted. In November, 1975, the couple approached the State Bank to apply for a loan. They were told it would probably be about 15 months before they could apply for a loan and that it would be about another six months before a loan would be approved and settlement made.

Working on that basis, and bearing in mind all the economic factors, they went ahead and bought the trust house. They arranged bridging finance. Two months ago they were told that they should check with the State Bank to see how the situation was progressing. They did so because they were finding it difficult to save money. They did not want to be forced to take too high a second mortgage to establish their house, and they did not want to keep on paying bridging finance.

The couple was told by the State Bank that they would have to wait at least 18 months before they could apply for a loan and that it would still take at least another six months from the date of loan approval until settlement. In other words, it could be two years from the time they applied until settlement was effected.

Mr. Jennings: I bet they've spent thousands of dollars on furniture.

Mr. BECKER: Unfortunately, they had to sell their car recently to meet the bridging finance monthly payment. It is not their fault that they are in this situation; it is the fault of the system. People must have houses, and we must encourage young people to buy houses. Under the previous Federal Labor Government, when the inflation rate reached an all-time high and building costs had increased in this State by a staggering rate, young people were forced into waiting two years for a housing loan. That is a disgrace to the system. In reply to a Question on Notice I asked last Tuesday, we are told that about 15 700 people have their names down at the State Bank needing housing loan funds of about \$270 000 000. What hope have those people got?

What hope do children attending primary school today have of owning a house, let alone having equity enough in a block of land? The couple to which I referred recently had to sell their car to carry on. It is not a question of whether they have been lavishly spending their money: it is a matter of keeping their heads above water since November, 1975, and trying to pay rates and taxes as they increase, as well as trying to meet all the other costs. Surely they are entitled to improve their property in some way. If this young couple cannot hang on long enough to get a loan they cannot sell the house on the open market but must return it to the trust. We know the price they paid; it was a good price. I am not kicking that system, but the Housing Trust should be given more money, and more funds should be poured into the State Bank so that we can keep building and refinancing. We must decide whether some of the Housing Trust houses built years ago could be sold to the people who have rented them over the years at a considerable discount, certainly not at market value. If the trust could dispose of some of those early properties, rather than having to spend exorbitant sums on maintenance, that money could be injected into the building of more houses and into refinancing.

It is a complex matter, but if we cannot get money in other ways we must consider the realities of the situation. I cannot see why young married constituents should have to battle and struggle, should have to sell their motor car, and should have to hang on for at least another six months before they can get a housing loan. It is tragic that young people are being forced into this agonising situation. What pressure does it put on the marriages of young people, and what is the psychological effect? It makes life tough for them when we cannot give the assistance we should be providing, and we cannot keep promoting and pushing the housing programme, as we have done over the years. The trust has done good work, but I urge the Government now to review the whole situation. Rather than destroy the lives of young people we must assist them. Life is not easy when people are faced with such problems, and we have a responsibility to help. If they cannot meet their commitments and hold on (they were told it would be 15 months and now it will be two years), we should take some blame, because we are not doing the job in this Parliament, and neither is the Government.

I now refer to the famous debate of some years ago, when the Totalizator Agency Board lost \$2 200 000 on the computer system. I understand that T.A.B. is to be computerised under a joint agreement between I.B.M. and Burroughs. The Burroughs organisation has not been involved in computerisation of off-course totalisators, although I.B.M. has been, as well as other companies in Australia. At least \$5 600 000 will be needed to establish an off-course totalisator computer in South Australia. We have already lost \$2 200,000. Who will pay? Will it be the racing clubs or the people of South Australia? Obviously, people who use T.A.B. facilities will pay. We know what will happen: the recommendation will be for a minimum \$1 bet, and commissions will increase to meet the costs. The T.A.B. was established to get rid of the illegal bookmaker, who contributed nothing to the community. Fair enough; we are getting rid of the illegal bookmaker, and profits from the T.A.B. have been a bonus to the racing industry, well received and well used. Now, at least a further \$5 600 000 will be involved. It will be an expensive computer operation if we add to that

sum the \$2 200 000, as well as interest. South Australian punters will pay dearly for the computer.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Don't you think they should get it?

Mr. BECKER: The whole thing should have been correctly handled years ago. We can do nothing about mistakes that have been made, but now we are to be asked for another \$5 600 000. Surely we should clear one matter up before we consider the other: we should have a proper investigation.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: If you knew what you were talking about, you would make sense.

Mr. BECKER: I know the investigation that took place. T.A.B. officers went on a junket to America. Who within the Government is promoting Burroughs?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You don't know what you're talking about.

Mr. BECKER: I want to know who, in the Government, is promoting Burroughs to install computers for the South Australian Government. That organisation has no experience whatever in this aspect.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you think we should go to the computer, or not?

Mr. BECKER: We should go to the computer, if—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Who should pay?

Mr. BECKER:—it could be proved that it was economically viable and necessary. Let us not use a company that has had no experience. We have lost \$2 200 000 on some stupid scheme that should never have been allowed, with bits and pieces of computer all over the place in Melbourne. It was the greatest shemozzle of all times. How do we know what this sort of arrangement will be when Burroughs is brought into it? Why? How? It is not the first time that that firm has been referred to in State Government departments in relation to computerisation. Let us consider the experts in the field. Let us go to the other States and find out about the operation of off-course T.A.B. establishments. We could go to Western Australia and find out; it has been a success there. We have to do everything the wrong way, and hit the poor old average citizen, and see workers' hard-earned money going down the drain.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You dribble like an old man.

Mr. BECKER: I am glad that is what the Minister thinks of the average citizen. The Minister likes to throw the average citizen's money away; I do not. It is too early for the T.A.B. to go into computers: we should consider that issue, and give Parliament the chance to debate it. We will not be given that chance. We have had to cough up the \$2 200 000, and pass legislation on that previous mistake. Any expenditure of this magnitude by the T.A.B. should be authorised by Parliament.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Speak to Max Dennis.

Mr. BECKER: I am not frightened of him, or of anyone else in T.A.B. I am not convinced that the Burroughs organisation should be part of the deal. I want to know who in the Government is pushing Burroughs. This Government has no credibility, and never has had. It has got away with bluff and bully tactics in the way it treats the people of this State. Let us consider some of the bleatings of the past few days regarding sport. All politicians are on the band waggon to criticise the performance of Australian athletes in the Olympic Games, and what a shame it is that politicians are doing that. All Australian athletes have done better, in times and performances, than

they have done in the past. Now we hear stupid statements from Government Ministers that the Fraser Government is responsible for the fact that we won no gold medals. I do not know how low is the intelligence of the present Administration in this State and of the parrot supporters of the present Government. Let us consider the statement issued by Mr. Newman, the Commonwealth Minister for Housing, Environment and Community Development. Last evening Mr. Newman stated:

Any Government is responsible for ensuring that its citizens have access to facilities to enable them to keep fit and to develop sports prowess if they choose . . . I must emphasise that we will not be holding an inquiry into why this country did not win gold medals. We will, however, examine the proper role of the Commonwealth in assisting national sports organisations.

A few weeks ago, the Chinese badminton team visited Adelaide. The tour cost more than \$10 000 and was paid for by the Federal Government. When I telephoned the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport in this State at that time asking for \$300 to assist with a special function to welcome the Chinese team, I was told, "Forget it. We have not any money." My request was refused. Thank goodness the Federal Government came to the aid of the party and paid that account also. So much for this State Government.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Henley Beach): I support the motion, and thank the Governor for the splendid work that he has done for the people of South Australia. I am sad that this time was probably the last on which he would deliver the Speech. I also join those members who have expressed sympathy to the families of former members who have passed away during the past 12 months.

The Speech contains many interesting factors. In the period of about 11 years since I came to this Parliament, the Address in Reply debate has given members (particularly Opposition members) the chance to criticise the Government when they consider that the Government's administration or its legislative programme has been at fault. The measure of success of an Address in Reply debate is how well the Opposition can use it against the Government.

It has seemed clear from the speeches that have been made so far that the Government ought to be proud of His Excellency's Speech, because the Address in Reply debate has not brought forward any real criticism of the Government that cannot be answered easily. Most members have tried to promote issues that have been not genuine but simply political. The Governor's Speech outlines a healthy legislative programme, and many new initiatives are to be taken. The Speech also refers to many Government initiatives in public works that will benefit almost every section of the State.

More important, we can see that the Government has managed the finances of the State to the envy of all other States, at a time when Government finances are under much pressure. It is a credit to the Treasurer that he has been able to allocate money to make up for any reductions that the Australian Government has made, particularly in housing. I was interested to hear the member for Hanson make several valid points. Although younger people are having much difficulty in financing houses, nevertheless figures show that this State has had tremendous housing development in the past 12 months compared to other States. We can be pleased about that, because obviously this is providing houses for our young people.

I thought that the member for Hanson should have been directing his remarks not at this Government (because about \$20 000 000 has been channelled into housing, and the State Government is doing more than its fair share) but at the Australian Government, which has reduced the amount of funds available for what the member for Hanson claims (and I agree with him) to be an important area of concern to the community. I am particularly pleased about the new initiatives that have been taken in environment and conservation, and I am pleased at the reference in the Speech to the legislation which will be introduced during the session and which deals with control of advertisements, noise pollution controls, national parks and wildlife, and recreational trails. Funds have been required for these matters for a long time.

The legislation, particularly that in relation to noise pollution, has been sought by many members, and this shows the concern that there is about the matter. However, I know the many difficulties in preparing such legislation, and I am pleased that they have been overcome and legislation is being prepared.

Mr. Millhouse: Of course, we won't know whether they have succeeded until we see the Bill.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I have more confidence in the Government than the honourable member has and, knowing the long time that the Government has been dealing with this aspect and knowing the difficulties that other States and countries have had in dealing with noise control legislation, I am sure that the time and experience applied to this matter will show that we have a measure that can work. The Speech, in referring to a Bill being introduced to encompass a new approach towards the problems of mental health, states:

My Government will, through its Department of Public Health, continue to decentralise its activities by the location of staff in major country centres.

Again, I am pleased that the department concerned is able to follow the philosophy of the Government to decentralise wherever possible. I refer now to matters affecting the Public Health Department. A newspaper report from Sydney, published about two or three weeks ago, states:

A high percentage of take-away food in Australia was unfit for human consumption, health authorities have warned. Singled out as "special risk" goods were milkshakes, hamburgers and roast chickens. Food inspectors who raided 100 take-away outlets in southern New South Wales this month found that 36 per cent of the food tested was contaminated. Authorities are so alarmed by unhygienic food handling that they have set up special training schools for shop assistants in Wollongong and Dubbo. . . . "Food contamination here and elsewhere in Australia is quite a problem," he said. The main risk foods are milkshakes, rissoles used in hamburgers, and chicken displayed in rotisseries.

We have shops in which hamburgers and chickens are sold, and television meals can be obtained in take-away form, so I looked at the latest annual report of the Metropolitan County Board. That report is for the year ended November 30, 1975, and I read it to find out what the board considered about the matter. At page 10, the board refers to examinations it made in relation to meat and meat products, and part of the report states:

Inspectors commenced a survey by taking samples of raw sausages to the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science to have them bacteriologically tested to determine the type of bacteria present and plate counts. It was considered that the survey was necessary to determine if sausages were bacteriologically satisfactory.

Of the 33 samples tested, eight conformed to standard; 25 failed to conform; seven had excess fat; six had excess preservatives; and 23 were deficient in meat. Those figures do not make one believe that the barbecues that

Australians generally enjoy are as healthy as we think they are. Perhaps it is not the red wine complained about that causes difficulty next day, it may be something else. Pages 14, 15, and 16 set out the different specimens submitted for bacteriological examination to the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. These statistics, to me, are quite disturbing, because, in relation to cheese, *Staphylococcus pyogenes* were present in five cases out of 24 tested and in another five, out of 24 tested, *Enteriform Coli*, was present. Two samples of cooked prawns were examined and *Staph. pyogenes* were present.

Of the 56 cases of meat inspection of swabs from plant and equipment at butchers' smallgoods premises, in 12 cases *Staph. pyogenes* were present; in one case *Salmonella* organisms were present; and 43 samples were satisfactory. For poultry dressing premises (chicken cooked and uncooked) the number of unsatisfactory tests were not particularly high. In most cases about seven were tested; five were satisfactory, but the fact that two were unsatisfactory seems to be a most unsound state of affairs. Of the total of 36 tested, *Salmonella* organisms were found in six cases.

The report states that 518 complaints were received by the board during the year, and the reasons for complaints were: dirty premises, food adulterated, diseased, unsound, unwholesome, or unfit, and food handling breaches, and the like. It seems that because of the increase in the sale of take-away food throughout the State, where there is a change within our community, greater attention should be paid to public health concerning our food. I ask the Minister to note what I have had to say. I would like to see, perhaps, a greater activity by the department in inspectorial work, and more sampling than is being undertaken at present.

The other matter concerning the Public Health Department relates to the conflicting statements we have heard, as a community, about the value of influenza vaccines. Recently, I have noted several conflicting medical viewpoints in relation to flu injections.

Mr. Rodda: Don't they make it out of fertile eggs?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am not sure of the process, but, from what I know, a situation is likely to occur from time to time in which errors in the treatment or establishment of the vaccine can occur, and people can possibly suffer more harm than good. In June the Director of Monash University's health service (Dr. J. Green) said in Melbourne:

Once the flu epidemic had started, people could be incubating the germ, and this could result in a bad case of flu if they had a vaccination.

"The injection temporarily drops one's immunity therefore if anyone is incubating influenza, the result is likely to be a more severe attack," he said.

"If people wanted to have the injection they should have had it when the epidemic started. I no longer consider it to be in a person's best interests to have the inoculation."

A Canberra doctor is reported as describing flu injections as "a gimmick": Dr. B. Furnass, a member of the Australian National Universities Student Health Service said:

It is a gimmick that is put out, and people think "I must be in on this".

Another medical specialist in Brisbane virtually said the same thing:

"I have seen two patients in the past few days who have contracted asthma after inoculation and other doctors have reported other cases," he said.

"I have advised all my patients against inoculation for these reasons and also because the vaccine is only 30 per cent effective."

He continued:

People strong enough don't need it and for weak people, it's too dangerous for them to have . . . If such a person has the vaccine and then gets the flu, he becomes doubly ill and the chance of serious illness increases.

The only other report from which I quote briefly is from the State Director of Public Health (Dr. Woodruff) who, I believe, in the report of the *Advertiser* of April 10 this year, summarised the position fairly well when he said:

The National Health and Medical Research Council had recommended the vaccine should be used by people with chronic lung or heart diseases or other serious debilitating diseases, old people and pre-school children. Other people might feel ill but would not be endangered.

"I don't propose to have the vaccine myself," said Dr. Woodruff.

I think the truth is that, if one considers those reports, each year we suddenly find that a form of influenza strain hits Australia. The newspapers tend to stress that people are going to die in the streets in some way, and members of the community believe that they owe a service to their family by visiting the local doctor and having the vaccine, and that, in some way, they are protecting the community. It is clear, from the reports to which I have referred, that the overwhelming weight of medical evidence would recommend against this procedure. However, the number of people who have the vaccine is increasing each year, because there seems to be a shortage of vaccine for people who ought to be receiving it: the old, the young, and those who suffer from some other ailment ought to avoid the flu, particularly, and I believe that a firm statement should be made by our health authorities advising people that (if what I say is correct, of course) people should not have the flu vaccine each year unless there is a sound reason for it.

While we hear such statements from time to time, I do not believe that the public are told clearly enough of the actual situation. I believe that the Governor's Speech is a good one. It sets out a programme of general development throughout this State and it sets out what I believe will be a long legislative programme. As I do not wish to delay any longer than necessary our chance to proceed with that legislation, I support the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): It would be avoiding reality if, on this first occasion of a formal speech during the present sitting of the House, I did not say something about my own political position. I do not propose to go over in any detail the events within my former Party of the past few months, except to say that what happened to me was as painful as it was surprising.

Mr. Jennings: You shouldn't have been surprised. You're too trusting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I may be naive. I certainly did not expect it to happen.

Mr. Allison: You're as naive as Jack is.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know about that, but I had no idea that anything like that would happen. I thought I had four colleagues, that I would have them indefinitely, and that our numbers would increase. However, that was not to be.

Mr. Jennings: We'll stick to you!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know that I welcome that, even from my dear old friend from Ross Smith. The fact is that I am now alone in this House, and that is not a position which I relish. It reduces my opportunity to take action in this place, and I had a prime example of that last week in relation to Kangaroo Island. How-

ever, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, and other members that I shall do my modest best both inside and outside the Chamber to make my presence felt wherever I may be.

I am pleased to be able to say that the all new Liberal Movement is doing very well indeed. None of us who preferred that course enjoyed the task of having to pick up the pieces of a smashed Party, but we did it, and I have already on a number of occasions in the House referred to my Party as the new L.M. I have noticed that invariably the reaction of other Opposition members, particularly the member for Rocky River, has been a sneer, but I assure him that we are a Party and that we propose to play a very forceful and significant role in politics. The new L.M. is a continuation of our former Party (the Liberal Movement Inc.). It will, however, be more distinct from any other Party, particularly from the Liberal Party, in its policies. We have no obligation whatever to any other political Party, represented either in the House or anywhere else, and I had something to say about this matter at the first convention of the new L.M. a few weeks ago. I will quote some of my remarks on that occasion, as follows:

I have said often that I believe strongly in the need for a third force in politics. This must be a Party with its own distinctive outlook and policies. It must be a positive force, not just anti-Labor or anti-Liberal. The New L.M. will be a positive force. We shall avoid the insistent socialism of the Labor Party and the stubborn conservatism of the Liberals. We owe no obligation to any other political Party. We shall be the voice of those occupying the centre ground of political thought in Australia. As well, we shall give an opportunity to be heard to people who otherwise might have no voice at all. I have always tried in Parliament to do this and I shall continue it. We can only be that positive force if we are not afraid of new ideas. We must think hard about the situation of the world now as it enters the last quarter of the twentieth century. Our outlook must be wide and take in the whole of life and not only here in Australia. We all owe a much wider duty to mankind.

That is what I said, and for my pains I was labelled by Mr. Eric Franklin, who is, I think, the senior journalist on the *Advertiser* in this place, as the Man from La Mancha. He may take that view, but others take it rather more seriously, and only a few days ago I received a letter from a lady who lives in College Park (not in my district, but probably in the Premier's district) asking for help, and stating:

It seems to me that a minority Party such as yours is the best agency through which to raise matters which, because of their ramifications, may touch on the interests or intentions of larger Parties with diverse ideological and sectional affiliations. The particular area of my concern is the present embattled state of the farming community because of the drought . . .

She then went on to deal with that problem. Her letter is typical of many responses I have had to the new L.M. We had in the House last week a prime example of the need for a third force in politics in South Australia; I refer to the debate that took place on the question of a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia. The debate took the form, as I understand it, of a censure motion by the Liberal Party of the Government, but it was in the clearest possible way merely playing politics (and not very effective politics at that), because both the Liberal Party and the Labor Party have expressed their support for the idea of a uranium enrichment plant. The Leader of the Opposition, weeks before he moved his motion, had said so in the press. He said that he agreed with it, in principle, and the speech from the Minister of Mines and Energy during the debate could have been the speech of Mr. Doug Anthony, the Deputy Prime Minister, for its conservatism, its arrogance and its absolute certainty not only that

uranium mining must come but also that it would be beneficial to this State and to mankind.

I could scarcely believe that we could have a speech like that from a Government Minister; certainly the Premier was a little more diplomatic and tactful and, I suppose, political in what he said. He was much milder, because he perhaps has a better appreciation than has the Minister of the deep split in his own Party. The speech of the Minister of Mines and Energy was indistinguishable from the speeches of senior Ministers of the Federal Government in Canberra. I was the only member to say unequivocally (as I do) that I am opposed to the mining of uranium in Australia, and that earned me the jibe, during the division, from the Minister that I had joined the grebes. Perhaps I have, and I certainly am not ashamed of that, if my opposition to uranium mining means that I have joined the grebes. I believe that this issue cuts across Party allegiances, that it will be one of the divisions in politics in the next few years in Australia, and that it could well of itself bring about a realignment of political allegiances. However, for the time being the new L.M. is the only Party represented in the House that has sympathy for it (I put it that way, because I speak for myself, as my Party does not have a specific policy on it, and I do want to be taken as speaking for the whole Party) and is the only Party to have spoken out against the mining of uranium.

Since last week's debate, my attention has been drawn to what the Attorney-General has said about this matter and, as all members have been informed by the Parliamentary Library, an interview with him is reported in a recent issue of *On Dit*. I will quote from the article because it gives the lie direct to what the Premier said during the debate: that there is no division of opinion in the Labor Party. There is a division in his own Cabinet on this matter, and it is a most deep and fundamental division. I thought less of both the Premier and the Attorney-General that it was kept quiet during the debate.

Mr. Allison: The Leader brought it out.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, I did not notice it being brought out too clearly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me continue to quote what the Attorney-General has said. It is as follows:

Duncan:—

that is the Attorney—

I'm opposed to the mining of uranium because, if Australia with its large sources of uranium ore decides to go ahead and export it overseas, this will give great impetus to the general trend that is developing towards the use of atomic power.

Later, he says:

This use of uranium will have disastrous consequences for the future of mankind. I think if this generation decides to proceed and use uranium we will not only be running safety risks ourselves but also we will be condemning future generations to enormous expenditures and manpower in purely keeping waste products from nuclear fusion in a safe condition, and this will go on for virtually thousands of years. This is a decision we must make not just for ourselves but for the whole future of mankind, and thus the issue is not just an ordinary day-to-day political issue.

I certainly agree with those comments. If the Attorney believes that that is not just an ordinary day-to-day issue, it is his duty to say so in this House when he has the opportunity to do so. He had the opportunity last week but he did not take it. He cannot have it both ways. He cannot say that this is not an ordinary day-to-day political issue. In other words, he cannot say this is an

issue transcending Party politics and then, when he gets the opportunity in this place, do nothing about it.

It will be interesting to see whether what he regards as his duty to mankind prevails over what he regards as his own political future in his present political Party. There is no doubt (if I may say something more about the Attorney relating to other matters) that he will (as he has already done) get the Government into trouble.

Mr. Coumbe: He was chastised last week.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not surprised to hear that, because the Attorney has, ever since he won the job, been indiscreet several times, apart from the uranium issue, which I quoted. The latest indiscretion was his criticism of the State Public Service. It is interesting to see the soft replies I got today to the Questions On Notice I had asked about that matter. It is interesting that the Attorney has adopted in his replies the Government's view on the whole matter. His reply does not line up at all with what he said at that seminar, so one wonders how long the Attorney-General will last in office. Personally, I hope that he will last for some time, because he is one of the weaker links in the Government (as his colleagues must know).

Mr. Coumbe: Is he the Government's Achilles heel?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: True. That cliché is almost as good a description of the Attorney as there could be. I hope he lasts for some time yet, because he is an easy target for his political enemies, despite the rapidity with which he has got off-side with members of the legal profession. I say that despite my high regard for the member for Playford, who is, in my opinion, far better qualified than the member for Elizabeth for the position and would be far more competent in it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Why do you think he didn't get it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not intend to speculate on that matter now. I said, in a speech from which I quoted a few moments ago that I made at the new L.M. convention, a few things about the Liberal Party. At the risk of causing offence to some of my former friends in the Liberal Party, I intend to repeat some of these comments.

Mr. Rodda: Are they still former friends?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We will see about that. I said that the Liberals had not changed at all since we left their Party. I believe that that is true; every indication I have is that it is true. I have been amused in the past week or so to be handed by my staunch supporters copies of the *New Liberal*. Apparently, with a few exceptions such as myself, this small publication has been sent to all former members of the Liberal Movement Incorporated, whether they have chosen to join the so-called Liberal Party or not. Several of them brought their copies of the publication to me. I did not get a copy sent to me, but my mother and certain other relatives did. They have been receiving literature from the Liberal Party ever since they ceased to belong to that Party three or four years ago. No doubt they are still counted as members of the Liberal Party for purposes of the statistics released from time to time by Mr. John Vial. I was pleased to see the *New Liberal*, because it confirms what I have said about the Liberal Party. On page 1 it states:

L.M. merger completed—

huh!—

With the merger of the Liberal Movement with the Liberal Party now complete we welcome to our ranks all former Liberal Movement M.P's, members and supporters. They can count me out.

Mr. Mathwin: That's four to one bar one!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is not what the honourable member's paper says. The impression one would get after casually reading the *New Liberal* is that all members of the L.M. went back, but we did not. The article continues:

Two of the new members, Mr. Mike Wilson and Mr. Dick Clampett, were welcomed by the State Executive to its meeting recently. They will sit on the executive until after the annual meeting of State Council in October. Most interesting of all is a photograph of the executive, which confirms my conviction that nothing has changed despite a few superficial changes. Who do we see in a prominent place in the photograph? None other than the Leader of the Liberal Party in another place—Mr. Ren DeGaris. He is not a member of the executive, but he is there as an observer, whereas the Leader of the Party in this House is absent. It is significant that the photograph of the executive of the so-called Liberal Party includes Mr. Ren DeGaris.

Mr. Mathwin: It's not a very good photograph of you, Robin, is it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is a long time since my photograph has graced the pages of a Liberal and Country League publication, and it will be a long time before it does again. Of even greater significance is that a friend of mine, during the weekend, came to see me about a certain matter. That friend was opposed to the so-called merger of the L.M. with the Liberal Party, but when the Liberal Movement convention voted for the merger he chose the path of rejoining the Liberal Party and was received with some suspicion in a branch. However, he was immediately put on the local S.E.C. of the Party. He has already become rapidly disillusioned with the Party. Last week he was taken out to lunch and offered preselection for the Mitcham District, where he would stand against me.

Dr. Tonkin: What!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. That very night he came around to my House to tell me about it.

Mr. Mathwin: How could he be given that? That's ridiculous.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is a matter for the Liberals themselves to sort out. I can vouch for this having happened. I know that the Liberals have revived the vain hope that they had before the last State election of defeating me in Mitcham. They are doing their best to raise money in that district and, when they are asked why, they say, "To get rid of Robin". That is the reason given. I am regarded as part of the grey menace of socialism! That is how it has been described. "We must get rid of the grey menace of socialism", but the first step towards that is getting rid of me in Mitcham.

I can assure honourable members of the Liberal Party that they will have no more success in getting rid of me than they did last time, when their vote was 27 per cent of the total; they could not even do as well as the Labor Party. I know precisely what they propose. They keep on saying hypocritically, "You must come back", but all the time that is what is going on. I am glad not to be one of them when I look at what they are doing and at what their Federal colleagues in Canberra are doing, those colleagues whom the Leader of the Opposition so loyally supports on every possible occasion. We had a notice of motion today which would do just the same thing; it was from one of his back-benchers.

I acknowledge the difficulty of the present Federal Government in trying to repair the enormous damage done to this State by the Whitlam Labor Government. We have had this week a reminder of the sort of thing we

experienced when Labor was in office. The member for Hanson mentioned it this afternoon. I refer to Dr. Jim Cairns coming out and saying what he has said in the past few days. That was precisely the sort of thing we had day after day from him and other members of the Labor Government when that Party was in office in Canberra. It does no harm for us to be reminded of how awful it was to have a Federal Labor Government. Jim Cairns has done that; maybe he has reminded you, Mr. Speaker, too. He has done that very effectively in the past few days, and his performance was both weak-headed and disgraceful. Having said that, I want to say a few more things about the Liberal successor to the Labor Government.

In March of this year I was perturbed at the decision, quite contrary to the policy speech of the Liberal Party, to change the National Employment and Training scheme. I sent a memorandum, having had three complaints from constituents and near constituents, to Senator Hall early in March of this year. I was perplexed when I got no action and no response. I found afterwards the reason, but I intend now to quote the precise and specific cases, because this is a good example of the callous perfidy of the Federal Government we have today. I will not mention names. The first man lives just out of my district, in the Fisher District. He is a chap, I should think, in his thirties. Based on some earlier qualification, he went to the University of Adelaide last year to do civil engineering. This year he is to do his final year. He has received \$82.75 a week under the N.E.A.T. scheme. Under the new scale of allowances, this will be reduced to \$62.15 and, as he said, he will now have to live from hand to mouth. He showed me a letter which he received about January, 1975, and a subsequent handout setting out the allowances he would receive. He also showed me a letter received in December last year setting out the new tax scales and finally what the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations has headed *News Release*, setting out the new allowances. That was the first bloke.

The second one was a minister of religion, who is on 3-year social worker training and will lose badly after April this year, when the present \$83 per week is to be broken down into: unemployment, \$60, and training, about \$20. Introduction of the means test after April will mean that because his wife is working he will lose the \$80 and be reduced to \$20 a week. He feels it is disruptive to many students after enrolling to have this happen in the middle of the year, as they were accepted for the courses with verbal understanding that payments would remain constant. In his case, he has given up a job and a manse and the family are trying to buy another house and have committed themselves financially, which they would not have done if he had known this was to happen.

The third case also concerned a minister of religion, who states that the new reduced level of N.E.A.T. allowances means that he and his family will be reduced to penury; the new allowance has no sliding scale for means test; the Government has not kept faith with those who have been on it, as in his case, for two years. He wrote to me again last month. This is what he says:

My wife and I are getting by because she is working seven days a week. There is not even a sliding scale means test, and for every \$1 I earn over \$6 per week \$1 is taken off the \$23.50. It stinks to high heaven, but, apart from acting through the N.E.A.T. Action Group, there appears to be little that I can do.

If that is an example of the regard the Federal Government has for its word and for the welfare of people in this country who were induced to change their position upon undertakings given by its predecessors, I do not think much of it.

However, those are not the only people who are complaining about the Government. Of course, the Labor Party is, and members of unions are; they have a perfect right to do so over Medibank. There is no doubt whatever that the Federal Government has broken its word over Medibank. I have here a pamphlet distributed to one of my supporters at his place of employment, one of the larger factories in Adelaide. It is authorised by the Medibank Defence Committee and quotes from the policy speech of Mr. Fraser, as follows:

We will maintain Medibank and ensure that the standard of health care does not decline.

It goes on to say, perfectly rightly, the following:

He has broken enough promises already. Do not let him get away with this one.

Let me finish the array of complaints about the Federal Government by quoting from yet another source. This is from the annual report of South Australian Brewing Holdings Ltd., big business, and referred to as such by the Premier in his Chifley Memorial Lecture. I have heard that the board of the brewing company was one of the establishments mentioned, along with the Bank of Adelaide, my bank.

Mr. Becker: What is this establishment?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have often wondered. Let us see what the brewing company says in its report about the Federal Government. The report, given by Sir Norman Young, states:

When the Liberal and Country Parties contested the last election, they gave a specific assurance to the electorate that they would take steps, if elected, to dismantle the Prices Justification Tribunal. So far this promise has not been honoured, and from press reports it would seem that the Fraser Government is now inclined to abandon the pre-election undertaking of the Parties in this respect—what a euphemism—

apparently on the improbable consideration that Mr. Hawke and the trade unions are likely to give the Government more co-operation if the Prices Justification Tribunal remains in existence.

That was putting it in a very gentlemanly way. On the pamphlet put out by the Associated Chambers of Commerce of Australia, it was put far more bluntly than that. There you have it: a Government which does not keep and has not kept its word. I am glad I am not part of the Party that supports it. What could be the future relationship between the New L.M. and me in Parliament, and the Liberal Party? There is no prospect whatever of my rejoining the Liberal Party, of my going back to the Liberals, as it is usually put. The unhappy events of the past few months have, if anything, pushed us further apart than we were before. Whether that was an intended consequence, or not, I do not know, but it has been the consequence.

However, I am willing to work in this House with any other Party, provided I am recognised as the member of a separate and distinct political Party. I am not willing to go any further than that, and if members on this side, or on the other side, want to pay any regard to what I have said, then it will be for them.

Mr. Coumbe: What does that suggest?

Mr. Allison: Open to bribes!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member for Mount Gambier does not make a promising response to what I have just said. All he has said is that perhaps I am open to bribes. If the honourable member for Mount Gambier knew me better than he does, he would realise that I am not, in any circumstances, open to any bribery. I hope that other members of his Party will not jump in as

foolish as he has. I now say something about members on the other side of the House, because I am not at all attracted to the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Slater: We are not attracted to you, either.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is mutual, and that balances with what the member for Ross Smith said earlier in my speech. I am happy to get it from the honourable member for Gilles because, whatever the electoral boundaries may be, the area that he now represents is one upon which my Party casts covetous eyes.

Mr. Slater: What a forlorn hope.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That was not what the honourable member was saying before the previous State election.

Mr. Slater: You're wrong.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not wrong, I know how the honourable member felt, and how worried members of his Party were about his survival.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The present Government, so called, in this State has now been in office for just over six years. Obviously, it is running out of ideas, and that is to be expected. Part of the theory of Parliamentary democracy is that one side and then the other (however the grouping may be made up on each side) has a chance to be in office and to put into practice the ideas that it has developed. In due course, when it runs out of ideas, it should go back into Opposition to recharge the batteries. It is obvious that that is the position that we are rapidly reaching (if we have not reached it) with the Labor Party in this State. If members opposite do not want to accept that, I remind them of a few indications of it. Let me remind them that the Premier said soon after the previous election that he was now more interested in administration than he was in legislation. It may be that that was a statement made by him when he saw the state of the Parties in this House: it is certainly what he said, and he denied staunchly that it was because of the state of the Parties in this House. I will have more to say about that in a moment.

I now refer to the programme for the sittings of this House. That programme has obviously been worked out to mask the fact that we are going to sit for fewer days in total than we ever have since this Government came into office. By having a convenient break here and there, we will keep going until November when, in previous years, we have kept going without a break except for one week for the show. Of course, the reason for this is to mask the fact that we are sitting much less frequently than we ever sat.

Mr. Jennings: What about in Sir Thomas Playford's days!

Mr. Langley: Three days in one year.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The dear old member for Ross Smith and the dear old member for Unley come in like the tide. I have heard that retort in this place many times before, but let them, if they intend to speak in this debate, explain why, after six years of their Government, this is happening. I do not think we will get an explanation, either from them, or from any other member. Of course, it may be that it is because, as I have said in this place, that the Government is on a knife edge, and does not like it. When I said that, I got my usual sneer from the Premier. The Premier is good at sneering: I know him very well now. When he reacts in this place with a sneer or an insult, and not with reasoned argument, it is because he has no reasoned argument.

He is able enough to rebut attacks on him and on his Government with reasoned argument, if he has any, and with no-one is it clearer than it is with him that, if he simply retorts with abuse or insults, he has no other answer whatever. We had two examples of this last week when I was told, I think on the first day of sitting, that the barbed wire fence on which I was sitting must be painful. The next day he said that I had my mug on one side and my rump on the other side of the fence. Of course, it was a ploy (which at the time succeeded admirably), because it immediately turned the Liberals off the attack on him and his Government to spiteful glee against me.

Mr. Becker: He's paranoid!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was quite satisfied, because I knew it meant that what I had said (and I must apologise to you for this, Mr. Speaker, because it was by way of interjection) had hit home, and that was the only way the Premier had of defending himself. It was I who first said that the Government was on a knife edge in this place. It was sneered at at the time, but I notice that, at the convention, when the Premier was ramming hard for your readmission to the Party, Mr. Speaker, that was the very phrase he used himself. A poor compliment to you, of course, that that argument had to be used to get you back in, but it worked, and, if I may say with respect, good luck to you. If that is what you want (and I cannot understand why you should) there it is: you are back, and that is okay.

Mr. Jennings: We won't accept you, I can assure you of that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I can tell the honourable member for Ross Smih that that is a decision he will never have to make.

Mr. Jennings: I am glad of that. I would resign from political life if that were the case.

Mr. Allison: We thought you had.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I turn now to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —another matter spoken about in this place, and about which the Liberal Party is panicking; that is, the likelihood of an early election in South Australia. Nothing shows more clearly the dishonesty of the present Government than the denials of the Premier that this is likely. On every logical ground, it is likely. The Government does not like the situation that it is in in this place. It believes the electoral redistribution will favour the Government, and it believes (and I am afraid rightly) that the growing unpopularity of the Federal Government will rub off on State politics. Why then should the Government not simply be waiting for the time when it believes it will win an election to have one? The Government would be foolish if it were not. It is so patently obvious that that is the position, that I think the less (if that is possible) politically of the Premier for his denials of the matter.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You think we will bolt in if there is an election?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I do not think you will. I think you think you will, and you are simply waiting for the time. The Labor Party may miscalculate, but it is making that calculation, undoubtedly: when it thinks it will win, it will have an election. Of course, any Party would do the same thing. I blame the Labor Party for dissembling on the matter. Why cannot it be honest about it and say what is obvious to anyone who knows anything about politics? When the Government has an

election, it will have to account to the electorate, particularly giving an account of the Government's achievements, but what have been the Government's achievements, even when one looks a little under the surface? Certainly, there is now a freer social climate in this State compared to the old Playfordian days, but there is little of material advance that one can see in the State. Rather, our ability to compete on markets where our secondary and, indeed, our primary products must be sold, has been reduced because of increased costs and controls that have multiplied during the past six years.

Mr. McRae: That's not borne out by employment figures.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me give an example of it, again from the same source, a brewing company report, that has been quoted in the House. One of my runner friends is a cement manufacturer who said that, when he started up his factory about 15 years ago, he went to the council, spoke to an officer, and was given oral permission to set up his works. Now, he says that he would have to go through a dozen authorities over a long period with no assurance that he would get permission in the end to start a business. He uses this as an example of the way in which private enterprise is being stifled, and this situation is obvious in the brewing company's report, which states:

The frustrations—

exactly as my friend put to me—

arising out of the costs, delays and uncertainties involved in meeting, or overcoming, the technical requirements and objections of the multiplicity of Government departments and official agencies whose approvals now have to be obtained before it is possible to build an hotel. For example, in the case of the Duke of Wellington Hotel at Payneham, we were advised in 1966 by the Highways Department of its intention to acquire a large part of the land on which this hotel is built for the purpose of road widening. It then took us no less than 10 years to obtain the consents and approvals and to meet the objections of the Highways Department, the Licensing Court, the Land Board, Metropolitan County Board, the Payneham District Council, and the Planning Appeal Board before we were in a position to proceed with plans to relocate the hotel on a nearby site. Ten years, during which the cost of building the new hotel multiplied many times. No system of private business can be sustained whilst it is restrained and restricted by this form of unco-ordinated and purposeless bureaucratic control.

There we have it quite plainly and factually from an Adelaide business man, and this is not the only kind of restraint we have in this State. It is about time we reduced the size of Government. What did I hear on the radio this morning? It is likely that the Public Service will not, in the coming year, be allowed to increase quite to the extent that it did last year, when it increased 3.8 per cent in size. We have to have an increase in the size of the Public Service because of multiplying Government activities. The prime exemplar of socialism is Government control and, if we are to exercise control, we must increase the size of Government to do it. That is what is happening, and the fools on this side agree with it. They may say that they do not, but what have we had?

Let us consider the size of Cabinet, and this is one modest improvement we could have. When I was a Minister about six years ago, there were nine of us. We had to work damn hard, but we were able to keep the job going and administer government. We were in the same position in the House as is the present Government. It was hard work and, although it was a challenge, we all enjoyed it, and we were sorry when it came to an end. Since then, there have been three increases in the size of the Ministry and, each time, I think, the Liberal Party has supported it. The Liberal Party is simply making it easier for a Labor Government to increase its

controls in the community, and why? Because it has the distant hope that one of these days there will be more jobs for it if it is ever able to win Government. I make the specific proposal that the limit of the number of Ministers in the State Constitution is a ceiling: we do not have to have an increase and, in my opinion, we do not need it. I suggest that, when there is a change of Government, there should be a decrease in the number of Ministers. I believe that this State could be perfectly properly administered, and I am only echoing what the Prime Minister has said. This State could be perfectly properly administered by nine Ministers. We do not need the extra, and that would save, on Ministers' offices alone, \$150 000 a year for each of them, and that, I should think, is a conservative estimate.

Another point that riles me is the way in which the number of Ministerial motor cars with drivers and the size of those cars have increased. It is unnecessary for so many members of Parliament to have Ministerial cars to drive them about. It is a complete waste of money, and the cars themselves could be half the size for those who need to use them that they are now. Not only would that save money, but also it would save scarce resources.

Mr. Jennings: When you were Attorney-General and were in military camp, you used to have your secretary run up there every day to have you sign documents.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take the honourable member's point, but it is an exaggeration. It happened I think twice whilst I was in camp. If that were a fault, I must accept it, because of what I am saying now. It is entirely unnecessary for Ministers who live in Adelaide to have and use Ministerial cars constantly. What do we have public transport for, anyway?

Mr. Becker: Come on!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Members on this side who still harbour the vain hope that one day they will be in office do not like that idea: it is one of the perks of the job. I suggest that this is one of the ways in which the South Australian Government could set an example of restraint and economy. I have said that one of this Government's achievements is a somewhat freer social atmosphere than we had before. On the whole, I think it is a good thing but, in some respects, I believe it has gone too far. We now have what are called, euphemistically, massage parlours, and they have come with a vengeance to the State since the present Government took office: not only in this State, and I am not suggesting that it is the present Labor Government that has done it. Certainly, I believe that the Government's outlook (and we could get examples from the Premier himself of this) is one of the worst aspects of the present Government. Included in this morning's *Advertiser*, that pillar of respectability, are 65 advertisements for massage parlours, as I had my secretary count them. I have noted a few of the more titillating advertisements, as follows:

Attention. New girls for best massage. 56 Grange Road, Welland, 10 a.m. to midnight.

They are short hours; they must do very well.

Mr. Slater: Are there any parlours in Mitcham?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A parlour started there last week, and I heard about it within a few hours. The advertisements continue:

Sweethearts. Beautiful young clean girls to massage you at your own choice, hotel, motel, or home.

Be satisfied with a relaxing massage by Dianne, Donna, and Suzanne. Two-girl massage our specialty—

I do not know why three girls are named if two is the specialty—

at 66 Hughes Street, Mile End. Monday-Friday . . .

La Casbah, 228 Gilbert Street. Happiness is a warm and tender massage with Koby, Kathy, and Leighanne.

Sandy ex Russell Street is now working again and would like to hear from all old clients and friends at 29 Kensington Road, Norwood.

That is enough.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We may laugh, but it is going on and we are entirely hypocritical about it. Nine out of 10 parlours, if not 10 out of 10 are brothels. That is a commonly accepted word for them. There is no reason for us to dissemble; they are brothels, unless they are simply agencies for assignments where, technically, they go out and give a "massage" somewhere else. We should either get rid of them (which we are not going to do—there is no doubt about that, because the Government and the Party on this side are not willing to take sufficient action to get rid of them), or we should recognise and control them. There is nothing else we should do. Throughout history this has been the classic dilemma between morality and practicality. There is no doubt about which way we should go. Why are brothels not controlled?

People are going to use them. If that conforms with the mores of the community, it is absolutely essential that there should be measures to reduce disease through control. What we are doing now is simply ignoring an evil (if evil it is regarded as, which it is by me) in our community, because we do not have the guts to tackle the matter head on and take some action, which I believe we should take. There is no chance of wiping out these institutions in our community. If so, the only alternative is to take action to control them so that they are not the cause of physical and moral ills. Having raised the matter, I hope I will get some expression of opinion from members on both sides—

Mr. Becker: You know you will.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —about what should be done. The last matter to which I refer (and it shows again the fundamental dishonesty of the present Government) is the question of Mr. Ray Taylor's payment for giving up his job as Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission. I was immediately suspicious when I read the reports of his resignation in March of this year. A report states:

Not enough to do: head of Monarto quits job.

Mr. Taylor is pictured, and the report continues:

I could not become a person who would take money without the effort being given back to my employer.

The Premier said:

Mr. Taylor would be compensated for the early termination of his contract . . .

However, the Premier did not say how much, and that made me suspicious, because the Premier is the master of the half truth. In a subsequent comment I said that I would make sure we got the answer, and we have. Mr. Taylor said that he hoped others in the community would take note of his attitude to work and salaries. I hope they do not, as things have turned out. What did we ascertain when the truth was eventually wrung from the Government: Mr. Taylor is to get \$100 000 for giving up his job. Today, in reply to my supplementary Question on Notice, it was stated that not only was he getting, as Chairman of the Monarto Development Commission, \$31 374 of straight out salary but also that he was getting another \$6 922.40 by way of allowances. Therefore, he was on an equivalent salary of more than \$40 000 a year. If that is put beside

the \$100 000, I suppose it is not as big as it seems. I asked how the \$100 000 was arrived at. The reply (and this is what the Government was concealing in March, and I do not know whether it hoped it would get away with it or that no-one would ask questions about it) was that the \$100 000 paid as compensation for the early termination of Mr. Taylor's employment was determined from within the range of \$85 000 to \$138 000, as estimated as being the minimum and maximum by the Premier's Department. That is the first time the Premier's Department has come into the matter. All we heard about before was the Crown Solicitor, as follows:

The Crown Law Department considered that this approach was not appropriate.

What charming words. The reply continues:

The actual sum was determined by negotiation, bearing in mind inflation.

There is no doubt about what happened. To get rid of Mr. Taylor, the Government had to make a payment of that amount. It is the final example of the present Government's dishonesty. In conclusion, I congratulate the member for Florey who moved the motion, which I support. I did not have the pleasure of hearing his entire speech, but I have read it. It was a perfect example of the way in which union thinking dominates his Party. However, the member for Florey, while I differ from him on political matters, is a man for whom I have much respect and affection. The member for Florey moved the 21st Address in Reply that I have heard; that is, if we count the first one I moved, and I have never been asked to do so since. His contribution was the best of those, and I congratulate him for it.

Mr. Wells: Thank you very much.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I join him in his expressions of condolence and congratulation to the people to whom he referred.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): First, I join with other members in conveying condolences to the relatives of three former members who have died since the House was last called together. The only member I knew personally was Jim Ferguson. Even though our political philosophies differed, Jim was a kind and sincere man. I express my sympathy to his family on their bereavement.

Contrary to the remarks of the member for Mitcham relating to the initiatives of the present Government, I believe that the Governor's Speech, indicating the number of legislative proposals that will come before the House this session, demonstrates clearly the Government's initiatives and ideas regarding intended legislation. Legislation in relation to the maltreatment of children is long overdue, and I join the member for Playford in expressing support for such legislation. I note in the Governor's Speech a proposal for the establishment of community school libraries to give small rural communities library services they would otherwise lack. Greater use can be made of resources of school libraries, particularly now, as I have been informed today by the Minister of Education, in reply to a question, that no Federal funds will be available in future for the funding of school library resource centres; such funds have been curtailed by the present Federal Government. It is necessary to use our resources to the best advantage, and this means school resources being used by the community. Not only school libraries but also other school facilities for recreation should be available for community use.

I noted with interest in other countries that Governments, along with local authorities, provide recreational facilities

for student use during school hours and for community use after school hours. In Britain and Europe, I was impressed with the provision of sporting and recreation complexes utilised by students and the community generally. Some of the school centres I visited had modern and sophisticated equipment such as gymnasia, indoor swimming pools, squash courts, and a variety of recreation facilities fully utilised by the school and the community. Full-time caretakers and administrators were appointed, and the centres were well organised, well appointed, and well conducted. A large capital investment is required to provide school facilities, so the resources should be fully utilised and put to the fullest possible use by being available to the community.

Last week in the adjournment debate I spoke on the failure of the Federal Government in relation to recreation and sport. As I did not have time to expand on the subject, I shall add to my remarks. On the following day, I found that the comments I made were supported by the Deputy Commonwealth Government Whip, Mr. Cameron, of Queensland, who strongly criticised Government inaction in relation to sport and recreation. He said:

It would have been worse for Australian athletes if the previous Government had lost office earlier. He also said, "To give them their due, the Labor Party, when in Government, helped sport like it had never been helped before. It seems crazy that in the 1974-75 financial year 17 of the Olympic sports were given almost \$400 000, but, because of Government intervention in the year that mattered most, the expenditure programme for those sports was \$20 000 less."

Another matter mentioned during my speech was the shelving of the Bloomfield report. Another report on sport was also shelved by the present Federal Government, but I shall make specific reference to the Bloomfield report, indicating lack of initiative by that Government. The report states:

Since the daily routine of so many people demands no more physical effort than walking from the front door to the garage and from the parking lot to the office, this far from satisfies even a minimum daily activity requirement. There is no doubt that Australians are facing unprecedented physical problems as a result of this physical inactivity. The number of very obese people, often quite young, whom one sees in Australia, is an indication in itself of the poor state of the nation's health. Rejection rates of national servicemen during the last eight years have markedly increased and there has also been a definite shift from the communicable to the non-communicable diseases, such as those of a cardiovascular nature. Australia at the present time has one of the highest death rates due to cardiovascular disease in the world, but probably the most worrying feature of this problem is that it is more frequently striking young men in their 30's and 40's. Other problems have also occurred during the last decade which give those people interested in preventive medicine some concern. Longevity of the Australian male has decreased slightly since the early 1960's and is several years below that of his European counterpart. Even our children appear to have lower physical and motor fitness levels when the results of random tests are carefully studied. This is not surprising when one finds that the vast majority of Australian primary school children have no regular physical education programme.

The report shows clearly the need for assistance and Government thinking on the important aspects of the general health of the people, and it also states:

Perhaps Australians need to soberly take stock of these same trends which appear to be occurring in our affluent society.

However, as I have said, the Federal Government is willing to relegate the physical wellbeing of the average Australian to a low priority. I refer now to another aspect of Federal incapacity: I refer to social security.

A copy of a letter sent to me by a member of the Commonwealth Parliament regarding the inactivity of the Fraser Government in social security states:

The Government's actions in social security and related fields have had considerable effects on the underprivileged in the community, and cuts in welfare services have been used as an easy way to cut Government expenditure.

The plan of Government strategy has become quite clear:

(1) To cut expenditure in areas where those affected have little political clout.

(2) To create an atmosphere of resentment in the community against the poor, unemployed and supporting mothers.

This is evidenced by the campaign that has been conducted over a period, in which the term "dole bludgers" has been used against certain persons. This can be effective if newspapers use the term often. The letter continues:

It is an old conservative tactic to divide society on issues and create a crisis atmosphere. The following is a summary of some of the actions taken by the Government:

Pharmaceutical Benefits:

(a) Prescription charges were increased from \$1.50 to \$2.

(b) Subsidised pharmaceutical benefits were abolished, resulting in increased charges from 75c to \$2. These were the first legislative actions of the new Government. They affect the poor and chronically ill above all. Removal of the subsidised pharmaceutical benefits has had a bad economic effect on sickness beneficiaries, some unemployed, supporting mothers and new migrants.

(c) 54 items were deleted from the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme with little warning—pensioners have been badly affected and doctors have resented the short notice. Though some of the deletions were justified the failure to follow the policy of five months notice has caused needless inconvenience and distress.

Legal Aid and Divorce:

(a) 28 new legal aid officers were deferred (January 15).

(b) Income tests for Legal Aid were made more severe.

(c) Legal aid in maintenance cases was refused.

(d) Supporting mothers' and deserted wives' pensions were withheld from those who had not sought maintenance.

(e) An attempt has been made to exclude possible social security maintenance determinations—contrary to the spirit of the Family Law Act.

Migrant Welfare:

(a) Telephone Interpreter Service was reduced with only an answering service late at night (March 17).

(b) Funds for interpreter training were withdrawn on February 16 but reinstated 10 days later after an outcry from all sections of the community.

Pensions:

Pension increases were delayed by one month (admitted by Mr. Fraser after continual denial).

Promise by Chipp in November to introduce legislation to provide for instant and automatic pension increases in line with C.P.I. not kept, and Senator Guilfoyle admitted in Senate no intention to do it.

Abolition of Means Test not proceeded with as promised.

Pensions of all kinds now taxable (May 20).

Unemployed:

January: New Strict Work Test; Young unemployed forced to move away from home to receive work.

March: Six weeks waiting period introduced for voluntary unemployment even if the reason was failure to receive award conditions; Forcing hand delivery of income statements to C.E.S. officers; Increased harassment of unemployed.

Mass raids on unemployed.

Commonwealth police instructing departmental officers on investigations and interrogation techniques.

Increased field officer staff to detect "bludgers".

General campaign against dole bludgers by Liberal-Country Party politicians.

Red Scheme abandoned.

Supporting Mothers:

(a) Repeated statements by the Minister expressing doubt as to the "worthiness" of women to receive benefits.

(b) Increase in level of "prying" investigations by field officers in some States as to the nature of relationships supporting mothers have with male friends.

Only this week, in the matter of child care centres, the Fraser Government decided that it would not continue with the 75 per cent subsidy, and as a consequence new centres will not be opened and existing facilities will be seriously curtailed. To sum up, the whole thrust of the Fraser Government's decisions is as follows:

(1) Increased harassment of beneficiaries.

(2) Concerted attack on services for the poor.

(3) Government opting out of the welfare field.

(4) Attempts at denigrating the poor and underprivileged in the eyes of the community.

(5) Destruction of local initiative.

Mr. Mathwin: Who wrote that for you? Jim Cairns?

Mr. SLATER: No, he did not. An officer of the Department of Social Security recently denied a claim that women receiving benefits were being discriminated against because of their personal lives, but several cases have been brought to my attention of action having been taken against women regarding benefits, following investigation into their personal lives. I do not accept the statement by the officer that that has not happened; I, and other members, know that it is happening.

I do not blame the departmental officers; they are acting on instructions from the Federal Minister and the Government. Because of that and other matters, I believe that there is disquiet amongst Commonwealth public servants in the Department of Social Security. I place no blame on the individual officers or the staff of the Social Security Department, but I am aware (and this has become obvious to me over the past six months, from the kind of inquiries a member makes for his constituents) that the service the public receives from the department is not at the level that existed some time ago. Departmental morale is low as a result of reductions the Government has made in the Public Service. I have been told that the service is understaffed and that the workload is too heavy; consequently, errors and omissions occur.

Mr. Mathwin: Tell us how to do it.

Mr. SLATER: The honourable member can make his speech later. I blame not the department but the Government for the pressure it is putting on the Public Service and the activities associated with the fact that it is trying to—

Mr. Mathwin: Put the blame where it belongs.

Mr. SLATER: I am putting the blame on the present Federal Government, which must stand condemned for its actions through the department.

Mr. Mathwin: Well, then—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg will have the opportunity of speaking later in the debate.

Mr. SLATER: I will now refer briefly to a remark made by the member for Hanson earlier today regarding housing. He said that it might be a good proposition for the Housing Trust to sell some of its older type houses that people have been renting for some years. The trust's policy, as I understand it, is that it does not sell to tenants.

Mr. Becker: Not all.

Mr. SLATER: The trust does not sell to tenants unless they have occupied the accommodation for five years, I think. At one time the trust's policy was that some houses were sold for reasonable market value or for less than market value. What happened, from my experience of cases in my district, was that the houses were resold by people at a considerable profit. As the trust's policy is reasonable and fair, I do not agree with the member for

Hanson that we should sell the tenants houses aged 20 years or more, because the shortage of rental housing is obvious to members who receive repeated requests from constituents to assist them. If the houses were resold, fewer houses would be available in the metropolitan area. At the time of sale, the houses would have deteriorated considerably and would need much restoration work carried out on them. I support the motion.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I am pleased to support the motion moved by the member for Florey and seconded by the member for Semaphore and, although the Opposition could not agree with the general sentiments they have expressed, I say that the member for Florey is a kindly gentleman who gave us perhaps a taste of his attitude towards the Opposition. I am always pleased to take part in the Address in Reply debate, because it is one of the forums of the Parliament in which members can express themselves freely on matters of interest to the State, and because the debate provides a permanent record which, time and again, has proved valuable for future reference.

I join with the mover and seconder in the tributes they have paid to former members. The late Jim Ferguson was a member when I was elected in 1965. He was the member for Yorke Peninsula. I shared with the member for Mallee (the then member for Albert) a back bench in the Chamber, and I was struck by the friendliness that emanated from Jim Ferguson. He was a member of what was known as the "charmers club", and any member was lucky to get a seat in it. This was when Sir Thomas Playford was Premier, and he spent many hours in the club, with perhaps his single new member and Mr. Ferguson, who had a wide knowledge of agriculture and who never failed to speak out for his industry. He was widely respected in his district, and his passing leaves a great gap in the ranks of liberalism.

I was privileged to know Mr. MacGillivray, not as a member of the House but as a member of the Land Settlement Committee and the Public Works Standing Committee, when I was an officer in the Lands Department. It was particularly noticeable that he had a great interest in the State's progress, and his special love was war service land settlement. He never failed to seek out the programme that was set down during settlement. His main interest was in the Murray irrigation areas, but he paid close attention to dry land settlement, and he was a great advocate for the settlers. I well remember, as a departmental officer, paying close attention to *Hansard* and the speeches he made on behalf of the settlers, and his dealing with teething problems that arose from soldier settlement in those early days.

Mr. Hogben had family connections in Naracoorte, so we often saw him in the South-East. He had a long and special interest in the Housing Trust, to which the member for Gilles has just referred. Mr. Hogben left a lasting mark by the contribution he made to housing in this State. I join with other members who have expressed messages of condolence to the families of these former members.

When His Excellency opened Parliament on June 8, we all felt sad that that would be the last occasion on which we would see him officiate in this capacity, unless we have the election that is much talked about. One can never speculate freely or with great assurance on whether this may be His Excellency's last such occasion, but I think the odds are that it was the last occasion on which Sir Mark Oliphant will open Parliament. I pay a tribute to him for the way in which he has discharged his duties as Her Majesty's representative in South Australia. He has

spoken out on fundamental issues, and this has caused people in all walks of life to stop and ponder their responsibilities in the wide ramifications of living responsibly and taking their part in making a better world. The Governor and Lady Oliphant, with their frequent visits to every area in South Australia, have endeared themselves to all people, and they are indeed a much-loved couple. I wish them a long and happy retirement.

Earlier in his Speech His Excellency referred to the drought situation facing South Australia. It is indeed regrettable that, in the intervening months, we have seen the ravages of drought impose themselves practically right across South Australia and, in many cases, the situation has reached crisis point. The Minister of Lands has announced relief by way of subsidies on freight for agistment of breeding stock and for fodder cartage.

The member for Mallee, during a recent grievance debate, has drawn attention to the plight that faces rural producers in South Australia. Slowly but surely the crisis is being recognised by the Government. Samcor is now receiving drought-stricken stock at the metropolitan abattoir. One wonders whether this will help in extreme cases, because primary producers will still face a deficit between what they receive at the abattoir and what it costs them to get stock to market.

Mr. Nankivell: It will only help those who live within about 100 km of Gepps Cross.

Mr. RODDA: Yes. Otherwise, stock will be slaughtered on properties. A bright spot is that, since the middle of last week, rains have fallen in several areas of the State. Falls up to 5 centimetres have been recorded in the South-East, and will give a lift to the season. The Lower South-East has received good rains, and thus a fairly strong start to pasture. If there are follow-up rains in spring, that part of the State will have a reasonable season. Much of the grain crop has not been sown, but weekend rains will allow some seeding. People in the drier areas of the State will have to think deeply about whether or not to seed this year. More than likely there will be a limited sowing and a fairly poor grain harvest this year. The harvest prospects therefore are not bright, and a good harvest is sorely needed in a primary producing State like South Australia.

In paragraph 4 of his Speech, His Excellency said that his Government would greatly step up the involvement of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department in the field of management of the State's fisheries resources by a reorganisation of the services provided by the department and the provision of more staff for both the research and regulatory functions, and also by the provision of greater research facilities. He also said that, during the next year, it was intended that further additions of staff would be made to improve the department's capacity to carry out the Government's policy in relation to fisheries management. He said that in aid of this a measure dealing with fisheries would be before Parliament in the forthcoming session.

The Agriculture and Fisheries Department is of special interest to members on this side. We are pleased to see these declarations by His Excellency and will be most interested to see what this reorganisation of services will be. If ever an industry needed research facilities, it is this industry. For some time there has been a crying need for such action by the Government. For the past three years there has been a constant clamour from this side for the appointment of a Director of Fisheries. Unfortunately, such pleas fell on the deaf ears of the then Minister, who fobbed us off with replies such as

"No-one suitable has applied. Applications for the position will be recalled." We continued our pleas for two years, and poor Mr. Olsen, in his capacity as Acting Director, carried on the work of his department and, without status, performed the onerous duties of running the department.

The industry went through a period of great frustration. The 1973-74 financial year in the fisheries industry will, when the history of the Dunstan Government is written, stand as a monument to an industry's going it alone. In 1975, a great change occurred when the Corbett report was tabled in this House. That report dealt with the restructuring of the Public Service. Everyone with an interest in the Fisheries Department was shocked to see that it rated only about four paragraphs in that report and that it was recommended that that department be amalgamated with the Environment Department. I am not saying that in a slighting way against the Minister; however, Parliament was faced with a Bill to amalgamate the Fisheries Department with the Agriculture Department. That is the present position.

Last week I heard a leading fisheries executive (I believe it was Mr. Moore from Safcol) say that he did not want to see change for the sake of change. He was referring to a proposal that a Liberal Government would set up a department to administer fisheries as a separate department. That is exactly what would happen if a Liberal Government assumed the Treasury benches. Mr. Moore wanted (and rightly so) a larger funding for research so that that research could be tied to production and the taking of fish in concert with a harvest, as that would maintain and regenerate the industry.

The name Agriculture and Fisheries Department is misleading. Primary producers are growling about the name and asking, "What have fisheries to do with agriculture?" That occurred only last week at a field day in the South-East when an announcement was made about agriculture and fisheries, and great disdain was expressed by primary producers.

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

Mr. RODDA: Great concern has been expressed by fishermen regarding some of the managed fisheries. The people who seem to be greatly concerned are the abalone fishermen. The Opposition believes that these people should be given the right to have their own advisory council to speak for their industry. Furthermore, in Government the present Opposition would tie the authority to the vessel and thereby give some security to those people who have an authority and who invest many hundreds of thousands of dollars in equipment.

The glaring case that comes to mind is that of the widow of Terry Manuel, who unfortunately lost his life in an incident with a shark. As a consequence, the widow has faced bankruptcy, and she cannot dispose of the equipment or the vessel; this is a glaring anomaly that has brought great hardship to her. Surely, the Minister must pay heed to this in the administration of his department. I hope that the Minister, in the legislation that has been foreshadowed in His Excellency's Speech, will look to some uniformity in that regard.

The honourable member who moved the motion talked about the unity of the Government. He laid severe and heavy charges on people on this side for their lack of cohesion, and generally upbraided the Opposition. Speaking of cohesion, one could not start with a better spectacle than what has happened to Sir John Kerr and Sir John Egerton.

Mr. Slater: He is not a member of the Labor Party.

Mr. RODDA: I believe he was. He was a boiler-maker's son. It is all very well for the member for Gilles not to claim him now. For some reason or other, Sir John Kerr has fallen from favour with the people on the other side.

Mr. Gunn: He's too honest for them.

Mr. Slater: Plenty of people agree with us.

Mr. RODDA: I think the honourable member would be surprised, if it came to a referendum, to hear what people think about the conditions to which Sir John Kerr has been subjected by a minority of people in this community. I was not setting out to talk about Sir John Kerr; I was talking about Sir John Egerton. He, too, has come under the lash from his colleagues for accepting an honour that was his. Despite the fact that members opposite do not pay much attention to knighthoods, Sir John Egerton has been a great Australian and a great credit to the political philosophy to which he subscribes. In some of the things he is reported in the *Australian* as saying, I notice that in speaking about some of the people who have been playing up on this side of politics he said:

They would rather sit in the centre of Collins Street and throw stones at the Governor-General than go about the job of planning the welfare of Australia.

As that came from one of the pillars of the Labor Party's own organisation, I think members opposite should sit down and take a little notice of what a most distinguished member of the Labor Party has had to say to his own people. On looking closely, one can see deep divisions in this Government.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Where?

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Where?

Mr. RODDA: The very first person to interject was the youthful and good looking Attorney-General. The rumblings on the uranium issue have brought division to the Government. The utterances of the Attorney-General in meetings to which he has spoken, reported reliably in the press, indicate that this is not his cup of tea. We know what the Attorney-General thinks about a uranium enrichment plant at Port Pirie. The same, of course, would apply to some of the things he has had to say about the Public Service. I think he referred to public servants as bureaucrats, and as recently as yesterday he was reported as having had something to say about justices of the peace in the evening of their careers.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: How is that an example of division in the Government?

Mr. RODDA: I rather detect there are many members of the Labor Party who do not like that very much. Mr. Simmons, of course—

The SPEAKER: I call the honourable member's attention to the fact it is "the Hon. Mr. Simmons"; he is a Minister.

Mr. RODDA: We find it hard to see much clamour for a uranium enrichment plant in the Hon. Mr. Simmons's make-up. The Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries (Mr. Chatterton) is, of course, very much off-side with the farmers for having referred to the superphosphate bounty as "feather bedding".

Mr. Gunn: Members opposite don't even know when they can make bread. What's wrong with them?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre is interjecting from out of his place.

Mr. RODDA: We are not very happy about what Mr. Chatterton had to say about the farmers. We know how much this Government depends on some of the country

seats that make up their number in the Government. We have been hearing things about an election that will come about when the redistribution is a fact.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You are listening to your own rumours again.

Mr. RODDA: The Government is looking longingly at a number of seats in the country areas, and the utterances of the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries did not endear the Labor Government to the electors. I think it was on the first day of the session, in June, that the Minister of Labour and Industry gave some words of wisdom to the House that we were to have compulsory unionism. It was very quickly watered down by the Premier, who said we were to have preference to unionists, which is a different kettle of fish. Of course, the Premier is particularly edgy now. Today the Premier refused to answer some questions, ruling them out of his ambit, because of the personal nature of them. I can assure the Premier and the Government that it is not the last they have heard of the question that the Premier did not answer today.

The Minister of Mines and Energy returned early from overseas. He had some time left, but for some reason or other he turned up back here when Parliament assembled. There are all sorts of rumblings about why he did this. Because he is not without ambition, he arrived back here to take his place in the House. In reply to a Question on Notice (*Hansard*, page 177), the Premier states that persons accompanying him in Malaysia were Mr. Bakewell (Permanent Head of the Premier's Department), Mr. W. L. C. Davies, Mr. Steven Wright, and Ms. Adele Koh. The Premier's reply details the work carried out by these people in Malaysia. It states where some officers went after leaving Malaysia. The reply states:

Ms. Koh, as a former journalist in Malaysia, undertook press duties and was invaluable in providing background material for the many meetings undertaken.

Mr. Davies, Mr. Holland, Mr. Wright, Mr. Dempsey and Mr. Crease went to Europe, but there is no mention of whether Ms. Koh went back to Australia or went along for the ride. Because of the \$42 000 that was spent on the overseas travel of this entourage, I assure the Premier that he will face further questioning from the Opposition on this matter. It points up the division on the Government's side.

In his contribution to the debate, the member for Florey dealt with land tax and castigated the Opposition. He said that he was concerned about the subject discussed during his visit to Mount Barker, and he said that Opposition members should seek refuge in section 12 (c) of the Land Tax Act. Of course, he was referring to hobby farms. However, newspaper reports suggest that the honourable member failed to appreciate the concern expressed by landholders at the meeting. One newspaper report of the meeting says:

One of the most savage examples of land tax increases is the case of Mr. J. L. Frame, of Burnbank, Mount Barker. The land tax on the property, which has been in the family since 1847, and is now farmed by Mr. Frame and his two sons, jumped from \$320 last year to \$4 096.

The article also says that land tax liability in another instance has increased from \$4 000 to \$18 000. The meeting referred to is the meeting that the member for Florey wrote off by suggesting that the people should take refuge in section 12 (c) of the Land Tax Act. If that is the only consolation that rural people can get from the Government, it is a pity that the responsible Minister did not go to the meeting personally to hear at first hand the problems facing people in the Adelaide Hills.

The member for Florey made some confident remarks about the next election, but he did not say when it would

take place. He said that when the Premier, Big Chief Pretty Bull, says "Go" we will go, and that the Labor Party would rip strips off the Opposition. The honourable member then accused the Leader of the Opposition of all sorts of things, and that pattern has been followed by almost every Government member in this debate. They have referred to the Leader as Ocker the knocker. The member for Price took up this matter in some detail. We have seen the pattern repeated so often in this debate that it points up the Government's concern about the able manner in which the Leader of the Opposition is leading his Party.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: We do not like to see him knocking South Australia all the time.

Mr. RODDA: He is not doing that; he is criticising the Government's policies; for example, the jabs at justices of the peace. Last February, the Leader highlighted appointments to the Housing Trust and the Savings Bank merger. This is why he gets the label of "knocker". I refer again to the remarks of the member for Florey about the next election and about Opposition members trembling in their shoes; well they might, because, as a result of the new legislation, five or six country seats will disappear. That is a shocking deal for country people, and it shows what numbers will do.

At this stage I will not canvass what was said at hearings of the Electoral Commission, because we have not yet seen the commission's report. Country members are making a sacrifice of one seat in three, as a result of this wicked legislation. When the Electoral Commission's findings are announced, it will not be all the gloss that Government members expect. When the next election comes, all the criticism of the Leader will not save the Government from the electors' wrath. The member for Florey also said that the Premier was far too cagey a gentleman to give any clue as to what he intended to do. At this stage the date of the next election is a matter for speculation, but we will be ready when the election is called. At present the Government is charged with the duty of running the State, and the Government may as well make the most of it.

One is struck by the upholstering evident in paragraph 28 of His Excellency's Speech. In paragraph 6, which has also met with a series of petitions, there is a reference to preference to unionists. Undoubtedly, we will be involved in another debate on this legislation. What was said in paragraph 7, relating to Monarto, is probably the greatest myth of the Speech. I know this from some of the people who are now living in my district and who were displaced from their properties. They left Monarto with about \$100 000 in cash and had to resettle themselves on the land. That is all they knew and, indeed, it was their life's programme. They bought into properties costing about \$200 000 and today, with inflation and low farm incomes, they are busily trying to service a debt of \$100 000. These people get fairly poor heart from what is now happening at Monarto. This is a real blow to people who were once firmly established in that area east of the Hills.

In paragraph 9 of the Speech, His Excellency referred to community school libraries. I commend the Government for including this matter in the Speech. At the same time, I remind the Minister of Education that the people at Keith have for some time been on the list for one of these community libraries, which will go into good hands when it is established at Keith.

In paragraph 10 His Excellency refers to forestry expansion. I have said before to the Government, and I say again, that there is a need for increased afforestation, and

one of the areas in which we can make practical progress is in encouraging farm lot forestry. One of the private companies involved has a plan of encouraging farm lotting on private land, whereby it will supply the pines and the expertise required for planting of and caring for pines.

There is much concern in the community about the breaking down of moral standards and the behaviour of persons to one another. Every member will have received copious letters regarding the age of consent. Petitions on the subject are flooding into this House, and it becomes clear that there is a large body of opinion against the lowering of the age of consent. The concern of the average person in the community is evident from the thoughts that have been expressed on the foreshadowed change in this area.

A couple of nights ago we heard the voice of experience of a former Stipendiary Magistrate, Mr. R. D. Elliott, who spoke out against rapists. Indeed, he raised quite a few eyebrows by what he said, of which members of Parliament should take heed. Ever since I have been a member of this Parliament (the same applies in other Parliaments) there has been a soft-shoe attitude to criminals, whereas the victim of a crime of violence has been forgotten. It is a heartening change to see a man of Mr. Elliott's eminence, and indeed others, speaking out against these criminals.

There are one or two other matters of interest affecting my district to which I should like to refer, not the least of which is the opening of the Naracoorte meatworks. This complex took its rise from the initiative of a number of local graziers in concert with several Adelaide businessmen interested in the meat industry. However, it could not have been opened at a worse time. Soon after its opening, there was down-turn in farm income and on the rural scene. At present, the works are closed. This has given rise to problems for many people who were expert in the industry and who came to it from all over the country. The Housing Trust played its part and built many houses. The biggest programme was under way when the closure occurred. Half the houses have been built and there are 25 or 30 foundations there awaiting the resumption of the programme.

This is an area that gives a balance to employment in the district and, indeed, in the South-East generally. Two companies are involved in the meatworks, one of which is a local company, the other being a firm from another State. I hope that eventually they will be given any assistance, in the form of concessions, that the Government is able to give them.

I noticed that mention was made in another place of problems being experienced at Penola. The likelihood of the closure of two industries was also referred to. However, I have had discussions with one of these enterprises and have been assured that, although it may have to rationalise some of its work, the industry will not be taking people out of the town. So, its employees will be able to continue living in Penola, which will give the town some impetus.

Schools are always important, and this subject is becoming the hardy old chestnut. The permanent structure for the Lucindale school is still on the drawing board. I mention this again to the Minister and his officers, who, I trust, will not forget that Lucindale is an expanding area and that, with the expected improvement on the rural scene, there will soon be a need for this solid construction building.

I refer also to the problems being experienced at Keith specifically relating to the required upgrading of the schoolyards and library. Mundulla is awaiting similar treatment. I refer also to youth complexes. The people of Naracoorte are grateful for what the Government did in relation to their \$150 000 complex. This is having the desirable effect of providing something for young people to do. Penola, too, has proceeded with the restructuring and refurbishing of the old civic centre. It has a youth centre that is keeping young people off the streets. The centre at Lucindale has been commenced, and Bordertown has hopes for the future.

The wine industry continues to flourish at Coonawarra and Padthaway, and vineyards are starting up at Wrattobully and Glenroy. All these developments are giving balance in the rural areas. These people look with concern at what will result from the redistribution of electoral boundaries in the South-East. We will need more luck than Jessie to be left with more than two members. I suppose everyone wonders why Jessie is so lucky: I think she may be luckier than the South-East will be when the Electoral Boundaries Commission announces what is to happen to one of the districts in the South-East.

I have been pleased to participate in the debate. I join with the member for Florey and the member for Semaphore, who moved and seconded the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, even though I cannot endorse all that they said. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. WELLS: The member for Victoria said in his speech that I had, in effect, led an attack on his Leader. That is entirely inaccurate. At no time did I refer to the Leader. The only member I identified in moving the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply was the member for Glenelg. I apologise now; it was an omission on my part earlier, but time ran out on me.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I support the motion so ably moved by the member for Florey and seconded by the member for Semaphore. The Governor's Speech has always been a delight to me since he has held his high office. One cannot but admire His Excellency's qualities and note the respect in which he is held in all parts of the State. I am sure that all members will recall His Excellency's first address when he spoke to people assembled at Government House, within an hour of returning to his own State.

I regret the passing of former members and extend my condolences to their families and friends. I knew Mr. Hogben, who was the member for Sturt, and Jim Ferguson, who was a great friend of all members and a prominent member of the Parliamentary bowling club. He served the club in many capacities and was well thought of by players from all other States. His constructive speeches will be recalled by all members.

I will now take up the question of the Liberal Party's allegations regarding a split in the State Labor Party and remind the Opposition of my Party's slogan—"Unity is strength". I assure the Opposition that such unity is evident in our ranks today. What about those Opposition members who were at one time members of the Liberal Movement? I refer to the Leader of the Opposition and the members for Hanson, Goyder, Davenport, and Glenelg. They split from their Party for a while, but they got the message and went back to the fold; there is no doubt

about that. During that period three other Opposition members flirted with the Liberal Movement, and I refer to the members for Torrens, Alexandra, and Chaffey. They knew what the consequences were and, lo and behold, they did not flirt too long before going back to the Liberal Party.

Mr. ARNOLD: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Unley has just said that I was a member of the L.M. I should like to refute that statement, because I have never been a member of the L.M.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member for Unley said "flirted". I do not think that he said that the honourable member was a member of the L.M.

Mr. Arnold: He implied that I was a member.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member used the word "flirted". The honourable member for Unley.

Mr. LANGLEY: I now take it that Opposition members are a unified Party, but it seems unlikely to me that they have no differences after going through the stage to which I have referred. I assure the Opposition that the Government Party is in no way split. Even in the Federal sphere one hears from week to week that Government Ministers have had differences of opinion; this has just happened over the question of sport. They are not too proud to go to the press, whereas we meet as a Party and the majority rules, "Unity is strength", and I can tell the Opposition that we are a strong Party. Whatever can be said about the Labor Party in other States, I assure the Opposition that we are strong fellows who will stick together.

Mr. Dean Brown: You're told how to vote, aren't you?

Mr. LANGLEY: If the honourable member's Party worked as well as my Party, he would be better off for it. The member for Hanson had strong misgivings about my Party. He commented on the cost of water and on the cost differential involved in water supplied in the city and in the country, but at no time did he suggest how this problem could be solved. The Government has held many inquiries into the best way in which the problem could be solved, but at no stage could it come forward with a plan that suited everyone. The member for Hanson did not mention pensioner concessions for water rates and land tax (a move at no time made by the Opposition when in Government for 25 years), nor did he refer to pensioner concessions on council rates. He gave a one-sided argument. He did not tell us how council rates were imposed, nor did he state that this Government gives concessions to pensioners.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LANGLEY: The Opposition, when in Government, had the opportunity to grant pensioner concessions. Many Opposition members have continually expressed their dislike of unions, because they think there is something wrong with them. However, sometimes they ask Government members to use their good offices to prevent or break a strike.

Dr. Tonkin: They never take any notice.

Mr. LANGLEY: The Premier has solved many problems by going to Trades Hall. The Opposition does not understand union affairs, yet most Opposition members would at some stage have joined some organisation. Members opposite have hoped to get a benefit from such an organisation, too. I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition is a member of an organisation, but I am sure he is a member of some organisation. Perhaps some members opposite are members of a farmers and graziers organisation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LANGLEY: Members opposite would certainly want benefits for joining organisations. I was a member of a union and abided by union rules. Nothing stops an employer, either, from being a member of a trade union. I was a member of a trade union when I was an employer because I agree with what trade unions stand for. As a member of a trade union I always expected something in return. If a person is not a member of a trade union he should not reap benefits won by trade unions. The Leader of the Opposition knows as well as I do that in Western Australia, under certain legislation, if a person is not a member of a union he does not receive any benefits won by that union.

If members opposite could convince me that they joined organisations or trade unions without expecting a benefit, I would be extremely surprised. I am not arguing about the Labor Party or the Liberal Party, although they are both organisations. Anyway, we all join those to reap a benefit if we possibly can. The press in this country is reasonably powerful. One reads in the papers about the different wings of the Labor Party—the right wing and the left wing, but there does not seem to be a centre. I have been in those positions in another sphere, where I played centre, and left and right wings. The press is abusing its right by trying to put words in people's mouths. In the past we have heard about collusion. Next I suppose it will be "flankers" and "centres". I have heard much condemnation by people in my district of the Federal Government.

Dr. Tonkin: Mr. Fraser has a tremendous interest in your district, as he is the No. 1 ticket holder in the Sturt Football Club.

Mr. LANGLEY: I did not do anything about that. He is followed by Mr. McLeay, Senator Jessop, and the Leader of the Opposition in this State, and the member for Mitcham and I run stone motherless last. I am not perturbed about the situation and still barrack for Sturt.

Dr. Tonkin: You were a good player.

Mr. LANGLEY: Thank you for the compliment.

Dr. Tonkin: You were one of the finest wicketkeepers this country has ever had.

Mr. LANGLEY: The Leader of the Opposition is really trying to say that I played football, too.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr. LANGLEY: Mr. Fraser has said that the coalition Government will preserve the real value of pensions. The number of people who come into my electorate office (and I am sure each member was pleased to be provided with such an office by the Government of the day) concerning matters of pensions is large. I have many pensioners in my area who were rather disturbed that they did not receive a pension rise on time. The total pension increase around Australia would have amounted to only about \$25 000 000. That is not a big sum, but these people look for their pensions. What they receive is not a pittance; it used to be, but the situation has improved. Today, pensioners expect their cheques to arrive on time.

It must be remembered that the pensioners of today were the people who made this country what it is. They lived in times that were harder than they are today, when wages were much lower and when they would not buy a commodity, such as a washing machine, unless they had sufficient money to do so. Times have changed

for the better. All members would be experiencing in their districts people's confusion about Medibank. If any honourable member can explain to me what is the position I should like him to do so. I do not understand it, and I am sure that people around the country do not understand it, either. The current suggested change is the present Government's second or third attempt to convince the public that the system will be good for them. I am sure that the people of this country will soon reject the present Federal Government. I hope that Government will govern for its three years and that, during that time, it will lose the support of the Australian people. I support the motion.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I am pleased to have the opportunity to support the motion. I extend to the families of Jim Ferguson, Mr. Hogben and Mr. MacGillivray my sincere sympathy. When I entered this House in 1968, I was privileged to sit behind Mr. Ferguson, who encouraged and benefited me greatly in my early days in the House. As all members have said, his passing is a sad loss to South Australia. I did not have the privilege of knowing Mr. Hogben, but undoubtedly, judging by the remarks that have been made by various members, his services to this Parliament were appreciated. I make particular mention of Mr. William MacGillivray, who was the member for Chaffey for about 18 years. I may, without any doubt, that Mr. MacGillivray had the greatest influence on my life with regard to my interest in politics, and his interest and encouragement in my early days played an important part in the fact that I eventually offered myself for election to this Parliament.

I move on to some of the important matters that have been raised in the Speech. This was His Excellency's final Speech, as he has almost completed his term of Governor of South Australia. I, too, compliment him on the excellent manner in which he has carried out his duties in this State. I believe he has been a credit to the State.

Probably one of the most important problems facing South Australia at the moment is the dry season. No matter where we go in South Australia the same problem exists. Outside South Australia, in Western Australia, Victoria, New South Wales, and even Tasmania, the same problem exists at this time. That leads me to the vital importance of water resources and the importance of the Murray system to the livelihood of South Australia.

I was interested to note that a week or so ago the Minister of Works announced his appointments to the Water Resources Council under the new Water Resources Act. I was delighted to see that Mr. Rex Coates of Waikerie was appointed to that council. He is Chairman of Golden Heights Irrigation Settlement, and also, Chairman of the Waikerie Co-operative Packing Company, the largest packer of citrus fruit in Australia. Undoubtedly, his vast knowledge in the management field, and also in the field of irrigation programmes, will be of enormous benefit to the council.

However, I am completely and utterly astounded that the Minister saw fit to exclude from appointments to the council Mr. Jack Seekamp, who would be undoubtedly recognised throughout South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales as the leading authority on Murray River salinity. He is conspicuous by his absence from this council. I give notice that I intend to move to amend the Water Resources Act to provide for a specialist in the field of Murray River salinity; this would mean an increase of one member on the Water Resources Council. I think the reason why Mr. Seekamp was excluded from

the council is very evident. He has such a vast knowledge on this subject that he could be a source of embarrassment to the Minister if the Government did not implement many of the recommendations that he would put forward as a member of this council.

Dr Tonkin: That's not in the best interests of South Australia, is it?

Mr. ARNOLD: Certainly not, and there is no doubt that we are heading into a period of drought. If one looks back through history in Australia, one has every reason to believe that there is a cycle of wet seasons and droughts and that the Murray River and its tributaries work in a very similar manner. We have had, in recent years, a series of very large flows in the Murray system. I do not wish to be a prophet of doom, but I am quite sure that we must, on the law of averages, be heading into a series of low flows in the Murray River system.

This means that South Australia's water supply is in real jeopardy. The exclusion of Mr. Seekamp from this council at this stage is of enormous concern to me. If we are heading into a period of prolonged drought, the problem of high salinity levels in the Murray River will be acute. The Government must then face the responsibility of having deferred the construction of the Dartmouth storage dam for two years to make a political gain. I hope what I forecast does not happen, but I have a nasty feeling that it will, and the Government will stand condemned in the eyes of all South Australians if we suffer as a result of high salinity and low flows in the Murray River.

I am quite sure that we must face this problem before long. The Government has been fortunate in getting away with it for as long as it has. The deferment of the construction of the Dartmouth storage was purely a political move that enabled the present Premier of this State to gain office in 1970. He could shortly reap the rewards of the move he made at that time. The effects on South Australia could be enormous. In South Australia, the horticultural industries are largely dependent on good quality water in the Murray River. There is also a problem that exists along the Murray River with regard to irrigation from anabranches. As river flows decrease and the salinity of the main flow of the Murray increases, the problem within the anabranches becomes even worse.

I refer again to the problem of Ral Ral Creek. The Chaffey irrigation area, which is a Lands Department settlement, and the Cultong division totally depend on the waters taken from the anabranch, which is Ral Ral Creek. Although works have been undertaken by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in recent times, I am convinced that in a period of low flow in the Murray River that the engineering works that have taken place on Ral Ral Creek will prove to be a complete disaster for the two settlements I have mentioned. The only one practical alternative, is to cut a canal from Ral Ral Creek through to the Renmark reservoir and out below Lock 5; this will create a flow out through Ral Ral Creek.

At the moment the department has built an embankment across Ral Ral Creek which will collect all the salinity and which will be a complete disaster for the two irrigation areas that I have mentioned, so the Government faces a real problem and responsibility in this sphere. Unless the Government is prepared to act quickly in respect of Ral Ral Creek, we could be faced with enormous damage to permanent plantings in that area. I have made a point in this House that the salinity level in Ral Ral Creek has reached as high as 56 000 e.c. units, which is beyond the realms of possibility as far as

irrigation is concerned; so, unless the Government acts quickly in this field and acts before this summer, I assure the House that it will be hearing much more of the problems of Ral Ral Creek and the irrigation settlements at Cooltong and Chaffey.

Before referring to the Lands Department, concerning which there are several matters I wish to raise, I refer briefly to a question placed on the Notice Paper by the member for Eyre last week; it was answered today by the Minister of Works. The first part of the question was:

When did the Government receive the Gutteridge report on salinity in the Murray River Valley and what action has been taken to control salinity within the Murray River since the tabling of this report?

The reply given today was:

The report was received in 1970.

That was some six years ago. The reply continued:

All schemes for salinity control work, as proposed by the consultants for the mitigation of salinity problems in South Australia, have been the subject of further investigation as clearly recommended in the report.

I agree it was recommended that further investigations be carried out, but surely the further investigations will not take six years, which is precisely what it has taken so far. As a consequence, approval was given for the construction of first-stage works at Lake Victoria, which has increased the intake and output of Lake Victoria, and at the Renmark reservoir, both of which projects are substantially completed; but they are two minor undertakings, to all intents and purposes, and while not completed so far, it has taken the Government some six years to get around to them. If we are faced with a serious drought period, starting from now and continuing for the next two or three years, the State Government certainly stands condemned for its lack of activity, because it received the Gutteridge report in 1970 and so far virtually no action has been taken. When we consider that the Murray River can supply anything up to 80 per cent of South Australia's total water needs, it is little short of criminal.

I now refer to the Lands Department. Late last week, I directed a question to the Deputy Premier, representing the Minister of Lands, about the provision of adequate housing and industrial sites in the Lands Department irrigation areas along the Murray River. In reply, the Minister said he was surprised at my question, that he did not realise that this was the situation. I sincerely hope that, once the Minister has discovered that this is really the situation, the Government will hand over the development of land for housing and industrial use to either the private sector or the South Australian Land Commission. Either would be better than the present situation. I have referred to the subdivision of land for housing. I now refer to the overall situation along the Murray River as far as the fruit industry is concerned. There are some areas in which the Government could be of considerable assistance to the fruit industry in its present plight.

Dr. Tonkin: Do you think it is really interested, though?

Mr. ARNOLD: Whether or not it is interested will be proved shortly, because I have a notice of motion on the Notice Paper for the provision of a decentralised industry pay-roll tax rebate measure, which should be implemented in South Australia as a real incentive to decentralise industries and also to assist decentralised industries now in trouble—the canning fruit, the citrus, and the wine industries.

There are also other areas in which the Government can assist, if it is genuine in what it is saying. I have mentioned pay-roll tax. There are also irrigation charges,

land rental, and freight concessions. Last week, the Minister for Primary Industry visited the Riverland to meet with fruitgrowers to discuss their problems and to meet with industry leaders to try to resolve many of those problems at management level; that is in the Federal sphere. The Federal Government has already acted in relation to the citrus industry. It has agreed to restrictions on the imports of juice concentrates, which I believe will solve the problems to a great degree for the citrus industry. However, the canning fruit industry is a far more complex problem than is the citrus industry.

The citrus industry has a shortfall in production in Australia of some 40 000 tonnes of citrus products annually. Consequently, we have to import about that much to meet the requirements of the Australian public. Unfortunately, with no restrictions on imports, close on 60 000 tonnes of citrus products was imported into this country during the past 12 months. Since many of these citrus products are coming from low-cost structure countries, they can land those products in Australia at considerably below the production cost of the Australian product: 16c a litre on juice concentrate compared to a cost of production in Australia of about 24c a litre for a similar product. The Federal Government's action in restricting the imports of juice concentrates will now enable the Australian citrus crop to be processed and absorbed on the Australian market.

The canning fruit industry is a totally different problem. Once again, it is a very labour-intensive industry, and in the past we used to export a high percentage of its products to Europe. Since the entry of Britain into the European Common Market, it has been very difficult to penetrate that market and, further, costs have soared to such a degree in Australia during the period of the Whitlam Government that the cost of production is out of all proportion. Today the average wage in Australia is about \$35 above the average wage in the United States of America. This indicates the problems Australia faces in labour-intensive industries and in trying to compete with its exports on the world market. It is virtually impossible to compete, and the problems of the canned fruit industry are obviously different from those facing the citrus industry.

Mr. WOTTON: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. ARNOLD: I have referred to the problems of the canned fruit industry and the fact that it is a labour-intensive industry dependent on exporting much of its production. More unfortunate is the fact that about 80 per cent of South Australian canned fruit used to be exported, and this has emphasised the problem in South Australia. As I have stated, the State Government can assist in several ways.

The Commonwealth Government can assist by providing finance and assisting in the rationalism of canneries, whereas the State Government can assist considerably by implementing the same system as that existing in Victoria, that is, by enacting provisions similar to those in the Decentralised Industry Incentive Payments Act. Currently, the South Australian Government is extracting from fruitgrowers in the Riverland area about \$1 000 000 annually. A charge of about \$6 a tonne is paid to the Government as pay-roll tax on fruit delivered to the Riverland cannery.

Mr. Nankivell: It is an iniquitous tax.

Mr. ARNOLD: Yes, inasmuch as it is a tax on trading and productivity and not a tax on profitability.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You should be complaining about what all the fruitgrowers up there are complaining about.

Mr. ARNOLD: That is right. That is the point I am making. I am glad that the honourable member recognises this and will support the motion seeking to establish a rebate.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: The growers are protesting about the Federal Government. You should be supporting the growers and not trying to shift the blame elsewhere.

Mr. ARNOLD: Growers support wholeheartedly the introduction of pay-roll tax rebate legislation. The honourable member will soon be hearing much more from South Australian fruitgrowers on this subject. Pay-roll tax paid to the South Australian Government amounts to about \$6 a tonne. If a grower delivers about 200 tonnes of peaches to the Riverland cannery, pay-roll tax extracted from his payments amounts to about \$1 200. Many Riverland growers pay more to the South Australian Government in pay-roll tax than they pay to the Commonwealth Government in income tax.

Mr. WOTTON: Mr. Speaker, I again draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. ARNOLD: Having largely covered the matter of pay-roll tax, I now refer to irrigation charges. The State Government's increase in irrigation charges can be most clearly illustrated by the comments made in the following letter from a constituent dated July 20, 1976:

We would like to bring to your attention the latest increase in water rates for fruitgrowers in the Berri Irrigation Area. In 1975-76 the Lands Department introduced a new watering system. At that stage water entitlement was based on 37 hours/hectare for a 2-cusec stream, this being charged at \$2.10 an hour, and any extra at \$2.50 an hour. As we have 9.1 ha our entitlement was 333 hours, which cost \$699.30. Water over the entitlement amounted to about 40 hours at \$2.50. This was \$90, bringing the total to \$789.30.

The department has just notified us that it will increase the rate to \$2.35 and \$2.80 respectively. This alone is an increase of 12 per cent. But it has also decreased our entitlement to 30 hours/ha, a decrease of approximately 20 per cent or, in our case, 60 hours. If we are to use the same amount of water as previously, our new entitlement of 273 hours will cost \$639.50 plus 60 hours extra (to make up for the lost entitlement), and 100 hours at \$2.80 making an extra cost of \$280, bringing the final cost to \$919.55, which is an increase of 16½ per cent on 1975-76.

We currently have an effective increase in water rates in Lands Department irrigation areas of about 16½ per cent. This increase comes at a time when the average return, whether it be for canned fruit, wine grapes or citrus, has declined. First, pay-roll tax is costing the average grower \$6 a tonne of fruit delivered to the Riverland cannery; secondly, increased water rates amount to 16½ per cent; and, thirdly, I refer to increases in land rentals as the result of transfers of property. The first example is the case of an application to subdivide section 256, hundred of Cadell, in a family transaction to enable a son and daughter-in-law to take a transfer of land which they had developed at their own expense and which was considered a viable area. The Crown rental of \$5.81 per annum on perpetual lease No. 7824 was increased to \$520, under section 206 of the Crown Lands Act. That is another small example of the increase that the present Government has imposed on landholders and primary producers. It represents an increase of about 10 300 per cent, which is considerable, even for the Labor Government.

I could cite many other examples and they add to the whole sorry state of affairs. It is a matter of whether or not the Government is genuine when it says it is concerned about the plight of the fruit industry. Pay-roll tax, irrigation charges, and land rentals are matters in

which the State Government can alleviate the position of the fruit industry and try to put some profitability back into it.

My other comments in relation to the Government as it imposes its policies through the Lands Department concern increases in land rentals. A pensioner, aged more than 80 years, recently brought to my office a statement that he had received from the Government. Previously he paid a rental of \$12 a year on a shack site which is his only home and which is part of the Cobdogla evaporation basin. He has been told that the rental now will be \$50, which is another mammoth increase in comparison with the figure that applied 12 months previously.

Last week I referred to national parks and wildlife management and I spoke of the purchase of firearms. I agreed with the member for Playford then that there should be restrictions on the availability of firearms, with either a cooling-off period or a provision that persons wishing to buy them at least provided some identification or proof that they were members of a sporting organisation involved in shooting. I hope that amendments will be introduced soon in regard to that matter.

I also stated at that time that there were anomalies in the National Parks and Wildlife Act, which was introduced largely to give ease of management. It provided far-reaching powers that have now become apparent and, as I said, the most obvious one was the power of an officer to confiscate a firearm, which was then held by the department in Adelaide. I said that there was doubt about the condition in which the firearm was maintained. The Act provides penalties and only one authority, the court, should impose those penalties. The value of firearms can vary from \$50 to \$2 000, and there is no justification for a penalty in addition to that imposed by the court.

The authority for handing back the firearm is with the Minister completely, and there is no justice in this type of legislation. If the court confiscates the firearm because it considers that the person is not a fit and proper person to own it, well and good. I have no objection to that, and that is for the court to decide, but it is not justice as we know it in this country for the Minister to make such a decision on hearsay or unproven evidence, even though that evidence may have been provided in good faith by officers. The Act should be amended as soon as possible so that the power is in the hands of only the court. A valuable firearm may have been handed down through generations, and it is unjust to have a family heirloom confiscated for a minor offence under the Act.

Dr. Eastick: Do you think they're exercising too much power?

Mr. ARNOLD: That is excessive and dictatorial power and no Minister has the time to delve into each case to find out whether a firearm should be returned.

Dr. Eastick: Do you think it's bureaucracy at its worst?

Mr. ARNOLD: I believe so. An officer of the department or a police officer should be required to obtain the serial number, calibre, and make of the firearm if he believes that a person has committed an offence under the Act. This would provide necessary information for the court, and the court could confiscate the firearm if it deemed that necessary. Unfortunately, many firearms have been confiscated compulsorily. I believe that the department has many of them at present, and the owners will probably never see them again. Ultimately they may be auctioned or disposed of as surplus requirements. If no real offence has been committed, this is a tragedy, because in many instances firearms are family heirlooms.

Because of a minor offence against the National Parks and Wildlife Act, a person may face a penalty of more than \$2 000.

Mr. Nankivell: In rural areas, firearms are often essential in the control of vermin, to protect crops.

Mr. ARNOLD: Yes. To have a firearm confiscated in such circumstances can be an added burden on the primary producer because, in addition to the fine, he faces the confiscation of the gun and the loss of some of his crop through the ravages of vermin. I am interested in seeing justice done. I stress that I have no desire to see irresponsible people running around with firearms, but the court and the court alone must make the decision—certainly not the Minister.

I turn now to a situation that has developed in Berri involving the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the requirements of the State Planning Authority. The Engineering and Water Supply Department recently embarked on the rehabilitation of the irrigation distribution system in the Berri irrigation area. To carry out that work, the department had to establish a depot and a camp site, and also a residence for its engineer. The department has placed a transportable house on an allotment in Dennis Street, Berri. There are strict regulations under the Planning and Development Act in relation to the type of dwelling that can be placed in a certain area, the value of the dwelling, etc. I have received a petition, signed by all the house owners in Dennis Street, protesting about the department's placing this transportable house on the allotment. Under the Planning and Development Act, all the residents have been required to build houses of a certain standard in Dennis Street, whereas the transportable house is, to all intents and purposes, a substandard dwelling. The petition states:

Petition against the erection of third-hand Engineering and Water Supply Department house in Dennis Street, Berri.

We the undersigned object to the erection of this substandard house and demand that the council do all in their power to stop it immediately. The following are our main objections:

1. It will devalue our life savings, which have been invested in our homes.
2. No paint or trees will bring this up to the standard of the houses in this street.
3. Why are we compelled to use new material when the Engineering and Water Supply Department can use third-hand material?
4. We have had to comply with the Lands Department standards, as stated in "Agreement to Purchase".
5. Will the council lower our council rates if this building is allowed?
6. Alternative suggestion is that the Lands Department purchase a new transportable home (1976 model, not 1900) and sell it at the completion of their work in the area.

As the petition indicates, the house has already been sited in two other areas of the State. Any Government department can erect a substandard dwelling, yet the Government demands certain standards from the public. It is ironical that the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department is also a member of the State Planning Authority, which stipulates the standards of dwellings and allotments in South Australia. It is certainly an incredible situation. I believe that the house should be removed and that the Government should erect for its engineer a dwelling of acceptable standard and comparable to other dwellings in the street, as demanded by the regulations. There is absolutely no chance of the Government's losing money on the dwelling, because there is an enormous waiting list of people wanting houses in the Riverland.

There is an 18-month waiting list of people wanting to get a housing block, under the situation existing in Lands Department irrigation areas. So, the Government has absolutely no excuse for depositing a substandard dwelling in Dennis Street. Not only is there a strong demand for housing allotments and houses but also any person in the area is very fortunate if he can acquire a house from the Housing Trust in less than three years. Only two months or three months ago the Minister in charge of housing said that the average waiting period for a house from the Housing Trust was between 12 months and 18 months. I only wish that that was the situation in the Riverland, because many people contact me about their applications, many of which have been in for between 2½ years and three years. So, there is no risk of the Government's losing money by erecting a satisfactory dwelling in Dennis Street, Berri: the Government can only make money on it.

I turn now to the question of purchasing national parks in South Australia. Although I did so last week, I make particular reference to the purchase of Hyperna and Canopus stations in the North-East of the State. Now that the Government has acquired the two stations, I trust that it will have the resources and manpower to enable it adequately to care for this country. The problem is that, if there is insufficient manpower, in the event of a fire outbreak the properties will be totally dependent on surrounding landholders and stations for protection.

This is not a fair go for the surrounding landholders, and it is essential that the National Parks and Wildlife Division retain sufficient fire-fighting equipment on the properties to enable it to handle any fire outbreak. It is also essential that it have sufficient manpower (at present I believe there is only one permanent ranger to look after the two properties) not only to contend with the possibility of fire outbreaks but also to maintain fencing and dams on the properties. After all, these will not be conservation parks for long unless an adequate water supply is maintained on the property. An adequate water supply is needed, and fencing must be maintained, as must the district's fire fighting ability.

However, I question the Minister's wisdom in purchasing Nullarbor Station at this stage. The lease of that station, which is on Eyre Peninsula, has only six or seven years to run, after which it will revert to the Crown. The department purchased the station for about \$40 000, which was taken from the Wildlife Conservation Fund. I question the Government's wisdom in doing this. I think it is \$40 000 virtually wasted, as after five or six years the property will revert to the Crown. I do not believe that the property will deteriorate in any way in the next five or six years, or that any damage will be done to it that has not already been done. That is \$40 000 that could have been spent on fencing and on controlling noxious weeds and vermin in existing conservation parks. This is an important area because, unless the division has the resources and manpower to enable it adequately to control noxious weeds and vermin, and to maintain water supplies and ensure that adequate food is provided for wildlife, there is absolutely no way in which wildlife can be maintained within the reserve.

I made the point last week that it was totally unfair on surrounding agriculturists to have conservation parks in their area if the department did not effectively manage them. If they are used as a refuge for wildlife during the day only, and at night that wildlife comes out and feeds on neighbouring farmers' properties, the division will always be at loggerheads with agriculturists.

National parks and wildlife management is very much a public relations exercise. The officers of the division should be involved more in wildlife management and should spend less time acting as a law enforcement agency. If this happened, we would start making headway in wildlife management in this State. I have much pleasure in adding my support to the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. HARRISON (Albert Park): In supporting the motion, I, too, sincerely express my deep sympathy to the families of deceased members who have served in the House of Assembly, as referred to in His Excellency's Speech. I also congratulate His Excellency the Governor, Sir Mark Oliphant, and Lady Oliphant, on a job well done, and wish them both well in their retirement. South Australia has indeed been fortunate to have such distinguished persons as representatives of Her Majesty the Queen.

I also congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion on a job well done, and I support fully all that has been said by Government members. I do not intend to repeat what has already been said by members other than to congratulate the member for Spence on his contribution in clarifying, for the benefit of Opposition members, the matters of union membership and closed shop agreements. Perhaps now may be an opportune time for me to reflect on the benefits derived by South Australians from legislation introduced recently by this Government, argued against by the Opposition, but subsequently passed and assented to. At random, I chose the few I will now mention.

Dr. Eastick: I bet it excludes workmen's compensation.

Mr. Coumbe: You mean selected ones.

Mr. HARRISON: The honourable member will see. He should wait just a moment. First, I refer to the Brighton to Christie Downs Railway Duplication and Extension Act. What a great benefit this is to the areas so served. It is indeed gratifying to see the support being given to the scheme by the people who are being served by it. One of the major points in implementing any public transport service is whether or not the service will get the support of the people in the area it will serve. It is indeed gratifying to see from the report recently tabled in the House by the Minister of Transport the support given by the people in the area and the appreciation they have shown.

Dr. Eastick: Who initiated the project?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARRISON: The other matter I chose at random related to the Bill that repealed the Building Societies Act, 1881-1968. The former Act did not give societies the power to control monetary policies, so that the problems of fluctuating interest rates and those associated with an inflationary economy and shortage of liquid funds could be resolved. Therefore, the legislation affords protection to the investing public and the borrower.

Members saw what happened when the Premier had to go out into the streets and appeal to the public in relation to the Hindmarsh Building Society. The Premier should be commended on the action he then took, when he staved off what could have been a real problem, not only for the Hindmarsh Building Society but also for other building societies in this State. We saw previously that it had happened in Queensland. If members care to look, they will see that is so. However, it seemed to flow to this State. I think there may have been an undercurrent. The Premier had enough guts to go out and tell the people what

would happen, and he said that he would introduce the necessary legislation. The Opposition is prone to forget that, and to argue against it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARRISON: The next matter I took at random was the Constitution Act Amendment Act (No. 5), which provides for the redistribution of House of Assembly districts with as nearly as practicable an equal number of votes but with a tolerance from an electoral quota of 10 per cent either way. Provision is also made for a permanent Electoral Boundaries Commission consisting of a judge of the Supreme Court, the Electoral Commissioner, and the Surveyor-General, who will be charged with the responsibility of carrying out periodic redistributions. The redistributions they determine in accordance with the provisions of the Act will take effect without intervention by Parliament; that is how democratic it is. This proposal will be entrenched in the Constitution, which means that it may not be amended without a referendum of citizens supporting the amendment. Members are fully aware that the commission's first determination is to be made soon, and members of the Opposition and the Government alike are anxiously waiting to see what that determination is.

Workers in the building industry have for many years suffered under an anomaly because many of them were casually employed, thereby losing certain benefits. The Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act provides for a scheme of long service leave for casual workers in the building industry, and such a scheme is long overdue. The Act also establishes a fund whereby employers in the industry are required to pay a percentage of total wages paid to casual employees, and that is no more than is done for permanent employees in other industries. On accumulation of 10 years service in the industry, a worker will be entitled to payment for three months long service leave (and that is no more than he is entitled to). Provision is included for service prior to the commencement of the Act to be included. I agreed with that provision, and I had been arguing to have it introduced so that retrospectivity would be granted. The Act provides entitlements similar to those of more permanent employees under the provisions of the Long Service Leave Act, wherever practicable. All that they are entitled to obtain is what everyone permanently employed in industry is entitled to.

Mr. Venning: Have you ever run a business?

Mr. HARRISON: Yes, and it was one of the biggest unions in the State. The Public Finance (Special Provisions) Act provides that, should there be a reduction in the flow of Commonwealth Government funds to State Government activity, employment dependent on or related to the availability of those funds will, within the limits of available resources, not be adversely affected. The Act provides that the Treasurer will be authorised to make good from available resources any shortfall in Commonwealth funds (and we have them) and, if necessary, to borrow moneys for this purpose. Commenting on this foresight of the Government, I point out that the legislation was assented to in 1975. We had the crystal ball on the Fraser Government, and it was to the State's benefit that we did, because the Treasurer has the opportunity to borrow money under certain conditions.

Another matter taken at random is the introduction of Acts whereby (and this is important, particularly to the rural areas, which benefit by it) the transfer of properties, rights, and powers, duties and liabilities under the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act, Municipal Tramways Trust Act, and the State Transport Control Board

were transferred to the State Transport Authority. No more commonsense approach could have been taken than to have every facet of public transport placed under the one authority, which I consider is bringing great benefits to the travelling public of South Australia, whether in the country or in the city.

I also bring to the attention of the House my appreciation of the departmental officers under the control of the various Ministers. Together with other members, I have many times had to seek information or action; this has always been readily available and has been much appreciated by my constituents. I give credit where credit is due. Even though we have passed certain legislation, I sometimes find that it is not being carried out in the manner intended. The greatest offenders in breaking down our legislation are the major industries.

Mr. Venning: You would fix all industries, wouldn't you?

Mr. HARRISON: Yes, large or small. I am talking about the position in my district and, if the honourable member has problems in his district, he should deal with them himself. I am now talking about the large and small industries in my district which have flouted the provisions of certain environmental legislation. I have drawn the attention of the Minister of Health to this problem, and he sent down his departmental officers to take noise readings. These readings were taken for 24 hours of the day on each shift in four factories involved in my area. It was proved by tests made by competent people that some industries were definitely flouting laws regarding noise pollution, smell and other factors. In fact, factories were flouting the law to such an extent that they were given a certain time in which to solve the problem. It cost, in one instance, tens of thousands of dollars to solve the problem. The member for Gouger can grin. He is a member of local government and knows the laws that tier of Government imposes. I thank the Ministers and their departmental officers for the help they have given me regarding problems raised by my constituents.

If members opposite are dinkum they will admit that, if they have had similar problems, they have taken up those problems, if justified, and have been given all possible help. I hope sincerely that cognisance will be taken of the legislation outlined in the Governor's Speech, because it was outlined with the full intention of being implemented wherever possible.

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): I support the motion so vigorously moved by the member for Florey. This is the first opportunity I have had to speak in this place, other than at Question Time, as a member of the Liberal Party. I came into this House on June 8, 1974, as a member of the Liberal Movement. On July 12, 1975, I was re-elected as a member of the Liberal Movement. Subsequent to those occasions, I have watched the revitalisation of the Liberal Party that the formation of the Liberal Movement has effected, and I have listened to the representations of my constituents about the good sense of promoting a united Opposition in this place to bring about the defeat of the Government.

It will be recalled that, on the occasion of the Premier's pleading for your return to the fold, Sir, from a somewhat similar position to mine, and on the occasion of the vote that brought about your return to the Australian Labor Party, the Premier greatly emphasised the fact that the Liberal Party was the strongest it had been for years. In some measure that is a result of the merger of the Liberal

Movement and the Liberal Party. I have added one to the number of Liberal Party members in this place, and the Hon. Martin Cameron and the Hon. John Carnie have added to the strength of the Liberal Party in another place. I am therefore pleased to speak in this debate as a member of the Liberal Party and to support the motion.

I, too, add my condolences to the families of those to whom His Excellency referred in the opening remarks of his Speech. I have heard from members of this place that Mr. Horace Hogben had much influence in the early days of the South Australian Housing Trust. Sir Thomas Playford has paid tribute to the work that Mr. Hogben did in establishing the trust. Mr. Hogben was not known to me personally, but I am sure his family would be content in the knowledge that he was a great South Australian.

Similarly, Mr. MacGillivray was not known to me. I am sure he took his place effectively in this Chamber, too. In speaking to Jim Ferguson's memory I can speak with far greater knowledge than I could about the other two gentlemen. Jim Ferguson was my friend for many years and represented for about 10 years the district that I now represent. At the time of his death I spoke in appreciation of his life and work in this place. What I did not say is that, although Jim Ferguson retired from active politics when he left this House, he did not totally retire, but returned to his home at Weetulta and became actively involved in every activity for the good of his community, and indeed for the wider community.

Until the time of his death he was Chairman of the committee to establish the Maitland retirement village, and gave untiringly of his time towards that cause. It is pleasing to note that recently the Hon. C. R. Kelly announced that funds were to be made available so that that project could continue. It will be a fitting memorial, if not in name in effect, to the work that Jim Ferguson did for that project and for the Maitland and wider community of Yorke Peninsula.

I, too, pay tribute to the work of Sir Mark Oliphant in this State. Sir Mark has made more relevant the Vice-Regal position in South Australia. He has been willing, and has even dared to speak out on matters which concern him and which in his view—

Mr. Slater: Do you think he is better than Sir John Kerr?

Mr. BOUNDY: They are both very fine fellows. Sir Mark has spoken out on issues which, in his view, are of interest to the State. He has added lustre to the office of Governor in South Australia. I join with other members who have expressed the hope that both he and Lady Oliphant, his gracious lady, will continue to enjoy themselves at the place they desire and in the fields they enjoy.

I have been in this place only a short time, but on the occasions I have listened to His Excellency's Speeches, it has always interested me that, at the beginning of his Speeches, he refers to agriculture. I would not give the Government credit for recognising that agriculture is the most important industry in this State, but I am sure that His Excellency knows that it is the most important industry. His Excellency's Speech indicates the concern that we all feel for the present agricultural situation that has resulted from drought.

It is now some weeks since that Speech was made and the situation has not altered much for the better. Only isolated pockets have seen anything like adequate rainfall. The position is getting worse, and every day without rain exacerbates the problem. It is pleasing to see that the

Government, in some measure, has recognised the obvious plight of at least some sections of the rural community and has declared areas as drought affected. I suggest that the Government could do far better than declare drought areas. I believe the whole State should be declared an area of concern, with regard to agriculture and seasonal conditions.

I am lucky enough to live in an area reasonably well favoured; we do score the occasional coastal shower. On my farm, our situation cannot be considered desperate. The whole of Yorke Peninsula is not a declared drought area. I think that that would be reasonable enough, but even in that favoured district I have been approached by constituents who are in bother. There are pockets in every district that suffer shortage of rainfall. One constituent in the south Kilkerran area, which is otherwise all right as far as I know, rang to say he had to destroy 300 sheep. He asked whether there was any relief for him. Another constituent at Warooka had to send 100 breeders off to agistment. His problem was that it would cost him \$15 to get them to the Broken Hill area, \$15 to get them back again, and about \$20 to keep them there to retain the nucleus of his herd.

We are not a declared drought area and receive no help by way of freight, or freight on fodder. Farmers in my area are out on a limb, and that is why I believe that the Government should recognise that this problem should be considered on a merit basis in every district. All farmers affected could readily prove that they deserve assistance. I am sure that the gentleman who is faced with the decision of spending \$40 a head to get his cattle to market and so retain them is a very worried man indeed, because in economic terms at present it is the wrong decision. After we come through this situation, what price may he have to pay for replacement stock then?

Mr. Venning: Do you really think the Government of South Australia has done all it can do?

Mr. BOUNDY: No. I was pleased to read recently that Samcor has instituted a scheme whereby producers could send their bare-shorn stock down to the meatmeal plant, have it rendered down and be compensated some 40 cents a head. I think it is relevant to point out that Samcor is paying the producers 40 cents a head for this service, and not the Government, as has been stated in the press on at least one occasion. Samcor is offering the producers this small compensation, and it will be able to sell the resultant meatmeal at a profit because there is a shortage of meatmeal at present.

I believe that in this situation the Government can assist a little further. The Government could subsidise freight of stock to the abattoir. The Government could subsidise the slaughter of stock on farms if the drought worsens and we are unable to handle all the stock by this meatmeal process. We need freight assistance to the abattoir, and assistance and subsidy for slaughter, at the very least. Whatever happens (if it rains inches tomorrow), it is already too late for the early districts of the State. For most of those early districts of the State this drought year is the second one in a row. They have not come recently on hard times, as this is the second blow to their economic viability. Here, too, the Government can take some blame for their problems.

The matter of land tax has been amply ventilated in this place. Land tax and land valuations have been reassessed in many areas of the State. Land valuations effect water rates and council rates, and now land tax and many other matters have a bearing on the value of land. I listened with a great deal of interest yesterday

to the Country Hour programme when Michael Shanahan pointed out an inequity that had hitherto escaped me, and that was that the unimproved value of rural land was about 60 per cent of the total value of a farm or enterprise, whereas in secondary industry the unimproved value of the land on which the factory stands represents, at the very most, about 10 per cent of the value of the land. That is a real inequity at which this Government could look very hard.

Mr. Russack: The land is the plant.

Mr. BOUNDY: Yes, and primary producers are paying a levy on 60 per cent, whilst secondary industry is paying at the same rate on 10 per cent. I am sure fair-minded members opposite would realise the inequity in that situation. While still dealing with this matter of help to rural industries in time of drought and difficulty, I think that the Government may well have to look at the matter of subsidising council rates to those in difficulties in the rural area, as well as looking at land tax, or even at granting a moratorium on the payment of some of these rates. With regard to council rates, it is not only the viability of the farmer but is also the viability of the country town that is at stake.

The Government may well be advised to help with the payment of council rates so that the employees can be kept on. The alternative is the payment of unemployment benefits, and there are so many deleterious effects of unemployment, particularly in a rural town, that great care must be exercised by all of us to avoid unnecessary hardship. Finally, it may not be obvious to Government members just what happens on a farm when things get tough. The only way a farmer can overcome economic difficulty and drought and stay a farmer is to trade his way out of bother. In short, he must go further into debt in order to get out of difficulty, or else leave the land altogether. That is only a solution to very few, because all the members of the community have to eat and the farming component of the community is of great importance to the welfare of the State.

I leave the agricultural situation and move on to paragraph 6 of His Excellency's Speech. Perhaps this is the most significant paragraph of that Speech. First, it will provide in industrial matters for action for damages to be removed from the civil courts and heard in the Industrial Court. I do not believe that this is a good move; I think it tends to be making fish of one and fowl of the other. There are occasions when actions involving industrial matters should be heard in a civil court, and I think this is one more action of this Government that makes special conditions for unions and industrial matters.

I move on to this quaintly worded sentence at the end of paragraph 6, that the Bill "will also propose the removal of the present limitation on the power of the Industrial Commission to provide in its awards for absolute preference to members of trade unions". What does this mean? What is "absolute preference"? The member for Florey comes right out and says what absolute preference is: he says it is compulsory unionism. Such a practice is to be deplored. It means, in short, that a worker in secondary industry in South Australia can make a democratic decision: either he joins the union or he does not eat. The charge is laid that we on this side of the House do not understand unions. I admit that my knowledge of unions is incomplete. I have never been a member of the kind of union of which the member for Unley has been a member, but I am certainly a member of the United Farmers and Graziers, which works hard for the benefit of primary producers in this State, and

I pay my dues to that organisation cheerfully. But I contend that Opposition members, without the complete knowledge of union matters that our friends opposite have, must judge by what we see. I can only make my judgment on unions when I learn that a shipment of wheat to Chile, my produce, has been stopped because the unions of this country sit in judgment on the politics of another country; and in saying that I am not suggesting that I agree with anything that is going on in Chile. However, I think that is a matter outside of the province of the unionists of this country.

Again, I look at what the storemen and packers did at Port Adelaide, either earlier this year or last year, in the handling of our wool. The rights and wrongs of that dispute were a little both ways, I must admit, but the end result of that dispute was that I guess there are men down in Port Adelaide in the wool handling industry working their eyeballs out to mechanise completely the handling of wool down there, or mechanise it so far that we rely less on manpower. So the end result of the union action, whatever the rights and wrongs of it are, is that more and more union members will be done out of a job.

There is one further example of union action that disturbs me. I come to the city about once a week, I come past Ardrossan and every week since the middle of November I have seen an oil rig sitting out in the gulf doing nothing. It is there because the seamen's union will not let it leave. I understand it is under contract to go overseas. Because it will not take an Australian crew, no permission will be given for it to go, and there at great cost it stays. We cannot use it, so they cannot use it—a totally dog-in-the-manger attitude. There may well be some good reason for the action that has been taken, but the end result is that what people see there works against the good honest unionists. I think it is a pity that political actions of that nature are taken. It does little credit to the union movement when we have to watch that dog-in-the-manger attitude go on for six to eight months, at great cost to all concerned.

Then, too, I refer to the Medibank strike two weeks ago. What an exercise in futility that was! One would have thought that radical and militant union leaders would be satisfied with that. They claimed it was a success; they said it had had its effect, but that is not so. Now, we see sanctions against the State Transport Authority—no mail, no fuel. The State Transport Authority made a democratic decision not to strike, but its betters decided it should be taught a lesson. What is the lesson? They are condemned out of their own mouths. I have quotes here from Sir Jack Egerton and Mr. Fanning that will substantiate my remarks. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I want to talk about what I class as government by stealth; of course, I refer to the Fraser Government in Canberra. Here we see a Government elected by the people of Australia with an enormous majority, and this majority was gained, to some degree, by promises made by Mr. Fraser and his henchmen.

However, once he had attained the office which he desired so strongly and which he strove so hard to get, he immediately began to repudiate the promises he had made. The first and most important problem confronting the Australian people was Mr. Fraser's determination to dismantle Medibank, and he is doing this by stealth by making Medibank a service that will not be available to every Australian. Therefore, Mr. Fraser seeks to drive people who would normally seek to be covered by Medibank to private health funds.

We have already seen the enormous rates that are to be charged by the Government. Ultimately, these rates will be superseded by the rates charged by private health funds. Indeed, there was an ominous note in this morning's newspaper. Although it did not receive much space, the report stated that the Medibank rate would be reviewed annually, I think. The rate will be reviewed and we will see an increase in the levy that is to come into force on October 1.

Mr. Fraser promised a policy of "hands off" wage indexation. That has not transpired, either. Wage indexation was to take into account appropriate increases in the cost of living, and Mr. Fraser promised he would not interfere with the Whitlam edict that workers would be reimbursed by increased salaries to the extent of the increase in the cost of living. Mr. Fraser agreed that this was an admirable situation, yet he immediately sent his officers into court demanding that the judges considering wage indexation should halve the rate of indexation due. On the first occasion the matter was considered this was not done but, on the second occasion, full wage indexation was interfered with. I believe a similar interference will result when the court next brings down its decision. This greatly concerns me.

I refer also to social service pensions. Mr. Fraser promised a prompt and healthy increase for people in receipt of social service pensions. These increases have not eventuated in the two months since the promise was made. That, too, causes me great concern. These attacks were cowardly and premeditated attacks on the part of a ruthless man controlling a ruthless Government. He attacked people who could not fight back: the aged and the sick, and this will be to his eternal disgrace.

Probably the greatest fault with Mr. Fraser (and honourable members opposite may disagree with me) is that he has proved to be absolutely contemptuous of the opinion of the working class. He does not care for anyone whom he does not consider to be in the upper echelon of society, and he clearly demonstrates this view in his actions and his statements. The most dangerous thing that Mr. Fraser did was to make a cardinal blunder in having the temerity to align Australia with Red China against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. China and Russia will probably continue to have their disagreements and no-one knows what will result, but Australia should not have aligned itself in any circumstances with either one of those countries, yet Mr. Fraser chose to do this. There is no doubt about it: he wants to introduce again in Australian politics Menzies' favourite stunt, the red bogey—a Communist under every bed! This is Mr. Fraser's ultimate aim, and we will see this brought to fruition in the near future.

I was sickened to hear and read of his cringing efforts to appease Russia upon his return to Australia after he was roundly castigated by his foreign affairs officials. He did not try to deny their authority, and members of his own Party in the House were perturbed at his actions and statements in Red China. He then went to the United

States of America. He was not going to be a Holt and go "all the way with L. B. J.", but he was upstaged in that country at all times. It was stated that he had a tumultuous welcome, and he probably did, because Americans like to get rid of their ticker tape by throwing it out of the window.

In America he allowed himself to be a tool of Ford, because Ford was battling for his political life and seized upon Mr. Fraser, thinking that he would be good enough for him to use to get some endorsement of policies. Ford thought that he would be able to say that Australia was all the way with him, as it was with L. B. J. Mr. Fraser was used as a tool, and he made an idiot of himself. I was ashamed when I read the statements that he had made, without any endorsement from the people of this country. I have no doubt that Mr. Fraser, if he dared, would align Australia with America again, and introduce national training immediately, because he and his henchmen would not hesitate to send our boys to fight in a foreign war at any time.

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

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I consider that the lack of self-discipline in our society costs us more than our total education budget, which is about \$265 000 000 at present.

Mr. Slater: Bring back the whip!

Mr. EVANS: That is not the approach that I am taking, but many parents, teachers, Parliamentarians, and people who make judgments on crime will agree with what I have said. If the cost is as I have said (and I believe that it is), we have a major problem that we need to solve so that we will have more money to spend in areas of need. There is a massive cost to our community in excessive drinking and the taking of drugs. We would see that there was a real problem in this area if we could assess the amount of police time involved in this problem, the labour lost, the administration time, the damage to individuals, hospitalisation costs, the cost of rehabilitation, the loss of life that cannot be measured in terms of money, the loss of efficiency in industry because people are affected by drink or drugs, and the loss of effectiveness of board management because many people in that area have for many years been almost alcoholics.

How much does it cost us when a person is confined to a wheel chair because he or some other person was affected by alcohol, resulting in a major road accident that crippled the person? What is the cost to our society of that irresponsible action? And it is all caused through lack of self-discipline. What is the cost to our society of the breaking of laws generally—rape, assault, breaking and entering, arson, and the recent case of throwing fire bombs into a house? Are we saying that we should attack the problem where it begins, within our homes? Through lack of discipline by parents toward their children, through giving children too much freedom, the children are not self-disciplined. The teaching profession must accept some responsibility, but teachers are guided to some extent by directions from the Government or from Parliament. If the Government says that it does not want discipline in schools or in the community that is too strict, we will have an undisciplined society, and we have that at present. Can we afford it?

What does it cost the Highways Department as a result of damage done by vandals over the years and through the loss of equipment and manpower? No doubt the department could give an estimate. What does vandalism cost councils? In many cases, the community knows who has

carried out the acts of vandalism. We do not say that a person should report this to the police but, in a totally disciplined society, I suppose we would. In a responsible community, a person can go to those responsible for acts of vandalism and say, "If you do not own up, someone may have to take action." In our society, we do not worry so long as it happens to someone else. If an old lady down the street has her house broken into and if we have a clue as to who did it, we take the attitude that we do not want to get involved: we avoid it.

Dr. Eastick: It is a lack of responsibility, one to the other.

Mr. EVANS: Yes. We really concern ourselves only when it is something close to us. Vandalism is only one area that costs us a great deal through lack of self-discipline. Litter is another such area. What does it cost councils, the Highways Department, beach authorities, and national parks authorities to clear up litter? It costs a massive sum. Our universities are supposed to be places of highest learning, but how much does disruption and vandalism there cost the community? I refer particularly to the recent strife at Flinders University. How much does all the graffiti cost that is spread over buildings? It is a massive cost, which society should not have to face. We give people freedoms, but freedoms can be protected only if people have self-discipline and accept responsibility.

We can consider the private enterprise sector. The farmer who does not build firebreaks or who does not preserve fodder for bad years is an example. Many farmers do build firebreaks and preserve fodder, but some farmers are not self-disciplined. The unions, with their demarcation disputes, deny fellow employees the opportunity to work, thereby decreasing productivity; that involves a lack of self-discipline and a failure to understand the real problem of preserving our country's economic structure. That sort of action is costing this State more than our total education budget of \$265 000 000 a year.

What do we do about it? The first place to act should be this Parliament. If Parliament shows concern for the lack of self-discipline in the community and emphasises this concern through speaking out with a united voice, departmental officers will realise it, schools will realise it, and universities will realise it. The message can then be got home to parents and to the average person in the community. There are many areas in which we waste the opportunity to channel money in the right direction.

I make my final point regarding this matter. Many people in the community come to members of Parliament or to Government departments and say, "We are in trouble financially. We cannot afford to buy or rent a house at the normal private enterprise figure prevailing in the open market. We cannot afford the hire-purchase payments to which we have committed ourselves. We are at the end of the road financially." A short time back in their lives, those people would have been receiving reasonable money. Indeed, they may still be receiving a reasonable salary. However, they have been unable to discipline themselves to live within their own budget.

Although these people have been through the school system, in many cases for up to 12 or more years, they have not been taught self-discipline or how to manage their own budgets. After they have bought a flash motor car for their son or daughter, or stereo equipment, or made a trip, they come to the Government and say that they cannot afford to buy a house and therefore need help. Governments do help and rightly so, because such persons

are in trouble at that time. However, I make the point that that Government help would not be required in many cases if people had learnt self-discipline. Some members will say that this is impossible. I know that it is impossible to have self-discipline in society as a whole, but I believe that we can get a sufficient change in people's attitudes regarding this matter, thereby reducing the cost incurred by Government departments, local government and private enterprise. This cost could be decreased substantially if we attacked the problem. If we do not do so, we should be saying to those people, "We do not care how much money you waste. We will not do anything about it."

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

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I rise on this occasion to speak in a lighter vein. One of the pleasures I have had as a member of this House stems from the Government's decision to appoint a Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport. I am sure members on both sides, especially the member for Hanson, would be pleased that this happened. What a wonderful thing it has been for the sports people of this State.

Although in the Federal sphere this a hot potato at present, I assure members that in South Australia we have a wonderful working party. When the Minister for Tourism, Recreation and Sport was appointed, it was decided to have two councils, one of which was the Recreation Advisory Council and the other the Sports Advisory Council. The membership of these councils most likely involved difficult decisions being taken by the Minister. I am sure that when I name the members of the Sports Advisory Council, members will realise their sporting prowess and management capabilities.

I refer to Mrs. Wendy Ey, a member of the South Australian Women's Athletics Association; Miss C. Burton, of the South Australian Women's Netball Association, who is an Australian player and is still participating in the game; Mrs. Joy Dundon, of the South Australian Sports-women's Association, who is an able administrator; Mr. J. D. C. Nelson, Administrator of the South Australian Lawn Tennis Association; Mr. Geoff Noblet, of the South Australian Cricket Association Incorporated, an able administrator who has also played much cricket; Mrs. R. Chaplain, of the South Australian Amateur Fencing Association; Dr. F. X. Bencini, of the South Australian Soccer Federation; Mr. N. L. Grimm of the South Australian National Football League, who was also a player with the West Torrens Football Club; Miss J. Bayly, a Ministerial appointment, thus acknowledging her prowess; Mr. J. W. Daly, who was formerly Chairman of the council; and Mr. Mick Nunan, who is a prominent footballer and cricketer. I, too, am a member of the council whose members have sport at heart and, at all times, they say that their sport should be treated no better than any other sport. The appointments are changed every two years. One of the main objects is to start from the beginning with young people. The council's coaching schools, which help administrative officers in the amateur field, are much appreciated. The council has spent many thousands of dollars to assist sport in many ways. I think that all members would be well advised to take note of happenings in this regard in their district. The council spends about \$13 000 to \$15 000 each month, so

there is the opportunity for helping the sports that need help.

Mr. Becker: If it's an affluent area, you don't get anything. That's right, isn't it?

Mr. LANGLEY: Being a member of a bowling club, I can say that they are not even considered, because they are believed to be able to hold their own. The Clare district was helped by the provision of a building and amenities for basketball, through a joint Government and local council venture. That happens often. Why should affluent people receive help?

The council ensures that every project is considered before a decision is made. Our aim is to help the people concerned who are in need. Undoubtedly, amateur sport in Australia needs much help, so the time and money spent by the Government are well spent. The State Government has even taken over the work that the Federal Government should be doing by helping junior sport, and assisting sporting administrators of the future, and it will continue to do so. This Government is going even further now because, with the help of the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport, it is assisting in the coaching field. I am certain that the council's activities will improve sport in this State.

I could go on for some time talking about sport, but I will have another opportunity to do so later. Since South Australia has had a Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport I have had heard nothing but praise for the way in which the duties of the portfolio have been carried out. The member for Henley Beach was the first Minister for Tourism, Recreation and Sport. He was followed in that portfolio by the Hon. T. M. Casey in another place who, I am sure, will carry on in the same tradition. I also hope that he will be able to provide more funds to help South Australian sport.

Competition is good for sport. I have known sportsmen here who, because the competition has not been good enough in South Australia, have moved elsewhere. The present system of picking teams from juniors up to those at the top level of the sporting activity in question has vastly improved the situation in South Australia. I am not going to speak about the whys and wherefores of what is happening in the Federal sphere, but before the Federal Labor Government was defeated it had plans to improve the standard of sport in Australia. If other bodies had gone to the Government for support, as the Sports Advisory Council can do, I am sure that the standard of sport in this country would improve. However, I am not too sure that that is happening now. The more that can be done for sport the better it will be for this country.

Mr. Allison: The East Germans received no subsidies at all.

Mr. LANGLEY: I am not so sure that they did not receive subsidies, because their air fares were paid for them.

Mr. Allison: That was a Federal grant of \$750 000.

Mr. LANGLEY: The honourable member probably knows that a swimmer has to train for a considerable time but a cricketer does not have to train as much.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The question is "That the House do now adjourn."

Motion carried.

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 4, at 2 p.m.