

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 4, 1976

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GRANTS COMMISSION BILL

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

PETITIONS: SUCCESSION DUTIES

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON presented a petition signed by 103 residents of South Australia, praying that the House amend the Succession Duties Act to abolish succession duty on that part of an estate passing to a surviving spouse.

Mr. LANGLEY presented a petition signed by 107 residents of South Australia, praying that the House urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that the present discriminatory position of blood relations be removed and that blood relationships sharing a family property enjoy at least the same benefits as those available to *de facto* relationships.

Petitions received.

PETITION: SEXUAL OFFENCES

Mr. MILLHOUSE presented a petition signed by 27 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: AGE OF CONSENT

Mr. ALLISON presented a petition signed by 1557 residents of the South-East of South Australia, praying that the House would not pass legislation to lower the age of consent to 14 years.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SUCCESSION DUTIES

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At the time of the last election, the Government made promises concerning relief in the area of succession duties, and particularly related those promises to the inheritance of the average matrimonial home by the surviving spouse without payment of duty and the indexing of succession duty remissions. Since then those promises have been implemented, and we have examined the effect of the alterations in the succession duty provisions. While a number of people have taken advantage of the moratorium on stamp duty, transfer fees and the like that the Government provided for the putting of matrimonial homes into joint names, it is apparent that,

despite the indexation of the exemptions provided in the Act, some people are adversely affected by the present rate of succession duties, particularly in the case of surviving spouses, and in the case of superannuation benefits inherited.

Consequently, the Government has examined, along with its general examination of the present budgetary position, the situation of succession duties between surviving spouses, and it has looked to alter the exemptions, to increase them in order to provide better relief for surviving spouses in this area. The examination led to the conclusion by the Government that by increasing the exemptions we would not be left with a significant amount of revenue from this area, and that we would be providing a disability to the average spouse by requiring all spouses to file succession duty statements and valuations to show that they were not liable to duty, a cost to the average inheritor that we think is not reasonable in view of the amount of revenue that would be left in this area were we to retain any of it.

Consequently, the Government will introduce legislation to the House early this session to provide that, in respect of all deaths occurring on and after July 1 this year, there will be no succession duties whatever payable as between surviving spouses.

In addition, in respect of other succession duty provisions, an examination of the succession duties payable by charities in South Australia on successions reveals that certain charities are totally exempt and others pay a concessional duty of 10 per cent. The Government intends, in respect of all those charities that are the subject of concessional duty, to exempt them totally. That will be the other part of the provision to be introduced during this session.

QUESTIONS**WORKING HOURS**

Dr. TONKIN: With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I must say in response to the Premier's Ministerial statement this afternoon how pleased the Opposition is that the Government has seen fit to adopt Liberal Party policy in this matter.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You can talk and talk.

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased that it has now been able to find the money to do so, when it said only a few months ago it could not afford to do it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Leader to carry on with his question.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say whether the Government believes that union claims for a 35-hour week in the power industry in South Australia should be considered, and whether it has investigated, or plans to investigate, the effect that a flow-on of a successful union claim would have on industry generally?

It has been recently reported that unions in the power industry intend taking action to gain a 35-hour week. If they are successful, this will set the pace and will spread throughout industry. It will inevitably result in significant increases in costs because of penalty rates, and the cost of power must therefore rise. Obviously this will be passed on in the cost of products, and increased prices will in turn be inflationary.

There is considerable concern in the community because, particularly in the present economic climate, we cannot afford such an action, as it would be defeating the entire purpose of the measures being taken to control inflation.

The Government has an urgent responsibility to investigate the effects on the community of a planned 35-hour working week, and to make these known to the people of South Australia as soon as possible.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In relation to the question that the Leader asked, the position of the Government in this matter is that, over some period now, the Electricity Trust of South Australia has been negotiating with the unions for the adoption of a 37½-hour week on the basis of increased productivity.

Dr. Tonkin: A rather hard thing to come by, isn't it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it is not. The trust was satisfied that this package could be satisfactorily negotiated. That is the basis on which negotiations are proceeding. In relation to the other matter to which the Leader adverted, I seem to remember the last series of policy speeches, and what I have announced today in the House was not Liberal policy at the last State election.

HEALTH AND WELFARE SERVICES

Mr. HARRISON: Does the Minister of Community Welfare consider that there is likely to be any real benefit to the people of South Australia from the work of the Federal Committee of Inquiry into Health and Welfare Services? It was announced recently in Canberra that a committee of three (two Commonwealth public servants and a retired public servant from New South Wales) had been appointed to examine health and welfare services in the community development area. In the announcement it was stated that the Government was concerned about duplication and overlapping of Commonwealth services and wanted more co-ordination. In view of the Federal Government's record in this field and the composition of the committee, what is the Minister's attitude?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In view of the current record of the Federal Government, I suppose that my attitude is that I would have very grave doubts about any benefits being likely to accrue from the committee to the people of South Australia. Perhaps that is a bit unfair, with regard to the committee. Possibly, a better and, albeit, fairer way to answer the question raised by the honourable member would be to consider the matter in that light: to look, first, at the committee and then, perhaps, have a quick look on behalf of the House at the terms of reference with which the committee has been charged. Possibly from that members will be able to form their own conclusion whether the State is likely to benefit.

The members of the committee (Mr. Bailey, Mr. Rimes, and Mr. Lightly) are public servants, and I have no quarrel with them. I know, from personal experience of South Australian Public Service officers, that they would do their best to carry out correctly and with integrity, and in accordance with the terms of reference, the task given to them. Therefore, I have no concern regarding the personnel comprising the committee. There is nothing in that regard that would prevent benefits from, perhaps, accruing to the people of South Australia. The press release, under the heading "Acting Prime Minister", sets out a full page of terms of reference, and the reason for the concern I have indicated will now become apparent to honourable members. The first paragraph of the press release states:

Against the background of the Government's Federalism policy and its concern at the proliferation and overlap of Commonwealth services and programmes in the health, welfare and community development fields, the task force shall examine and report . . .

It seems that any suggestion that there is a great proliferation and over-supply, as it were, of welfare programmes to the people of South Australia, or even to the people of Australia, is a doubtful proposition. One could believe that it might be better if the committee were charged with ascertaining whether gaps existed. Undoubtedly they exist, because some have been created since last December by the removal of certain benefits—

Mr. Gunn: What nonsense you talk!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: —obtained by people in South Australia and Australia. On that aspect I have grave concern for the people of South Australia.

Mr. Gunn: The Whitlam Government—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The wording used in paragraph 1(b) is rather ominous, and is as follows:

The possibilities for elimination of individual programmes and consolidation into broader-based programmes in a manner which enables more efficient and economic delivery whether by the Commonwealth or the States . . .

I suggest that the word "elimination" has a foreboding ring for the citizens of Australia, if the pattern that has been set for welfare provisions is continued. Paragraph (c) states:

The possibility of achieving better co-ordination and avoiding overlap by more specific definitions of programmes, eligible projects and eligible organisations, having in mind—

and this is the point I want to stress—

that co-ordination could be effected at the State and local government level without Commonwealth involvement.

That is the point that also worries me. Recently, I attended a conference of Ministers both Liberal and Labor held in Darwin. We were told that the A.A.P. programme was to cease within a certain time. We were also told that funding for the Social Planning Unit (previously funded in S.A. through the Community Welfare Department) was to be discontinued forthwith. When I reminded the Commonwealth Minister that an aim of the Social Planning Unit was to achieve co-operation between Federal and State Ministers and the department's concerned, the Federal Minister did not listen to my request regarding the continuation of funding. When I then submitted a compromise that, since co-operation was involved, it would not be unfair to suggest that 50 per cent of the finance should come from the States and the other 50 per cent from the Commonwealth, the suggestion was rejected out of hand. If that is an example of the co-operation and co-ordination that is intended, I fear for the people of South Australia in this matter.

GOVERNMENT WORKS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Works say what economic studies are being undertaken into intended Government works and construction in order to compare the cost of a project done by day labour or by private industry? The Federal Minister for Construction (Hon. John McLeay) said recently that an investigation into a project undertaken by his department indicated that about one-third of the cost to the Government could be saved by letting the work out to tender. Referring to South Australia the Minister said that public works that could have been let to private contract included roads built by the Highways Department, jetties and wharves built by the Marine and Harbors Department, and work undertaken by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. He said:

I can quote examples such as the Glenelg sewerage scheme, the Anstey Hill and Hope Valley water treatment works, and the Port Lincoln jetty.

In reply the Minister of Works is reported to have said:

Any decision taken by the South Australian Government between day labour and private industry was on the basis of economics. Whichever sector offers the cheapest and most efficient service gets the job.

Because of that statement, I ask the Deputy Premier what these economic studies are, and how they are undertaken in order to compare the costs of projects.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have read recently where the Deputy Leader has been waxing eloquent about this matter of his discoveries in other States about the percentage of day-labour forces used compared to contract work and the allegations he has made of inefficiency in Government departments using day labour where they should use contract or private enterprise to do the work. As usual, he quoted from a Federal colleague of his (Mr. McLeay), who seems suddenly to have become a great authority on this matter; he is the Minister for Construction in the Federal Government. A few things ought to be said about this matter. I had information in my bag that seems to have disappeared. It is a pity it is not there, because it would have shown to the House that what the honourable member has been trying to get across to the public of South Australia is not correct. His colleague, the member for Fisher, also has often criticised the day-labour force employed by the Government. Earlier this year (unfortunately whilst the member for Fisher was overseas) I arranged an inspection of a building managed by the Public Buildings Department but built by a contractor. I particularly wanted to show it to the member for Fisher, because once in the House he told me and my colleagues that the building opposite was a classic example of how private enterprise can operate. The Government has operated very much better in relation to the new Education Department's office in Flinders Street than did the builder opposite. We have to employ labour, too, and we have to look after it, and we do. The Deputy Leader makes an allegation, and then virtually says that I must disprove what he is saying, but I do not intend to do that. However, I ask him to produce evidence that we can examine, and to quote the source of that evidence: he will not do that, because he cannot do it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Did you listen to my question? Why not reply?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I did, and I will reply to it. What I am saying to the honourable member is that the ploy he is using is an old one that has been used many times by people far cleverer than he is, and I will not take the bait.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You can see through it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Who would not see through it? Regarding economic studies, I offer the honourable member the chance to go into the Public Buildings Department, and I will make its officers available to him, not for me to tell him but for him to see what exactly we do before we put the Construction Division of the department to work, as opposed to contractors. If the honourable member wants to accept that offer, he may: I am making it to him.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Other departments, too?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member may go anywhere he likes. I do not want to protect my public servants from him: what I think I will have to do is to protect him from my public servants.

RAILWAYS

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Transport indicate the date of implementation of the railways transfer legislation considered by the State and Federal Governments, as it relates to the transfer and conditions of service of railway employees? Following a lunch-hour meeting yesterday of about 8 000 railway employees, doubts remained on the new status of staff and entitlements under the agreement. These relate to the status an officer will hold on the declared date, the position of an employee who does not wish to join the Australian National Railways, and whether superannuation entitlements will be the same under the Commonwealth. It is feared that conditions and entitlements generally will worsen when an employee leaves the State railways.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I regret that I am unable to advise the honourable member of the actual date of transfer. Regrettably, I do not think as much effort as should have been put into the matter has been applied in order to resolve outstanding problems. When the transfer was being negotiated, principally between the former Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) and the Premier (Mr. Dunstan), and to a lesser extent between the former Minister for Transport (Mr. Jones) and me, several safeguards were demanded by South Australia. Amongst those safeguards was a provision that no employee of the South Australian Railways would be disadvantaged as a result of the transfer. This is a simple matter that should have been understood by everyone, and one that the South Australian Government not only insisted on, but has since demanded should be honoured. Time and time again, the Premier and I have said that, until that provision is completely satisfied, there will be no finalising of the transfer; we will not allow the Federal Government to use employees of the South Australian Railways for political purposes. That, regrettably, is what is happening at present.

Mr. Venning: No.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Rocky River says "No", but what he does not know, I suspect—

Mr. Venning: It is a shonky deal.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is a shonky deal for the Commonwealth, but a wonderful one for the State. Of course, that is sufficient reason for the member for Rocky River to condemn it because he, like the Leader, is anti-South Australia. Only this morning I ascertained that the Federal Transport Department had received from the Federal Treasury a document setting out the proposed superannuation arrangements to apply to those persons who transfer. Although the document is still being carefully evaluated by officers of my department, it is quite clear from the outset that it will inflict on officers and employees transferring lesser conditions than those they now enjoy. Under the terms of the agreement, that is just not on. Unfortunately, the Federal Minister, in allowing this document to go from his department to the unions concerned, is clearly attempting to contravene the principles of the transfer. After we had a meeting of the unions concerned in March, the Premier met a delegation of 20 or 30 people. I was present, and following that meeting I wrote to the Federal Minister pointing out that the superannuation question must be satisfactorily resolved, as indeed all the others must be. To assist in the transfer and in an endeavour to get the declared date brought forward, I offered, with the authority of the Premier, to have legislation introduced into this Parliament to allow present contributors to the South

Australian superannuation scheme to remain contributors after the transfer, thereby fulfilling the obligation we had entered into in the agreement that no employee would be disadvantaged. That was last March, and the Federal Government has not acknowledged or replied to that letter. At times we get blamed for delaying this matter, but it is quite clear that the finalisation of the transfer cannot be determined until all these matters (superannuation, workmen's compensation, and the like) are satisfactorily resolved, and they must be resolved on the basis that no employee will suffer as a result of the transfer. That situation has applied all the time and it still applies. I have asked the Federal Minister to nominate a place and time at which we can try to resolve the outstanding matters so that the transfer can be finalised: he has again declined to accept that offer. Regrettably, he is now using the employees of the South Australian Railways (or attempting to use them) as the scapegoats. It will not work, because South Australia will not sign the papers necessary for the declaration date until we are satisfied that the terms and conditions of the transfer, including the condition that no employee will be disadvantaged, are satisfactorily met.

PINERA BRIDGE

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Transport further examine the dangerous situation that exists for pedestrians crossing the bridge near the Pinera railway station? A few months ago I asked the Minister whether safety features of the bridge could be improved because of the danger to pedestrians. I have seen by today's *News* that twin boys were struck by a motor car on the bridge this morning while in the custody of their mother. The nearby school has made an approach similar to the one I made. I posted to the Minister at the time a photograph of a bridge in another State showing safety features that could be used effectively on the Pinera bridge. It was suggested to the Minister that a death or a serious accident could occur. A serious accident has now occurred: two young boys have been injured, and the danger still exists. Will the Minister have the bridge examined to see whether it is possible to eliminate the danger?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will refer the matter to the Road Traffic Board.

MODBURY COMMUNITY CENTRE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Community Welfare obtain a report on the stage reached in the finalisation of the purchase of land for the development of a community welfare centre at Modbury? The Minister will be aware that, in about February, State Cabinet approved an expenditure of about \$195 000 to buy a block of land of 0.6 hectares fronting the North-East Road, adjacent to the offices of the Tea Tree Gully Corporation. At that time, it was decided that the Community Welfare Department, in consultation with the local community council for social development, would begin planning the facilities to be provided. It was expected that they would be basically similar to those in the existing community welfare centre at Campbelltown, and that the building would be available in two to three years. When built, the centre will replace the existing office of the Community Welfare Department, which is housed in leased premises at Ridgehaven.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I would be delighted to obtain a report for the honourable member.

SCHOOL CONTRACTS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Education say how much money is to be spent on new capital works in his department during this financial year? On July 21, the Premier announced that, of about \$40 000 000 allocated to South Australia by the Commonwealth for education, South Australia would be able to let contracts for new schools worth only about \$2 000 000 in a building programme that was normally for more than \$40 000 000 on present costs. Only nine days later the Minister of Education announced that, of the \$40 500 000 allocated, \$7 900 000 would be spent on new works from July 1. As that is four times the amount the Premier said would be spent on new work, and as there is so much variance between the figures, can the Minister say which of the two figures is correct?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It depends on what is meant by new works. I have operated on the figure announced by the Premier, as when most people in the education community refer to new works, they mean projects for which there has been no Government commitment at that stage. Some projects are carry-overs from last financial year because work has actually begun on construction in the physical sense; there are projects that are carry-overs from last financial year, because although no work has actually begun much documentation and planning has been done by the Education Department and, more importantly, by the Public Buildings Department; and in some cases a contract may have been let. The difference between the two figures relates to the difference between what is new work in the sense of buildings actually appearing on the ground, and what is new work in the sense of what is new to the education community; that is, those projects about which they know nothing at that stage. I will obtain more specific figures for the honourable member that will make it clearer: it is not necessary to detain the House with a long explanation, nor do I have the specific figures in my head today. They will certainly be set out in the Loan Estimates for honourable members to see.

PINE FORESTS

Mr. GROTH: I understand that this week the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs issued a press and radio warning to the people of the Murray Bridge district. This warning referred to the need for caution in investing money in commercially promoted schemes for the growing of pine trees. A company named in the warning was Furneaux Forest Co-operative Society. If this type of investment is again being promoted in this State, has the Attorney-General more details about the activities of the promoters, and can he say whether people should invest money in such schemes?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: At present at least three organisations seem to be active in South Australia in seeking investment funds connected with selling, planting, growing and harvesting radiata pine trees. One, as the honourable member said, is Furneaux Forest Co-operative Society Ltd. The other is Willdana Ltd., which is promoting the Willdana Forests 1976 Plantation Trust. Willdana Ltd., is a firm with its registered office at 464 St. Kilda Road, Melbourne. The firm is asking people to invest in a scheme to plant, grow, and harvest pine trees in the Kongorong area in the South-East of this State. It is offering 488 units at \$750 each. The land

totals 162.44 hectares, situated about 28 kilometres from Mount Gambier. Each unit is offered to cover all costs of planting, growing, and marketing the trees. The promoters claim in their prospectus that the investment will offer capital growth, and will provide benefits that will act, to use their own words, as "a hedge against inflation".

The land in question was twice offered to the Woods and Forests Department, once in 1962 and again in 1971. Both times the offer was rejected, because the land was assessed as being inadequate, bearing in mind the price being asked. The Woods and Forests Department, in conjunction with the Victorian Forests Commission, inspected the operations of Willdana Ltd. in the Kongorong area. Part of its report showed that the land was climatically suitable but that the soil was variable with overlying limestone at differing depths, and on a significant part of the area, estimated from aerial photographs at about one-fifth, it was too close to the surface for sustained tree growth. The report stated that, whilst it would be possible to establish trees on these areas, growth in the long term would decline and it was unlikely that an economic return would be obtained.

The investigations found that on the remainder of the area soil depth was still variable and these sites must be regarded as marginal for this purpose. Trees could be readily established and would grow satisfactorily for some years, but eventually the growth rate would decrease prematurely, possibly leading to decline of the growing stock. This inspection was carried out in March this year. An information sheet concerning tree farming has been issued by the Victorian Forests Commission, and is available from the Woods and Forests Department. I suggest people in the community considering investing in such projects could obtain a copy of this document to inform themselves about the situation. The document states that tree plantations are generally grown for 35 to 45 years. The first return is obtained at about 12 years from a thinning, with further thinnings every five to seven years thereafter. Willdana Ltd. prospectus claims the trust shall have a nominal life of 10 years, although this may be extended. The firm claims the trees will reach marketable maturity at 10 years. This is an interesting contrast to the circumstances surrounding the general growing of these trees.

In his warning to the people in the Murray Bridge area, the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs referred specifically to Furneaux Forest Co-operative Society Limited, which was active in the district and is now operating in the Whyalla and Port Augusta regions. Furneaux was active in Tasmania earlier this year, and was the subject of a report to that Parliament by the Consumers Protection Council in Tasmania. The report referred to advertising by the firm that suggested security and potential high return from investment in 606 ha of radiata pines on Flinders Island. In fact, the firm had 99 ha on unencumbered title with an option to buy more land. The firm expected a return of 500 to 600 per cent on the original investment. The Tasmanian Forests Commission inspected the area and reported it was only marginally suitable for growing pines, being highly leached soil, low in phosphorus and copper. The rainfall was also considered to be inadequate for the purposes required. The report concluded that the best possible return to shareholders would be 6.8 per cent a year for an 11-year investment, compared to the alleged expected return of between 500 and 600 per cent. It could well be lower, given adverse conditions.

In February of this year both I and my colleague Mr. B. A. Chatterton (Minister of Forests) in another place, warned about the need for extreme caution in investing money with tree-farming organisations. A third firm, Forestry Management Limited, is planting near Port Lincoln. The Woods and Forests Department has established a pine plantation in this area but this has been considered to be a failure and is now used for growing hardwood. The department will not buy any more land in that area, because it believes the combination of the soils and the rainfall is too marginal for commercial pine plantings.

The Consumer Affairs Branch has also received complaints about Forestry Management breaching the Door to Door Sales Act. Full refunds were obtained in the cases reported to the branch. Forestry Management has an office at 305 North Terrace, Adelaide. I repeat the warning I gave to this House earlier this year: the situation is being closely watched by my department and, wherever possible, swift action will be taken to control undesirable practices, but great care must be taken by people when investing money. The best way my department can assist these people is by public warnings at the appropriate times.

MAGISTRATES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Attorney-General say whether he or the Government has sought to compromise the position of magistrates in South Australia by proceeding to implement an amalgamation of departments without giving due regard to the consequences of the amalgamation? Members will be aware of the announcement which appeared on page 3 of the *Advertiser* today and in which Mr. Grieve is quite fully reported in respect of an attitude (a commendable attitude, I suggest) that he took in the courts yesterday. I ask the question about compromising the position of the magistrates because of the reply given by the Attorney-General's predecessor in his place (Mr. L. J. King, now Mr. Justice King) to questions on this matter on October 27, 1970 (page 2044 of *Hansard*) and November 24, 1970 (pages 2956 and 2957 of *Hansard*). Those questions and answers referred to an action taken by the Salisbury Council, which used a justice of the peace who was on the council's own staff to sign the summons. The parallel is not specifically the same as that relating to the magistrate, but it was stated that this should not have occurred. Indeed, Mr. King, the then Attorney-General, arranged with Mr. O'Loughlin, Special Magistrate, to prepare some information for distribution in the community, particularly to justices of the peace, indicating that in no circumstances could a person connected with the office taking legal action be permitted to be involved in the matter. I suggest that the parallel is quite clear. Even though the recent matter relates to magistrates, it is obvious from the Attorney-General's comments this morning that he recognises that the magistrates were not satisfied with the position into which they were being forced.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The answer, of course, to this question is most certainly "No". The Government at no time has sought to compromise the position of magistrates, nor will it do so in the future. The position is quite clear. In Victoria the magistrates are in the same department as the Crown Law officers; it is a situation that exists in very many common law jurisdictions, and a situation which, for administrative convenience, we have established in South Australia following the recommendations of the Corbett committee, which investigated the Public Service. I can assure the honourable member that the magistrates' independence will be, in fact, as always—

complete independence. The situation has not changed at all as far as their judicial tasks are concerned; they will continue to have the same independence as they have always had. I, for one, would certainly go to any lengths necessary to ensure that their independence was maintained.

LIBRARIES

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Education say what are the recommendations of the so-called Horton Committee of Inquiry into Libraries in Australia? What information is available on the likelihood of these recommendations being implemented by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Despite the enormous advances in funding for education that have occurred in recent years, there remain two areas which are significantly under-funded. I do not suggest that any of the areas are over-funded, but two areas are significantly under-funded: one is technical and further information, and the other is the area of library and information services. The so-called Horton report, to which the honourable member refers, is the report of a committee set up by the Whitlam Government to inquire into library services in Australia. The report has been published, and it is available to any honourable member who likes to invest the necessary money with the Commonwealth Publications Office in Pirie Street. It is a very significant report, which has received too little publicity, because it does provide some sort of a charter for the future of library and information services in Australia. Very briefly, it suggests a 10-year programme of expenditure at the rate of \$20 000 000 a year from the Commonwealth Government to assist the States in their efforts to bring library and information services up to par.

The split up of the money would basically be on a per capita system, with two exceptions, the first being that Victoria is regarded as what might be called the standard State: that is, because of the concentration of its population, it is regarded as the State that has the easiest job in providing library services. All other States are weighted as against Canberra. That is a little like the standard States situation that applies in the Grants Commission. So, there would be some additional assistance for South Australia because of the weighting it would get. In addition, there is a recommendation that Queensland and South Australia be given immediate grants of \$200 000 each to assist them with the conversion of their subscription library systems to free municipal based public libraries.

I hope there will be money in the forthcoming Commonwealth Budget to enable this task to be commenced. I have corresponded with Senator Withers, who is the relevant Minister to whom this report was made, requesting an interview with him. I am hoping that eventually that will be granted. There was a move on the part of my Tasmanian colleague, Mr. Batt, to get a conference of all the State Education Ministers, or at least those Ministers responsible for library services, in order to discuss what we might call the tactics of the situation. In fact, South Australia and Tasmania were the only States, at the time, that were interested in going on with the exercise, so we reluctantly decided to drop it. I am doing what I can to endeavour to find out what moves the Commonwealth Government is likely to make on the matter. I commend the report to all interested people in South Australia and recommend that they should similarly take what action they think is desirable to obtain some Commonwealth commitment in this very important area of education.

DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister of Works, representing his good friend the Minister of Lands in another place, say—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Come on, fuzzy, get on with it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It's a good thing I've got friends. You haven't got one.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am all alone. Will the Minister ask his colleague whether the Government will alter the scheme of drought relief under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, 1967, to allow relief to producers in any industry affected by drought, even though not in an area proclaimed under the Act? I ask this question as the representative in this place of the new Liberal Movement and therefore having an obligation to the whole of the State. As I understand the position—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: He's got a sole agency.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As I understand the position, at present relief is payable to producers only in certain proclaimed areas or (and I am indebted to my friend from the Mallee for this extra information) for those very close to the boundary of the proclaimed area. There are, I am informed, a number of industries such as the dairying industry, which is very hard hit at the present time by drought, even though dairymen are not in the area proclaimed. I have in mind, particularly, the area in the Lower North, I think in the Light District and thereabouts. There seems to be no reason in equity why people in that industry who are suffering very great hardship, even though they are not in a drought proclaimed area, should be denied any relief at all. That, of course, is the crux of my question. The view of my Party is that these people should qualify for benefits in the same way as producers who are in areas which have been proclaimed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will have the honourable member's question examined by my very good friend the Minister of Lands.

Mr. Millhouse: I am obliged to you.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member would realise, of course, that the Act to which he refers was passed during the time of the Walsh Government.

Mr. Millhouse: There is nothing in the Act to bar this from being done.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is indeed nice to think that the honourable member, being the sole member of the new L.M., after all these years is taking an interest in the primary producers of South Australia. Both the Labor Party and the Liberal Party will have to take due heed of that move.

Mr. Millhouse: You are absolutely right.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am certain that the Liberal Party especially—

Mr. Millhouse: Indeed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:—will be interested in any moves the new L.M. is making and the concern the honourable member is expressing in this area.

Mr. Millhouse: After all, your Party has not got much interest in agriculture.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member knows that statement to be untrue.

Mr. Millhouse: Come on!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member knows that not only have we a great interest in this section of the community but also that we have done many great things for it, too.

Mr. Venning: Yes, land tax.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Aren't you pleased about succession duties?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member does not accept anything. In fact, he should belong to the Workers Party, because he does not believe in taxation.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Yes he does—tax the workers.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is right. He would tax the workers but not the farmers. I shall be pleased to take up the matter and to have serious and due consideration given to it. I will let the honourable member have a reply in due course.

DISABLED WORKERS

Mr. WELLS: Is the Minister of Labour and Industry in a position to announce the names of members of the working party that he intends to set up to study the position of disabled workers in South Australia and their placement in employment? I am anxious that such a committee be set up as soon as possible because of the situation of disabled workers in South Australia, which is well known to the Minister. He has shown his deep concern and respect for them by suggesting that such a committee be set up. I want to know the names of persons who will be on the committee, because I am interested in the formation of such a committee. I am certain that those members will be capable, because the Minister will ensure that they are people who understand the task before them. I know that the Minister has an intense desire to help the disabled people of this State.

Mr. Coumbe: Have you got the reply there, Jack?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I just happen to have a reply.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: A Minister must try to forecast what will happen each day in the House. I am a bit lucky to have the reply with me. However, let me be honest about the situation: the honourable member approached me about this matter yesterday.

Dr. Tonkin: Why not say so?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am being honest. The honourable member warned me yesterday that he would ask the question. The member for Florey is perfectly correct in saying that I am keen to get this investigation off the ground. I am pleased to be able to tell the House that a working party has been set up of men whom I consider are an excellent cross-section of the public; they are a group of men who are most ably equipped to carry out this important function. I believe this is a real coup: I am proud to announce that the Chairman of the working party will be Mr. K. T. Jenkins, Director of Bedford Industries Vocational Rehabilitation Association. Mr. Jenkins has unique experience in the administration of shelter type workshops. Recently, he was elected President of the International Society for Rehabilitation of the Disabled. The Government and everyone in South Australia should be extremely proud that Mr. Jenkins can give his time to us, because he is a busy man. After long discussion he decided to accept the position. I am therefore pleased to be able to announce—

Mr. Becker: He will be representing A.C.R.O.D.?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: He will be representing the disabled people of South Australia. Other members of the committee are Dr. A. W. Burnell, Senior Visiting Medical Specialist in Physical Medicine and Medical Consultant-

Director at the Western Domiciliary Care Service, Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Dr. Burnell is an expert in medical and other aspects of rehabilitation. He is also actively involved with the Phoenix Society. I thought the member for Hanson would be extremely interested in this announcement—

Mr. Becker: I am.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: —because he is the only member who has asked me a question about it. I thought he at least would be courteous enough to listen to me while I am reading out the names of members of the working party. After all, the member for Hanson asked that members of his organisation be represented on the working party.

Mr. Becker: I am interested, but the Minister of Transport is trying to cut the whole thing down.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have plenty of time; I have nine minutes left.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Another member of the working party is Mr. A. Saunders, Compensation Officer, Amalgamated Metal Workers Union. Mr. Saunders is the only union official in South Australia employed full-time on workmen's compensation and rehabilitation problems. Mr. L. Mills, General Manager, South Australian Brewing Company Limited, is also a member of the working party. Mr. Mills has high standing in the business community and is extremely interested and informed in the general field of rehabilitation of the disabled.

Mr. R. Llewellyn, Administrative Officer, Eastern Regional Geriatric Medical and Rehabilitation Service, is another member. He is a paraplegic and a public servant who is well regarded by the Director of the Rehabilitation Service. He would have a unique knowledge of the work situation from the "consumer's" viewpoint. The final member is Mr. David C. Gribble, Senior Administrative Officer (Research and Planning), Labour and Industry Department. Mr. Gribble is familiar with the general subject and has been involved in the analysis of statistics for the purpose of the Workmen's Compensation Act. I propose that the working party will be serviced by the Labour and Industry Department, and it is intended that Mr. Alan Harmer, Graduate Research Officer of the department, will be secretary to the working party. I have already been long enough in my reply because of interjections, so I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* the fairly long terms of reference.

Mr. Millhouse: Huh!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Does the honourable member want me to read them?

Mr. Millhouse: No, but I think you will have trouble getting them in unless they are statistical.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If that is the case I shall read them, because I want them included in *Hansard*. I was prepared to table them, but it seems that I cannot, because the Speaker is shaking his head. It is important that the terms of reference be included so that the public is aware of them. They are as follows:

1. To obtain information on:
 - (i) the numbers in South Australia of those who are partially and fully disabled at any one time;
 - (ii) the nature of such disability and whether it is permanent or temporary;
 - (iii) the causes of such disability; and
 - (iv) any significant changes in the above over recent years.
2. To ascertain:
 - (i) the facilities available in South Australia for the treatment, rehabilitation, training and job placement of disabled persons;

- (ii) the degree of use of such facilities;
 - (iii) the categories of disabled persons using them; and
 - (iv) the costs involved and the source of funds.
3. To list and describe:
- (i) the scope and activities of all sheltered or special workshops for disabled persons in South Australia;
 - (ii) the scope and activities of any organisations concerned with the employment of disabled persons; and
 - (iii) the costs involved and the source of funds.
4. To ascertain:
- (i) the degree to which industry in South Australia is employing handicapped persons;
 - (ii) the industries or companies involved in such employment; and
 - (iii) any special facilities that are provided by such industries or companies.
5. To consult where necessary with any individuals, organisations or Government departments relevant to the above.
6. To report to the Minister of Labour and Industry by December 24, 1976.

I thank the House for its indulgence, but it was absolutely necessary that the public be made aware of the terms of reference of the working party.

VEHICLE REGISTRATION

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Transport say what is the reason for discontinuing the inclusion of the engine number of a motor vehicle on the vehicle's registration disc? Can he also say whether a more durable ink could be used in typing registration disc details? This matter has been drawn to my attention by several people who believe the new registration procedure could delay identification of a vehicle, particularly in urgent cases. Ventilation windows, which often carry registration discs, and number plates can be removed and installed on other vehicles. In addition, a car engine can also be replaced. The new discs carry only the following detail: serial number, expiry date, registered number of the vehicle, and the make. There could be a good reason for this, but it is not obvious and it seems to be a disadvantage. Would it also be possible to use some form of ink that would be more durable, because it is noticeable after a few months that the detail fades badly, and it is difficult to read the detail on a disc?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The engine number details have been excluded from registration discs for some time now, and the decision to exclude was made after discussions between the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and the Police Department, when it was accepted that the engine number provided no positive information of any value any more than one could ask why, if the engine number was shown there, the chassis number or gearbox number should not be there. One could go on putting all kinds of numbers.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You could even put telephone numbers.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes. The only information on the disc at present is the relevant information, namely, the registered number of the vehicle. That is what counts, and it is attached to that vehicle for the whole of its life, whereas the engine number may or may not be. As the honourable member said in his question, the engine could be changed. Indeed, what was happening (although it is illegal) was that people were changing their engines without notifying the Registrar of the change, so the information on the disc was false, anyhow, whereas the registered number of the vehicle, once having been allotted to that vehicle, remains with the vehicle for life. There is no business of transferring the registration

from car to car as it is bought; that went out with button-up boots. The registered number stays with the vehicle, and that is the relevant information.

I acknowledge the honourable member's point regarding the disc. The Registrar is not pleased with the quality of the disc. In fact, the disc on my car is tattered, but that happened because it was so thin when it was being applied that it was something I had to live with for a year before getting a replacement. The year is almost up, and I will be careful when placing another disc on the car. The Registrar is far from pleased with the quality, and is trying to improve it. When that is done, automatically the problems to which the honourable member has referred will be solved, as it is simply a matter of the poor quality of the disc itself.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say what is the estimated cost to State revenue of concessions to be granted under new succession duties amendments announced this afternoon?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Between \$4 000 000 and \$5 000 000.

OBSCENE PUBLICATION

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of community affairs seen the obscene centre spread called *Change* that circulated through some northern provincial papers between five and six weeks ago, and can he say what action he intends recommending to the Commonwealth Government? In reply to a question asked earlier this afternoon on community welfare matters, the Minister commented on the fact that federal funding was being scrutinised. He mentioned, among other things, the A.A.P. As I consider that the obscene centre spread entitled "If I were a woman" was promoted by the A.A.P., is he recommending to the Commonwealth that its complete activity be terminated?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I believe the honourable member referred to me as the "Minister of community affairs", but I do not think that I would be allowed to involve myself in such things. It is not a matter for the State Minister or the State. If, as the honourable member outlined in his question, it was geared in some way to the A.A.P., it was a Commonwealth financed body that was concerned. It therefore seems to me that any question on this matter might be directed to Senator Guilfoyle.

At 3.10 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 3. Page 389).

Mr. BOUNDY: At the adjournment of the debate last evening, in response to charges by certain Government members that members of the Opposition did not understand unions but were union bashers, I was demonstrating that

some unions and some union actions tend to condemn the unions themselves. I was about to quote from one of Australia's newest knights, Sir Jack Egerton, whose comments were reported in the *News* of July 27, as follows:

He says that workers have been trying to get too much of the cake. Everybody has in fact. "Inflation is our main problem today," he says. "The whole future of Australia depends on it. We must curb costs and that includes profits and prices and wages. The unions have to realise that higher wages will only exacerbate the problem . . ."

I would say that the condition of the ordinary workers had worsened during the period of the Labor Government. That's the time when the top salary earners really got their impetus: they got much more out of it. It's ironic that the people who put least into the Labor Party got the most out of it. The people who put the most into the struggle are now getting the least out of it. The unions fight for indexation and we find the academics and even vice-chancellors of the university getting bloody indexation."

I have another quote, which refers to the matter to which I referred prior to the adjournment of the debate last evening, namely, the steps taken against the State Transport Authority for its defiance of the Medibank strike. I will quote a report of what Mr. Fanning, Secretary of the 1400-member Australian Transport Officers Federation, said:

"But this aspect worries us because the T.L.C. has just knocked one union off," Mr. Fanning said. "The union itself is the supreme body, not the T.L.C. and the individual union should not be pushed around." Mr. Fanning said the T.L.C. had become involved because it considered the Medibank issue was one that interfered with wages. "Practically everything you like to think affects wages, so if this is going to be the order of the day we can look forward to complete anarchy."

He is charging the union movement with promoting anarchy by irresponsible unionism, so that it is not only those on this side of the House laying such charges. Some actions of unions bring them into disrepute. I referred earlier to the subjects of wheat for Chile, the oil rig at Ardrossan, the storemen and packers at the wool store, and the Medibank strike. In this is a lesson for all, both labour and management, because the whole community must get its meal ticket with dignity. We cannot behave in an irresponsible way, because we damage ourselves in so doing. Surely, negotiation on the job with patience is to be preferred to confrontation and hatred. Having said that, I would not suggest for a moment that every action by unionists or unionism is irresponsible or lacking in concern for the welfare of the community.

In his Speech, His Excellency referred to hobby farms, a difficult problem for which to seek solutions. I must confess to some ambivalence in this matter. Some hobby farms I have seen have made me wish there were none, whilst others have made me believe that they have a real contribution to make to the benefit of the district in which they are located. I agree that many hobby farms are situated in the Hills area. The owners have much to contribute to the welfare of the community, and some have improved their properties so that they are an asset to the community. Some of the larger hobby farms, the 30 hectare allotments seen more and more in my own District of Goyder, are very good, but others have been acquired by people who, perhaps unwisely, think they should enter the business of farming.

Any practical farmer knows that 30 ha of broad-acre land is insufficient for effective agriculture. In some situations there will be a bad effect on the total life of the community, first, in the management of the farms. A person who works off the property (which must be done on 30 ha to survive) cannot give proper and adequate attention to the husbandry of the stock, and cannot afford

the equipment necessary to crop the holding. It is not a viable proposition for a share-farmer, because often the fencing is poor, and the property contains half a dozen sheep, a couple of goats and a horse or two.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Sounds like the Opposition!

Mr. BOUNDY: If I were a potential share-farmer, I would not entertain cropping land in such a situation, because I would know that stock straying into the cropping area could decimate any return likely to accrue. The hobby-farm situation does have its dangers, but, as I believe in the free-enterprise system, I do not believe that we should prevent people from acquiring these farms, nor should we prevent the broad-acre owner from selling his farm at the best price. I know of one such owner who sold quite legitimately: he moved to Queensland to escape succession duties because, in his family, he has had some unpleasant experiences with quick successions. He cannot be blamed for wanting to swap one asset for another elsewhere at the best price. I believe that the Government is to blame in some measure for this desire to sell to the highest bidder and move to Queensland.

It was pleasing to hear the Premier today outlining some benefits in relation to succession duties. I would be interested to know whether action is to be taken to cover the anomaly that has occurred as a result of amendments made to the Succession Duties Act in the previous session of Parliament regarding rural land. Members on this side were under the impression that the rebate for joint ownership and tenancies in common in the final analysis would be the same as the rebate for single ownership. When put to the test by the department, I understand the end result was that a joint ownership or tenancy in common achieved only half the rebate of a single ownership. That anomaly and inequity needs to be remedied.

Hobby farms are indeed a matter of concern but, believing in the free-enterprise system, I say it is impossible to prevent them. The Government should set standards in the matter of weed control and continued proper husbandry. Perhaps councils could set and maintain standards for the husbandry of these areas, as I believe they already hold many of the necessary powers. This is a planning matter, and I am concerned about another planning matter: the development of intensive piggeries, both from the point of view of drainage and the offensive odour that emanates from these enterprises.

Dr. Eastick: It was once said that the squeal was the only part that couldn't be used.

Mr. BOUNDY: That may be so, even now. Some pig units in the area north of Adelaide and in adjacent districts have large piggeries on about 162 ha. I understand one in the Wasleys area is on about 283 ha and, with a full population, will house about 35 000 pigs.

Mr. Jennings: What do you do to get a vote there?

Mr. BOUNDY: It is interesting to note, for the benefit of the member for Ross Smith, that a pig excretes each day three times as much as a human. It does not take a mathematician to work out that the excreta from 35 000 pigs is equivalent to the human excreta from a city of 100 000 people—and all this on 283 ha! I have been sent a petition by a group of people in the area alongside the piggery. The stench is vile and unbearable; in fact, I have been told that it is necessary for some of the stout-hearted ladies of the area to get up in the middle of the night and have a couple of brandies in order to calm themselves down and endure the rest of the night.

Mr. Jennings: Any excuse!

Mr. BOUNDY: I have not heard what the husbands do. The winds during the day tend to carry the stench away. I do not raise this matter lightly. I believe the Government should introduce research into this matter. The stench is caused by the giving off of methane gas and other matter from the effluent in the pondage outside these intensive piggeries. I have a publication entitled *Petroleum Gazette*, which seems an unlikely place to find a reference to this matter. In referring to fuel from feed lots, it states:

The steer that provides your steak may also produce the gas to cook it. The odds against one steer serving this dual function are indeed long, but it could happen. The Chicago company makes the point in a report on its moves to utilise a neglected and substantial source of energy. The source is the manure produced in vast quantities by beef herds as they fatten in feed lots. Unlike fossil fuels, it is a renewable energy source. Peoples Gas Company has contracted to take the output from plants being built in Oklahoma and Texas to convert accumulating manure at feedlots into methane, which is the main constituent of natural gas. The conversion technique is relatively simple and by no means new. Louis Pasteur helped develop the technology back in the nineteenth century. The Indian Government has been promoting it at the village level for several years. Called anaerobic fermentation, the method promotes bacterial reaction with the animal waste in an oxygen-free atmosphere, yielding methane and a useful form of fertiliser . . . "There's enough manure in the United States to produce 10-20 per cent of the nation's energy requirements, and we propose to tap that market," he says. Peoples Gas Company has also agreed to accept gas produced—in small volume initially—by a similar biogas process being developed by Chicago's Institute of Gas Technology, using urban refuse and sewage as feedstock.

That refers to the excreta of bulls and steers, but it could refer equally to excreta from pigs. If research were conducted into this matter, I am sure a means could be found to use such excreta in the future because undoubtedly the incidence of large numbers of intensive piggeries will add to this problem.

Another problem relating to intensive pig raising in small areas is drainage. I believe the Government should conduct more research into that problem as well. After several wet years, I imagine the drainage properties of the land surrounding some piggeries will cause a severe problem that will effect the property owners, particularly those down-hill from the piggeries. In raising these matters and suggesting to the Government that work should be done in this matter I do not criticise—

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. BOUNDY: I was implying no criticism of the piggery owners for their handling of their enterprises. I believe people involved in intensive pig raising are doing all they can to see that no harm comes to adjoining landholders and as little distress as possible is caused by the stench. I understand that an afforestation programme is being undertaken in an attempt to overcome the drainage problems in some of these areas. I am sure it will be agreed that more research and planning is needed so that these enterprises can be promoted so that they cause no harm to people living near them.

I was pleased when the Minister of Works tabled the report of the consultants on the use of Bolivar effluent. I have asked many times for this report to be tabled, and the Minister promised that it would be tabled in February of this year. I noticed that the report is dated February, but it is better late than never. We now have the report, which is most comprehensive. I believe the consultants (Kinnaird, Hill, DeRohan and Young) are to be congratulated on the work they have done in pro-

ducing such a comprehensive study of the water problems of the Adelaide Plains. The report recommends the reticulation of the whole area at a present cost of about \$20 000 000. In presenting this report to the House, the Minister gave a reasoned explanation until he said that the Government could not go on with it. He took up his Party's theme song of knocking the Federal Government when he said:

The scheme is therefore most unattractive economically, and could not be financed by the State, nor am I optimistic that the scheme would receive favourable consideration from the Commonwealth Government, particularly in the light of its present economic policies and the generally unhelpful attitude of that Government.

That is the policy of bashing the Fraser Government, and it is unnecessary in this case. The Minister has told us that this so-called penny-pinching Federal Government will not give us the money, but he has not said that this State has a generous surplus, that the Premier is always singing the praises of his Government's financial management, and that the financial returns are well above estimate for stamp duty, succession duty and land tax. I believe that the State Government has the funds to implement this scheme at least in part, and I agree with the Minister of Works that it is better to wait a few weeks to gauge the reaction of the growers in the Virginia area. It will take time for growers to evaluate the cost of using effluent.

The Minister made a statement of great value to those growers when he said that a five-year guarantee would be given in relation to their water quotas. What these people need more than anything else is to be secure in the knowledge that they can continue their enterprises, that they can make changes and improvements to their businesses, and that they can still be viable in the future. The Minister has helped them; they know they are secure for five years. They know that they can continue for at least that period. A few anomalies still exist in relation to the water supply in that area, and one of those anomalies was ventilated recently by the member for Light when he asked the Minister of Works whether anything would be done to review quotas. The Minister said, in reply, that he felt that the matter had been resolved, that there was no difficulty; the people who needed quotas and could use them already had them. I add my support to what has been said by the member for Light. Many of my constituents say that they would like to have a quota. They say they need a bigger quota, or that somebody has a quota that he is not using. Therefore, I think that the time is now appropriate for the matter of the justice of the allocation of quotas to be tested once again to ensure that those who need water and can use it do, in fact, have it.

I refer to a further anomaly, to which the Minister referred, that it has now been discovered that the basin will not become depleted as soon as was first thought. The Minister, stating that salinity would be localised, said:

This is due to the apparently limited areas by which the highly saline waters from the upper aquifers find their way into deeper aquifers, and the fact that the saline water from these upper aquifers will be substantially drained out in about 30 years time. This means that irrigation will be disrupted in certain localised areas due to salinity problems.

I believe that that is an anomaly, because while he has said that the life of the basin is longer than was first thought, he also admits that there will be localised salinity. While this may not be serious in the overall situation, it will be very serious to those growers whose

bores happen to be in the place where the salinity congregates. From being only partly viable, they will reach the situation where they have no future at all, and the Government will be required to relocate them somewhere else if it does not agree to reticulate the effluent water.

Not to act now means that this local salinity will discriminate against some growers. Also, it will be detrimental to the whole basin and ruinous to some individuals. I think the Government should consider the importance of the Virginia area and its value to the State. The Government cannot deny its proximity to the city. It is interesting to note that that area at Virginia provides, in January and February, 80 per cent to 100 per cent of the potatoes for the Adelaide market; 60 per cent to 80 per cent of the tomatoes for six months of the year; cabbages and cauliflowers, 80 per cent to 100 per cent, May to November; carrots, 60 per cent to 80 per cent of the supply for the whole year; lettuce, 60 per cent to 80 per cent of the supply for six months of the year; and spinach, 40 per cent to 60 per cent all the year. I would not mind if the spinach died out, but that is a side issue.

This area has a great value to the State, because it is the cheapest and closest area from which the city can be supplied with vegetables, etc. Another aspect of this matter that the Government should consider is the age of the community. We want to secure the situation in the Virginia area for a long time. The use of effluent water now will make the area viable for many years to come. The report of the consultants shows that 50.3 per cent of the population of the area is below the age of 24 years; it is a young community. This is significantly higher than for the State as a whole, where the proportion of population below the age of 24 years is 46.5 per cent. The report also says that the population aged over 65 years is considerably lower in Virginia than for the whole of the State, where the proportion of the population over 65 years is 8.5 per cent; in the region under consideration it is 4.8 per cent, so the population of the region seems to be more youthful than in the State as a whole.

Therefore, it is worth looking after, because, as all honourable members are aware, the average age of farmers in the State is fairly high. Here is an area of market gardeners with a young community, and it should be preserved. I, therefore, believe that the Government should proceed with stage 1, scheme A, as outlined in the consultants' report. This stage supplies the most intensive area of gardening land with a shandy. It provides for a three-quarters use of effluent and a one-quarter use from the underground basin. Obviously, that will reduce the draw on the basin. It will prolong the life of the basin, leave more underground water for the remainder, and prolong the time before salinity will become a problem.

I think that the Government also has a public relations job to do. It has to sell the idea that the effluent cost is largely offset by lower pumping charges and lower nutrient input requirements. The cost of the effluent to producers is in some respects offset on their income tax, and the most important aspect is the long-term security of this most valuable asset. In respect of scheme A, the cost of stage 1 is about \$6 500 000. I think that that is a cost that this State can easily bear in the light of its receipts.

I notice in the report that interest on capital is taken as 9.5 per cent, so interest has been allowed for in the costing. Additionally, of course, we need to use this effluent for the viability of the security of that district, but in a drought year particularly it should be of concern

to all of us that that effluent resource, which is flowing into St. Vincent Gulf, should be used as quickly as possible. It has been proved that that effluent is doing damage to the seabed of the gulf. It has been proved that it is affecting the breeding grounds of some fisheries. I believe it is imperative that the Government act to implement at least stage 1 of scheme A of the Bolivar effluent scheme as soon as possible.

I now wish to deal with the Governor's reference to the involvement of the Further Education Department in the development of Wardang Island as a self-supporting tourist venture. The Minister for the Environment has kindly furnished me with some details of what is proposed in this area.

Dr. Eastick: Do you think it can be done?

Mr. BOUNDY: I think it is fraught with many difficulties. The proposal is to teach adult Aborigines skills that can be used in the management and maintenance of their own area and of the tourist venture: to teach them welding. It is well known that an employment problem exists in areas such as Point Pearce and the Aboriginal community generally. If the Further Education Department could instruct and help Aborigines to acquire skills relevant to the needs of their community and in relation to this tourist venture, value would be found in the exercise. Unfortunately, in many areas of Aboriginal activity action is taken on an *ad hoc* basis and the kind of result hoped for is not achieved. However, this could be a step in the right direction. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): I support the motion. I congratulate the mover and seconder, both of whom spoke ably in the debate. The motion has been supported by all members who have spoken. It has been supported enthusiastically by members on this side and rather begrudgingly by members on the other side. This years debate is tinged with a certain sadness, because it is the last opening of Parliament by the present Governor, who has been an adornment to this State and an inspiration to its citizens. I am sure many people will long remember the Governor's reply in the *Advertiser* to critics who said that the hot gospeller, "Dr." Haggai or whatever his name is, should have been invited to visit Government House.

I am sure the Governor will have a long and well merited rest and that South Australia will be well served by his replacement, Sir Douglas Nicholls. May I also congratulate you, Sir, on rejoining the Labor Party—

Mr. Boundy: I hope you'll extend the same courtesy to me.

Mr. JENNINGS: —and to the Labor Party for accepting your application to return. It augurs well for your political future and virtually ensures your position as Presiding Officer of this Chamber, a position you have enhanced since accepting it. I am sorry that the member for Mitcham is not in the Chamber, because I congratulate him, too, for being elected auditor to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

Mr. Coumbe: Unopposed.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes.

Mr. Coumbe: Receiving the same stipend.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, it has neither been doubled nor reduced. The distinguished Leader of the Opposition spoke in this debate on Tuesday last. I did not hear much of what he said, because the rumbustious bellicosity of the Leader is not to my liking, particularly when it is insulated in a hot-air cushion. If *Hansard* has reported it correctly, the Leader said that he would knock the

Government over and over again. He has not done it once yet, so I do not believe he is likely to do it again. If the Leader's performance does not improve, he will not be given a chance much longer.

Let us consider what the Leader said and why he may have said it. He knows that he is not doing too well, that he has few able supporters on his side and that, despite his own energy and personal ambitions, his hopes of attaining power are waning day by day because of the regular performance of this Government and the disastrous performance of the Liberal Party in the Federal sphere. No wonder the Leader is becoming frustrated, realising that his long-cherished hopes to be Premier of the State are waning like the desert flower. The Leader did not need to lead a coup to knock off his able predecessor; he cannot do any better himself. He seeks the support of the press by sickening sycophancy. The Leader said:

... the extent of press bashing that goes on by the Government is appalling, underhanded and miserable; journalists are subjected to tirades of abuse and criticism in this House and are threatened with a ban or at least a condition that all material should be checked with the Premier for his approval.

I remember the Hon. Raymond Steele Hall, when he was Premier of this State, taking violent action against a reporter who was only doing his job. The Leader's Party has welcomed Steele Hall back into the fold.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I doubt whether they have welcomed him: they have taken him back.

Mr. JENNINGS: That is so. For some reason known only to the Liberal Party, it has taken him back into the fold despite what has happened in the meantime. The best journalist I have ever known in this House was Rhys Clark, of the Australian Broadcasting Commission. He had little time at his disposal, yet he was able to get valuable information in the limited time he had.

Dr. Eastick: He was scrupulously fair.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. I never heard him criticised by any member in the House.

Dr. Eastick: He recognised that every coin had two sides.

Mr. JENNINGS: The honourable member has interjected just what I was going to say. Great minds sometimes think alike. Journalists—

Mr. Coumbe: Insults won't get you anywhere.

Mr. JENNINGS: —make mistakes. They are human, after all. That should not prevent any Government, Minister or member criticising a reporter; indeed, most of us realise that reporters are severely circumscribed by sub-editors and others in what they do. Most of us would remember that whenever Sir Arthur Rymill made a speech on the "Flowers that bloom in the spring tra-la", or something like that, he was reported verbatim because he was a Director of the *Advertiser*.

Dr. Eastick: That's not correct. Now we start to differ.

Mr. JENNINGS: In this case I know the honourable member is wrong. The Leader says:

The Fraser Government is taking what action it can to contain inflation and return support to the private sector. What Fraser is doing to contain inflation is nothing but trying to curtail the operation of the Arbitration Commission to ensure that one section, the least able section in the community—the working section—bears the burden of inflation. He is undoubtedly trying as hard as he can to return support to the private sector. If he believes that the private sector will not insist on the greatest possible profits that can be extracted from the community, obviously he is not fooling himself but trying to fool the

rest of us. After all, that is nothing new; Mr. Fraser is following his old master. The "25 years ago" column last Saturday in the *Advertiser* stated:

Opening the Sydney "halt inflation" conference, Mr. Menzies invited the delegates to consider the application of a wage freeze as one measure for tackling the problem.

Mr. Olson: There's nothing about a profit freeze.

Mr. JENNINGS: No, there is never any suggestion of a profit freeze: that is an entirely different thing. The more I read of the Leader's speech, the more pleased I am that I relieved myself of the burden of listening to it. The Leader said about our Premier, "He has taken every opportunity to scare hell out of the people of South Australia, and this is another cardinal point." We know the penchant of the Leader to mix his metaphors, but surely it would be the point of most cardinals to scare hell out of people.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you the devil's advocate?

Mr. JENNINGS: I am on the Pope's right-hand side. The Leader said:

No other Premier would have less reason to squeal than would the Premier of this State. The matter of the railways and the Medibank arrangements, etc., has left the Government with surplus funds of which the Premier was proud to boast a few months ago and on which he has now gone quiet.

The Leader seems to be criticising the Treasurer of the State for good government and good administration. Of course this Government has done well financially, and it is the people of the State who benefit as a consequence, but it is only recently that the Leader more than once has asked that the surplus be spent on all sorts of profligate projects. One cannot spend money and still have it. What a mess we would be in now if this money had been allowed to be frittered away by the present lousy Liberal Treasurer in Canberra. We would not be in the position we are in today.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: We'd be like Victoria.

Mr. JENNINGS: We would be even worse. Surely it is clear that it is a prudent thing not to spend every cent one has, whether in Government or an individual, particularly in times of insecurity, which it seems is most of the time when the conservatives are in power. Let no-one in rebuttal of that statement try to tell me that I do not appreciate the difference between personal spending and Government spending. I know there is a difference. The esteemed Leader, when he referred to Medibank, would have done more service to the House if he had tried to explain Medibank as his Federal colleagues have emasculated it. I do not understand what goes on now, and I do not think that anyone to whom I have spoken understands, either. I do not think that many members would like to explain Medibank, as it exists. The Leader, for whom I have always had a secret affection (indeed, so secret that I have never admitted it to myself) is a gone coon. Surely it is only fair that, in the interests of responsible Government, which to some extent depends on a good Opposition, I should offer to choose its Leader, as it has failed so miserably to do. The next Leader should be the member for Victoria: he has had Ministerial experience, is of pleasant demeanour, and is a highbrow.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: He's a pillar of the church.

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not know about that. He is a farmer, and is thoroughly dedicated to the rotten principles of the Liberal Party. He would be an acceptable Leader of the Opposition, but would have as much hope of becoming the Premier as the former Leader had and as the present Leader has.

Mr. Slater: Would you vote for him?

Mr. JENNINGS: If I lived in Victoria, I would stand against him.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What about the person acting as Leader at present: would he have latent possibilities?

Mr. JENNINGS: That is a different proposition altogether. I think he has latent ability. I have solved the problems of the Liberal Party, and I think that that is enough statecraft for me for one day. The rest is up to the people of Australia. New South Wales has given a good lead by kicking out the conservatives after they had woken up to prefect Fraser, something that has not been referred to by Opposition members, strangely enough. The Opposition has spoken about everyone else, but I do not think that anyone has bothered to refer to that.

Mr. Slater: It was a large swing, too.

Mr. JENNINGS: It took a large swing. The rest of the Commonwealth will soon wake up, and the conservative coalition will crack.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Here's your designated Leader now.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, because I am going to choose him. His Party has tacitly agreed that I will be given the chance to choose its new Leader. Evidence of the beginning of the crack in the coalition is apparent by the recent announcements of Mr. Anthony, Deputy Prime Minister, who certainly has the Country Party in his pocket. I conclude by saying that I am a prophet in my own country, but with honour.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): Having listened to some of the contributions from the Government side, particularly the last one, I wonder why some members bother to speak. I wonder how many more are yet to speak. I support the motion moved by the member for Florey and seconded by the member for Semaphore. I join with all other members in the usual courtesy of extending congratulations and condolences in the normal way. I am sorry that Sir Mark Oliphant is to leave us. Sir Mark is a graduate of the Adelaide University. I wish his successor well on the job, and I suppose that we will have the honour of being invited to his induction ceremony later in the year.

I have noted some of the contributions of Government members to the debate. The member for Florey entertained us with his usual fiery and free-flowing style. He left us in no doubt what his sentiments were, because he put them forcibly in his own inimitable way. I thought that one of his phrases was a gem. When he was taunted by one of my colleagues about the use of the secret ballot and asked the question about a person wanting to donate to the Liberal Party, the member for Florey was frank about what would happen: the applicant's name would go to the next stop-work meeting, which would be told that this person wished to contribute to the Liberal Party (I am using the honourable member's own words), and it would be up to the meeting to decide. The honourable member also said that no such unionist had applied.

Mr. Wells: That's right.

Mr. COUMBE: Who would be game? He would finish up in the drink. I have great admiration and respect for the member for Florey, but I think that that remark surpasses all his other frank statements. What hope would anyone have? In other words, everything is fair except from that point of view. The member for Semaphore gave us the benefit of his erudition, but it was a perfect

example of doctrinaire socialism, if I may say so. I almost wanted to give him a soap box. I know he will take this in the kindly way it is meant. He was a little mixed up with his financial sources, because he was out of his depth. If he had done his research, he would have found that the matters for which he was criticising the Fraser Government were cut out by the Hayden Budget last year. I have checked that.

The cuts in funds for tertiary education from which we are now suffering were a direct result of the Hayden Budget, which introduced the 12-months pause in tertiary education and the end of triennial funding, as we had known it for many years. People connected with tertiary education rue the day when the 12-months pause came into being in August, 1975; its effects are now being felt drastically in many of our universities and colleges of advanced education.

I prefer not to comment on the remarks of the previous speaker, but I listened with considerable interest to the contribution of the member for Playford. I thought his speech was an exception to the rule, as he made a considered and valuable contribution. He is undoubtedly an expert on industrial law, particularly on workmen's compensation. I asked myself why the member for Playford had been passed over for a place in the Ministry in favour of the present incumbent: his speeches are always rather erudite and able. It was suggested to me that he should replace the present Attorney-General, because of the Attorney's rather dismal performance of late and his ability to put his foot in it on every possible occasion. When this was suggested to me, I violently disagreed. I want the present incumbent to stay there. It suits me and the Liberal Party extremely well; the longer he is there, the more the Liberal Party will benefit.

Mr. Langley: Who passed you over in your Party?

Mr. COUMBE: I was christened many years ago.

Mr. Langley: I know what happened to you, and you well know it.

Mr. Allison: You are doing a good job, and they don't like it.

Mr. COUMBE: That is the usual reaction when things get under their skin. I heard the member for Unley making some noises, which I took to be a contribution: he followed the general line of the other speakers. I have checked with my colleagues to see whether my impression is correct, and you, Sir, who have sat here for weary hour after weary hour, would no doubt have come to the same conclusion. Without fail Government members have toed the Party line from the start, and have set out deliberately in an attempt to denigrate the Leader of the Opposition in this place and the Prime Minister in Canberra.

The natural reaction is to question the motive, and one realises that the pathetic performance from Government members highlights the paucity of ability of members opposite. The member for Tea Tree Gully was one exception, because she made some good points in her speech. What we have seen in the past few days—

Mr. Langley: But why—

Mr. COUMBE: I know the member for Unley is dying to get a word in, but he had his chance, so I will have my turn now. We are seeing what I would call a tired State Government, a Government that has been in office for a little more than six years and is becoming tired and running out of steam. It would seem that it has no alternative, so its members have been instructed to resort to personal vilification.

Mr. Langley: Oh!

Mr. COUNBE: That is so. The honourable member who preceded me, the master of alliteration and the pun, indulged in a little bit of this; he is a past master of the art. I recall that the Premier said publicly earlier this year (and I am paraphrasing) that he was more interested in consolidation and administration than in introducing much new legislation. We have seen that. One has only to peruse the Speech to realize that it amplifies my points. Many matters referred to in the proliferation of subjects presented in the 1975 Speech were not discussed by the House in the previous session.

In this session, it would seem that undue emphasis is being placed on industrial matters. Why are they so predominant and so pre-eminent? Obviously industrial matters, as a whole, are slipping out of the grasp and control of the Government. The intended introduction of a whole series of industrial measures is an action to pacify the industrial wing of the Labor Party. It is an old Parliamentary adage, and I am sure the Attorney-General is aware of it, that the principle of legislation should be that all legislation is remedial. One can realise the sense in that. Some of the items in the Speech referring to the legislative programme for this season are certainly not remedial. Some points need to be improved, but many are simply a rehashing of other matters, while some are simply not required urgently.

Previous speakers from my Party have referred to splits in the Government Party. It is not necessary for me to emphasise that point, because it is obvious to anyone who watches the faces of members opposite, their habits, and their performance—particularly the performance. One has only to look at the members of the A.L.P. Parliamentary Party in both Houses (of which I understand you, Sir, are now a member; I am not referring to you in any way) to realise how many are former union secretaries or officials, and to realise why we have this preoccupation with industrial matters. It is being done deliberately to pacify the industrial wing of the Party, because these matters are slipping out of the hands of the Government, and the trade union movement (in some cases quite rightly, in my opinion) is becoming a bit fed up with some of the academic measures introduced in this House by fellow travellers in the Government. I know that not one Government member would agree publicly, but would probably agree privately, although he would not say so. If there were none of this internecine strife in the Party opposite, why did the member for Unley spend his whole time in this debate trying to whitewash his Party? He would have us believe that all is apple pie in his Party, and that they are a bunch of happy fellows.

Mr. Langley: And we are, too.

Mr. COUNBE: The honourable member came in on cue: thank you, that is what I was fishing for. I reiterate that we have a tired Government, which is running out of ideas: it is a desperate Party—

Mr. Langley: Remember Thomas Playford! Four months of the year we used to sit.

Mr. COUNBE: Has that something to do with what I am talking about?

Mr. Langley: You are talking about a tired Government. You were very tired.

Mr. COUNBE: The present Government is tired because it is running out of ideas. It is running out of steam. During this debate, during Question Time, and during the grievance debate at the adjournment of the House each evening, Government members, one after the other are criticising the Federal Government: they have not missed a chance. Certainly, that is their prerogative, but why

are they doing it? It is obvious they are trying to cover up (not very successfully) the present State Labor Government's shortcomings. I said that the Government was desperate: at every opportunity, at the drop of a hat, Ministers, particularly the Minister of Transport, criticise the Federal Government, because their own Party is in such a state of disarray in Canberra. Of course Jim Cairns did not help much this week, either. I believe that the riots and disturbances in relation to Sir John Kerr are taking place in order to take the pressure off the disabilities and inabilities of the present Labor Party's operations in Canberra; they have nothing else to talk about.

Mr. Venning: It didn't stop Jim Cairns from hitting the headlines.

Mr. COUNBE: Jim Cairns put his foot right in it. At least the Federal Government is doing one thing differently from the way the Whitlam Government did it: it is getting away from the trend that was so evident in the Whitlam Government for bigger and bigger Governments. One has only to peruse the statistical records of the number of departments, sub-departments, secretaries, assistant secretaries, and so on, set up and appointed, to realise the phenomenal growth of the Federal Government from 1972 to 1975 in Canberra. At least the Fraser Government is trying to cut down on that, and I wish that that philosophy could be carried through to the operations of the Government in South Australia. I was somewhat staggered recently when I saw figures showing the growth of the Public Service and ancillary departments conducted by this Government. What has caused all the trouble that members opposite are complaining about? They have asked why certain cuts are necessary. The present Federal Government certainly inherited a frightening financial position. The deficit that was to occur would have staggered any Government. The Federal Government has inherited the highest inflation rate in Australia's history; the highest deficit and highest potential deficit in Australia's history, and soaring unemployment. All this happened during the regime of the Whitlam Government, which members opposite have lauded from time to time. They were all caused by a considerable amount of bungling, incompetence, and corrupt Labor administration. Scandal after scandal occurred. Two Ministers (Murphy and Barnard) resigned and got out before the balloon went up. However, others, like Clyde Cameron, were demoted. I believe that the demotion of Clyde Cameron should never have happened. I do not always agree with him, but at least I respect some of his opinions and I believe he was one of the more able Ministers of the Whitlam Government, apart from being a South Australian. During that time there were three different Treasurers, and we saw the spectacle of one Treasurer (Jim Cairns) not even presenting a Budget. One of the national major problems we have to face is inflation.

Mr. Langley: How much has the inflation rate changed since your Party came to Government?

Mr. COUNBE: It is going down and the rate of building is going up. Under the Whitlam Government inflation was climbing and climbing. The Premier last year allowed for 20 per cent inflation, but it is now just over 12 per cent.

Mr. Langley: What about the unemployment figure?

Mr. COUNBE: The unemployment figure is up, but it started during the time of the Whitlam Government, and it cannot be turned back overnight. The member for Unley knows that: if he wants to blame anyone for unemployment, he can blame the Whitlam Government,

where it started. The member for Unley and his colleagues have done nothing to inspire confidence in the manufacturing industries in this State and to help them reduce unemployment.

Mr. Langley: Have you ever heard the statement—

Mr. CUMBE: I will give the honourable member an example. Yesterday, a member quoted from the annual report of the South Australian Brewing Company. The Chairman of that company, in making some caustic remarks about excise, said that the excise paid last year was the highest in the company's history of about 100 years, and that the last huge excise increase was brought about by the Whitlam Government, the friend of the worker who drinks the beer. How did the Whitlam Government treat the worker? It increased the price of beer by imposing a record rate of excise.

Mr. Langley: Is your Government going to change it?

Mr. CUMBE: The present Government said, the other day, that excise on beer would not be increased. I hope the honourable member for Unley is beginning to have second thoughts about his inane interjections.

Mr. Langley: No, I'm not; in no way at all.

Mr. CUMBE: I say the bias is showing in the speeches made by members opposite. Their vindictiveness in some of the comments that have been made really amazes me. Of course, they overlook the verdict given by the electors last December, when the Labor Party nationally suffered the greatest defeat in the history of Commonwealth elections. Never before has a Government of either Party been returned with such a huge majority as the Liberal and National Country Party coalition was returned with. As a corollary, I recall very well the antics of the Premier during last year's State election campaign in publicly dissociating himself from the then Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, claiming that his support of Whitlam was hurting him (the Premier). After the election, they immediately became buddies again. One would think butter would not melt in their mouths.

I have mentioned one or two aspects of the Governor's Speech in passing, but one matter I noticed seems to be a sin of omission: there is no mention of finance. There is a paragraph referring to a possible trading result, or a small surplus, but, for the first time that I can recall, there is no mention of financial figures in His Excellency's Speech, and I invite members to look at the papers to see that this is the case. I do not know whether this was done deliberately or not, but normally His Excellency, in addressing members of the Assembly, talks about the finances of the State. There must be some reason for that omission. The State Budget is being handed down after the show recess, this year, a little later than usual. I have been in this House for some years, and the Budget has always been introduced by the State Treasurer on which day the House rises for the show recess. The show recess gives those honourable members who care to study these matters and do their work diligently and conscientiously an opportunity to study those figures. They cannot be easily digested in a short scanning of the document, and they are vitally important to the welfare of the State. With these two facets I have mentioned, one wonders why this is happening.

The Premier says he is waiting on the outcome of the Federal Budget, but that will be brought down on August 17. It will be interesting to see not only the result of that Budget but also the outcome of the State Budget and how the Premier will fix his figures. It will be most interesting to see the Treasurer's statement and how he will comment on the effect of the Federal Budget

on the State's finances. One good thing that may come out of the deferment of the introduction of the State Budget is that perhaps we will have, for the first time, the Auditor-General's report available concurrently with the Budget papers, which will be interesting and welcome.

I wish now to speak briefly on one or two matters that I believe concern us all, because His Excellency, in his Speech, talks about a number of industrial matters in which I am interested. I believe it is germane and cogent that I speak on one or two matters in this regard. I appeal to the community as a whole to have a little bit more common sense in day-to-day workings, whatever one's vocation is. We saw earlier this year, the complete debacle at the Ansett building opposite Parliament House. You, Mr. Speaker, have probably seen this daily. I understand there were more than 50 disputes on that project.

Mr. Venning: They were mainly between employee and employee.

Mr. CUMBE: The honourable member is quite right. I have always regarded demarcation disputes as one of the most unnecessary types of dispute in our community. It saddens me to think of the number of demarcation disputes going on, mainly caused by inter-union jealousies. Nobody wins in these cases, so I say that the demarcation type of dispute, which you, Mr. Speaker, have seen in your district, and the inter-union jealousies that have gone on across the road are to be deplored. They do not help anybody. Although the domestic and home building rates are going up, commercial building rates have shrunk, and very few are planned for the City of Adelaide. When this sort of thing happens, unfortunately investors or developers, who are likely to create employment by putting money into the erection of large buildings, are frightened off. The message seems to have gone out, "Do not build in Adelaide; you will never get your building finished." This is the regrettable part of this whole matter.

Ultimately, it is the tradesmen and workers on those projects themselves and their families who will suffer, so I appeal for a little common sense in this regard, because in most instances the disputes are not with the principal but between one union and another about who will do certain work, or who shall operate a lift to take goods to a certain floor. How silly can you get? It saddens me to see that sort of thing happen.

Many articles have appeared in the national press, not only in South Australia but in Australia, about the whole future of apprentices. You and I, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have experienced the apprenticeship system. I believe we must give some solid thought to the whole future of the apprenticeship system as a means of training and providing tradesmen for the future, in whatever field of endeavour or whatever craft it may be, because, if we do not train apprentices in the appropriate number and in the right disciplines or in the right trades, certainly in the future we will suffer. I would be the last person who wishes to see migrants brought into Australia as tradesmen to the detriment of natural born Australians. We must consider carefully the future of this type of endeavour. Reports that have appeared in national and South Australian newspapers have canvassed both sides of the question and highlighted the desirability and the disabilities of the system. I served an apprenticeship. My father, my grandfather, his father before him, and I have employed apprentices.

We are coming to the crossroad of this aspect of apprenticeship. The Apprenticeship Commission is doing a good job. The Chairman, Mr. Crawford Hayes, has my admiration for the way in which he is administering

the law in that field. Today, with better educational opportunities being available, a snob value has crept into the thinking of many parents who want their boys to go into white collar jobs rather than become tradesmen. That must be corrected. Sooner or later, those who go into dead-end jobs at a fairly reasonable salary find they have no future, whereas a lad with a ticket has a future, provided certain things happen.

Broader courses must be introduced so that a lad who enters a trade does not need to stick to that trade for all of his life. He must be trained in a wider fashion so that he can improve himself. Shorter term indentures must be considered, too. Several years ago the indenture was six years, subsequently it was reduced to five years, and is now four years with a provision for a three-year indenture period. Apprentices receive credits for approved subjects studied at secondary schools. Block release training is a splendid idea. Under that system an apprentice receives continuous training for a certain number of weeks. The block release system is the result of training country apprentices, who have a problem peculiar to that area. Block training is now being used in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Overseas it is called "sandwich" course, isn't it?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, it is a good expression, especially in the brick-laying industry, which is one trade where a crash course has been accepted and where youths have been given a start. After their initial training, if youths go into the workshop it is to their own and their employer's benefit. Technical education facilities must be improved. Most lads who enter an apprenticeship now have been exposed to at least three years of secondary education. Of course, not all of them have passed the necessary examinations. Years ago a lad would enter an apprenticeship at the age of 14 or 15.

We must also consider introducing mature age apprenticeships. I am not suggesting that we revert to the troubles that were experienced with "dilutees" after the Second World War. Wages, too, must be reviewed, and employers and trade unions must seriously consider this matter. There has been quite a revolution in European countries and in the United Kingdom in this regard. Regarding mature age apprenticeships, unions may have to think about qualifications and get away from the old ideas and antagonisms expressed in the time of "dilutees". Employees might have to look at appropriate wage rates for mature age apprentices.

Another matter to be considered is the ratio adhered to and demanded by unions of one apprentice to three tradesmen. Some industries are crying out for tradesmen, so that ratio may have to be reconsidered. With the consent of the Apprenticeship Commission, the ratio can be varied. I have suggested several matters that are worth considering; I have put them forward in a constructive manner. We ignore this matter at our peril as far as industry is concerned.

It has been suggested to me that employers should be offered incentives to take on more employees. A monetary incentive operates at present, but it has been suggested to me that a remission in pay-roll tax could be given to a company or an employer who enrolls more apprentices than it is necessary to employ. I put that suggestion forward because I am concerned about this aspect in a State where we rely more and more on manufacturing industries for the welfare and livelihood of the people of the State. Undoubtedly, my friends from the rural sector will agree that rural populations are declining because young people are coming to the city to find work not only because of

financial and weather problems but also because farms and stations are now far more automated than they were five or ten years ago.

I have heard one or two members opposite beat their breasts about the question of private enterprise. I would remind them that private enterprise employs the greatest number of people in this State; in fact, in Australia. It is the aim of the present Federal Government to reduce the number of people employed in the public sector and to boost employment in the private sector. That is a good course to follow. Between 1972 and 1975 a terrific expansion, which the Federal Government is now trying to reverse, occurred in the Commonwealth Public Service. I hope the same happens in the State Public Service, too.

When local government is considered, too, we see that the public sector employment figure is frighteningly high. In 99 per cent of cases, people employed in that area are non-productive, so the rest of the employing community must provide gainful and useful employment. Despite the hoo-ha from the Premier about trying to assist private enterprise in this State and about wooing people to come here from Penang, Asia, Europe, Japan, or wherever, what do we get? The Premier, at a Chifley memorial lecture given about a week ago in another State, slammed private enterprise as hard as he could. He cannot have it both ways; on the one hand, he is trying to woo Japanese business men to come here and, on the other hand, publicly kicking private enterprise in the tail. One can only think that he is a chameleon.

I have heard Government members in this and in other debates talk about profit as though it were a dirty word. When you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, were in business, you had to make a profit or you would not have been in business for long. It seems to be a dirty word in the mouths of some Government members. What happened last year in the Federal sphere? Suddenly the Federal Government woke up to what was going on because of the squeeze put on private enterprise, and we found no lesser persons than Messrs. Whitlam, Hayden and McClelland (senior Ministers) saying, "We must have a profit, and help private enterprise. We can't get on without profit."

Mr. Dean Brown: Even Jim Cairns.

Mr. COUMBE: He came on to the scene.

Mr. Dean Brown: He may not be on the scene much longer.

Mr. COUMBE: He may be an ephemeral figure at present. We must have profit; otherwise, people would not be in business. During the term of the Whitlam Government, many of us suffered. I was one, and my century-old family firm went to the wall, but I am not bitter about it. If we are going to have a better Australia and South Australia, we must give all sorts of advantages to industries coming here, and existing industries must be able to expand and to continue to operate without harassment from the Government. It is as simple as that, yet we find the Premier making the snide remarks he made in the Chifley memorial lecture that would drive anyone away from entering the State. He has said several times that he has a vast department (it is certainly vast; one cannot keep count of the number of bodies in it) which sets out to attract and assist industry.

I happen to serve on a voluntary committee which has as its object research into and assistance to South Australian industries in promoting new products. Unfortunately, an organisation collapsed last year. I am pleased to see what Amdel is doing in this regard, along with other organisations. I think that we must go even further:

we must more actively promote industries. We have a new Director-General of Industry (Mr. Bill Davies), whom I know very well, and I wish him well in what he is doing. I believe that he, too, needs the support of his Premier as well as that of every member of the Government Party. I assure you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that all Opposition members want to see industry promoted, but what has happened to my Party's suggestion about helping small businesses? I have heard nothing much about that. When I asked a question of the Premier earlier this year, he said that it had been taken care of, but I have found no instances of that. I am talking not only about self-employed persons but about those employers who employ between six and 20 people; they want help and expertise in their operations.

The whole tenor of the speeches we have heard from the Government side has been extremely critical; there is no doubt about that. They have been motivated by the orders that have gone out from the Leader of the Government to denigrate at every opportunity members of my Party and its leadership; that simply shows the paucity of the Government's ability in this realm and the fact that it is a desperate and tired Government. In the circumstances, I have no option but to support the motion.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I, too, support the motion and congratulate the mover and seconder, but I do not support what they said. I believe that they set out in the main to denigrate the Federal Government, which has been given one of the most difficult tasks any Australian Government has been given. The Federal Government, I think, is doing its job well. Before the election, every Australian knew that there had to be a tightening of the economy before Australia could get back on the road of economic stability and be able to progress, with people having confidence within our community. That kind of attack is not warranted and should not be condoned in any way.

I also support the remarks of those members who have referred to the ex-members of Parliament who have died, and I express my condolences to their families. I did not know two of the late gentlemen, but I did know Jim Ferguson. I was fortunate, on coming into Parliament, to be placed in the same room as Jim, when he had a damaged neck. It was a balanced House, and he had to come here and lie down for many hours to see whether there would be a tied vote in the House. I appreciate his sincerity and the advice which he, as an elder statesman, gave me. I also appreciate the help he gave along the way in the initial few months that a new member needs to settle down in what one might call a strange environment. I owe a lot to Jim Ferguson, and I express my sincere thanks for the help he gave me, even though I gave my thanks to him personally years ago.

Earlier today, the Deputy Premier tried, when answering a question, to make a scathing attack on the Deputy Leader and me in relation to day-labour and the use of that method within the State system of construction and development. I say to those people who have that philosophy that even in the Scandinavian countries, Great Britain, Germany, France and Italy, whatever country one goes to in Europe, the people avoid the day-labour system in the public construction field. They have had many more centuries of experience than Australia has had in the field of development and they are aware of the problems. When the Deputy Premier was cornered today, he decided to attack. He was asked whether any study had been undertaken, or was likely to be, to ascertain whether the day-labour

system was efficient or otherwise. The accusation was not made that it was necessarily inefficient.

I am sorry I missed the chance to inspect a new building that the Deputy Premier said was available for inspection while I was away, but perhaps what I learned in that time was more important than looking at a building under construction. It is like looking at a painting when it is half finished, and when it is complete. Unless one knows the number of man-hours and the method of costing, one can never tell whether the system is efficient or otherwise. That is the problem we face.

When we ask the Highways Department for the cost of a project, does it quote only man-hours of the men working on the job, and the number of hours the machines are used, or does it quote a total cost, including all the administration costs involved in putting the project into operation? This detail can never be tracked down, and that was all the Deputy Leader was asking. We have a Government which, on many occasions, has said it believes in open government. How much more open can it be than to make available the details of the efficiency of day-labour compared to other methods, with a complete study of that aspect?

If we are spending substantial amounts, or perhaps more than we should be spending, because of the day-labour system, let us change the methods. However, if we are saving millions by using that system, we should use all day-labour. It must be one or the other, and the system can be justified only by a close examination. Many people believe that the day-labour system, particularly in building trades, is inefficient. I tend to be one who supports that philosophy, because I have no evidence to the contrary. Until we have that evidence, how can we support the system?

It is easy for the Deputy Premier to make statements such as he made today and say, "You could have seen the building half finished and you would have seen that it was an excellent project," but that is not proof, because one does not know the cost in real terms. The Deputy Premier and his Party are hiding behind that: unfortunately for the State he is deliberately avoiding the truth. The Deputy Leader made a reasonable request at a time when every Government department in Australia (State or Federal) had been asked to consider its cost structure and its efficiency. Surely, that is part of the problem we face.

Recently, the Premier has made statements about money for housing not being made available by the Federal Government. I suggest that the Premier should be cautious, because the building industry is close to a critical point. I will not say much about that today; possibly the chance will come in the Loan Estimates debate. We are building houses at the rate of about 14 000 or more a year, and 14 000 is the critical figure for the industry, the point at which we are able to supply bricks, timber, other materials, and the tradesmen. Once we exceed 14 000 a year we are in a difficult situation with shortages of labour and material: there is the chance to exploit the industry by asking for more, and a dangerous situation is created when we are trying to attack inflationary trends.

The Premier should be cautious. If he speaks to people in the industry, he will know (and I think he knows already, if he is honest) that the industry breaking point is about 14 000 houses a year. The Premier might perhaps become a little more active regarding housing by looking at the methods of his so-called friend in philosophy in New South Wales, where the Government is considering the possibility that people on above-average incomes may have to pay a little more rent for the commission houses in which they

live. The Premier, by doing this, could back up the statements he made earlier when he said that some action should be taken in this matter.

The member for Torrens raised an important issue in relation to the apprenticeship system. Although education is an advantage to a child or to a person in any profession, I am convinced that sometimes the individual can be disadvantaged, to a degree, if he wishes to become a tradesman and must continue at school until he is 17 or 18 years of age. At that age, young people are nearly adults, but they are asked to work for much less than the adult rate of pay. They have to compete socially with their friends, many of whom (except those studying at tertiary level) receive full adult rates of pay. Apprentices, whether boys or girls, have to compete, and they are never guaranteed a chance to be in the high income group: they are in the tradesman group.

They are disadvantaged. Often they become disillusioned with society after they have continued for so long with their education and find they are in what they think is a dead-end stream for a few years. I strongly believe we would be better to encourage some young people to leave school at an earlier age, if they show the attributes required to take up a trade. In many cases they would then be qualified at the age of 18 years. Why should we not encourage them to become tradesmen by the time they reach the age of majority? If they are at an age to accept all other responsibilities, why can they not be fully qualified tradesmen? If they wish to go back to school and further their education on becoming qualified or during the process, they may do so under the present education system. I support the member for Torrens in his concern about apprentices.

Much has been said, I think unnecessarily and unfairly, both here and in other places regarding the Olympic Games and the success, or lack of it, of our sportsmen and sportswomen. I do not believe we have anything to be ashamed of. Maybe we should be disappointed, but perhaps what has happened at the Olympic Games is to a degree typical of trends within our society. At home we have lost the attitude to compete and compete keenly, so that our top sportsmen and women, such as the Olympians, who are keen to compete and who do make sacrifices, do not have the competition at home to push them further towards their goals. I think that is where we are falling down as much as anywhere. Our dedicated top sports people are not able to get the competition necessary to improve their performances. I hope that the community realises this.

I know business in years gone by have made substantial contributions to sport, and I think they still do to a great degree, but not as much in purchasing power as they did. That is because they have been taxed out of existence. They themselves are struggling to survive. In this State provision for long service leave, workmen's compensation, and extra holidays have all placed a toll upon businessmen in the community, so that they have to consider their budgets, and then say that they do not have the money to promote what are believed to be good things within our community. When people start attacking the Commonwealth Government, I hope they realise that it has been in power for only a few months, and Olympians are not made in a few months. If people want to play politics they should consider the number of medals won before 1972, but I believe it is above politics. It is not the fault of the Commonwealth Government, but the result of our own attitude.

Yesterday, I asked the Premier a question about a sporting complex for the South Australian Meat Corporation at Pooraka. I believe there is a smell associated with this

that seems to be hidden. I do not know what is in the Premier's mind, or in the mind of the Minister of Agriculture about this, but someone should make a statement about the newspaper report that appeared on December 22, 1975. Either they have not been advised of what is going on in the development of a sporting centre in South Australia, or an error was made in the *News* report of Monday, December 22, 1975. The headline was "Sporting Centre for Pooraka, Largest of Kind in Australia". The report stated:

The South Australian Meat Corporation is planning a major recreation development south of Salisbury.

When the Minister of Agriculture was asked about the newspaper report he said he had no knowledge of it. I am sure one of the back-benchers in this place had knowledge of that newspaper report, and would have brought it to his attention. It was to be a large project including an ice-skating rink, indoor bowling facilities, social and medical complex for the Abattoirs Employees Association, child care centre, indoor sports stadium with multi-purpose hall, three bowling greens, 18-hole golf course, flexi-games area, picnic park with sweat track, lake, roller skating areas, cycle and pedestrian paths, and bridle tracks. That cannot be announced in relation to a semi-government department, a statutory body, and Ministers say they do not know anything about it. They should at least say that it has never been considered and that that report is totally false, and that Mr. Harry Bowey (the Mayor in that area) is wrong in saying it was on, and that Mr. Jack Bormann (Town Clerk) is wrong in saying that it was being considered. They have put their names to it, and yet both of those people say it is not on.

Dr. Eastick: Both of which people say it is not on?

Mr. EVANS: The Premier, and the Minister of Agriculture in another place. Mr. Bowey and Mr. Bormann say it is on. I have a suspicion that one or two members particularly in the other place, of the A.L.P., have been dropping one or two words around the place to put the skids under a man they have been able to find a useful tool: that is the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport. I am concerned that a person who has tried to do his best is now, possibly, going to be thrown to the wolves for the sake of political philosophy.

First, there was an advertisement for a Director of Tourism. We are told, as a result of a question by the member for Hanson, that there were 23 applicants, but that none was successful.

In the *News* of February 20 this year appeared a report that Mr. Beresford from the Australian Tourist Commission, a senior executive, had been appointed. The Public Service notices of February 18 contained a similar announcement. It did not say who the appointment was made by in either case, so who did make the announcement? Who gave permission for the documentation to go through? Did somebody set the Minister up to put some more doubts in the minds of the public, so that there could be justification for casting him aside? At the same time, I see that the Hon. Mr. Geddes, in the Upper House asked a question on Tuesday, August 3, about the appointment of two people to the positions of Research and Development Manager and Marketing Manager in the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department. The positions were advertised, but when asked whether those positions were filled, the Hon. Mr. Casey said:

The only indication I can give the honourable member at this stage is that the appointees have not yet been decided. As I am conscious of the fact that these two positions are of major importance to the development of the South Australian tourist industry, I hope that some finality can be reached soon.

I want to know who is making the decisions: if the Minister is keen to make the appointments, who is holding the appointments up? Is it the board? Is it the Deputy Premier? Is it the Premier? Whence are the hitches coming?

Fortunately, or unfortunately, whilst I was in Hong Kong I made one or two contacts who, on a continuing basis, will be of some help to me in relation to tourism, and I am pleased I did, because one person told me at the time that a friend of his (not a direct friend but a person with similar interests) had applied for the job as Director of Tourism. He did not say who it was or what the person's name was, and it did not really matter, because I realised that the chance of somebody being appointed from Macao would be doubtful. Subsequently, on arriving home, I was told certain things, and I have written back, asking the name.

I have been told that that person has been promised a job in the Premier's Department in marketing. I ask the question in my own mind, "Is that in the area of marketing in the Tourist Bureau, and will the Tourist Bureau be transferred to the Premier's Department?" I believe that (and once I know the correct name I will make it public) this move may be intended. In the magazine *Travel Trade* of June 14, 1976, the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport is reported to have said:

The South Australian bureau is living 20 years in the past.

Perhaps I am wrong in saying that he said that, but it is reported that he said it. The report continued "Claims Casey", and then stated:

The South Australian Tourist Bureau is likely to undergo major changes making it a more effective marketing body as a result of the State's first tourism plan.

We are referring to marketing again, which makes me wonder whether we are going to have a Director of Tourism at all—

Mr. Slater: A marketing manager, do you think?

Mr. EVANS: —and whether there is to be a marketing manager in the Premier's Department. It is interesting to hear a Minister say that it is the first tourism plan for South Australia, when his Government has been in Government for 6½ years of the last 20 years. He says it is the first time they have had a tourism plan in that department, and he sets out to criticise that department. During the past week I have spoken to people in the Australian Tourist Commission in Melbourne and people in the industry in South Australia, and when I referred to that report, one person said to me, "That is a lift-out by Casey from the report on the Government Tourist Bureau". I said, "What report?" He said, "The one into the Public Service." I went to the Public Service report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Public Service of South Australia, and on page 130, which falls under the heading of, "Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport 6.318" and one paragraph I wish to refer to stated:

The committee do not propose to comment on the Tourist Bureau division, having learned that it is to be investigated by a separate committee.

The first thing I do when I wish to get a report is go to the obvious place, as a Parliamentarian would, and I found that a report was produced last year, but that it is not available to members of Parliament, or to the public.

Mr. Coumbe: Shame!

Mr. EVANS: The original committee that investigated the Public Service said that it would not consider this department because there was a committee already investigating it, and logically believed in all honesty that that subsequent report would be available to the public. A

person named Tattersall was in charge of that committee. The report was made available some time late in 1975, but what makes me angry is that a person in the industry has seen that report outside of the Government department, because he told me that this report of Casey's was a direct lift-out. Did the report come out after June, 1976? I am sure that it did not, because it came out last year; the Minister considered it, and thought it might get out one day, but that he would be in the clear, because he knew the skids were under him. I believe the Tattersall report should be made public. It forms part of the report on the Public Service, and should not be hidden because it is a public report. The Corbett committee deliberately left it out because it was believed that that report was to be made public. I understand that it is hidden away in the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department. According to *Travel Trade*, Mr. Casey admitted that he was not happy with the bureau and that it was living twenty years in the past. Yet the member for Henley Beach, when he was Minister assisting the Premier on matters of tourism, and the Premier himself, as a result of my questions over the past three years, have said that tourism in South Australia is the best and has had the largest increase of any State in Australia. Yet, the Hon. Mr. Casey can say that the bureau is twenty years in the past.

Dr. Eastick: So much for open Government.

Mr. EVANS: I wonder whether the present Minister decided to adopt a similar tack to that taken by the Attorney-General when the Attorney said that the Public Service was overly bureaucratic, inefficient and, worst of all, it clothed its operations in secrecy and seemed to take a delight when dealing with the public in reducing people to unbearable levels of frustration. Is that what the present Minister is trying to do, or has he been told to say what he has said by someone above him, or has he been forced into the situation so that the Tourist Bureau can be disposed of or be controlled by the Premier's Department? There is something wrong, and we, as Parliamentarians, should be told what has been done.

The Australian Federation of Travel Agents is a united group trying to promote tourism in this country and outside Australia but, in the main, its loyalties are at home. An unnamed member of the association said, according to the report in *Travel Trade*, that the bureau has been criticised for selling overseas travel. I do not object to that comment. A State Government tourist bureau's duty is not necessarily to sell overseas travel. The Australian Federation of Travel Agents should consider its own operation, because I understand that it is holding its August convention in Hong Kong.

Perhaps the federation is justified in going outside Australia at times, but I hope it will not continue to do so. The Adelaide Convention Bureau's newsletter suggests that A.F.T.A. is preparing a bid to stage the 1978 Australian Federation of Travel Agents Convention in Adelaide. If successful, the convention will attract more than 1 000 delegates, including travel agents, journalists, air line and hotel executives, etc., from Australia and the Pacific.

I hope the Government will support that move: I can assure the Government that the Opposition will support it. I hope that the news media will give any support it can to A.F.T.A. to enable it to hold the meeting in Adelaide, because it will boost S.A.'s economy. Australians should be encouraged to hold meetings in Australia. When one speaks about the Australian tourist industry, one encounters a problem; more than 900 000 people went out of Australia last year and just over 600 000

came into Australia. That is a bad imbalance for our economy, and we need to be more conscious about it.

I support a move by the Australian National Travel Association, a move that I promoted recently by other methods (I did not promote it publicly) that advocates that every working person should be able to claim as a taxation deduction any travel up to \$250 he makes within Australia. I am not entirely convinced that that is the correct approach. However, I am convinced that a family, consisting of a husband and wife, should be able to claim a certain sum, but it would be unfair for a working husband and wife to do the same, because they would have a distinct advantage and be able to claim double the amount.

Families receiving a single income are usually in a worse financial position than two-income families, so they are again at a disadvantage. With that proviso, I support the association's suggestion. The scheme has been put to the Industries Assistance Commission, where it is being studied. Such a scheme could be introduced, if Treasury problems are not encountered, and more Australian travel could be encouraged.

To a greater degree the Belgium bonus system could be used whereby railways, hotels, restaurants and other facilities could join the scheme to offer a discount to travellers from other States. Discounts could not be offered to local residents, because such a discount could not be afforded. If such a scheme could be encouraged in all States, all States would receive an advantage. I have made all the information I have available to the tourist industry, so I hope it can work on this matter, because it is worth considering.

I have never received a complaint about the Hon. Mr. Casey as a man, or about his attitude. When the Hon. Mr. Casey was endorsed by the Labor Party for the seat that would see his entry into Parliament he was still a member of the Liberal Party because of a bank order arrangement. He entered the Labor Party to win a country seat that would normally have been difficult for that Party to win. He has served the Labor Party well. The Liberal Party expected to win the seat, but the Hon. Mr. Casey won it instead.

Because of a shortage of numbers in the Upper House and because the Labor Party did not want too much of a radical left look about it, the Hon. Mr. Casey was given the chance to win a seat in that House. He succeeded in doing so, and has served his purpose in that Chamber for the Labor Party. He was Minister in a portfolio of which he had considerable knowledge, more knowledge than the present Minister—Agriculture. The left wing of the Labor Party, because he was too efficient, ensured that he was given a different portfolio: it knew that he could succeed in that portfolio and that he could not have the skids put under him. The Hon. Mr. Chatterton was given Agriculture, but what about the Hon. Mr. Casey now?

A redistribution is about to be brought down, which many people are waiting patiently to see, if they have not already seen it. The Labor Party knows that it has more members in the Upper House. It has people up there with itchy feet waiting to get their teeth into a Cabinet position, with the responsibilities it carries, in keeping with the philosophy they have—some of them with extreme left philosophies. Most of them up there on the A.L.P. side have extreme left philosophies, and the last thing they want is a person who has belonged to the Liberal Party and who has served as a useful tool over the past few years. If not immediately before the next election (whenever it may be called), it will ensure that he is able to get it after the election.

The build-up of the leaking of information from the building by one or two up there and the stopping of appointments after they have been announced are part of a plan to dispose of a man who has been honest in his attitude in serving his portfolio and to place him in a field in which he does not have as much knowledge or understanding of the situation as he had in the other one. This places his position in jeopardy in the eyes of the public and gives some justification for his disposal later. That is obvious to any of us who examine the present situation.

While away, I examined certain other areas, one of which was the field of casinos. I had heard for many years some of my colleagues and people in the community say, "What do you see wrong with a casino? They have them in France. They have a type in England. They have them in Germany, Austria and Switzerland. What are you worried about? They have them in Italy, Greece, Macao, Noumea, Wrest Point, and many other places." I was told by people in the industry that casinos were a great attraction for tourists and that they were a real benefit, yet I looked at two reports in this field, one of which was published in the *Advertiser* on Friday, June 25, in which the Executive Director of Federal Hotels (Mr. J. M. Haddad) stressed that the gambling casino was the least important part of the operation in Tasmania. At the same time, the Premier was caught out by a reporter who did his job well, who kept full notes of an interview he had with the Premier, and who ensured that the full details were printed. The report was headed "Dunstan and the casino interview. What was said at meeting on Wednesday". The report appears in the June 25 *Advertiser*. Mr. Dunstan was asked certain questions about the proposal, and he mentioned Mr. Ho. Mr. Dunstan said:

Mr. Ho is involved in Federal Hotels, but he was not present at the conversations we had.

The reporter posed the following question to Mr. Dunstan:

These people in Hong Kong. To your knowledge, are they involved in casinos at all?

The Premier slipped cleanly around that point. Mr. Stanley Ho, as we will find his name to be, has considerable interests in this field in Hong Kong and, I believe, in Macao. It is in that area that I will speak about casinos. I was impressed by Sir Stanley Raymond's attitude towards gambling in Britain; he is Chairman of the Gambling Board. He said to me he believed that one of the most immoral things about a casino operation, which is taxed heavily by the Government, is that the Government sets out to advertise gambling to raise revenue. Let us look at that a little. Last November, I received a letter from a woman who complained about a large advertisement in the *Advertiser* in regard to the State lottery. The advertisement read, "Shop early. You could be lucky to pick up \$70 000." That is a form of advertising to encourage people to gamble, but I do not necessarily object as strongly to that as she did, because I do not believe that it is in the serious area I wish to talk about.

If we allow oversea interests to have an interest in our gambling, we run a serious risk in the field of the Mafia and of crime, and that is precisely the point that Sir Stanley Raymond made. For that reason, any casino operating in England (they are all clubs, and one must be a member for 48 hours before playing in them, unless one is taken in as a visitor) cannot have a management, board members, or directors who have any interest in any business outside the United Kingdom. There is no chance (to use the words of the spokesman over there) to bring in dirty money from outside and make dirty money clean. A casino is the best place to make illegal

money legal or dirty money clean. That system is easily recognised when one considers the situation.

A person who has committed a major robbery or fraud can get at least a large part of the money back into the system as clean legal money. He buys chips during the night for \$1 000 000, gambles with them for a while and ends up with \$600 000, if he loses, or even more if he wins. He goes to the management and says, "I need a cheque for that amount," and walks out of the casino with money that is clear of tax in most countries, and no query about whence the money originally came. In England, a person is not allowed to advertise gambling in clubs or have live entertainment to encourage people into one room to watch a strip show, or a live performance, and get them to gamble later. No person can advertise cheap meals to encourage people into the operation. It was put to me by some personnel that, if they lost the Arabs from the oil-rich areas, at least one-half of the casinos or clubs would be out of business; they could not keep operating. In 1961, there were 1 000 such operations. However, through a tightening of the law, there are now only 125. Their approach is that they need to tighten the law even further.

In the United States of America, a Federal inquiry is being held into gambling because it is causing many problems. The authorities there cannot track down whether the Mafia is or is not operating gambling. A spokesman for Federal Hotels said recently that it had paid too much for its licence; originally, the company agreed to 30 per cent for the licence but, once it got the licence, it said it was too much. The Government later agreed to 20 per cent. They say, "People in Nevada get their licence for 6 per cent" They did not say, however, that there were 300 casinos in Nevada containing 17 000 opportunities to gamble in an area of about 500 hectares. If we put 12 casinos in Tasmania I am sure that the Government would be pleased with 6 per cent, but I do not think that Federal Hotels would be pleased with that operation.

Let me deal with another field. Some people say that no problems are associated with gambling. I challenge members to name one country in the Western world where gambling is not strictly controlled, with the exception of Holland, where a new casino is to be opened on October 1 next. In Austria, a company formed with Government approval, with 12 Government-appointed directors and 12 appointed from outside, pays 91 per cent of its takings in tax. No entertainment is provided (just straight gambling), and 91 per cent of the take goes in tax; 9 per cent is left.

Everyone in those countries has an identification card, which must be produced on entering a casino. There are nine casinos, all controlled by one company. If a local person goes three times a fortnight and gambles at a reasonable rate, a note is made of which casino he visits, and that information is passed to a central office. The person will be called in and told that he is known to have been gambling too heavily, and he will be asked the extent of his income. If he refuses to disclose it, he is told that he should not gamble more than once in three months. If he discloses his income, he will be assessed on the information disclosed. When the pressure is applied in this way, 60 per cent of people queried have admitted getting money by means perhaps just outside the law or avoiding taxation.

In Greece, Italy or Belgium, public servants, people who work in banks, lawyers running trust accounts, treasurers of clubs, those handling other people's money,

those in the employ of any semi-government or Government department, or members of the Army are not allowed to gamble. If there is nothing wrong with gambling, why is that restriction imposed? If the casino were in the Port Adelaide area, for example, no resident of the Port Adelaide council district would be allowed to gamble. Because everyone has an identification card, the situation can be controlled. If a person wants to gamble, and if a casino is situated in a neighbouring district, he must drive from his own area to get there.

Some people would say that restrictions should be placed on the amount of money gambled. That was tried in Switzerland, where the maximum was set at about \$2 Australian. In Lugano the casino was insolvent at the time I was there; it was in the hands of the liquidators. The casino at Baden was owned by the community council with a management looking after it. It showed a loss last year of 450 000 Swiss francs. The community was concerned, but the management said it could not be made to pay. That is another example of the controls that must be applied and the results if such controls are strictly applied.

Members opposite are often proud to refer to what is going on in Sweden, but I would advise them to watch that scene over the next few months. Sweden has 10 000 poker machines in clubs and a few roulette wheels in clubs, one roulette table being allocated to a club. The club is a restaurant; there are not many bowling clubs, and things of that kind, with poker machines. These machines are likely to be banned as a result of the public outcry. The only thing preventing the ban is that the Government owns 130 of the 2 500 restaurants and showed a profit of 5 000 000 krone from its restaurants; 20 000 000 krone came from poker machines, so if they lose the poker machines they face a deficit of 15 000 000 krone from the restaurants.

When I was there the suggestion being made was that the Government should not have to take them out of the restaurants, but that private enterprise operators should have to remove them. The man who ran a company owning 55 per cent of the machines showed me through the factory where they were made, and showed me how the machine could be varied to give a bigger or smaller payout and how they were serviced. He said that he had been advertising on television and radio and had taken full-page advertisements in newspapers pointing out how many people would lose their jobs if the machines were banned. The banning of the poker machine is being considered in Sweden, and it has reached the political scene.

We have never considered them in South Australia, and most countries, even those with casinos, have banned poker machines. However, another machine called "snap shot" is in operation, as well as other similar machines. Snap shot was claimed to be not a poker machine but a game of skill. Three or four wheels spin around, and if one is quick enough one can stop them at a certain point, but I defy anyone to say when they would stop, because they spin so quickly.

Much more could be said about the operation of casinos in other countries and the benefits to tourism, but I believe they are of no real benefit at all. If a Government sets out to establish a casino with the idea that the management should be able to advertise gambling as a method of raising State revenue, I believe it is the wrong attitude, because it is encouraging people to gamble, leading to an increase in the number of compulsive gamblers.

In no country did an official tell me that he believed gambling was a good thing. Most countries put their

casinos on the border, hoping to get custom from neighbouring countries. France has 147 casinos, but it has reached saturation point. There is no need for people to come to Australia to gamble; they can do it in many other places. If we are to supply a facility for gamblers, that is a different argument, although I would not support it. To encourage people to gamble in an action or impulse gambling centre—and that is what a casino is—is different from having a lottery or a horse race. I have never been able to acquire the skill that I am told is necessary to judge a horse race.

I appreciated the opportunity to visit other countries. While I realise that Australia is a small country, I do not think we should jump on any band waggons thinking we can solve all our problems by picking the best from other countries. I do not believe that is possible. Most members in this Chamber and in the community know that Australia has a tough row to hoe, and casting Australia's future aside for political purposes, as A.L.P. members have done in this debate, is harmful to the future of this country and to its stability; it is an unwarranted and unnecessary attack. When their Leader was fighting a cause, he said that all he wanted was a fair go. He got that. All that is being asked is that a fair go be given to those who have been given the tough task of rectifying the problems created for us. I believe that the statements to which I have referred were not made sincerely: it was a planned attack. The members were instructed by their Party to do it. Many with a moderate view know what is best for Australia in the longer term, but they were forced into making such statements. We all have sacrifices to make, and I hope we can make them for the sake of Australia, and particularly of South Australia. I support the motion.

Mr. GROTH (Salisbury): In supporting the motion, I join with other members in extending my sympathy to the families of former members who passed away during the previous 12 months. Of those former members, Mr. Jim Ferguson was the only member whom I knew. I admired him particularly for the unbiased way in which he spoke in the House. A kindly man, he was admired by all members; one could detect this admiration by the way in which everyone spoke about him.

In reply to Opposition members who said that Government members made their attacks on the Opposition under instructions, I say that their allegation is completely false. I have no intention whatever of attacking either the Federal Government or the Liberal Opposition in this place. One does not have to attack these people: one has only to draw attention to their actions, because their actions, in themselves, are criticism enough.

In reply to the member for Torrens, who said that this Government was old, tired, and running out of steam, I point out that the large amount of legislation planned does not indicate that we are running out of steam. Further, the community does not believe that the Government is tired. I congratulate the Government on its programmes, particularly in the education field. Larger sums were made available for education by the Whitlam Government when it was in office than by Liberal Governments. In my district, three new primary schools and one new secondary school either have been completed or are well under construction. The new Salisbury Downs Primary School has been completed, and a new primary school is being built at Salisbury North. It will be completed either late this year or early next year. A school at Bagster Road, Salisbury North, was built during the term of office of the Playford Government; in that

school was a derelict, old, filthy, wooden structure which was a disgrace. It took the Labor Government to begin constructing a new solid brick building, and I commend the Minister of Education and his department for that. I also commend the Whitlam Government for making the money available for this purpose.

A new high school being constructed at Parafield Gardens will be finished before the scheduled time for completion, to the credit of the contractors and the workmen. This school will be one of the best in South Australia. Some students are already in it, and they are as proud to attend the school as I am to have it in my district. It is a great school, it is staffed by great teachers, and it will be very beneficial to the area. So, Opposition members can see why I am not attacking them or the Federal Government: all I am doing is commending this Government and the Whitlam Government for making funds available.

Yesterday, the member for Rocky River asked the Minister of Transport a question about the railway overpass at Dry Creek. I do not intend to carry on from where the Minister left off, but I point out that the construction work being carried out by the Highways Department is commendable. There has been a great problem at the location for quite a while. Traffic on the Salisbury Highway banked up because people living farther north took an unfair advantage in getting out on to the Port Wakefield Road. When they got to the junction they had an advantage in that they did not have to give way to the right. The Highways Department has constructed a two-lane highway which, after completion at an early date, will overcome many of the problems, but it cannot overcome all the problems and it cannot be completed until the bridges are built. It will allow a more even traffic flow because it will allow traffic to come out from Salisbury Highway on to Port Wakefield Road, provided the drivers are sensible and do not try to gain an advantage. If everyone acts sensibly and responsibly, the problem now existing will be overcome.

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

Mr. GROTH: In conclusion, I should like to clear up one point referred to by Opposition members who think that the Government benches are loaded with past trade union leaders. This is not so and, because I desire to have this fact recorded in *Hansard*, I will now list Government members who at one time were trade union officials, as follows:

Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, Brown, Groth, Harrison, Olson, Slater, Wells, and Wright.

That is a total of nine. Therefore, of the 24 Government members in this House, 15 have never been trade union officials. This disproves the accusations made by honourable members opposite that the Government benches are loaded with past trade union officials. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Light.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I am looking forward to being the honourable member for Light for many years.

Mr. Olson: Have you been given the green light?

Dr. EASTICK: So long as we get a green belt in the area I will refer to the Minister for Planning (we need a green belt, there), the honourable member for Light will be happy.

The death of Jim Ferguson was a heavy personal loss to me. I found Jim to be, as has already been indicated

by many members in this House, a personal friend. He was well considered in his district. Certainly, he was well regarded in this Parliament, as has been evidenced by the comments made from both sides. Unfortunately, he did not live long enough after his retirement to have enjoyed what would have been his just desserts. Jim Ferguson was a member of this House who had the welfare of all members at heart, but it went beyond that, because often he brought to this House floral tributes that were used in the dining area and elsewhere, and helped to assist in creating the proper decor in this place.

The late Mr. MacGillivray was not well known to me, but I did know him. I appreciate that he was well respected in the Murray River area, and the work he commenced in that area is being followed, not in the same Parliamentary sphere, but in the third level of Government (in local government) by Mr. Bill MacGillivray Jr.

Mr. Hogben, whilst not known to me, was a person whose name features prominently in the annals of history of the South Australian Housing Trust. He left his mark at the time of his death in the form of a continuing tribute to a job well done in the Housing Trust's efforts throughout South Australia. Later, I shall refer to aspects of the trust's activities.

I refer to paragraph three of the draft Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency, as follows:

We thank Your Excellency for the dedicated manner in which you have served the State during your term of office as Governor and wish Your Excellency well in your retirement.

I extend that to wish Lady Oliphant well in a long and happy retirement in association with His Excellency. Sir Mark came to this position at a time when there were grave aspersions as to his ability to fulfill his role.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It was a limited area.

Dr. EASTICK: Although it was a limited area, His Excellency's actions quickly dispelled any trepidation that might have existed as to his ability to fulfil the role. His Excellency is a quiet and gentle man. He was and is genuinely interested in the affairs of this State. Indeed, it is unfortunate that, on the occasion of his last address to Parliament in an official sense, he was confined to the requirements of a prepared document. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to have His Excellency speak to members of Parliament, and to the public generally, on the situation as he sees it and as he has experienced it, without the limitations imposed by such an official occasion.

I suggest to the Deputy Premier that the Government gives serious consideration to holding a dinner at which the opportunity be given to His Excellency to speak his mind on the period he has enjoyed at Government House, the progress he has seen during that period, and to make comment, as we know he can, on a whole range of subjects determined by him.

Mr. Jennings: And abuse us all if he wants to.

Dr. EASTICK: Doubtless, His Excellency is the type of man who, if he saw the need to issue abuse, would do so, not destructively, but constructively, and the criticism (which is a better word than "abuse") would be well deserved. Moreover, I have been concerned for a long time about the attitude of honourable members opposite and of their Federal colleagues in relation to the abuse they are placing on the Governor-General.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There has been no Government in the history of South Australia that has allowed its Governor the same freedom that we have allowed Sir Mark Oliphant, and you know it.

Dr. EASTICK: That is not what I said. If the Deputy Premier would wake up and listen to the whole of the debate, I would appreciate it.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You cannot link us with anything else: we are not responsible for Sir John Kerr.

Dr. EASTICK: The Government Minister is certainly responsible for the abuse issued in relation to Sir John Kerr by way of debate and by way of snide comment on every possible occasion. The situation is almost in the same category as the type of abuse now being levelled at the present Federal Government. The Governor-General paid an official visit to this State: he was well received and was accorded a State dinner at the Hotel Australia.

I had the chance of a private audience with His Excellency before that dinner, and I was able to refer to him then as I do now, as a genial giant. I believe he has shown just how gigantic he is by his willingness to accept the criticism that is being levelled against him by honourable members opposite and their colleagues in another place. The Governor-General is a person who will be respected in the history of Australia. I was interested to read extracts of a speech by Senator Jim McClelland in the Senate in February of this year. I have a great respect for him. I have said that earlier. He makes a pertinent point in this speech, that he paid the political price for doing what was necessary in Australia when he was the Minister for Labour and Industry and taking actions that were not politically acceptable to his own side and, more particularly, to the trade union movement. We have to thank Senator Jim McClelland for some of the progress in stemming the inflation rate in Australia (not all of it but some of it) and I have applauded, and I applaud now, Senator Jim McClelland for some of the work he has undertaken in the Federal sphere since he has been a Senator. I refer to his speech to the Senate on February 18, 1976.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Did he speak in front of the Governor-General?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What did he say about the Governor-General?

Dr. EASTICK: He makes an interesting point, which I want to develop for the sake of members opposite, when he said, at page 55 of the report of the Senate debates:

It was especially painful to me because he was—and I underline "was"—

it is Senator McClelland speaking, not I—
a close personal friend for many years.

He was very proud, the last time I spoke to him, to indicate that His Excellency the Governor-General and he had spent a considerable time together in the industrial sphere and that they had played a prominent part in the now famous *Moore-Doyle* case; that sometimes they were on the same side, and on other occasions they were on opposite sides, but that they always had a tremendous respect for each other. To see a person prepared to stand up in the Senate and speak in this vein of a "was" situation rather than accepting that what Sir John Kerr did was a responsibility which he had and which he thought to be correct, is most unfortunate.

Senator McClelland gives his interpretation of some of the actions that took place. On page 56 of the report, he says that he and His Excellency were able to telephone one another and have immediate private audience. He says that on those occasions he never sought to impose his view or to speak outside of what Sir John had said to him, or the subject that had been discussed, but this time he said:

I have never divulged, and I did not think I should divulge until today, something which I am about to, which I feel incumbent on me to divulge in the interests of historical accuracy: that is, that a little more than a week before November 11 the Governor-General phoned me at my home. We know what has been said about what he did, about the option which he ultimately exercised being the only option available to him, but that was not what was on the Governor-General's mind that day.

Then he proceeds to indicate some of the discussion that took place on that occasion, but again denying the opportunity for His Excellency the Governor-General to state whether in fact the Senator's interpretation of that conversation is the correct one.

We have often heard members opposite talk about "cowards castle", but I suggest that what Senator McClelland has done in divulging a personal discussion of this nature is a situation of having used "cowards castle" to put a point of view that is not necessarily the total point of view or the correct interpretation to be placed on the discussion that took place between those two people. In making these statements and suggesting that this was the total discussion that took place between the two of them, he sought for "historical benefit" to have it taken as the gospel truth.

I do not speak against Senator McClelland, a man I have met and had dealings with and who has always presented himself and his facts very well, but I do question, in the light of other historical evidence available, whether his interpretation of that discussion is correct. I believe that the Fred Daly papers, which were published, give a fair indication of what the Labor Party thought it was doing in having put Sir John Kerr in the position of Governor-General: it believed it would be able to trade on old friendships and to impose upon a man of integrity, a man who had shown his worth in the industrial courts of this country to the benefit of both sides, not only for the worker but for the system and employer. The Labor Party thought it could manipulate him to get him to accede to its every request. The Fred Daly reports have headings like "Where Gough goes wrong" and "Hawke must wait" and it was stated, "He shocked his friends" in an episode which appeared in the *Advertiser* of Thursday, May 25, 1976, and under the latter he states:

In politics there are no second prizes so, when a Government is still in high office, it does not normally pick its enemies.

What an indictment of the Whitlam Federal Government that it sought to impose upon a friend an office that it would then want to manipulate! It continued to say that if you can find a man with the capacity for the job and with broadly the same ideological views, you appoint him. I always thought Sir John Kerr was sympathetic to the Labor Party, not that I expected him always to conform to Labor attitudes and decisions. Here, Daly is admitting that he would not have expected Sir John Kerr necessarily to accept the views put by the Labor Party and, because he (Sir John) had the temerity, in the eyes of the Labor Party, to do just that, to balance all the factors and come up with a decision that was politically unfavourable to the Labor Party, it now tries to besmirch and belittle him, as it has Sir John Egerton. It is simple, it seems, for the Labor Party to walk away from those who have served it well when they cease to serve it in a manner that the Party believes or dictates as the correct method of approach.

Mr. Wotton: They disowned him.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes; the member for Florey said, "John who?", as though he had never met him, although at other times he spoke of him as a particular friend. What

I accept of the approach taken by Sir John Kerr on November 11 is an approach in a different area but in the same vein as that which we had on the local scene more recently from other public servants and other persons of authority in our community. I refer to the statement that appears on the front page of today's *Advertiser* from Mr. Harold Salisbury, the Commissioner of Police. It is all very well for the newspaper this afternoon to criticise his phraseology, but it is only commenting on the small extracts that have been inserted into the stories this morning in talking of darkness and the light. The point made rightly by Mr. Salisbury was that there is a grave and growing concern in the community at the failure of society to learn or to attempt to live with itself. There is a growing concern that has been expressed by so many other people including the retiring Superintendent Hender when appointed last week to an important position with the Road Traffic Board.

Mr. Langley: A very capable officer.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes. I consider that he will bring a wealth of experience to that position and I trust that the matters that he has raised will be considered by all members of Parliament, and those members will enact amendments to give effect to those matters.

A report in the newspaper this morning (page 3) shows that Mr. Grieve, S.M., was not going to be compromised by the Government or be placed in a position where, by proceeding with a particular case, there was a chance that at a subsequent appeal his action would mean the upholding of the appeal. As I told the Attorney-General this afternoon, there is a parallel instance of this, although it refers to justices of the peace rather than to magistrates. That was when His Honour Mr. Justice King, as Attorney-General, upheld the view that what Mr. O'Loughlin, S.M., had said was fact and needed correcting. I consider that Mr. Grieve, S.M., has indicated to us that there is a need for correction.

For a long time Mr. Justice Sangster has been indicating positions clearly and plainly, and the Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Bray, several times has stated that he sees flaws in legislation and an urgent need to attend to them. Further, Mr. Justice Wells has highlighted the inadequacies of the present planning legislation. Thank goodness, that matter will be debated in this session, and I will refer to it again later. We also had the case of Mr. McLean Wright, S.M., being moved from the position of resident magistrate at Elizabeth because some people considered him to be too strict. He may have been too strict in some instances, but the people of that area respected him and they were not then plagued by vandalism and hooliganism at Elizabeth and in places extending into my district. The conduct extends to Kapunda, and the Kapunda council has referred the matter to the Minister of Community Welfare, whom I thank for sending a senior officer to discuss with the council the problem there.

It is all very well for members opposite to have suggested in the past few days that insufficient money has been made available for sport and to say that not enough is done for the welfare of young children and not enough opportunities are available to them. I realise that, but how can one tie these matters in with the vandalism and hooliganism taking place in the early hours of the morning? Can it be said that the Government or anyone else can make funds available to offset actions that will be taken at that time in the morning?

There are in our community those who tend to get too much publicity and who, regardless of the facilities available, will continue to attack society by breaking

windows, throwing fire bombs in windows, doing wheelies in the main street, knocking down posts and signposts, and pulling branches from trees.

When speaking in this debate last week, my colleague the member for Mount Gambier indicated clearly his attitude to some issues that are being discussed, such as aspects of the Mitchell report on rape and incest, and suggestions that various drugs should be made more freely available. I join with him in saying that we in this place have a real and genuine responsibility not to follow an idle permissiveness and an idle attitude of going along with what is happening, because it seems to be the "in thing" at present. We have a responsibility to consider these matters clearly and plainly, and to make a decision in the best interests of the whole community.

Without transgressing, I wish to speak on electoral reform, and I ask where the elusive South Australian voter has gone. Figures that have been made available to the House show that there are almost 6 000 fewer South Australian voters now than there were in November last year. I have a statistical table that is pertinent to this point, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard*, without my reading it.

Leave granted.

VARIATIONS IN STATE ELECTORAL FIGURES

Date of Statement	State Total	Numerical Variation	Percentage Increase or Decrease*
March, 1970	634 113		
December, 1970 . .	648 368	14 255	plus 2.25
December, 1971 . .	649 574	1 206	plus .19
December, 1972 . .	689 897	40 323	plus 6.21
December, 1973 . .	745 985	76 088	plus 8.13
December, 1974 . .	754 492	8 507	plus 1.14
July, 1975	771 414	16 922	plus 2.24
September, 1975 . .	780 593	9 179	plus 1.19
November, 1975 . .	792 661	12 068	plus 1.55
February 6, 1976 . .	794 862	2 201	plus .28
May 31, 1976 . . .	790 627	4 235	minus .55
June 30, 1976 . . .	788 909	1 718	minus .22
March, 1970, to November, 1975		158 548	plus 25.00
March, 1970, to June 30, 1976 . .		154 796	plus 24.41

* Expressed as percentage increase or decrease on number of electors at previous comparison date.

Dr. EASTICK: Those figures have been made available by the Electoral Department, either as a collection of figures from electoral rolls or as official releases. Of all the figures that have been available, this is the only occasion when there has been a reduction in the number of electors on a State-wide basis. If we take heed of population figures that became available last week, we see that there was an overall increase in the number of people in the State and that much of that increase has been brought about by migrants. Not all migrants will enrol immediately, and, of course, no new-born child will be enrolled. Suddenly, after the Commonwealth Electoral Office had seen fit to undertake street-by-street and house-by-house inspections and to take evidence, there was a fairly marked decrease in the number of persons enrolled on the rolls of this State.

Mr. Dean Brown: Despite this morning's paper saying that our population had increased.

Dr. EASTICK: That is right. Between May 31 and June 30, 1976, there had been a further reduction in the number of people enrolled in South Australia. The number had dropped to 788 909, or a further reduction of .22 per cent.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: If you compared the figures of those who voted, it might give a truer picture.

Dr. EASTICK: I am glad that the Minister made that point, because I believe that many people who were on the roll in November, 1975, had no right to be on the roll; I believe that that is borne out by the Commonwealth enrolment officers' current campaign to check the validity of enrollees. It fits in well with the figures I provided to the House and brings me back to the question I posed about what was happening in respect of our electoral system (it is the system I question, not the people within the system), which allows such a disparity in the true voting position.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I believe that the Mitchell District was one of the test areas; they found that some were not on the roll, and now there is a net gain.

Dr. EASTICK: It is not shown in the figures up to June 30, and I am led to believe in the inquiry I have undertaken that the check enrolment arrangement was right across the State; it was not just in the city or in the country. It has been progressively overall, and it has detected this marked over-enrolment resulting now in a depreciation in numbers.

Mr. Slater: Why wouldn't they be eligible?

Dr. EASTICK: They have either shifted or they are enrolled in two or three places. They have enrolled, and have failed, when seeking enrolment on another roll, to declare that they have never been on a roll in another district. I cite the case of a person enrolling as a married woman and being on the district roll in both her married name and single name. We have the knowledge that was available in about July or August, 1975, that, whilst all of the new applications for enrolment on the Commonwealth roll up to and for the purpose of the July, 1975, State election were on the rolls, in many areas they were upwards of two months behind with deletions from the rolls. In figures published in *Hansard* of September, 1975, following a question I asked and a subsequent analysis I gave to the House, it was clear that in some areas there was a massive failure to vote which, in some cases, could be picked up and highlighted as being areas of discrepancy in enrolment.

I will take the matter a little further and again point out that, in taking out these figures, we have a variance, depending on the date of the electoral boundary decision, of massive proportions, depending on whether it was September, 1975, November, 1975, February 6, 1975, May 31, 1976, or June 30, 1976. The statement made at the opening of the commission indicated a mean of 16 912 on February 6 figures. As the table comprises statistical detail, I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

VARIANCE DEPENDENT ON DATE OF ELECTORAL BOUNDARY DECISION

Date of Statement	No. on Roll	State Mean	State Max.	State Min.
September, 1975 . .	780 593	16 609	18 270	14 948
November, 1975 . .	792 661	18 141	19 955	16 327
February 6, 1976 . .	794 862	16 912	18 603	15 221
May 31, 1976 . . .	790 627	16 822	18 504	15 140
June 30, 1976 . . .	788 909	16 785	18 464	15 106
		High	Low	Highest/Lowest
Maximum Variations . .	1 685	1 379		5 007

Dr. EASTICK: The table illustrates that, had we taken the lowest possible figure, the State mean would have been 16 609. If we had taken the highest possible mean (the State total divided by 47), the figure would have been 18 141. In other words, there was a discrepancy between the very highest and very lowest of 5 007 votes, which is well outside the 10 per cent plus or minus about

which we have talked. This shows how important it is that an electoral role be maintained correctly as nearly as possible on a day-by-day basis, so that, in the eventuality of decisions, a correct figure pertaining to that date can be undertaken. I have no doubt that in the document we will probably see tomorrow those decisions will have been made, having regard to the nearest possible available figure.

On a recent occasion I had the opportunity of attending the handicapped "worker of the year" awards at the Bedford Industries unit, at Panorama, attended by an excellent selection of people who had benefited from their involvement at that place. Two people tied for equal top place in the top award for the year. The Director of Bedford Industries gave some straight sage advice to those present. Although his advice appeared in the press, it was not given the prominence it deserved. This followed the statements made in the House by the Minister of Labour and Industry regarding handicapped workers. I sincerely suggest to the Government and to my colleagues that they heed the advice of the Director (Mr. Jenkins), who is also the world President of the handicapped persons organisation, before any attempt is made to introduce legislation to give effect to what I believe is acceptable to all members, namely, a place in society for handicapped people.

Whilst we all genuinely accept the need to give these people the opportunity of taking their place in society and of being able to develop to their maximum, we must ensure that in their employment, be it in the public or private enterprise sectors, we do not kill the goose that laid the golden egg. There is a degree of limitation on the service that some of these people can perform. They recognise it, and do not expect full tote odds in their employment. However, I am not suggesting (nor would I tolerate) any consideration of exploitation. Rather than they be refused job opportunities or not be taken into the work force, I believe that we must seriously consider a payment related to their ability to perform.

I give the following simple illustration of a small business with a telephone switchboard with three incoming lines and 18 internal lines where a person is performing particularly well but is limited to the handling of that switchboard and is unable to handle invoices or carry out some of the other tasks that normally go hand in glove with a small switchboard operation. That person is not gainfully employed for the full day answering three incoming lines and managing 18 internal lines. However, because of the demands made on that organisation, the employee concerned is, in a time of inflation and when considerable expense is incurred, drawing a wage that cannot be offset against his worth to the organisation.

This is indeed a sensitive area. We do not want to be in the position where every cent spent must produce some return. However, we must ensure that there is a relationship between what a person can do and what the employer is expected to pay for his work. There must be some relationship to work value, either by way of the in-between sum being paid by the Government by way of subsidy, which can be awkward, or by a negotiated payment. This is a matter on which we need to take advice, at all times recognising the integrity of the individual.

I make this plea to members: let us not get ourselves into a situation where there is some employer resistance, not because employers want to resist but because the economic facts of life require that they think twice before continuing with or commencing someone's employment.

Mr. Harrison: I think you'll find that that is happening in industry today.

Dr. EASTICK: Unfortunately, it is not.

Mr. Harrison: With the major employers, yes.

Dr. EASTICK: The pressures being exerted on some employers, be they small or large employers, do not enhance the prospect of this type of activity continuing without some difficulty in future. I am willing to discuss that matter with the honourable member quietly afterwards. I also believe that the work being done by many of these organisations is worth while, and I am proud to have been involved indirectly with the opportunity that is now being afforded to handicapped persons to be usefully employed in the rural sector. The work that is being undertaken at Normanville will be the vanguard of a tremendous opportunity for younger and older people in future.

In His Excellency's Speech, reference was made to rating, hobby farms, and the difficulties of planning. Certainly this area needs urgent attention. We need to be afforded a serious look at the definitions, especially those capable of being interpreted in a different context, depending on other factors. I suppose what I am trying to say is that a definition must not be so hidebound that it prevents consideration of other factors that are of equal or greater importance.

I highlight the situation in respect of agricultural viability: the need to be able to prove to the satisfaction of the Agriculture Department, the State Planning Office and other authorities involved that a block of land will be viable agriculturally, because it is in a rural or semi-rural situation, if subdivision is permitted. It must be accepted that intensive farming operations involving, for example, either mushroom production, pigs, poultry, or whatever, on 1 hectare or 2 ha lots will be agriculturally viable. In an almost identical situation, the same property could be a viable proposition for the keeping of one, two, or three horses, where it is advisable to take the horse population out of the intensely urbanised area because of the risk of health hazards, flies and other matters, but it is not always so regarded.

For instance, one cannot, in the Salisbury area, represented by my colleague who has just resumed his seat, speak about the agricultural viability of 2 ha or 4 ha lots. However, one can speak about viability in relation to the stabling and paddocking of two or three horses on the same area of land. One would also have to take into account that in that area, getting across towards Waterloo Corner, a number of facilities are directly associated with horses.

I refer to the equestrian federation establishment, Globe Derby Park, the South Australian jumping organisation and its facilities, or the South Australian polo grounds. All these areas provide a central function point for horses. For horse owners, access to those areas is better than having to bring their horses from, say, Mount Barker or beyond Tea Tree Gully or Inglewood. It is far better if the horses are allowed to be housed in that area. Therefore, the agricultural viability must be put aside and greater regard given to the importance of the practicality of the application, having regard to the other facilities that are available, and to the best interests of the health and hygiene of the public in the more densely populated areas.

These sorts of discussion are vital. Unfortunately, in some instances they are being put aside by too narrow an interpretation of definitions and by too narrow an appreciation by some officers responsible for decision making of what is, practically and aesthetically, the best course of action to take. I give the example of a house in the near Hills face area east of Salisbury. The person concerned said

that his house could be blended into terrain with no difficulty by the planting of trees, only to be told thereafter that in no circumstances would he be permitted to plant trees because it was a treeless area. It is bureaucracy or a system gone wrong if we deny a return to the situation obtaining in the area before it was denuded by the felling of trees for agricultural purposes. It is important that we examine the practicalities and that we recognise the importance of all aspects, not just one aspect in isolation, being considered.

I said earlier that I was concerned about a green belt in the Light District. In the Address in Reply debate last year, I said that it was extremely important that the State Planning Office, and the Ministers and responsible officers, urgently considered whether an agricultural belt should be maintained between the development of Salisbury and Elizabeth, particularly north of Smithfield, and the development of Gawler down towards Smithfield. A green belt area exists there at present. In the work the Education Department has undertaken in relation to its future requirements in the area, it looks on the belt of land north of Dalkeith Road at Smithfield toward the light industrial area south of Gawler as a permanent green belt. In giving evidence before the Electoral Boundaries Commission, Mr. Taeuber, then Chairman of the Lands Commission, at pages 579 and 580, was asked by Mr. Williams in cross-examination the following question:

Are you aware of the area in Smithfield north of Dalkeith Road? The area north of Smithfield—what is the general plan for development of that area over the next five or 10 years?

Mr. Taeuber replied:

If you are speaking of land at present zoned for urban use (coloured pink on the Metropolitan Development Plan) the border of which broadly forms the border of land held by the Land Commission and the Housing Trust, the building will progress through that area at a rate determined by demand. I could not put a figure on that because there will be progressive development throughout the area coloured pink on the Metropolitan Development Plan. The area north of Dalkeith Road is running into the area of the corporation of Gawler and the development occurring there is spreading southwards from Gawler rather than northwards from Smithfield-Elizabeth.

That is what I want to emphasise. The Land Commission, in all its planning, clearly sees that there will be a development northward from Elizabeth and Smithfield and that it will not become a direct development to Gawler, but that there will be a development southward from Gawler towards the Elizabeth-Smithfield development.

I suggested 12 months ago, and I repeat now, that there is no known way in which I would accept that any future planning be allowed for a joining together of those two developments. A natural boundary exists today, a boundary which I believe should be maintained and, if possible, whilst the land is in the ownership of the Land Commission or the South Australian Housing Trust, every endeavour should be made to increase the width of that green belt so that there will be a natural break between what is known as suburbia and what is contained within the outer metropolitan planned area of outer suburbia.

I said earlier that the late Mr. Hogben had had a considerable part to play in the affairs of the South Australian Housing Trust. I recently received some details of the development of the trust, and I find that the original establishing Act was Act No. 2333 of 1936, that it was a move taken in the wake of the depression, when housing was in short supply, when housing rents had escalated by 25 per cent to 30 per cent in the 12 months preceding its inception, when unemployment was an urgent problem, and when few substantial secondary industries were based

in South Australia. The principal arguments in support of the establishment of the trust were that housing would be cheaper as a result of stabilised rents and costs of production, that employment would be stimulated, and that cheaper housing, and consequently the prospect of paying lower wages, would attract industries to South Australia.

I believe that the activities of the trust have fulfilled those proposals in great measure. It was initially a small operation in respect of funding. The position has, by the general escalation in the building industry, got almost out of hand since that time, and we recognise that the trust has extended its activities into providing industrial facilities, building industrial facilities for clients, and more recently purchasing existing homes for upgrading and for use in the community. What we fail to recognise sometimes is that the trust's operations represent only about 15 per cent of housing within the State, and it is important that we seek to maintain a properly balanced relationship in the funds available to the trust and to the private sector.

As the private sector is responsible for 85 per cent of housing, obviously it must be guaranteed access to funds for the vital role it must play in the community. I relate this to a position which is starting to unfold with the South Australian Land Commission. In figures given to me yesterday by the Minister, it is apparent that the commission is starting to develop many blocks, and that the blocks will be available for general purchase. Details are associated with the manner in which the blocks are made available both under the scheme providing an opportunity for individuals in the community and also under the builders scheme. Documentation on these matters is available from the commission.

Last Saturday week, in company with some colleagues and members of the Munno Para District Council, I was able to look at the Blair Park subdivision, which is being undertaken by the South Australian Land Commission in association with West Lakes Proprietary Limited. About 1 500 building blocks, with a total area of 192 hectares, on the eastern side of the existing Elizabeth Downs subdivision, are being developed. The 1 500 blocks in the area will be a worthy acquisition, allowing the Housing Trust and private enterprise to undertake further development. I ask that the Land Commission, in making provision for further development, consider an organised and balanced approach as between its activities and those of the developers who are prepared, independently, to put funds into the development of blocks.

Just north of this area, in the immediate Gawler area, 212 blocks are being developed privately, and these will provide for a very real demand existing in the area. About 1 200 blocks are in the pipeline in and about the Gawler area, and we cannot have a situation where valuable funds are tied up in subdivisions which do not come to housing development because the Land Commission has flooded a market in the general area. I am not suggesting that the Land Commission should cease operations, but I suggest that there is an urgent need to make sure that the commission, along with other developers, provides development in areas where it is required so that the funds expended in providing these subdivisions will be returned as quickly as possible, so that more funds can be used in further developments, and so that all available funds over and above the development cost can be turned into housing. Enormous sums will be required for housing in South Australia in the immediate future. Because we cannot take decisions in isolation, it is extremely important that development and housing should proceed along lines that will be of maximum benefit to South Australians.

In conclusion, I should like to correct some statements made by Government members. The member for Florey said that Medibank would cost the average man \$9.90 a week, but I suggest that the member should read the fine print, instead of taking heed only of the headlines, which gave a totally wrong impression. The member for Ross Smith said that Sir Arthur Rymill always got a press in his own newspaper, but I point out that not long ago Sir Arthur, while still a member of Parliament, made an address which was subsequently printed in the *Bulletin* and which received worldwide recognition, but he was unable to get it printed in the *Advertiser*. Indeed, he had to go on bended knees to Sir Norman Young to have it printed in the opposition newspaper, the *News*. I support the motion.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): In supporting the motion, I commend His Excellency for the manner in which he presented the Government's programme. Sir Mark has endeared himself to the hearts of South Australians since he came to office. Before he came to office, the people did not know Sir Mark personally, although they had read about his achievements. It is only when we meet a person face to face that we can appreciate his qualities, and the people have now had an opportunity to appreciate Sir Mark's qualities. Sir Mark has visited my district, and I can say that he is a great country fellow.

On one occasion, he came to Wirrabara to open the senior citizens home there. They invited him to lunch, but he decided that he would not have lunch in Wirrabara; instead, he went into the forest and spread a table cloth on the bonnet of the Bentley, and he had his lunch there. When he came into Wirrabara he was met by about 300 senior citizens of Wirrabara and surrounding areas. He was led on to the dais, which was not very secure, and as he walked across the dais to the microphone he said, "I wonder whether the dais will hold a white Oliphant!"

I pay a tribute to the families of former members of Parliament who have died during the past 12 months. I did not have the privilege of knowing two of these former members, but I knew Mr. Jim Ferguson very well. Having worked with him in the Party room, I cannot speak too highly of him. With his wife and family, I treasure his memory. The member for Goyder, who knew Mr. Ferguson very well, spoke of his continuing service to the community after he left Parliament. It is a wonderful thing that, after years of representing his district in Parliament, Mr. Ferguson continued to work for it after he left Parliament.

My old colleague the member for Frome said in his speech in this Address in Reply debate that it would probably be his last speech in such a debate, although that may not necessarily be correct. However, I should like to pay a tribute to the honourable member, who has been a very hard worker. Mr. Allen entered Parliament first as member for Burra but, after the 1970 redistribution, he frightened our old blue friend, the former member for Frome, out of the area and took over the seat of Frome; when I say "our old blue friend", I am referring to the Hon. Tom Casey, now a member of the Legislative Council. Mr. Allen's situation involved a double barrel: if there was anything that he himself did not wish to attend to, he was able to get his local member to attend to it: he lives 1.8 km inside my district and 1.8 km outside his district.

Mr. Rodda: Who is his local member?

Mr. VENNING: The cocky from Rocky. I also pay a tribute to the wife of the member for Frome; she has been

a very ardent worker in the district and held office in the Spalding branch. At election time, she has worked as hard as one would expect her to work if she was working for her husband.

When I spoke in the Address in Reply debate last session, I addressed my remarks to the member for Pirie. At that time, he was the Independent member for Pirie, and I outlined what had transpired in Pirie leading up to the election. I also referred to newspaper reports of comments made by the Premier in Port Pirie in connection with the election campaign. The Premier did not go to Port Pirie in support of the present member for Pirie: he went in support of the endorsed Labor Party candidate, Mr. Jack Phelan. The Premier went to Port Pirie to launch the campaign for the Australian Labor Party and, in an article in the *Recorder* of June 30, 1975, under the heading "Dunstan Slates Mayor—'On Ego Trip'", the following extracts appear:

The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, has . . . called on Labor supporters to unite for the sake of the Party. Mr. Dunstan made an emotional plea for unity at the A.L.P. rally at the Port Pirie Town Hall on Thursday night. A crowd of about 180 people attended the meeting to hear Mr. Dunstan launch Labor's campaign to retain the seat of Pirie.

As recently as a few weeks ago, the Premier made a similar appeal, but he made it at the State conference of the Australian Labor Party. Calling for unity within the Party, the Premier was looking for support to get the Independent member for Pirie back into the Labor Party. On one occasion, the Premier called for unity in order to get rid of the present Speaker, yet only recently he sought support to get the Independent member back into the Party. I am sorry that the Speaker, having won his way out of the clutches of the Labor Party, did not wish to stay out of it. Unfortunately, we find that our Speaker is no longer independent and is again a member of the Labor Party. What will be the position when the new electoral boundaries are made known? What will then be the future position of the Speaker of the South Australia Parliament? Your guess, Mr. Acting Speaker, will be as good as mine, but I have a few thoughts on that matter.

Mr. Jennings: I bet he'll be the Speaker in the next Parliament.

Mr. VENNING: I am interested to hear the honourable member's comment, as it indicates what measures the Labor Party will take to ensure that the present Speaker remains a member of this Parliament. I thank the honourable member for giving me that information; it puts my mind and that of my colleagues at rest, knowing the Government's plans for the present member for Pirie.

Being a rural member, I am vitally concerned about the drought conditions prevailing in South Australia. I am also equally concerned about the comments made by members of the Government, whether it be the Minister of Lands, the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, or the member for Florey, indicating that they do not know much about the rural situation. Opening this debate last week, the member for Florey commended the Government for its action in this serious situation. The honourable member referred to the opening of the Parliament by His Excellency and stated:

Since His Excellency opened Parliament, South Australia has suffered and is still in the throes of a serious drought. That is most unfortunate. Expected seasonal rains did not eventuate, with resultant great hardship to our rural producers.

The honourable member went on to state:

I can say with great certainty that the plight of those people has troubled the Government, which, of course, always has been concerned with the economic viability

of such an important section of our community. I am certain that the people involved must be greatly heartened and gain much satisfaction from the prompt and generous relief afforded them by the Government of South Australia. However, the South Australian Government has done little to aid people in drought-stricken areas. The member for Florey further stated:

They surely should not gain any comfort from Mr. Ian Sinclair, the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry, who addressed the annual conference of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated recently. Judging by press reports of that conference, it is certain that Mr. Sinclair offered our rural producers nothing but a bleak outlook regarding their future activities. However, the State Government is aware of the plight of our rural producers and, as I have said, it always expresses concern and it has done something concrete to alleviate the situation caused by the present drought.

The member for Florey condemned the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry, saying that the Minister offered nothing when opening a conference of the United Farmers and Graziers a fortnight ago. However, I have received press releases from the Minister almost every other day indicating where and when action has been undertaken, for instance, in declaring over 100 shires in Victoria and several areas in New South Wales as drought areas so that people in those areas can redeem drought bonds.

In Victoria, about \$1 500 000 has already been spent on drought relief for primary producers. Therefore, I believe it is most unfair for the member for Florey to condemn the Commonwealth Minister and at the same time laud what his own Government is supposed to have done. The Minister of Lands in another place (Hon. T. M. Casey), in reply to a question by the Hon. J. C. Burdett, said that it was not practicable to declare the whole State as a drought area, because many areas were enjoying good seasonal conditions. I should like to know where those good conditions exist. True, some areas are in a better position than others, but I believe that the Minister should have, in conjunction with the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry, declared the whole of South Australia a drought area. In asking his question, the Hon. J. C. Burdett stated:

I have been told that several farmers with drought-stricken properties have asked at their local council office for a form on which to apply for drought relief, but they have been told that forms were not available in those council offices because the forms were distributed only in declared drought areas. Will the Minister consider declaring the whole State a drought area so that any person suffering hardship can apply for a subsidy and have his application dealt with on its merits?

That would have been a practical approach to the situation, because the position of each farmer would still be judged on its merits. All honourable members know that the weather pattern in South Australia this year has been most unusual, with few areas receiving a limited amount of moisture. I believe that the Minister could have come out and declared South Australia a drought area. On July 23, a map was published in the press indicating declared drought areas. It was stated that the drought might cost South Australia \$300 000 000, yet today I read that that cost has been estimated to be \$400 000 000. Certainly, the total loss to the State will be difficult to estimate. Indeed, if the drought continues, it will take two or three years (if not longer) of average seasons, for the rural sector to get back into an economic situation. The report accompanying the map includes the following statement by Mr. Grant Andrews:

If general rains did not fall in the next three weeks, the potential grain industry loss in South Australia would rise to \$2 000 000 a week. After that South Australia stood to lose as much as \$150 000 000 in grain production

this season. Last year South Australia produced 100 000 000 bushels of grain. If the drought continued that figure could be reduced by as much as 70 per cent this season. Members know sufficient about the rural situation to know that the plight of the man on the land is desperate. True, the situation could change overnight with an inch of rain, but we are now in the eighth month of the year; South Australia is a normally dry State in which the season finishes early and, unless we have a miracle, we will not get anywhere near an average return from our grain production. Currently, grain is the one commodity that is a payable proposition, not only to the farmer but also to the whole community, especially as wool is just holding its own and cattle prices are in the doldrums. It is interesting to read a comment in the *Advertiser* of July 24. Evidently the Minister was on the coast and commented about the drought in that area. One farmer (Mr. D. Woods) from Wirrulla is quoted as saying:

I give credit to the Government in attempting to help, but the benefits available from the scheme are virtually nil. I thought that was a funny comment to make: he commends the Government for attempting to help, but the benefits from the scheme were virtually nil! The article goes on to state:

All farmers and industry leaders who were asked yesterday agreed that the immediate introduction of compensation for farmers to destroy surplus stock would be the best relief measure. All agreed the situation was being aggravated by too many farmers holding too much stock in the hope of rain. From all reports it appears that a compensation scheme is needed, not only to provide financial relief but to provide psychological incentive for mass destruction.

I should like to know why the South Australian Government has not done similarly for the farmer as the Victorians have. They have a scheme whereby stock can be slaughtered on the farm, and the farmers get up to \$5 for cattle and 40c or 50c for sheep on the property. Certainly, the Government has a scheme in operation here whereby a grower who delivers stock to Samcor or the Port Lincoln works receives 40c a head. Those sheep have to measure up to a certain standard, notwithstanding, and the compensation to the grower for a sheep is equivalent to one loaf of bread or half a packet of cigarettes — 40c. That is the best the South Australian Government or Samcor can do for the South Australian producer.

What happens to the farmer at Ceduna, a bad area of the State; how can he get his stock down to Port Lincoln, pay the freight, and finish up by getting 40c? It is just not a proposition. I think the Government has been very penny-pinching in its efforts to assist the growers in this State. As John Kerin recently said at the State conference of the United Farmers and Graziers, on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the amalgamation of the South Australian Wheat and Wool Growers Association with the Australian Primary Producers Union:

Our members will be looking to the organisation to push for economic relief by way of reductions in capital taxation; help in drought-affected areas; and to press for the Federal Government to establish some form of rural bank able to provide long-term finance at reasonable interest rates.

The report in which those remarks appear continues:

Few of these areas represent new problems to farmers, which will account for a strong feeling of frustration expected among many delegates. The frustration is not likely to be directed at the U.F. and G. but at the fact that issues which appear so clear-cut to farmers are overlooked or ignored by those outside farming.

I believe the Government must take a more realistic look at the situation. We have a Minister of Lands who is an ex-Minister of Agriculture and we have a Minister

of Agriculture who has traversed the State, so surely they would have got the message from the growers of the urgent need for some real practical demonstration by the Government to assist them.

There has been much comment in the last few days about the rail transfer in this State. It has been rumoured in the North that the two railway lines, Gladstone-Wilmington and Quorn-Peterborough, should close. When I asked the Minister in the House last week what would be the reaction of the Government to these lines closing, it took him a long time to give me an answer (there was a lot of abuse prior to giving a reply) but he eventually replied that, as far as the State Government was concerned, those lines would stay open. I want to talk about the shonkiness of the rail deal made by this Government last year with its Federal colleagues.

First of all, the Bill in question was rejected by the Legislative Council and then we had an election on the issue, and the legislation was subsequently passed in the Upper House. But what a deal to make! I know that it was a deal made between friends and that the Commonwealth would take over the non-metropolitan lines. Part of the deal was that none of these lines should be closed unless the State Parliament agreed to those closures. What a deal to make with anybody—that we sell something to them yet we retain the final say as to its operation.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It was a darn good deal for South Australia.

Mr. VENNING: I say it was a shonky deal. I know the Commonwealth has a job to do, but why did this State sell to the Commonwealth? Because it could not handle the railways itself and it was happy to give them to the Commonwealth, the State having the final say as to whether any lines should close. Does the Government expect the Commonwealth to take over these lines and try to make them pay when the State could not do so? I support leaving the lines open but I am talking about the crook deal that was made. What did the Premier of South Australia want? In the Minister's reply today in the House to a Dorothy Dixier question, he indicated to the House clearly that the Government was wanting to have the best of both worlds: it wanted to get rid of the non-metropolitan lines. The Premier had already stated that the deal was worth \$800 000 000 to South Australia over a 10-year period but, because the Commonwealth was taking it over, you wanted to—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member, as I have explained on many occasions, uses the word "you". I try at all times to have members avoid that practice and I hope that the honourable member will do so in future. The member for Rocky River.

Mr. VENNING: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. In the debate in the House this afternoon it was clear that South Australia wanted the best of both worlds.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Hear, hear!

Mr. VENNING: This Government wanted to sell the railways and get money from the Commonwealth and yet have the final say as to how the lines in question were to be controlled. It wanted to retain the South Australian benefits in the form of employees' long service leave payments, etc., but when it hands over to another authority, in this case the Federal Government, it must be prepared to accept the provisions existing in the Federal sphere.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Why?

Mr. VENNING: How can you expect the people from South Australia working for the national railways to have a set of retirement payments different from those of people

working in other States of the Commonwealth? You want the best of both worlds, but that will not work.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has been warned about using the word "you".

Mr. VENNING: Honourable members want the best of both worlds, and it will not work. I smile when I hear the performance of honourable members opposite on this railway legislation. Last year I asked the Premier how he arrived at the figure of \$800 000 000 for South Australia, a figure that sounded good until we analysed it. How much have we had this year? A press report of comments made by the Premier at about the time the Bill was rejected by the Upper House states:

In Canberra last week, Mr. Dunstan said Treasury figures had shown the deal would have been worth \$800 000 000 over a 10-year period.

"That deal would have taken us out of the position of a State being constantly in need of hand-outs", he said.

"The rail transfer would have put South Australia in the best financial position of any State in this country." Mr. Dunstan told the cheering workers at Islington that he did not know why the Legislative Council had rejected the transfer.

The Premier is still seeking more money from the Commonwealth Government, and I repeat that, regardless of what happened, this State Government would never ever have enough money to fulfil its socialistic programmes.

Mr. Jennings: What does "never ever" mean?

Mr. VENNING: In January, 1975, the Minister of Transport referred to the closure of certain railway lines and a report on that matter states:

Closures only a proposal—Virgo. Union pressure short-circuited a Government move yesterday designed to cut multi-million-dollar losses on State transport. In a written Press statement at 11 a.m. the Minister of Transport (Mr. Virgo) announced:

Metropolitan rail fares would increase by 13 per cent. M.T.T. fares would rise by 5c for eight or more sections and for transfer tickets.

Railway services from Mount Barker to Victor Harbor, Kingston to Naracoorte, and Glanville to Semaphore, and the passenger service from Adelaide to Tailem Bend would be discontinued.

An hour later, after a meeting with about 16 union leaders at the Trades Hall, he said the move to close the lines was only a proposal by Cabinet and would have to be reconsidered by Minister next week. He said he expected there would be further talks with the unions on the subject and supported what he described as their right to protect members. . . . Mr. Virgo was reluctant to say who put the plan to rationalise services before Cabinet. "If you like, you can put it down as mine," he said when pressed. Mr. Virgo said it was common practice to go to the Trades Hall to discuss issues before the Cabinet announced them.

The Government has criticised a report by Mr. Lynch, an economist whom the Australian National Railways sent here to undertake a financial exercise on the viability of the Gladstone-Wilmington and Peterborough-Quorn railway services, and I understand that Mr. Lynch recommended that those lines be closed, but that was only one aspect of the situation. Last week the Minister was vocal about his reaction to the closure of those services. When he had the responsibility of controlling those services, he took a more realistic attitude: now that the Commonwealth Government is controlling them, he is taking a most irresponsible attitude. I support myself—

Mr. Jennings: You're the only person who does.

Mr. VENNING: My attitude to these two proposals is that the services should be retained, because there is more to the situation than the financial aspect. Our railways are decentralised better than any other industry in the State. Using Parkinson's theory that, when we have one group of people, we have another group to look after it, I cite

Wilmington as an example. If the line to Wilmington were closed, five families would leave, and that would mean that the school probably would be closed. There would be a reaction right down the line in regard to both services.

People are concerned about their areas. They have told me that they do not mind people in the metropolitan area having a free Bee-line bus service, and they do not mind how much money is spent on air-conditioning buses in Adelaide, but they want a fair go in the country areas and they want existing facilities retained and maintained, although they are not asking for additional facilities.

I deal now with flood damage in my district. We do not need much rain in this State before we get into difficulties. Last year we had about 100 millimetres of rain in some places, and it devastated rail and road bridges throughout the State. Further, there was the railway crash at Crystal Brook when a train was washed away and repairs cost \$1 200 000. A report on a statement by the Minister of Transport on November 5 last year states:

The Crystal Brook train crash on October 4 caused damage estimated at \$1 200 000.

Repairs to the track and the Crystal Brook Creek bridge, from which the train plunged, will cost about \$250 000. Replacement and repair of rollingstock will cost about \$750 000. Other costs include \$800 000 for a by-pass track and the recovery of damaged rollingstock.

I was amazed at some figures given by the Minister. The newspaper report of the accident, when referring to the Minister's comments, stated:

Livestock losses amounted to \$3 100 and 80 tonnes of diesel oil valued at \$8 100 had been lost or contaminated. He said 170 zinc ingots weighing 199.9 tonnes and valued at about \$112 640 had been damaged or lost. More than 4 000 lead ingots weighing 101.2 tonnes and valued at about \$29 500 also had been lost or damaged. "Some of this material is in temporary inaccessible places under water and silt which will protract the recovery exercise," Mr. Virgo said.

I have a report of the railway disaster at Crystal Brook, and I ask leave to have it printed in *Hansard*.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Is it only statistical?

Mr. VENNING: Yes. I got it through. In addition to the damage to which I have referred, at that time we had the misfortune to lose the road bridge at Wirrabara. It is pleasing to note that the Governor in his Speech said that the bridge would be replaced at a cost of \$250 000. However, it concerns me that it will be January-February, 1977, before any visible move will take place to replace the bridge, which was put out of operation last October. The Highways Department has spent much time on preparing plans, and soil tests have been taken in the area. To think that activity on this main highway has to be reduced by traffic having to navigate a by-pass road for such a long time is scandalous.

Approaches have been made to have a by-pass bridge made on the scene, but the Government and the department have turned down this proposal. For the sake of \$20 000 I believe that a by-pass could be constructed so that people would not have to travel on an unsealed road. Although money has been made available to the Port Germein council to maintain the road, it is in a rough state of repair, and I am concerned that for a long time yet this road will "have to" be used.

Mr. Wells: You wouldn't notice it in your big Chev.

Mr. VENNING: I traded in my Chev in February, 1975. Land tax concerns people not only in the rural areas but also in the metropolitan area. I have listened with much interest to the Premier's comments, and have read the following report in the press, as follows:

Farmers facing financial hardship will be given the opportunity of gaining relief from land tax. The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) told a joint delegation of the United Farmers and Graziers and the Stockowners Association yesterday that he would make an officer of the Land Tax Department available to consider hardship cases.

I believe that Mr. Oakley has been appointed to examine these cases. The report continues:

The delegation gave examples of rural land tax increases—\$400 to \$2 000, \$800 to \$9 000, and \$4 000 to \$14 000. Delegation spokesman Mr. R. James said farmers should take up the offer. Many have cut down on super-phosphate, on property maintenance and on production to pay land tax, Mr. James said. Applicants should stress these factors when writing to the Land Tax Commissioner.

The Premier's offer is over and above normal hardship provisions of the Land Tax Act. Mr. Dunstan also told the delegation that any estimated increase in rural land tax revenue because of increased valuation would be watched closely and appropriate remedial measures taken. Mr. James urged farmers to apply by submitting budgets which showed productivity and managerial practices would be effected by payment of the tax.

The delegation told the Premier the new equalisation system had produced anomalies, especially in near-city council areas. The Premier said provision existed for the Valuer-General to issue more than one equalisation factor in a local government area, and this should help overcome these anomalies.

I spoke with the United Farmers and Graziers Association only two days ago.

Mr. Langley: Are you a member?

Mr. VENNING: I have been a member almost as long as the honourable member has been on this earth. Having communicated with that organisation, I found that nothing had come from that visit to the Premier. I believe that the organisation intends to go to the Premier again to ask him to give serious consideration to these anomalies in land tax. I was interested to listen to the member for Florey the other evening and his comments regarding his visit to the Mount Barker area to handle a group of landowners there. He seemed happy about the area. It is a funny thing about politicians, who, if asked a sticky question, do not answer it but get around it by talking about something else.

I believe that that is what the member for Florey did, because I am told that he did not even mention land tax. That is how he got out of it and came home alive, and he has not even got a scratch on him. He must have put it over the meeting very well indeed to have got away as he did. Unfortunately, there are no votes for Labor in country areas, otherwise it might make much difference to the Australian Labor Party's attitude towards the rural problems of drought, land tax, and increased valuations. It was pleasing today to hear the Premier say what the Government intends to do as regards succession duties from a deceased person to a spouse.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Didn't our blokes put you in in 1973?

Mr. VENNING: I will now refer to industry. The member for Whyalla had much to say the other evening, but I could not help thinking that he spoke a heap of trash. He referred to the problems in the shipbuilding industry and hoped that that industry would be retained at Whyalla.

Mr. Wells: Why not talk more about sheep than about building ships?

Mr. VENNING: I know something about shipbuilding. The member for Whyalla said:

I now turn to what I consider is an important matter—the shipbuilding industry. I have spoken about that industry in this House, in Whyalla, in the press and anywhere else I could raise it. The current slump in

that industry has probably hit Whyalla harder than anything else that I can remember. In the past two or three months the attitude of people in Whyalla has been one of despair.

Whom do we blame for that? In Australia we are pricing ourselves out of everything as a result of union demands. When speaking to a man from Whyalla recently, he said, "There would have to be a 50 per cent Government subsidy for shipbuilding to survive in Whyalla." He said that ships could be built in Korea for less than the materials can be bought for in South Australia. The shipbuilding industry has priced itself out of the market, and this problem concerns not only the shipbuilding industry but all other industries in the State. This problem also concerns the primary producer and his costs in competing on world markets. The main exporting countries of the United States of America and Canada have contained their inflation and costs, whereas we have not contained ours.

I am amazed when I think of the representation Whyalla has. When I think of its Federal representation, I think of the man it sent to Canberra (Mr. Jack Mortimer) before the present member. If I had to have 100 sheep shorn, I would go to Jack Mortimer, but if I wanted representation in Canberra for places such as Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Whyalla, and Port Lincoln, I would select a man with the ability to put the case for those important areas of the State. I believe that, when the people of this area had good representation in Canberra, they did not appreciate it. Now, they have got what they have got and are getting what they deserve.

Mr. Wells: Did you know that Jack Mortimer was a wharfie?

Mr. VENNING: No. However, I know that he is a good shearer and, if I had 100 sheep to be shorn, I would be looking for him to do it for me, because there are not many good shearers about. I am referring to the representatives that these important areas of the State have sent to Canberra.

I now refer to the Governor-General, Sir John Kerr, who was entertained by this Parliament, and particularly by the Premier, at a dinner at the Hotel Australia on the evening of October 24, 1974, with all the grandeur that was possible. Later the Governor-General again visited South Australia but, because of his actions in the Federal sphere, he was not met by the Premier. It is a shocking indictment of the Premier that he saw fit not to meet Sir John Kerr. He got around the matter of protocol by saying that it was necessary to welcome the Governor-General only on his first and last visits to the State.

Sir John Kerr arrived at Adelaide Airport and was greeted by His Excellency the Governor, Sir Mark Oliphant, and Lady Oliphant, the Lieutenant-Governor (Mr. W. R. Crocker), an A.D.C., and a lady-in-waiting. Representing the Government was a protocol officer, Mr. K. Obst. A press report of the arrival of Sir John Kerr was as follows:

Sir John and Lady Kerr will attend a number of Festival outings before leaving Adelaide on Friday after officially opening the \$3 000 000 Torrens College of Advanced Education.

The Premier has stated that he will not be at the opening and that neither he nor his Ministers would be likely to attend any function which involved contact with Sir John.

I do not know what happened to Sir John, but I am pleased to say that my Leader, who will be the Premier of this State after the next election, took the opportunity to meet Sir John Kerr at all functions that he attended. I believe that what has happened in Australia since Sir John Kerr took the attitude that he did over the conduct

of the Federal Australian Labor Party Government has been nothing other than scandalous. I believe that the A.L.P.'s Federal Leader could easily have said "Stop this nonsense and let everyone get on with his job." I believe that the demonstrations have been encouraged, no action having been taken by the A.L.P. in either the State or Federal spheres to stop this damned nonsense regarding Sir John Kerr.

If the A.L.P. had won the election on December 13, we would not have heard a thing about what Sir John Kerr did in calling for an election. The Commonwealth Labor Government was done like a dinner by the Liberal Party. The people had the chance to indicate, by way of the ballot box, what it wanted to happen. It is a most disgraceful situation that some people have not accepted graciously the vote of the majority of the Australian people.

I now refer to Monarto. The golden handshake given to Mr. Ray Taylor is certainly something that concerns us all. One wonders how many other similar decisions have been made by this Government. Certainly, Mr. Taylor was honest enough to come out and say that he had no work to do and that he wished to be relieved of his position. We know that the Government has created positions all over the place for people.

Mr. Langley: Such as?

Mr. VENNING: It has built up empires and appointed committees. The Premier's Department has been built up with numerous personnel. In this case, a fellow was honest enough to come out and say, "There is nothing for me to do." Notwithstanding that, he went away with a golden handshake of \$100 000. Although the Premier tried to sidestep the issue by blaming the Crown Solicitor, Mr. Millhouse quickly pulled him into gear saying, "Do not hide behind that gentleman. Face up to the fact that the Government agreed to the amount being paid." That is one aspect of the situation.

I am concerned about this matter, knowing as I do about a family regarding whom I went to the Premier. These people were experiencing difficulties with the payment of succession duties. They had to sell their property in order to raise \$75 000 to \$80 000 for succession and probate duties. Two-thirds of the property had to be sold initially, and I believe that more of it will have to be sold because of the quick succession and the high valuation put on the property as a result of adjacent areas that have been planted to vine. It is bad enough that this family had to sell part of its property to raise money for the payment of succession and probate duties, but one becomes even more concerned when one hears of a golden handshake payment of \$100 000 being made, and this distresses me immensely. I suppose Mr. Taylor will have to pay only about \$5 000 in taxation on his golden handshake. That is one of the injustices with which the Government is associated. I wonder how many more of these positions, for which such a high salary is paid, have been created by the Government.

I refer also to our lack of success in the Olympic Games just concluded in Canada. People are asking what has gone wrong. It is the philosophy of the people in Australia today that is the problem, and it will take some time for the people to get rid of the philosophy of "Come day, go day, God send Sunday". It will take some time to inject the Liberal philosophy into the community.

Mr. Langley: Tell us what you'd do about it.

Mr. VENNING: Mr. Fraser will inject the right philosophy into the people of Australia, given the time and the chance to do so. People will realise that life is

worth living, as it has been. There has been no incentive, and I believe there must be a change of attitude by the people before Australia will again rank among the top athletic nations of the world. We have been able to produce athletes to compete in world events, but until the attitude changes here we will remain in a state of redundancy. The Fraser Government, with the philosophy of work, will take some time to redeem the situation that has occurred in this State.

Finally, I want to comment about the Commonwealth Leader, Mr. Malcolm Fraser. He is doing a wonderful job for Australia. I know we have heard many comments from members opposite, but how could Australia have continued with the downhill run in Prime Ministers? With a deficit of more than \$5 000 000 000, something had to be done to redeem the Commonwealth's finances, and Mr. Fraser is endeavouring to do it. I would not like his job, but I am pleased to think someone in Australia is prepared to put his shoulder to the wheel, irrespective of the criticism of people such as members opposite. Most Australians realised that something had to be done, and they indicated that on December 13 last. They will indicate the same thing in South Australia when next they have an opportunity to put their papers in the ballot box here. We know that the submission of the Labor Party on the revised electoral boundaries was such that it could win Government with 46 per cent of the vote, but we will see tomorrow just what is the true story. I support the motion.

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): I support the motion so ably moved by the member for Florey and seconded by the member for Semaphore. I express my sympathy to the families of former members of this House who have died in the past few months. I wish our Governor health and happiness in his retirement. He has presented the Governor's Speech to this Parliament for the last time. Some of his statements during his period in office have been rather controversial and they have made him rather a controversial figure, but in making those statements he has caused us to think, and anyone who makes the people think has achieved something. I believe he has achieved this result and that we are the richer for it. There is great difficulty nowadays, with so much apathy in the community, in making people think about the problems, the situations and the goings-on in our society. Our Governor will be remembered, I am sure, for this aspect of his term of office. I welcome Sir Douglas Nicholls as Governor Designate and wish him a happy and successful term as Governor of South Australia.

I turn now to the seasonal prospects for our State, prospects which at the moment are not terribly bright. However, with the change in the weather pattern that seems to be showing at the moment, they may improve over the next few weeks; we hope so. As has been said by other members on this side, large areas of our State are suffering drought or near-drought conditions, and large numbers of stock are in poor condition, to the point of starvation. In my district in the South-East, we are fortunate in that we have not been hit terribly hard. Our rainfall is below average, but we have had sufficient rain to supply stock with feed and, as long as we have good spring rains, we will probably come through the season in good condition. We are most fortunate.

Mr. Venning: Can you offer any paddocking down there?

Mr. VANDEPEER: We are not in a situation to handle any paddocking. It is a case of survival, and the situation

is somewhat aggravated by overstocking, mainly due to low cattle prices; I think we are all carrying more cattle than we should. Anyone with about 40 hectares of scrub has managed to use it to build up his carrying capacity, and those stock will have to come in for fattening if the season turns out well. Although I would like to help other areas, I cannot offer paddocking at the moment.

I must mention some brighter news we received in yesterday's paper, which reported that the Industries Assistance Commission had recommended that the superphosphate bounty be continued at existing rates until July, 1982. This has been a relief to many South Australian farmers. Superphosphate is costly nowadays, but it is essential. We are unfortunate in having phosphorus deficient soils, and the only way to replace that phosphorus is by applying superphosphate. We have been doing that for many years, and it has contributed greatly to the productivity of our agricultural land. With the high cost of production and preparation of the superphosphate, and also the large increase in the base price of rock phosphate that has occurred over the past few years, superphosphate has become extremely costly. To see that the Industries Assistance Commission has recommended the continuation of the subsidy is heartening news.

Although I do not denigrate this subsidy, it is nowhere near as great a percentage of the total cost as it was originally. From memory, I think it was \$12 a tonne and we paid about \$14 a tonne ex works for plain super. That price would have risen in the six months before the subsidy came off to about \$16 a tonne, but we are now paying \$40 and \$50 a tonne for super with the same subsidy, so it does not reflect the great increase in costs that farmers have had to bear.

With the present dry conditions, and the fact that many of our stock will have to be slaughtered and some of the breeding herds reduced, I take the Government to task somewhat for not forging ahead much more quickly with its tuberculosis and brucellosis eradication programmes. We might say that this is an old chestnut, but stock health is extremely important. We have oversea markets to consider and clients in other countries have said that they will refuse to take our meat if it shows any evidence of brucellosis bacteria. I think the limit will apply by about 1984, which is not far away and does not give us much time to eradicate tuberculosis and brucellosis. We must expect that many stock will go for slaughter, and we should be making absolutely certain that any diseased or doubtful stock, considering quality as well as disease, are slaughtered. In these present troubled times for the farming community, if the Government co-operated a little more and provided some money, with the necessary assistance of the Federal Government, and if it went ahead with a sound programme, primary producers would be assisted. The overall effect would not be apparent immediately but, when restocking occurred for the next season, which we hope will be good, these people who had had stock destroyed would be back in the market and relieving the position for anyone who was overstocked. So, such a programme would assist the community all round.

As the member for Rocky River said, the farming community is also suffering from the iniquitous burden of land tax, which is hitting many farming areas to the point where farmers will have to find some other occupation; this is occurring just beyond the metropolitan area, and even good farmers on viable properties are being taxed out of existence. The burden of land tax is also hitting viable farmers who are capable of adjusting to the changes that will come in agriculture in the coming years. Because

of the taxes, these farmers will join the large number of farmers who are on the breadline. At present, wool prices are relatively high, and we are not hearing allegations from Government members about a subsidy on wool prices. I would like to put this red herring straight. At no time has finance been made available to the wool industry that could be considered a subsidy: it is all loan money, on which interest must be paid. Many Government members have not seemed to understand this point in the past two years. The wool industry is willing to meet its debts and to support itself during this tough period, and we hope it will continue to be the magnificent industry that has virtually made Australia what it is today.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Wool prices are not bad now.

Mr. VANDEPEER: They are nothing special at present. In the past, the price often quoted was £1 a pound, but today the guaranteed price is 250 cents for each clean kilo; that is, for wool that has been scoured and cleaned. One gets only about a 60 per cent return out of a pound of wool.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: About 85 cents a pound, is that right?

Mr. VANDEPEER: I am glad that the Minister understands the figures, because we are suffering from a media complex. The price of £1 a pound has remained in people's minds, and the change to the metric system and the change in the quality for which the price is quoted have also been confusing. Wool for which 250 cents a kilo is paid is wool that has been scoured; also on the "64" quality wool, it does not include wool from the belly and lower class pieces. So, we come down to the price quoted by the Minister, 85 cents, which is different from 240 cents.

The Governor's Speech outlined a long list of legislation that is to come before Parliament this session. Much of the legislation seems to be regulatory. The words "control" and "regulation" are as prominent as they have been in the past. Legislation is proposed to control advertising and to amend the Builders Licensing Act. I turn now to the problems that that Act is creating. Some builders in my district are in trouble because they do not have a licence, simply because they forgot to reregister, and they now have to go through the whole procedure again. They even have to travel to Adelaide to appear before the board. Being aggravated they become hostile, and they have spoken strongly to me, demanding that I express myself in similar terms.

One of my constituents managed to get a licence without appearing before the board, but the board later looked up his record and said, "You cannot by-pass us this time. You must appear and answer questions." When I gave my constituent a copy of the building regulations to swot, he almost decided to be an illegal builder and take a chance. The Builders Licensing Act confuses and embarrasses many builders, and I hope the amending legislation will deal with this aspect.

There will also be legislation dealing with serious maltreatment of children. Other legislation to be introduced includes community welfare matters and the licensing of baby sitting agencies, which is obviously another regulatory Bill. Legislation concerning consumer credit will doubtless involve new controls. Legislation dealing with the prohibition of discrimination will be in a similar vein.

Legislation dealing with environmental impact statements will also be of a regulatory nature. Doubtless, firearms legislation will include many regulations. Second-hand motor vehicles legislation will come into the same category,

and planning and development measures will certainly involve more regulations. Outdoor advertising legislation will involve co-ordinated control. Once again "control" is raised. The same word appears in relation to noise pollution legislation and also in relation to industrial safety, health and welfare legislation.

Industrial conciliation and arbitration legislation will remove the right of people to take civil action. This measure will remove one of our freedoms. Individual freedoms have always been extremely important in our society. They are part of our daily function and, when a Government seeks to remove such freedoms, everyone is concerned. On Tuesday we heard, I think, the member for Florey telling the story referred to by the member for Torrens concerning the waterside workers union allowing any member to pay a contribution to a political Party other than the Australian Labor Party. That is a right that everyone enjoys.

However, in this case the individual freedom was completely destroyed by a stop-work meeting, as described by the member for Torrens. I found this to be a hilarious story, although I believe that the member for Florey believes in the freedom of the individual. I believe that many honourable members opposite believe in this; they believe in the right to strike, and so do I; they believe in many other freedoms, such as the right to work, the right not to work, the right to object, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion, yet the removal of the right to take civil action will take away one of these basic freedoms. The legislation dealing with this matter is of such a nature that we will be sorry about it in the future.

Individual freedom is part of our Party's philosophy, and it is something that we do not easily give away. It is one of those freedoms for which we have always fought; indeed, it is what the Americans fought for in the War of Independence and the Civil War. I refer to freedom of speech, freedom of religion and freedom of association. We do not like losing one of our freedoms.

I now refer to the measure to be introduced dealing with the maltreatment of children. If the Government intends to legislate against the maltreatment of children, it is attacking the problem from the wrong end. I do not condone the maltreatment of children, but to legislate to punish those responsible for such treatment will do no good whatsoever. Certainly, it will not do the children any good once they have been maltreated. No amount of legislation or control will have any effect on such maltreatment when it is committed by someone under severe psychological stress. Therefore, if action is to be taken, it must be by removing the severe psychological stress involved. Legislation to punish the offenders will have no effect whatsoever. In fact, it may even make the situation worse. Recently we discussed this problem and a story was told, but I will recount that story when I resume. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The matter I wish to raise this evening has been the subject of much discussion by Government members. Several statements have been made in the media regarding assistance to sport by the Australian

Government, and so-called assistance to sport by the State Government. I intend to refer to the established priorities and to just what has been done. I remind members opposite of the press release by the Minister for the Environment, Housing and Community Development, in Canberra on July 26, as follows:

The task force currently examining health and welfare policies will look at the Commonwealth's role in youth, sport and recreation and the reports from competitors and officials in Montreal will be of value to that task force.

Unfortunately, the performance of Australian athletes in Montreal has been used to raise this issue, yet I believe that our athletes have performed creditably. Many people forget that before an athlete is accepted for Olympic competition he or she must meet a specific standard and, if one has not achieved that standard, one cannot compete in an Olympic event. On August 2 the Commonwealth Minister made another statement, and I want honourable members to listen to this, as it is most important. The Minister said:

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. As early as May 20 the Government announced that there would be a review of Commonwealth sports and recreation programs. Since then the Government has established a task force to examine health, welfare and community development. This task force will look at the role of the Commonwealth in assistance to sports development among other things. 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. In this process we will have discussions with a broad range of Australian sports.

He further went on to say:

This examination will, of course, include reference to the report of the Australian Sports Institute, the Bloomfield report, and the report of the National Coaches Seminar.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: They are fine words; are they going to put their money where their mouths are?

Mr. BECKER: The member for Henley Beach reminded us of the Bloomfield report and I thought I should remind him of the statement made by the Minister on August 2 that the Bloomfield report will be considered and examined. Statements have been made that the Federal Government has drastically reduced contributions to sport and recreation, but I remind members that the Minister in the press release of July 26 said:

In addition, a considerable part of the \$11 600 000 announced at the same time for community assistance was earmarked for sporting facilities, such as \$250 000 for the E. S. Marks athletics field in Sydney, \$100 000 for design work on the grandstand for the Mount Gravatt athletics centre in Brisbane, \$105 000 for the Domain athletics centre in Hobart, \$120 000 for an indoor 50-metre heated swimming pool at Dandenong, Victoria, \$40 000 to extend the basketball centre at Perry Lakes, Perth, and \$15 000 for site investigations for an indoor sports centre in Adelaide.

All that money is being spent. The Minister said:

Any future programme of assistance would be determined against the background of the Government's fiscal and federalism policies—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: We know what they are.

Mr. BECKER: The federalism policy, if the member for Henley Beach does not understand it, is simply this: the State will get a lump sum and it will then have to decide its priorities and spend the money according to its desires. It is no good saying that we will spend money if the Federal Government will tell us how. It is time the State Governments grew up and decided where their priorities are. This business of tied grants that we were

accustomed to under the previous Federal Labor Government does not work today. It is far better to give the States back their share of the tax money, some 33·5 per cent or 33·6 per cent of the tax that is being collected in Canberra, and let the States be responsible to the taxpayers as to how they will spend that money.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Why won't they give it to us?

Mr. BECKER: If you have not consulted your own Leader and found out what percentage is coming to the State, I suggest you should consult him. The State Treasury is now preparing the Budget which, unfortunately, will be brought into this House considerably later than usual; but the Federal Treasurer has made it quite clear, as late as July 27, exactly what share the States are getting, what the amounts will be, but the States will have to decide how to spend it. We have heard so much of what the State Government has done for sport and recreation in South Australia. We have an Olympic size swimming pool at North Adelaide—and that's it. There is very little seating accommodation; it is not enclosed; it is not of a standard found anywhere else in Australia. Most cities overseas would have four or five of them. We have one of these things that is all right if it is a fine day or fine evening, but we do not have a decent swimming facility in South Australia. The old city baths building behind this place was demolished to make way for the Festival Theatre complex, and what have we been left with? It is an absolute disgrace for amateur swimming in this State. I remind the member for Henley Beach that, if he reads the *Guardian* of Wednesday, July 21, he will see, under the heading "Sports clubs protest on charges", that 15 sporting clubs in the Marion council area are upset that the Marion council has decided to increase their contribution towards the maintenance of ovals in the Marion council area. The Assistant Town Clerk of the Marion Council said:

The estimated cost of maintaining the six ovals concerned—Plympton, Marion, Mitchell Park, Glandore, Morphettville and Edwardstown—would be \$76 200 for the year ending June, 1976.

The Secretary of the Edwardstown Football Club said that clubs would go to the wall or have to cut back on their development. Let me remind the member for Henley Beach of the clubs involved. They are: Mitchell Park Cricket Club, Mitchell Park Football Club, Edwardstown Y.C.W., Edwardstown Football Club, Holdfast Bay and District Amateur Cycling Club, South Road Cricket Club, St. Mark's Cricket Club, Morphettville Park Football Club, Plympton Cricket Club, Plympton Football Club, Glandore Football Club, Edwardstown Cricket Club, Glandore Netball Club, Marion Football Club, and Marion Cricket Club.

All these and many other organisations are experiencing difficulty because the Minister of Local Government has insisted that councils charge sporting organisations council rates, and many organisations have been levied severe water and sewerage rates. The croquet club alongside the Glenelg Oval is charged annual council rates and water and sewerage rates at the rate of about \$15 a member. Whether croquet is one of the biggest or smallest in popularity does not matter: people are entitled to follow their own form of recreation.

Last evening I stated that the Glenelg and Marion Districts Little Athletics Club was seeking \$380 or \$400 to purchase a jumping bag for a high-jumping competition. The club had previously sought funds from the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department but was told that the department could not assist because the club was in an

affluent area. Who in the department decides who is affluent or whether a club is in an affluent area? That is the kind of treatment that sporting clubs (in this case, an athletic club) have received from the Government.

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

Mr. OLSON (Semaphore): This evening I will submit a proposition that I trust will assist in providing employment opportunities for some who are unfortunate enough to be unemployed. I refer to the value of minerals, particularly opal, produced in South Australia. The value of minerals produced in South Australia in the calendar year 1975 was about \$130 000 000, which included \$25 000 000 for opal. The value of opal produced ranks only second to that of iron ore production. It is worthy of note that South Australia produces 90 per cent of the world's opal, which is mined mainly from the fields at Coober Pedy and Andamooka. Since 1967 the quality of opal from these fields has increased considerably. In 1967, the value of production was \$2 835 000. In 1971 there was a marked increase, when the value was \$11 000 000. There was a considerable increase in value in 1972 to \$20 000 000. On the latest figures, those for 1973, the value of opals produced from those two fields in that year was \$25 000 000.

It is plain that the bulk of this precious stone is purchased by overseas buyers, who offer high prices for opal not only because it is a gemstone but also because of the employment that it provides in the Asian and Continental countries. The principal purchasers of our opal are Japan, Hong Kong, Germany, and the United States of America, in that order. It does not seem unreasonable to me that, in view of Australia's unemployment position, an opportunity should be afforded, particularly to the younger people in our community, to learn the art of both cutting and polishing this stone. At present, I understand that, through the adult education classes, four courses are available which permit interested people to take up this occupation. I understand that the course in the actual cutting of the stone takes only a few weeks, but for those interested in polishing the stone the course generally takes about three months.

Apart from providing a valuable industry to the State, by creating additional employment in regard to polishing the stone, we must consider the additional employment that would be created by manufacturing the necessary machinery and instruments for this work. I suggest that the responsible Minister should give this matter his earnest consideration, with a view to providing additional employment in the State. What we must consider is that, at the rate at which overseas buyers are purchasing the stone, they are actually selecting the best of the available opal: really, only the inferior quality stone, or the dregs of the stone, are being left for Australian buyers to purchase.

If this practice continues, the Government may in future find itself in the position of having to restrict the quantity and quality of stone permitted to be sent overseas. Significantly, the value of exports from South Australia in 1973-74 to overseas buyers exceeded \$5 500 000. The New Zealand Government found that, in a similar situation, raw jade was being purchased by overseas countries simply to provide employment for people living in those countries, and that Government had to place restrictions on the amount of raw jade the German and Japanese buyers were buying. As I said earlier, I see this as an excellent opportunity of being able to offer an incentive not only to

popularise the stone but at the same time to use to the greatest advantage our State's mineral deposits, thereby providing greater opportunities for the unemployed.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I rise to speak on a subject that has been ventilated in the House quite a deal lately, as you, Mr. Speaker, well know. However, I believe it is a matter we need to continue to push, and I refer to land tax in South Australia, particularly rural land tax. First, I will comment briefly on the Premier's announcement this afternoon regarding State succession duties. Although we agree that the actions that have been taken are steps in the right direction and, indeed, as was pointed out this afternoon, are similar, if not identical, to the Liberal Party's policy, I should also like to say—

Mr. Langley: It wasn't in your policy speech before the recent election, but it was in ours.

Mr. WOTTON: The member for Unley has not seen the Liberal Party's next policy speech.

Mr. Langley: It was an election promise.

Mr. WOTTON: I believe we have been very much aware of the emotional stress caused to spouses at the time of a death because of succession duties. This problem will, to a great extent, be alleviated as a result of today's announcement. My main point regarding succession duties is that the Government has still failed to hit the nail on the head. One of the main problems concerning succession duties arises with the passing down from father to son of properties, be they farming properties or private businesses of any description. This is one of the primary producer's greatest problems. I do not intend to say any more about that, but should like in a later debate to say more about succession duties.

It has been pleasing to see that the Premier and the Deputy Premier have made statements regarding the action intended to be taken about land tax. My main reason for speaking tonight was to ensure that the Government did something about this matter, and, if possible, to encourage it to speed up action on any plans it had on this matter. I now refer to a reply given by the Premier to a question I asked last week regarding the setting up of a Parliamentary committee of inquiry to investigate land use in the Adelaide Hills. The Premier was reported in *Hansard* as follows:

A further announcement will be made relating to inquiries into the situation to some extent relating to land use in the Adelaide Hills. In the meantime I have had discussions with organisations representing landholders in the Adelaide Hills in relation to land tax, and I have told them, as I have said publicly, that measures will be introduced to alter provisions of the Land Tax Act, some of which will be designed specifically to cope with the situation that occurs in the Adelaide Hills.

I also refer to a letter that was written in reply to a deputation to the Premier on the matter of land tax by a group from the township of Hahndorf in the Adelaide Hills. In a letter to the Hahndorf Association, the Deputy Premier stated:

The Government proposes to review the rates of land tax and the concessions granted under the Act, to offset some of the effects of the increased taxable values.

It is heartening to know that the Premier is at last taking notice of what the Opposition has been saying for some time and of the problems being experienced, particularly by primary producers in my district, because of this tax. I emphasise the need for the Government to expedite any arrangements it may be making to amend the legislation. I say that, because in the past three days I have received two letters from what one could call established property holders in the Adelaide Hills. They both tell

the same story: both have found it necessary, largely because of land tax, to divide their properties. I have received the following letter from the owner of a property at Meadows:

Taking into account the trend in the Adelaide Hills for commuters and weekend dwellers to buy small areas of land to get away from the city prompted me, in view of the highly unprofitable activities of primary production, to cut my property into a series of smaller areas. This was done in 1972 and titles are held for 22 blocks averaging somewhere about 23 to 24 acres or 10 hectares. No land has yet been sold and normal primary production is being carried on. In December, 1974, I received a land tax valuation of \$105 000 on 521 acres or \$200 per acre.

I emphasise to the Government, and particularly to the Premier, the need to consider this matter immediately, because this method of valuation, equalisation, is still continuing. The letter continues:

Last week a new valuation was received and in this short time the valuation has reached \$310 700 or \$596 per acre. This brings the taxable amount to \$6 146 on the present rate. On top of this is a new assessment in the District Council of Meadows area. Going on the land tax valuation it is not difficult to imagine how these two bodies go hand-in-hand.

What with wages and other costs of production it is impossible for me to carry on in the industry in which I have been involved all my working life, and will now be compelled to make subdivisions entirely against my wish. Not only is the production of vital food for the city cut off, but very high producing land will cease to be a food supplying unit. My estimation of lost meat is:

Lamb and beef:

	lamb	30 000 pounds
	beef	20 000 pounds
		200) 50 000 pounds
Estimated yearly meat		250 pounds
consumption per head . . .		a person

This used to be a land of dairy cows, then dairy cows and beef cattle; now horses. This prime land producing top quality products is fast being lost, as was the Torrens Valley.

Will you please press for realistic valuating on land tax and council rates to keep our necessary primary industries alive? We have enough to contend with seasonal conditions and low prices.

I have quoted from that letter, because it is virtually identical with another I have received. These letters have come from established property holders, not from fly by nights, but from people who have lived in the Hills all their lives. That gentleman had done nothing other than to work on a property for his entire life.

Mr. Russack: And he is only one of many in a similar situation.

Mr. WOTTON: That is so. Briefly, I should like to read a small section of a joint submission made to the Premier on behalf of the Stockowners Association of South Australia and the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated on land tax and land valuation methods. The submission states:

1. You will be aware of our deep concern about the crushing burden of land tax imposed on an unfortunate minority of producers, who, because of the size and type of their enterprise, are forced to provide a grossly disproportionate share of the revenue from this tax.

2. These people, not all with the larger properties, represent the back-bone of the farming and grazing industries of this State, and it is no exaggeration to say that their very survival is threatened, because they are being taxed beyond the income earning capacity of their properties.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 5, at 2 p.m.