

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 11, 1976

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

PETITION: SEXUAL OFFENCES

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 199 electors of South Australia, praying that the House would 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: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 33 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would 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.

Petition received.

PETITION: MOTOR CYCLE SPEED LIMIT

Mr. SLATER presented a petition signed by 128 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government urgently to introduce legislation to increase the speed limit for a motor cyclist carrying a pillion passenger to 110 kilometres an hour on the open road.

Petition received.

PETITION: AGE OF CONSENT

Mr. ALLEN presented a petition signed by 52 residents of Burra, Mount Bryan, and district, praying that the House would urge the Government to retain the present age of consent.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MOUNT LOFTY LAND

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The State Planning Authority at its regular monthly meeting yesterday refused an application for permission for the development of a retirement village comprising 36 detached double-storey dwelling houses in Summit Road, Crafers. The proposed development was to take place on land adjoining what is known as Mount Lofty House, overlooking the Botanic Garden.

The application was initially submitted to the District Council of Stirling by agents acting on behalf of Mr. F. G. D. Hill. Those agents have been informed today of the authority's decision. The reasons provided by the authority for its refusal of consent, pursuant to section 41 of the Planning and Development Act, are based on the following grounds:

- (a) The proposal is contrary to the Supplementary Development Plan (Mount Lofty Range) proposals for rural land and water sheds;
- (b) The proposal would be disadvantageous to the community;
- (c) The proposal would detract from the amenity of the locality, the conservation of native fauna and flora, and the preservation of the nature, features and general character of the locality; and
- (d) The proposal would tend to increase pollution in, or arising from, the locality.

Serious issues have been raised by the actions of the intending developer in this case. The Supplementary Development Plan for the Mount Lofty Range, which shows the land zoned for rural use and also contained in a watershed zone 2 area, was declared by the Governor to be an authorised development plan on February 26, 1976.

It is also important to note that the District Council of Stirling, which considered this application at its meeting on July 27, 1976, resolved that the State Planning Authority be advised that, in the opinion of the council, the proposals were not consistent with the provisions of the Mount Lofty Range plan. Despite this, I am informed that the would-be developer has caused the area to be devastated. Established pine trees on steeply sloping land have been bulldozed, and roadways have been scarred across the face of the hill.

This action has caused great concern and distress to many local residents as well as to other people of Adelaide who, like this Government, wish to see the unique character of the Hills preserved and their beauty enhanced. My colleague (Mr. Cornwall) has rightly deplored this destruction and has asked whether action can be taken to restore the very vast damage already done. I am advised that, as matters stand, there appears to be no means of control, under the Planning and Development Act, over the clearing and dozing operations that have taken place. This is a cause of concern to me that I believe will be shared by all other members.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SCHOOL BUILDINGS

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: A report in this morning's *Advertiser* stated that the Premier had announced a freeze on work programmes for seven schools and a community centre. A report on the A.B.C. radio news covered the same item but, when referring to the Thebarton Community Centre, the term "abandoned" was used. This has been most unfortunate and, however well intentioned, misleading in effect. The State Government has not abandoned the Thebarton project. As has been stated previously, the Thebarton project will need to be staged, because the Australian Government has not made any commitment to the project.

Mr. Mathwin: This is another slug.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is true. The State Government is committed to the project. The Community Welfare Department, the Further Education Department and the Education Department have all agreed that funds should be made available for the Thebarton Community Centre. The announcement in this morning's paper means that construction work will not be undertaken this financial

year. Design work on the first stage will continue so that it would be possible to begin construction early in the 1977-78 financial year. Stage I of the project and other deferred projects (and the Loan guidelines specifically mention Dover and Kidman Park High Schools and Richmond, Narrung and Whyalla West Primary Schools) will be considered for financing in the 1977-78 financial year.

QUESTIONS

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

BUSH WALKING AND LEADERSHIP TRAINING

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (July 29):

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I have provided the honourable member with a booklet which provides details of the new format for the leadership course. The training board was formed as an autonomous group in 1973. The first intake occurred in 1974. Twenty-one people started the course, 15 of whom were secondary school-teachers. The second intake, in 1975, was of 24 people (17 secondary teachers, three primary teachers, one technical college teacher and three people from youth clubs). They were selected from 30 applicants. In 1976 there have been over 50 inquiries. The new booklet has just recently been published. Within a few weeks of this, about 30 firm applications were in hand, mainly from teachers.

As the course takes about two years to complete, the people who joined in 1974 are now in the process of completing the course. Seven people have graduated and eight more are in the process of final assessment. Assistance has been of various kinds: Schools Commission funding has been received for the residential aspects of the course to the extent of about \$2 000 a year; National Fitness Council and the Physical Education Branch of the Education Department have absorbed costs with respect to secretarial work and some transport; more recently (May, 1976) the Director-General of Education approved the secondment of a primary school teacher as Executive Officer to the training board; the bulk of the work involved is still undertaken by advisers in their own time. This includes working with trainees at weekends and in evening meetings and discussions.

In summary, the training board can just cope with an intake of about 20 people a year because of the restrictions mentioned above, although the appointment of an executive officer enables the board to function in a more effective and professional manner than previously.

BAKING HOURS

In reply to Mr. COUMBE (August 10):

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The dispensation to bake bread outside of the hours prescribed in the Industrial Code was originally given by the then Minister of Labour and Industry in 1970 to six bakeries in the outer metropolitan area. Two of those bakeries have since gone out of business, and the remaining bakeries (other than the Time Bakery at Morphett Vale owned by Mr. R. J. Heidt) which are still baking at weekends and abiding by the dispensation previously given are as follows: Cuttings, at Christies Beach; Richardsons, at Clarendon; and Assenders, at Gawler.

BANK INTEGRATION

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say what progress has been made in the integration of the State Bank and Savings Bank of South Australia; when it is expected that the head of his department will take up full-time duties with the banks; and, what appointments to the Premier's staff are contemplated as a result of this move? Considerable concern still exists within the community about the future of the Savings Bank following the Premier's announcement that the head of his department had been appointed as Chairman of Trustees, and that he would not be required to leave his Public Service position at that time. The officer concerned is a respected and able public servant, who is highly regarded by all sections of the community, and I understand he will soon be moving from the Premier's Department. There is, too, concern that resulting new appointments could be made from outside the South Australian Public Service, and this concern should be allayed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The officer to whom the Leader refers is the Director of my department. He is Chairman of the Savings Bank of South Australia Board, a member of the State Bank Board, and Deputy Chairman of the State Government Insurance Commission. He is involved in the development of banking policies in South Australia that will provide additional facilities to the customers of both banks. The work of both banks has been stepped up in order to provide a better service to customers. That very real activity of the banks is of benefit to the customers of the banks and to the public of South Australia. I know the reasons for the kind of utterly scurrilous attack on this appointment that was made earlier in this Parliament by the Leader. He tries to allay that by saying that this particular officer is a highly respected officer. So he is.

Mr. Nankivell: Isn't he?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader made a gross public attack on him on the last occasion he raised the matter in this House. It was a disgraceful attack on the probity and proper actions of that particular officer.

Dr. Tonkin: That is not quite true, you know.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is absolutely true. What is more, the kind of attack the Leader made was deliberately designed to create a run on the banks in South Australia, to the advantage of the private banking system.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That was what he was at. The Leader has so much regard for the State banking system that he does not want anyone to bank with it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Actually, the State banking system in South Australia has been expanding its services to customers with very great satisfaction to those customers, and it will continue to do so in order to provide a service to the people of South Australia. I point out to members who represent rural areas that, if it were not for the State banking system in South Australia, a great many of their constituents would be without the kind of support that they have today.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am referring to the State banking system in South Australia, for if it were not for the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia many of those people would not have support at all from any banking system.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You had better leave them alone.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not leaving them alone: I am expanding the banking services to them and, if the honourable member is not aware of it, constituents of his have changed over to being customers of the State banking system recently, simply because of the expansion of services given by the State banking system.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This incessant questioning must cease.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Director (Mr. Bakewell) will be taking up a full-time post to be created shortly by the Public Service Board of South Australia, namely, a Public Service position in relation to the financial institutions of South Australia. At that time, his position as Director of the Premier's Department will be advertised and filled in the normal way, and I expect that it will be filled by a member of the Public Service of South Australia.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Dr. TONKIN: The motives attributed to me by the Premier in matters which came before this Parliament and which he specifically stated were deliberately intended by me to create a run on the State banking system are utterly untrue, and it is unworthy of him and of any other Government member. If he will examine the entire *Hansard* record, he will know that what he says, and what he said on that occasion was a lie.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I object to that; it is an unparliamentary term, and I demand its withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Leader to withdraw his last remark on the grounds that it is unparliamentary.

Dr. TONKIN: On the basis that it is unparliamentary (and on no other basis), I will withdraw it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I ask for an unqualified withdrawal of the remark.

The SPEAKER: I must ask the honourable Leader to withdraw the remark.

Dr. TONKIN: In that case, I withdraw it, and repeat that the statement the Premier made was false and untrue.

APPRENTICES

Mr. MAX BROWN: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry details of apprentice intake figures of employers in the city of Whyalla for the past five years? Can he say whether these figures show any drastic down-turn and, if they do, can he suggest any possible solution to the problem? I believe that the intake of apprentices has considerably declined in the city of Whyalla, especially in the past year and, with the present increase in unemployment figures shown in the recent Gallup poll, as the result of the Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations (Mr. Street) trying to opt out of his responsibilities, I am concerned that future opportunities for school-leavers to obtain apprenticeships will drastically decline. I am concerned at the possible Commonwealth trend, especially as it relates to my district, which depends largely on school-leavers for its intake of apprentices.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am unable to provide the honourable member with the past five years figures but, as he told me yesterday that he would be asking this question

today, I have been able to take out figures for a three-year period. True, there has been a drop in the intake of apprentices during 1976 at Whyalla. Inquiries I have made indicate that the bulk of this drop can be attributed to the fact that the shipyards at Whyalla did not indenture any young men at the beginning of 1976. I have been told that the company indicated earlier this year that it intended a mid-year intake of apprentices once the Federal Government had made its position clear as to supporting the shipyards' future. What the Federal Government is likely or unlikely to do with subsidies is dramatically important for Whyalla. It can truly be said that the Federal Government must bear a large part of the responsibility for a down-turn in the apprentice intake in Whyalla. I have figures that indicate the position in Whyalla over the past few years.

Mr. Dean Brown: Why blame the Federal Government?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is no good the honourable member's saying something from the back of his teeth; the fact is that the Federal Government has not made up its mind about what it will do at Whyalla. The subsidy has continued in Whyalla, but the city is in a state of flux, because no-one knows what will happen there. If the Federal Government would carry out its responsibilities and tell B.H.P. company what will happen in Whyalla the unfavourable apprenticeship position and other problems could be overcome. I point out that the total number of apprentices indentured during 1974, 1975, and 1976 in Whyalla is as follows: in 1974 it was 235; in 1975 it was 289; and in 1976 it was 194. That is a drop over the period of 95 apprentices. First-year intake figures for Whyalla Technical College are as follows: in 1974 the total was 226; in 1975 it was 260; and in 1976 it was 183. That is a drop over the period of 77 apprentices. The number of applications made under the National Apprenticeship Assistance Scheme on behalf of B.H.P., for first-year apprentices, is as follows; in 1974 it was 186; in 1975 it was 220; and in 1976 it was 165. That is a drop of 55 applications. The total number of apprentices indentured during 1974, 1975, and 1976 to B.H.P. are as follows: in 1974 it was 190; in 1975 it was 241; and in 1976 it was 170.

Again, that is a drop of 71 apprentices. It should be noted that the Whyalla shipyards would have indentured about 58 more apprentices at the beginning of 1976, had the company not been in considerable doubt about its future. It must be realised that, in a city like Whyalla, which relies as it does so heavily on employment opportunities at B.H.P. and the shipyards, any down-turn in those industries must have a dramatic effect on the intake of young people into the work force. A large decrease in the number of apprentices indentured has occurred throughout Australia. That drop in the number of apprentices has occurred since the present Federal Government made its promises in 1975 that it would cure the ills of unemployment, whereas just the opposite has occurred: it has made the situation worse.

Mr. Whitten: It's just another broken promise.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Over the past three years the total number of apprentices employed as at July 31 in those years is as follows: in 1974 it was 2 524; in 1975 it was 2 317; and in 1976 it was 2 185. The figure of 2 317 in 1975 was the next best to the 1974 intake. Remember, the Commonwealth Labor Government was in office at that time. The South Australian situation is much better than that in any other State in Australia, a fact that speaks well for the Government of this State. For 1976, the decrease was 132 compared

to 1975, a percentage that is far lower than for any other State in Australia. The Federal Government must ensure through its various financial initiatives that sufficient funds are made available to ensure that apprentice intakes are maintained, especially in industrial areas like Whyalla, as well as ensuring that industries like the shipbuilding industry are supported by subsidies of sufficient magnitude to ensure that they remain viable propositions, so that they can continue to make jobs available for young people seeking work in those companies.

Mr. WELLS: Will the Premier comment on a statement by Mr. Street, the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, in this morning's *Advertiser*? Mr. Street is reported as having said that he will require States to take over the training of apprentices and to bear the expense of the exercise. This, of course, is contrary to the national apprenticeship scheme. Further, Mr. Street is reported as having said that, concerning the financial situation, States should apply a tax surcharge of 0.5 per cent on pay-rolls. This seems to be an extremely urgent matter: when one considers Mr. Street's attitude, it is no wonder the number of apprentices in South Australia is decreasing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can confirm that the Minister of Labour and Industry has received from the Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations a letter containing certain proposals on the financing of apprenticeships. The letter was confidential. It has not been released by the Government, although certain terms contained in that letter seem to have reached the press, but not from this Government. The Government is concerned about the nature of the proposal revealed in the press: that is, that State Governments should assume the responsibility for apprenticeship training and finance the whole of this out of an increase in pay-roll tax. At the time the federalism proposals we have heard so much about in this House were put forward, there was a clear provision in relation to existing specific purpose grants and areas of Commonwealth expenditure. If the responsibility for them were transferred to the States, compensating amounts would be added to the States' proportion of payments from income tax to compensate the States for the transfer of that authority. This proposal, like all the others in relation to the reduction of specific purpose grants (and there has been a reduction in specific purpose grants of about \$1 640 000 000), has been without any compensating factor to the States. I know that does not worry the member for Hanson—

Mr. Becker: You created a \$4 500 000 000 deficit in Canberra.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know what the honourable member is talking about: a little while ago he was complaining about the surplus in South Australia. Instead of providing a compensating amount to the States in areas in which responsibility is being transferred to the States, no money has been provided. In this instance, not only is there no compensating amount to the States to take over the responsibility of apprenticeship training, but an increase in pay-roll tax is proposed. I have heard members opposite advocating a decrease in pay-roll tax.

Mr. Chapman: Hang on a minute: this was a paper report when you started, but now it is Federal Government policy.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member suggests this is not a proposal that has come from Mr. Street, I can soon disabuse him of that fact. It is a proposal from Mr. Street.

Mr. Chapman: Your abuse is now directed to him, and not to the press, as you began.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I did not abuse the press in this matter. I said that part of this letter had reached the press, although not from this Government. That is not abusing the press. I do not know where they got it, but it was not from us.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Why don't you listen?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He does not listen. The Government is concerned about the decline in the number of apprentices and the lack of chances for young people coming into the labour force who want to acquire trade skills. It is a grave problem, and it requires a close look at the apprenticeship system. The Minister has already initiated proposals for an inquiry to be made by the States into the system as a whole, and that is to be considered by the conference of Ministers in September. What is more, it is not good enough for some employers simply to avoid their obligation to take apprentices, leaving the training to be done by someone else in industry, and then poach the apprentice as soon as he has completed his indenture. Any scheme which gets those who are not prepared to pull their weight to contribute seems to be a fair one, but it is in this context that the Minister has raised the question of several proposals for the non-apprentice area under the Industrial Training Council. The Government is vitally concerned about apprenticeship training and the action of the Commonwealth Government in relation to it, because of what is being done about funding. Our survey of youth unemployment shows that a large proportion of the unemployed in South Australia is in the apprentice age group. It is a high proportion indeed: they make up 15 per cent of the population but nearly 40 per cent of the known unemployed. Unless we proceed with proper training, we are going to create within South Australia a long-term unemployment problem from people who will have been unemployed for a long period. This Government has undertaken a programme in relation to youth unemployment that is far beyond anything that is operated anywhere else in Australia. We have financed the youth unemployment system, and we have financed a series of job hunters clubs, and of those who have gone to job hunters clubs, we have been able to provide about 45 per cent of them with employment. Whilst this Government has been working in a way in which no other Government in Australia has worked, the Commonwealth Government intends to withdraw from this scheme effectively in requiring State Governments more and more to take over financial responsibility for apprenticeship training and, in addition to that, to finance what it does out of something that the Commonwealth Government itself knows to be directly inflationary by increasing the costs to industry. I do not know what honourable members opposite will say about this proposal, because so far they have always said the Australian Government was right no matter what it did. I will be interested to hear if they intend to increase pay-roll tax on this occasion to provide for apprenticeship training in South Australia.

MARIHUANA

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government is considering holding an inquiry into legalising the use of marihuana? It was reported widely that the State A.L.P. Convention called for such an inquiry into the question of legalising the use of marihuana. Indeed, the Premier has spoken strongly in favour of holding such an inquiry. The Opposition

does not believe such an inquiry is necessary, as there is plenty of scientific evidence available to indicate the harmful effects of the drug. I should like to know whether the Government intends to follow the direction of the A.L.P. Convention and the advice of the Premier to conduct an inquiry, or whether it is leaving this matter in the too-hard basket.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Attorney-General. The honourable Premier.

Mr. Chapman: Make up your mind on this touchy subject!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has not been in this House long enough to know what has been the programme of Liberal Governments, because we have not had one for such a long time. If he had been here when a Liberal Government was in power, he would have known that it was the programme even of Liberal Governments that, when a matter of policy was raised in the House, the Leader of the Government took the question.

Dr. Tonkin: You are very touchy this afternoon.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I thought I was being at least courteous to the honourable member, since he was being less than that. However, the position is that the Government, following a discussion in our Party conference, has been considering an inquiry into this matter. What concerns the Government greatly is that, although the present law prohibits the use of various drugs in South Australia, it seems that there has been, as in most other Western countries, some spread of drug use. The question is whether the present laws are the best way of coping with that situation. We are examining a means of a public inquiry into that matter to establish for the public (not on an emotional basis, but so that the public may know the facts) what are the issues that should determine how we should arrange the law in future in South Australia, and whether, in fact, we are doing the best thing at the moment in this regard.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What do you think?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no conclusions. It is not a question of the Government's having conclusions before an inquiry. I believe it is vital for people in South Australia to know the facts upon which they should make a judgment as to whether our laws are best suited to coping with this problem.

Mr. Chapman: So on this you are leaving it to the public?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I am endeavouring to establish (and the Government will endeavour to establish) the relevant facts publicly. From that, not only the public, but members of this House may be able to come to conclusions as to whether we are doing the right thing at present or whether we should be doing something else. I would have thought—

Mr. Goldsworthy: You have no policy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government is not putting forward a policy in this matter. It is simply saying this is something that ought to be established by public inquiry. I should have thought that every member of this House would be assisted by such a public inquiry, just as the public generally should be.

GOVERNMENT WORKERS

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what action he or the Government is taking to ensure that the hospital workers who are members of the Australian Government Workers Association receive an early flow-on of the May national wage decision?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: A problem exists in this matter. It arose not only from the May wage indexation flow-on but also from payments to be made associated with penalties for overtime, varied shifts and people working Saturday and Sunday time in hospitals. I must admit there has been some difficulty in this matter but it is not a difficulty that has arisen recently. I think the May indexation has accentuated it to some extent. This morning I had discussions with people responsible in the department, and I tried to get in touch with Mr. Morley, but he was not available. So far he has not telephoned me, as I understood he would do about mid-day. The best possible solution we can find at the moment is to bring forward by a fortnight (by overtime being worked this coming weekend) the suggested time of payment which was September 16 or 17. Other than that I can give no guarantees. I think it is essential for members to know the full history of this trouble. This is an unusual problem, because the Government in its attempt to follow its policy on wage indexation (that is, full indexation ought to apply) had to have discussions with the trade union movement and officers in the department which all delayed the wage indexation flow-on by five or six weeks. It should be understood that this is a unique situation, but I will be taking action that I hope will overcome any future delays. I do not deny that errors have been made, but we are doing everything we can to overcome the problem, and I hope we will be able to evolve a system that will obviate any future difficulties in this matter.

FENCING REGULATIONS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister of Local Government say what regulations exist to control persons constructing high fences or building garages or other buildings on corner blocks? I have noticed recently in many parts of the metropolitan area people constructing two-metre-high fences around their properties. I believe such fences should not be built around properties on the corners of dangerous intersections, and I believe the fences should not be there. I have also noticed garages have been built at the rear of blocks right on the boundaries of the properties, and motorists are therefore unable to observe traffic as they approach the intersections. Can the Minister say whether this matter concerns local government approvals only or whether the Road Traffic Board has some control of regulations relating to the construction of obstacles of this nature?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This matter comes within the ambit of councils, and as far as I am aware all councils have by-laws to prevent the erection of high fences within prescribed distances of corners. From memory, I think the height is a maximum of one metre within five metres of the building alignment. I will find out whether all metropolitan councils are applying that criterion. If the honourable member has any specific locations in mind, I shall be pleased to have them examined.

TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the temporary arrangements to control heavy traffic at the Dry Creek railway bridge, Port Wakefield Road, during the Interdominion Trotting Championships held earlier this year were successful? If they were, could a similar procedure be adopted during periods of peak

traffic flow, usually early morning and late afternoon, to alleviate the bottlenecks created? I understand that during the trotting championships a temporary by-pass was constructed and railway traffic lights installed on the eastern side of the bridge. If the improvisation was successful, in the interests of road safety could it not be implemented again to alleviate the traffic hazard, until the road and impending bridge works are completed? As it can be assumed that the facilities were installed at the taxpayers' expense, it would seem reasonable to believe that such expenditure should be used to its fullest extent.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Temporary provisions were installed specifically for the interdominion championship, because of the abnormally high traffic that was expected, and eventuated. Those provisions were installed after lengthy and serious discussions between the Commissioner of Highways, the Commissioner of Police, and officers of the railways. They were specifically agreed to on the basis that they would be temporary for that purpose, and that purpose alone, and they have now been removed. Suggestions have been made that the facilities should be installed again; the member for Salisbury wrote to me about three weeks ago with a similar suggestion. I have told him that those concerned, and especially the Commissioner of Highways, have seriously considered this suggestion, but he has advised me that, in his opinion, the proposal cannot be justified. That reply has been given to the member for Salisbury, and that is the reply I have to give the member for Gouger.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Works obtain for me a report on whether the Construction Division of the Public Buildings Department has finished the complete enclosure of the air-conditioning cooling towers at Modbury Hospital, which it was expected would be completed by the end of July this year? The Minister would know that the reason for the proposed work was to reduce the noise level.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I remember representations being made by the honourable member in relation to this matter.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Courteous ones, too.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, courteous and detailed. Approval was given for this work, but offhand I am not aware whether it has been completed. However, I will find out and let the honourable member know as soon as possible.

TEACHER APPOINTMENTS

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Education investigate the possibility of appointing up to three additional teachers to the newly erected special school built on the site of Murray Bridge Primary School at the cost of about \$333 000? The Minister will recall having inspected this school only a matter of three weeks ago. This school is built to accommodate some 60 to 70 students, but it has only three teachers. The demand is high in the district for additional pupils to attend that school, but at the moment the number of teachers does not permit more students to attend. What possibility is there of having additional teachers appointed to the school?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: At the outset I should place on record my appreciation of the hospitality of the honourable member's constituents on that occasion.

That is the first opportunity I have had publicly to do this. I will certainly take up the matter with my department and see what can be done.

CRISIS CARE CENTRE

Mr. WHITTEN: Has the Minister of Community Welfare any up-to-date information on the work of the Community Welfare Department's crisis care centre? From earlier reports given by the Minister it was evident this service was fulfilling a pressing need and that its resources, in both staff and facilities, were fully taxed. What is the present position?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I can give the honourable member a statement on the position now. I think the House well knows his continued interest in this important aspect of community welfare. There has been a continuing heavy demand on the service, as the honourable member has stated, and it has been necessary to appoint four more community welfare workers, bringing the total staff at the crisis care centre to 12. An important aspect of this is that there are now two persons on duty at the centre on the after-midnight shift. I am pleased to say that the people who are working there have been able to move from very cramped quarters in Waymouth Street and are now located in South Terrace. Their new telephone number is 212 1000.

Members have spoken to me privately already and have said how useful the service is when they are approached, as they often are, concerning domestic matters of a crisis nature, and they have been able to refer people to the service. The changes will mean that a more effective service can be provided. Also, more mobility has been introduced into the service by the introduction of three radio-controlled cars. Since February 16, 1976, the workers have attended 820 crises, which are now averaging about 30 a week. They have also dealt with more than 5 500 telephone calls. As I have said previously, the main case load still involves domestic disputes, tension between parents and children, runaway children, deserted and deserting husbands and wives, and attempted suicides.

CONTAINERISATION DISPUTE

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Now that the Government has had almost another full week to investigate the containerisation dispute at Port Adelaide involving storemen and packers, can the Premier say what action his Government will take to reduce the delays occurring in South Australia and thus minimise the severe economic effects that that dispute is having on South Australian industry? Yesterday, while I was not in the Chamber, the Premier made a personal explanation. Having carefully read that personal explanation, it is quite obvious to me that the Premier and Deputy Premier should now make an apology to Mr. Branson and me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Premier, in his letter to Mr. Branson, accused me of using information that had been deliberately fed to me by Mr. Branson. Mr. Branson's letter quite clearly indicated that was not the case at all. The Premier wrote a letter to Mr. Branson based on fabrication and deceit of the worst type, and I believe it behoves the Premier, when he commits such an act, to apologise to this Chamber. Furthermore, from that personal explanation and from the first letter sent by the

Premier to Mr. Branson (apparently in reply to the letter Mr. Branson sent), it seems that the only solution that our Premier can put forward for the current delays is to wait until next year, when the new container depot will be available and open at Port Adelaide. He does not acknowledge anywhere in that initial letter that there is, in fact, an industrial dispute—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: —which is caused by the storemen and packers—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the honourable member to order. He must not debate the question. He must put the question and explain it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The situation is critical. New information has come to me today which indicates—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! "Question" has been called.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: By whom, Mr. Speaker? May I take a point of order? Who called "Question"?

The SPEAKER: Several voices on my right called "Question".

Mr. DEAN BROWN: *Hansard* will require to know who called "Question".

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member in his question has referred to a dispute that involves the Storemen and Packers Union. As the honourable member knows, this is not a South Australian dispute but a national dispute, and it can be settled only at the national level. The honourable member is aware, if he knows anything about the matter, that discussions are currently taking place between the A.C.T.U. and industry in relation to the settlement of this dispute. Mr. Hawke discussed the matter publicly this morning on behalf of the A.C.T.U. The Government, because of its concern to help industry in South Australia in this matter, made available an officer of the Trade and Development Division to discuss problems with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in South Australia in an endeavour to ascertain how we might assist industry, given the circumstances of this dispute. If the honourable member suggests that there is something further than can effectively be done in relation to a national dispute, which cannot be decided purely locally, perhaps he will tell us what it is, but I have not heard it from him.

Mr. Dean Brown: You stopped me from explaining the question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Nor have I heard it from Mr. Branson. As to the matters between me, the honourable member and Mr. Branson, in the House I read through the letters in full which had passed between Mr. Branson and me on this matter. I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that Mr. Branson did not suggest that I should apologise; he said that in my circumstances he would have done what I did.

MONARTO DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Mr. WOTTON: Will the Minister of Planning give the House an unequivocal assurance that local government authorities in the Adelaide Hills and all other interested groups will be given adequate opportunity and in fact be encouraged to present evidence before the Monarto Development Commission in its proposed study of the Adelaide Hills? As it has been suggested that the

study is expected to take about 18 months to complete, does the Government intend that the purpose of the study is that the decisions arrived at by the commission will, in fact, formulate the policies of the Government concerning the future of the Adelaide Hills?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In relation to the activities of any consultants that were engaged to undertake studies of this nature, one would expect that a consultation with the relevant local government authorities would take place. I shall certainly indicate to the Monarto Development Commission that that is my view of the matter, and I give the honourable member a direct assurance on that point.

Mr. Wotton: What about other groups?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If they wish to contact the commission, I would certainly wish that it would listen to what they had to say. Any recommendations that come out of the study are subject to consideration by the local government authorities in the area, by the State Planning Authority and by the Government. There is no implication that the commission's recommendations arising from this study will necessarily go to determining Government policy: they would be persuasive, obviously, but no inquiry that has ever been undertaken to my knowledge has had recommendations which were automatically given the status of fully supported policy in every respect.

Mr. Wotton: Is this to be just another study?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not to be just another study. Regarding the questions that now arise relating to what are the ultimate objectives for the Hills and the specific policies that must be followed in order to ensure that those objectives are achieved, it may be that one automatic conclusion reached is that, under present arrangements, we do not have adequate powers to achieve the objectives that are generally accepted by the community and by the local people. One of the principal issues that may well come out of this study is what additional legislative powers are necessary, who should exercise them, or whether they should be shared partly between local government and the State, etc. It is not a straightforward matter in the sense that we can have inquiries that say that these things ought to be done. It is one thing for anyone to say that, but it is another thing to implement those specific policies, and yet another thing to be able to implement those policies with sufficient general support to ensure that they operate effectively and influence the character of the area in the way in which it is desired. I ask the honourable member to assure his local people that not only will consultations take place but also that much water will flow under this bridge before we will, as a community, be able to achieve agreed objectives with respect to the future development of the Hills.

LANDLORDS AND TENANTS

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs say whether it can be expected that legislation will be introduced soon dealing with landlord and tenant relationships, particularly on matters dealing with bond money and key money?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Government intends, during the current session, to introduce legislation dealing with these matters, but I am afraid that the honourable member will have to contain his curiosity about the exact details of the legislation, as those details will be available to the House only when the legislation is introduced. However, I can tell him that the legislation will be wide ranging and

will certainly deal with the matters he has raised, namely, the problems associated with bond and key money. Particularly, the Government wants to ensure that we have the best possible protection for tenants in their dealings with landlords and for landlords in their dealings with what might be described as bad tenants. We will ensure that we have the best possible legislation in Australia and, hopefully, we will lead the world in this area. The legislation will enact wide changes to the existing laws, and I hope that, when the Bill is introduced, Opposition members particularly will see the great advantages that will flow from it to the people of South Australia, will welcome it, and will support it wholeheartedly.

DROUGHT RELIEF

Mr. GUNN: Can the Premier say whether his Government will immediately consider paying graziers who have to destroy stock on their properties 50c a head for sheep and at least \$5 a head for cattle? I have had several telephone calls from my constituents during the past two days about this matter. They are concerned that they are unable to take advantage of the 40c a head that the South Australian Meat Corporation, at Port Lincoln and Gepps Cross, is offering, and they believe that they may have to destroy the stock on their properties without receiving anything. They are already facing a serious financial loss, considering that next year, when they will probably have to replace their stock, they will probably be paying more than \$10 a head.

The Victorian Government is now paying \$10 a head, and it has already slaughtered 27 900 head of cattle and spent \$145 000. Many people are requesting the opportunity to graze stock on a State Government reserve behind Ceduna that was used successfully for this purpose in 1959. I have already approached the Minister for the Environment and I hope that the Premier will be able to convince his colleague that this is absolutely essential. The Premier is no doubt aware that today's *News* editorial clearly indicates that these people are deserving of some slight assistance, because many of them are facing huge financial losses and, if the stock are not quickly removed from the properties, not only will there be problems in disposing of the carcasses but existing feed will be used and erosion might be caused because of the properties having to carry the stock for a longer period.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suppose that, given the history of South Australia, it is natural that Opposition members cannot resist the temptation to play politics with an issue such as drought.

Mr. Venning: Oh!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I put to the honourable member the following matters. Both the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries have indicated that there is an inter-departmental committee keeping the Government constantly supplied with very accurate information on the drought situation. They have assessed the State by hundreds, and have details of the stock numbers in each area as well as forward estimates of the stock likely to be affected as the situation deteriorates. This committee is closely monitoring the financial situation facing farmers in the drought-affected areas. The first problem farmers faced was the maintenance of breeding stock, and the Minister of Lands, in July, gave details of the Government's plans to subsidise freight for stock and fodder.

As the situation deteriorated it became apparent that farmers were facing a stock disposal problem. This time the Government provided assistance through the South Australian Meat Corporation. Farmers are being paid 40c a head for their stock, to help offset their freight costs, and Samcor is rendering the stock down to meat meal. Yesterday, the Minister of Agriculture announced that the stock disposal scheme would be broadened, and the Government has undertaken to pay local council costs incurred in disposing of such stock. Let me again emphasise to the Opposition that the problem at the moment is one of stock disposal, not financial assistance to farmers. Farmers must make their own management decisions to destroy their drought-affected stock, and I believe that producer organisations should be doing much more to encourage farmers to make this decision. Yesterday, members of the Opposition wanted to know why farmers were not being paid a bounty. The honourable member has asked it again today. Such a bounty would do very little to help the farmer with a severe cash flow problem.

The drought committee, after talking with producer organisations, made it clear that for most farmers major financial problems would occur later this year. The Government has already provided in its Estimates for carry-on finance for drought-affected farmers under the provisions of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act. There is no limit to the amount a farmer can borrow, and the criterion for such an application is that finance is no longer available through normal financial sources. Application forms for this purpose are available from the Lands Department. The problem of disposal of surplus stock is not the same problem as providing assistance to farmers who have been affected by drought and face severe cash-flow problems. They are two separate problems. In relation to the disposal of surplus stock, the Government has given assistance. Regarding the problem of farmers with cash-flow problems, the emergency assistance provisions of the Act are available. The Government has not set a limit on the amount of finance to be available in this area.

Mr. Venning: Borrowed!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but they can borrow money on terms, as the honourable member knows, which are extremely generous and which will enable farmers to obtain carry-on finance on extremely generous terms. That finance is available to any farmer who can show that he has cash problems and needs State assistance. It is just not the case that State assistance is not available to farmers. It is available on an extremely generous basis.

Mr. Chapman: If farmers can qualify for it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. If farmers cannot qualify, why should they get assistance? There is no reason for the Government to provide hand-outs on the basis of a difficulty experienced in a certain business if that business cannot show that it can qualify for State assistance. Why should anyone in the community be in a different position from that of any other business in the community on that score?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The member for Mallee knows it, too. He said it in the House yesterday.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If farmers can show they need assistance, it is available.

Mr. Chapman: That's not quite right.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They won't—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: For someone without a cash-flow problem to be paid a Government bounty for the disposal of his stock, which would put up the price

of stock (because that would be the effect), is not a sensible way of managing the present situation. It is not a justified way, either. The Government has given assistance in relation to the disposal of stock: that is proper assistance. For a farmer who has a severe cash-flow problem, assistance is available under the provisions of the Act to which I have referred. No-one who needs State assistance and who can show a need for that assistance will lack it. In those circumstances, I do not believe that the honourable member's contention is satisfactory. The Government does not intend to proceed in that way, because it does not believe that it is a fair and just way of proceeding.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Nor does the advisory committee that is advising the Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exactly.

SPORTS MEDICINE CLINIC

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister for the Environment obtain for me a report from the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport about the establishment of a sports medicine clinic in South Australia? It was reported in the *Sunday Mail* last weekend that the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport had stated that South Australia would soon become the second State to have such a clinic. The sporting fraternity is keen to have information about times and about the availability of personnel for sportsmen who are injured in sporting activities. They also wish to know whether equipment will be available to assist the recovery of such people. Such a clinic would alleviate the problem of people suffering sports injuries having to go to other hospitals. With the advent of a clinic, sportsmen would be treated by experts in this field.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I shall be pleased to obtain a report on this matter for the honourable member. Until late last year I was Chairman of the Executive Board of the Institute of Fitness Research and Training. I know that a proposal that that council was keen to promote was the setting up of a sports medicine clinic in South Australia. I should have hoped that more action would be taken in this area before now. Unfortunately, as in other areas of the promotion of fitness, that organisation is feeling a draught because of the activities of the present Federal Government. I hope that submissions now being made to the Federal Government will produce results next Tuesday evening. I do not know whether the desired result will come about, but I strongly support the idea behind the honourable member's question, and shall therefore be glad to get a report for him as soon as possible.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: MR. KENEALLY

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL moved:

That two months leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Stuart (Mr. G. F. Keneally) on account of absence overseas on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Yorke Peninsula Water Supply (Erection of 32.5 Ml Storage Tank at Arthurton).

Ordered that report be printed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 10. Page 548.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I thank His Excellency for the original, thoughtful and energetic contribution he has made to South Australia. I also express my sincere sympathy to the families of the late Messrs. Ferguson, Hogben and MacGillivray.

During the past 25 years, Australia has emerged from the shadow of Britain with a new nationalism and apparent economic self-sufficiency. It has been a period of great social, cultural and economic improvement. As a result, Australians look to the next 25 years with self-assurance and high expectations. But is such an attitude justified? In an attempt to answer this question, I will reflect on the present Australian economy.

There seem to be two well-defined segments in the Australian economy. One segment involves the rural and mining industries, which employ 8 per cent of the civilian work force but earn 76 per cent of Australia's export income. Because these capital intensive industries are export-orientated, survival dictates that they must be competitive in the world economy. The other segment of the economy involves the manufacturing and tertiary or service industries, which employ 92 per cent of the work force but earn only 24 per cent of the export income. This segment includes Government employees, and represents 24 per cent of the work force. These industries are largely directed towards a domestic market with a slow growth rate. Because these industries employ such a large portion of the work force, they largely determine national productivity and our cost and wage structure.

Despite recent developments in the mining industry, the increase in national productivity during the past 15 years (or the average growth rate of the gross domestic product per capita) has been disappointingly and exceptionally low at 2.9 per cent per annum. This compares poorly with the average increase in productivity of 5.6 per cent a year for 22 developed Western (or O.E.C.D.) nations. Australia was third to lowest. In addition to a low work output, this low productivity is caused by a mature economy, a small domestic market, poor industrial relations, managerial and trade union deficiencies, a low population density, and a high inflation rate. Benefits to the community of a non-productive nature, such as social welfare programmes and environmental controls, also slow the growth in productivity.

Other important characteristics about the economy are worth noting. Australia, by world standards, is an export nation, with 14 per cent of the gross domestic product being exported. This compares with figures of 12 per cent and 6 per cent for Japan and the U.S.A. respectively. In addition to the high level of exports, the export markets are dangerously concentrated on Japan and the U.S.A. During 1973-74, Japan imported 86 per cent of Australia's iron ore exports, 86 per cent of coal exports, and 38 per cent of wool exports. For the same year, the U.S.A.

imported 58 per cent of the beef exports and 31 per cent of chemical exports (mainly alumina). Wheat and sugar are the only major export products without a high and dangerous degree of market concentration; hence the saying, "If Japan coughs, Australia suffers from pneumonia."

The main characteristic of Australian industry in 1976 seems to be the deteriorating financial competitiveness of our manufactured goods against goods from other countries. As a protection to these industries and to employment, Australia has developed the highest tariff rates among the O.E.C.D. countries, although these tariffs apply to less than half of imported goods. Examples of the deteriorating position are numerous. Imported motor vehicles now face a tariff of 45 per cent and import quotas. Orange juice concentrate can be landed in Australia from Brazil at 65 cents a gallon, which includes a tariff of 18c, while the Australian cost of production is 110c a gallon. A large shipping tanker costs about 150 per cent more to build in Australia than is now quoted from shipyards in Japan and Korea. Even the profitability of mining exports has been seriously eroded in recent years. The closing of the copper mine at Kanmantoo is an example.

Obviously, not all industries are in this dilemma, but even successful companies such as Sola International are establishing manufacturing plants overseas to remain competitive. The reasons for this cost disadvantage in Australia are many. The main one is the high inflation rate of both costs and wages. Between 1971 and 1975, the average weekly earnings in Australia increased by 80 per cent while the increase in the U.S.A. for the same period was only 18 per cent (based on an equivalent exchange rate). The average wage in Australia is now \$25 (Australian) a week higher than the equivalent wage in the U.S.A. on the same currency basis.

Another reason is a lower productivity in Australia. One company, which manufactures the same product in both Australia and the U.S.A., and under similar conditions, has recently indicated that productivity an employee is about 25 per cent higher in the U.S.A. The small domestic market is another factor. This deficiency can be overcome only by enlarging the markets through exports. However, the trend in certain industries, such as the motor vehicle industry, appears to be the reverse.

The rapid growth of the Commonwealth and State Public Service has contributed significantly to increased taxation and to increased costs of production. Income taxes on persons and companies have risen sharply as a proportion of the G.D.P. to pay for these additional costs of government. Even in 1971, income taxes accounted for 53.5 per cent of Australia's total revenue (as against an average of 34.2 per cent for 22 O.E.C.D. countries) and this had risen to 63.9 per cent by 1975. This reliance on personal and company taxes has inhibited investment, productivity, growth, and incentive. Poor industrial relations in Australia have also contributed to costs. In 1974, Australia lost 6 292 500 working days through industrial disputes. This represented the second highest loss of working days per worker through industrial disputes of any developed nation, and almost twice that for Britain and the U.S.A. The peripheral benefits to the Australian work force far exceed the benefits received in other countries. For instance, long service leave is unique to Australia.

Higher costs do not necessarily mean inefficient industry, but may simply reflect the wage and cost structure of the economy. The Australian citrus industry, cited earlier, is as efficient as the industry in Brazil. However, all is not lost for Australian industry. The description of Australia as "The Lucky Country" is still appropriate. The population

is relatively homogeneous. Despite the events of the past two years, Australia has political stability.

The plentiful natural resources and the mild climate are also major assets. Australia is the most efficient producer of wheat and wool in the world, and one of the most efficient producers of sugar. It produces 51 per cent of world trade in wool. It is the largest producer and reserve holder of bauxite, rutile and zircon, the second largest producer of iron ore, and the third largest reserve holder of iron ore and uranium and producer of lead and zinc. In 1870, Trollope described Australians as "A people second to none in their own opinions, battling and grasping . . . often ignorant, always conceited, abusive among each other with more than British violence, but determined to succeed, determined to grow and become rich, and succeeding accordingly." Those characteristics, which are probably just as applicable today, have probably been one of our greatest assets in the past and may be our dangerous weakness for the future.

The facts suggest that Australians are currently living beyond the productivity of their economy. Production for the domestic market is costly and often inefficient. Export production is less competitive. There seems to be an excessive reliance upon the export of resources, the inflow of foreign capital (although this has diminished lately), and massive deficit financing by Governments. Many Australians seem to be equating the present prosperity and high standard of living with the need not to work as earnestly as in the past. The prosperity and high level of taxation have created a national expectation that Governments have the resources to meet all social, industrial, and community needs. The work ethic is ridiculed in many quarters. It is a matter of "Get what you can from the system and if you still aren't satisfied, accuse the Government of neglect and incompetence." Of course, Mr. Speaker, we hear plenty of that from the present State Government here in South Australia. But the fundamental principle is to make your protest as disruptive as possible and your cry as loud as possible, irrespective of your need. Australians seem to have adopted a gross selfishness and self-interest.

I am not advocating that Australians should abandon their high standard of living or that improvements in conditions of employment, social welfare, cultural development, or community services should not take place. Such improvements cannot be obtained without the entire work force being prepared to work for their achievements. The words of the New York shoe-shine boy are most appropriate: "There is no free lunch." With regard to their demands upon Governments, Australians should remember that "Liberty is the luxury of self discipline".

Manufacturing industries need firm long-term guidelines from Government for their future development. The proposed White Paper on Policies for the Development of Manufacturing Industry, now being prepared by the Federal Government, will hopefully establish such guidelines. Australia cannot expect to match developing nations in most labour-intensive industry. Preference should therefore be given to capital-intensive industry or technology-intensive industry. The further refining, smelting, and processing of minerals within Australia is one obvious area of expansion. These new capital requirements will follow a 15-year period of high capital investment as a proportion of G.D.P.

From the findings of the Jackson Committee report (Policies for Development of Manufacturing Industry) it is apparent that the many sectors of manufacturing industry

that continue to produce for the domestic market will also have vast capital requirements to upgrade existing equipment. For Australian industry to meet these capital requirements, there will need to be a continuing reliance on foreign loan and equity capital, an acknowledgement of the role played by multi-national companies, and an increased contribution of capital from within Australia. Such a policy would also require necessary safeguards to protect Australia's economic future.

In the area of industrial relations, management and trade unions need to develop a greater understanding of the other's problems and a greater co-operation for their mutual benefit. Improved communications within the work place are required urgently. Australia's unique system of conciliation and arbitration is worth retaining, but its prime role must be expanded to include economic considerations in addition to the prevention of industrial disputes. Few people realise that, under the existing Commonwealth legislation, the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission must primarily turn its attention to industrial disputes. An amalgamation of the prolific craft unions into larger and fewer industry-based unions is an inevitable but slow process that would benefit industrial relations.

The role played by rural industries within the Australian economy should not be diminished because of current low international prices and uncertain markets for some products. However, greater diversification and flexibility of production are required to minimise the impact of market fluctuations. With over 70 per cent of the national debt being owed by rural interests, new capital inputs and financial assistance are urgently required to save widespread financial collapse. Rural industries within Australia must continue to earn a major portion of our export income. Australia is without a doubt a "Lucky Country". The great expectations and aspirations of Australians for the next 25 years are attainable. However, in our competitive, changing world, with its rich and poor nations, "luck" will not achieve these goals. A national outlook, determination to succeed, new skills, and a combined work effort are essential ingredients for a successful, enriched and secure future.

I now turn to industrial development in South Australia. In doing so, I stress that industrial development should not become the master of Governments or have priority over factors affecting the quality of life. However, the maintenance and improvement of a high standard of living can be achieved only from a stable and strong economic base. The Premier recently claimed:

The Government wants new industries for South Australia, and we have gone out and got them. History and the facts would suggest that the Government has not been very successful in achieving this claim. The major election promise of 1973 was the Redcliff petro-chemical complex. Three years later that promise now seems more hollow than ever. The election promise of 1975 was the four-cylinder engine consortium between Chrysler, Nissan and Toyota. Plans for that consortium have already been abandoned. Monarto was the other grand concept that would attract major new industries to South Australia. The extent to which Monarto is ever likely to attract major new industry is very debatable. However, Monarto itself now seems a rather remote reality.

Many of South Australia's existing industries are facing at least short-term problems. Because of a world surplus in shipping and the high wage escalation in Australia, the shipbuilding industry at Whyalla has five months before retrenchments commence unless orders for new work are received. The basic problem is that a subsidy of

60 per cent is required to allow the Australian shipyards to tender competitively with the Japanese and Korean shipyards. The motor vehicle industry in South Australia is facing an uncertain future now that 85 per cent Australian content has been adopted as policy. The many small component manufacturers are already beginning to reduce their work force and diversify into other products. The fruit industry along the Murray River, particularly companies canning fruits such as pears and peaches, face a future where supply will greatly exceed demand for the next few years. The citrus industry is threatened by imported fruit juice, while the fishing industry is suffering from smaller catches than usual. Many medium and smaller companies have already closed their operations in South Australia. Kentish Clothes Proprietary Limited, Krommenie Floors Proprietary Limited, Wadham and Sons Proprietary Limited, Buttery's Proprietary Limited, and Freighter Industries Limited are some of the better known cases of closure that have already occurred this year. The copper mine at Kanmantoo is now operating on a maintenance basis only.

Certainly, the Premier can and will cite some industries that have established in this State, but most examples are more than two years old. Despite the increasing frequency of major overseas excursions by the Premier and his numerous staff in search of major new industries, fewer and fewer new development projects seem to eventuate. The industrial momentum of the 1950's and the 1960's seems to have dissipated, no doubt much to the lament of South Australia's great Premier, Sir Thomas Playford. The reasons are obvious. The cost advantages of the past have now largely been lost and new ominous threats hang over the future. Sir Alwyn Barker, Chairman of the Uniroyal Group in Australia, earlier this year stated:

Current trends indicate that the cost of manufacture in South Australia is increasing more rapidly than in the Eastern States. And as a consequence the advantages of manufacturing in this State are becoming difficult to identify.

He went on to say:

It may be necessary to give priority to expanding our company's manufacturing facility in Victoria.

Uniroyal, like so many South Australian companies, is obliged to sell outside the State more than 85 per cent of the production of its main works at Edwardstown. A similar pattern exists with the motor vehicle and domestic appliance manufacturers. More than 50 per cent of all metal manufactured in South Australia is exported from the State.

National inflation, depressed consumer demand, and Federal Government policies for the motor vehicle industry have certainly contributed to the problems. However, when it comes to South Australia's competitive position within Australia, the Dunstan Government must be largely responsible for the loss of the cost advantage of this State. In 1970-71, South Australia had the lowest per capita State taxation of any of the mainland States. The most recent figure based on 1975-76 Budget Estimates (which were exceeded substantially in this State) show a taxation rate of \$221 a head, which is only marginally behind New South Wales and Victoria, at \$235 and \$227 a head respectively, and well ahead of Queensland and Western Australia, at \$156 and \$186 a head respectively. For every \$1 paid to the South Australian Government in 1969-70, the public now pays \$4.88 (an increase which far exceeds the increases in the consumer price index or the average wage). The cost of building a house in Adelaide is now the highest of any mainland capital city; this is despite the fact that in 1973-74 Adelaide was one of the cheapest cities in which to build

a house. The average cost a square metre was \$122 in Adelaide in 1973-74, which increased to \$174.50 at the end of the September quarter in 1975, an increase of 43 per cent in a two-year period.

For the past three years (from December, 1972, to December, 1975) the growth of the Public Service in South Australia was 19.4 per cent. It has far exceeded the growth of Public Services in the other States or for the Commonwealth Government, which was 12.0 per cent. This again reflects the increased infrastructure costs that must be carried by industry in this State as a direct result of the Labor State Government. The introduction of costly legislation, such as the 1973 amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act, has discouraged the creation of new employment opportunities. The trade union movement in South Australia has now moved sharply to the left, which has caused a sudden left-wing domination with the Caucus of the Dunstan Labor Government. As a result, the Government seems quietly to condone any union action, irrespective of how tyrannical and undemocratic that action may be.

The radical industrial democracy policy of the Labor Government, and the numerous threats by the Premier to force this policy on industry with legislation, will probably be the final nail in the coffin of the prospects for major new industrial development in South Australia. Several companies have indicated to me that their operations will be moved to other States if the State Government proceeds to adopt this policy by legislation.

Mr. Abbott: Would you like to name them?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: No, I will not name them, but they have clearly expressed this view to me. I suggest that the honourable member ask the Premier to name the companies that have made very loud and plain pleas to him to drop that policy. Many companies and associations have been to the Premier and have tackled him on this policy. As I pointed out yesterday, the Premier, unfortunately, has been double faced and has lied in relation to this industrial democracy policy.

The impact of the gradual decline of industrial development will not be sudden or necessarily obvious. Likewise, recovery of the momentum for further development will be slow. It will require responsible, disciplined government that understands private industry and its problems. It will require a Government that can control its own desires for uncontrolled expansion. So that the community is able to make its own judgment, the Liberal Party has already outlined many of its industrial policies. Its policies on State taxation, decentralisation incentives, pay-roll tax, Monarto, the establishment of a petro-chemical complex, land tax, workmen's compensation and unions have already been clearly stated. I believe that those policies form the economic base for a controlled industrial development, the creation of new employment opportunities, the improvement of our standard of living and the evolution of a better quality of life in South Australia.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I join with other members in tendering condolences to the family of the late Jim Ferguson and of the other two former members whom I did not have the pleasure of knowing. I did know Mr. Ferguson, who was a member of this House when I first entered this place. I also knew members of his family for a number of years prior to my coming into the House.

I wish the Governor the very best in his retirement and the same to his good lady. As another member of this House said, when he was appointed there was much public comment, but I believe he has been an outstanding

Governor and has fulfilled the role in the true traditions of the office. I hope all those people who have the privilege of filling that office in the future will follow the example he has set.

I turn now to matters that have been causing concern to many people in this State. The first is the Samcor situation. I have had a brief look at the report compiled by P.A. Consultants on the operations of Samcor. The decision to appoint P.A. Consultants has, in itself, generated much discussion, particularly as that organisation has done a considerable amount of work at the Samcor works. It was P.A. Consultants that recommended the current manager of Samcor for this position. I do not wish to cast any aspersions on the manager, but I believe some doubts are left in the minds of people when an organisation that has been advising Samcor is then asked to carry out an independent report into its operations. According to my information, Mr. Ian Gray said there was not any other firm of consultants in a position to carry out a survey. I believe, on reflection, that Mr. Gray would not again make that comment, because it is nonsense, as a number of groups of consultants in Adelaide could have carried out this work. I was perturbed when I heard that the Chairman of Samcor had been involved in the selection of the consultants who carried out the investigation. I was of the opinion that, under the terms of the legislation that set up Samcor, the consultants should be independent of the organisation, independent of management and independent of the Government. This situation has raised a number of questions in people's minds.

When the report is printed and members have had the opportunity to study it and discuss it with other people interested in it, we may be in a position to make a thorough examination of that report and have it debated in the House. I do not think anyone involved in rural industry or the Minister would not have had drawn to their attention a number of complaints concerning Samcor. I believe many people in the rural industry are not happy with the current operation. A constituent recently gave me a comparison of charges on which appears the comment, "The new facilities of Samcor are having problems of breakdown." This is not unusual, as any new system can have teething problems. That comparison states that union labour will not catch up the loss of throughput because of breakdowns. Private Victorian abattoir charges are much less (\$12.50) than the South Australian Meat Corporation's charges, which average \$24 a head, or \$11.50 more than in Victoria. Buyers are charged \$1.60 a head for carcasses left in chilling rooms overnight and they are charged \$5.50 to deliver to the processor, but in Victoria processors do this for \$2 in their own vans. Interstate private works do not charge paddocking or other fees, and they are pleased to receive the business. These are matters which the corporation and the Government should examine closely. I believe that the comment that the corporation did not have good public relations with its clients ought to be acted on immediately. I am looking forward to some action by the corporation and to some positive suggestion from the Government, and I hope that, in future when any Government organisation is the subject of a consultant's report, the Government will be far more careful in selecting consultants. I do not wish to imply that the consultants are not a competent group of people, but I believe that they have put themselves in the position where it could be said that they would not bring down a report that would criticise past recommendations made to the corporation.

Mr. Rodda: They should offer practical suggestions about where we can cut down the cost.

Mr. GUNN: We will have the opportunity, according to His Excellency's Speech, to debate legislation about the transfer of the Port Lincoln abattoir to the corporation. After every member has had the opportunity to seek outside advice on the corporation's report, we could have a full and frank debate on this matter.

Mr. Rodda: What is the levy at Port Lincoln?

Mr. GUNN: It is 40c. The next matter with which I will deal concerns certain statements made by the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries who, in his wisdom, has decided that it is time to launch a tirade of abuse against me. I do not deny the Minister the right to criticise me or anyone else, but I do not apologise for my comments on the Minister's suggestions. Opposition members are well aware that the Labor Party is a socialist Party dedicated to implementing what it likes to call democratic socialism (one can put any interpretation one likes on "democratic"). The Minister has been suggesting for some time that farmers ought to involve themselves in farm syndication projects. We are all aware that certain rural producers and farmers have pooled their resources to buy plant but this idea, in my opinion, has a limited application.

During the Minister's trip to the West Coast, where he addressed two agricultural bureaux (I have always understood that those organisations were meant to be non-political), he took the opportunity to launch an attack on me. As I was present at the Chairman's invitation, I did not like to use the occasion as an opportunity to reply on the spot. However, I am taking the opportunity now to reply in some detail to the Minister. I think it is a sorry state of affairs that the only solution the Minister has to our agricultural problems is to suggest that farmers should involve themselves in syndication projects, which have only limited application. As was pointed out to the Minister at one of those meetings, the element of human nature must be considered.

Most people involved like to own their own equipment, because they have their own likes and dislikes about it. In the marginal areas, where it is necessary to get the crop in in a short time and where the farmer in many cases must go over a large area of country, the Minister's suggestion is not practicable. One person might wish to pull out of the syndicate, but how would it react? I believe that we will see more contractors involved in agriculture. We already have people who contract for weed spraying, superphosphate spreading, and reaping. Most of the seed grading and land development is done by contractors who are also engaged in fencing work. However, the big blow to these people was inflicted by the Whitlam Government, which made it impossible for them to purchase new equipment.

It is absolutely necessary that rural industry or any other industry should have the opportunity to reinvest its funds; that is, to put its profits back into the industry. If it cannot achieve that, it cannot last long. The decision that the Whitlam Government made was a major decision to discourage private contracting in agricultural areas. We are all aware that the cost of new machinery is becoming prohibitive in some areas. New developments in machinery have been significant over the past few years, and I pay a tribute to South Australia's machinery manufacturers. I have had the privilege of inspecting some of their products over the past few weeks, and I intend to examine even more of them soon. The West Coast *Sentinel* reports the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries as saying the following:

It makes me angry to read comments from ill-informed people who sneer at such new developments.

The Minister was referring to me. His suggestions are not new; they have been tried for years, and the Minister knows that. If anyone has displayed the characteristic of being ill-informed, it is the Minister, who has been proved over the past week to be one of the most ill-informed, unpopular and unpractical Ministers of Agriculture that South Australia has ever seen. The draft report of the Industries Assistance Commission is a complete condemnation of the stand the Minister took when the Federal Government rightly reintroduced the superphosphate bounty, and I think it worth going through the history of the Minister's sordid statements and actions in relation to this matter. I again suggest to him that, before he releases statements, he take a little advice from the practical people with long experience in his department and push aside the dominance of the private Ministerial appointees, who are interested only in promoting a political philosophy and in gaining sensational headlines. If the Minister were to get back to reality, take notice of these practical people and get rid of the private staff, he, the Government and rural industry would be much better off. A press report states:

I.A.C.'s final report on "super" favours bounty but no increases. Canberra: The superphosphate bounty should continue at least until 1982, according to the Industries Assistance Commission. However, the I.A.C., in a split decision, has advised the Government not to increase the bounty from the present general assistance level.

In an interim move, Federal Cabinet restored the bounty for 17 months in February last year. We all recall that, when the commission made a previous report to the Whitlam Government, the then Prime Minister attacked it as being pathetic. We must remember that it was the Whitlam Government which set up the commission. On every matter referred to the commission, when the industry has gone before it and has properly stated its case, it has been supported by the commission's findings. The Prime Minister's statements were irresponsible and, if anything has been pathetic, it has been his actions. To prove my point about the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries and how wrong he has been, I point out that the price on July 1, 1976 (and I was given these prices last week), for superphosphate was about \$54.24 to people who supplied their 20 sacks for the tonne and \$50.09 for bulk superphosphate. Perhaps I should quote some newspaper cuttings that I have collected on the subject. A headline in the *Advertiser* stated, "Farmers disillusioned with Minister." I believe that is the strongest criticism I can recall being made about any Minister of Agriculture in Australia.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He's not too good, is he?

Mr. GUNN: No. The newspaper report states:

The three statements regarded as being typical of examples of the Minister's attitude to farmers are: the decision to restore the superphosphate bounty will only restore the old image of farmers as the leather-bedded section living on Government handouts.

That is nonsense.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Chatterton said that?

Mr. GUNN: Yes. The report continued:

Perhaps an even more up-to-date example of farmers crying wolf is their emergency beef aid scheme, which was set up in March last year.

The Minister could not even work out—

Mr. Goldsworthy: When did he say that?

Mr. GUNN: March 30. The Minister did not understand that the reason people could not use beef aid was because of the stringent 11½ per cent interest rate. I

suggest that the Minister should go to Western Australia to see how the scheme is administered there. The report continued:

Pensioners, deserted wives and bankrupt small businesses are appalled at the way farmers seem to think they are over-living in the occupation of their choice. The U.F. and G. believes that these and similar statements by the Minister give a totally inaccurate picture of our rural sector and only serve to widen the understanding gap between the city and rural sectors.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Do you think the Minister understands anything about it?

Mr. GUNN: No, I do not. An advertisement drawn up and inserted in the *Advertiser* stated:

It appears that Mr. Chatterton does not in any shape or form realise the problems of primary producers in the present situation.

That is what John Kerin said about the Minister, and he has always tried to take a reasonable attitude in dealing with Governments, and has tried to ensure that his organisation is flexible and does not make decisions that are not in the public interest.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Does he always achieve his endeavours?

Mr. GUNN: I am not interested in the nonsense uttered by the Government Whip. In another report, Mr. Kerin (and this is U.F. and G. official comment) stated:

He is right out of touch with reality. I don't think he really understands his portfolio. He continually criticises but never puts forward practical solutions. Chatterton is playing politics at the expense of the South Australian farmers. He is trying to break down the structure and importance of farmers' organisations. Farmers cannot relate to him. We want a Minister who will try to help resolve the communications gap between country and city, not one who is consistently widening that gap. What I have referred to are just one or two comments made in relation to what Mr. Chatterton has said about the superphosphate bounty. Clearly, the I.A.C. report is a condemnation of his stand. Keith Martin in a report in the *Advertiser* stated:

Woolgrowers call for Minister to resign. This was revealed yesterday by the President of the Stockowners Association of South Australia, Mr. McTaggart, while reporting strong farmer reaction to Mr. Chatterton's suggestion that woolgrowers should press brokers to meet the immediate demands of the Storemen and Packers Union to lift the wool ban.

That was the second disastrous statement made by the Minister that was proved to be wrong. Such action would have increased the cost to graziers and wool producers by about 90 per cent. The Minister took the side of the left wing union Secretary, Mr. George Apap. Had Mr. Chatterton wanted to do something constructive in relation to the Storemen and Packers Union, I suggest that he could have gone to the Trades and Labor Council to ascertain how Mr. Apap was elected Secretary of the union. Why was a Mr. Thompson expelled from the union? What action did the Federal Secretary of that union take? What about the statements that were in the files of the—

Mr. Slater: I think you are on the wrong bus.

Mr. Whitten: Are you sure you are not getting mixed up with the wrong organisation?

Mr. GUNN: I have further comments to make about your union friends soon. I am sure you will be interested in those comments. However, I am able to make my own speech without the assistance of the expeller of the Federal executive. I will end my remarks about the superphosphate bounty by quoting from the *Australian* editorial of August 4—

Mr. Rodda: Have you read the list of 400 tonnes and over?

Mr. GUNN: Yes. The editorial refers to that matter, and states:

Farmers deserve the super bounty.

I wonder what the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries had to say about that headline. This is what it said:

Certainly it is small compared with manufacturing subsidies.

We do not hear much in this House about manufacturing subsidies. The member for Whyalla (and I do not blame him for sticking up for a local industry) explained why shipyards in Whyalla should be subsidised. If it is good enough to subsidise the shipyards at Whyalla, what is wrong with applying a tariff compensation by way of a superphosphate bounty to rural industries? The editorial continues:

Certainly it is small compared with manufacturing subsidies. For every dollar we pump into tariffs to boost our overpriced floundering manufacturing industries we gain little benefit in overseas trade. If anything, it means a loss, as it raises the price of our probable exportable commodities, such as primary produce. Every dollar we pump into superphosphate has a tangible measure of effect. We can all see the greenness of the grass, the extra fatness of the cattle, the improved quality of our wool, and so on. This money is well spent and we must continue with it. That is a most responsible editorial, for which I commend the editor, who obviously appreciates that this country cannot afford to neglect its rural industry. If I had time I would read the submission made to the I.A.C. by Mr. Lance Puckridge and Mr. Slee on behalf of the United Farmers and Graziers organisation. All I intend saying is that the cost of superphosphate has increased since January 1, 1971, when it was \$13.88 a ton, to \$14.17 in January, 1972; \$14.17 in January, 1973; to \$15.05 in January, 1974; to \$55.08 in January, 1975; and to \$61.90 in January, 1976. Superphosphate carries a subsidy of \$11.81. What does the subsidy amount to to everyone employed in the shipbuilding industry? What is the subsidy by way of tariff to every person employed in the motor industry? I should like the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries and all his colleagues to tell that to the people of this State. If he is against the superphosphate bounty, does he advocate the total abolition of tariffs which support secondary industry? That would be just as irresponsible a statement as it is to advocate the abolition of the superphosphate bounty. Mr. Cowell was reported as saying (and his remarks were echoed by the U.F. and G.):

Mr. Chatterton was naive, had lost grower-group support and the confidence of State farmers. Mr. Chatterton continued to alienate people that he was supposed to have represented. It was a sad state of affairs to find a Minister antagonising the people he is supposed to support. Never in the past 40 years can I remember a Minister of Agriculture destroying the confidence of farmers so much as Mr. Chatterton has done.

They are just a few comments. I shall be interested to see what Mr. Chatterton and his private advisers will say. I will be interested to see whether they will answer those comments and whether they will answer what the I.A.C. said. It was stated in the *Port Lincoln Times*:

U.F. and G. call on Minister to resign.

Another article is headed, "Farmers upset by Minister's so-called blunt talking". The Minister said he supported farm aid, but to my knowledge he has never supported farm aid, irrespective of what was said. The last reference appeared in the *Advertiser* on August 3. Mr. Roberts, of the Australian Woolgrowers and Graziers Association, said that the recommendation was a triumph for rural industry and that right from the outset of the controversy

over superphosphate his organisation had maintained that it could justify a bounty before an independent body such as the Industries Assistance Commission.

I turn now to other matters. What made the Minister so incensed about my comments was that I accused him of intending to set up collective farming. The Labor Party is a socialist Party, and makes no apology for that. To refresh the Minister's memory, I examined *Hansard* and I shall quote the contradictions of opinions expressed by the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries and the Premier. The Premier, in the *Industrial Democracy Newsletter*, said that public ownership of industry was not declared A.L.P. policy. He emphasised that that view was a complete distortion of the Labor Party programme. The Labor Party did not equate democratic socialisation of industry with public ownership of industry or nationalisation. That is a lot of nonsense. We all recall what Mr. John Scott had to say at the A.L.P. convention, when he advocated that the Chrysler organisation should be nationalised without compensation. The present Minister for the Environment said, in 1970, when discussing the new companies legislation brought in by the then Attorney-General:

This country would be better served by a socialist economic system. I make no apology for saying that. There are weaknesses inherent in capitalism that I think do grave harm to our society. However, I recognise that for some years at least it will be necessary for this country to suffer a predominantly capitalist economy.

Mr. Slater: That is right.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Gilles agrees. I am pleased that he agrees we should have a totally socialist economic system. Another interesting gentleman was elected to the Legislative Council at the recent elections. I refer to the Hon. Frank Blevins who, on August 13, 1975, said:

I wish to make only one more point, Mr. President, and it relates to the word "socialist". It is obvious that the honourable members opposite see red every time they hear the word. I am afraid that, unless they get a little more rational about it, they will be upset quite a lot over the next few years as I am a dedicated socialist who takes every opportunity to promote the principles and ideals of democratic socialism. The reason I am a socialist is simple: I do not believe that any person has the right to exploit the labour of any other human being for his own gain or personal well-being. To me the making of profit through exploitation is immoral and, although I make no claim to be a Christian myself, I am sure the misery and poverty the capitalist system brings to the people of the world also makes it unchristian. Like this Chamber, the sooner capitalism is relegated to the history books the better off mankind will be.

Mr. Blevins wants State control, too.

Mr. Slater: He's right, too.

Mr. GUNN: I am pleased that the member for Gilles wants State control. He has contradicted his Premier and has proved that the Labor Party is split. The Premier is completely out of touch with his back-benchers. I am pleased to hear of the division in the Labor Party. The member for Gilles has clearly demonstrated that the Premier was telling untruths, as the member for Davenport pointed out today. I commend the member for Gilles for bringing this to the attention of the House and of the country. People should know of the in-fighting and back-stabbing going on in the Labor Party. We see it in Canberra, and now we are seeing it in this State.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I refer the honourable member to the rules of debate. Standing Order 149 states that no member shall allude to any debate in the other House of Parliament or to any measure impending therein. I hope that the honourable member will not transgress that Standing Order.

Mr. GUNN: I understood that to be the position about a current year. I quoted from a matter referred to last year. It is often done in this House when members refer to previous debates. Now, Sir, with your permission, I refer to some comments made by the member for Price in this House almost a year ago. I hope that is in order, because it would be a pity if I could not make this comment. I have circulated a copy of his remarks to some of my constituents, and I may circulate it again. They were most interested. On August 26, 1975, as reported on page 474 of *Hansard*, the member for Price said:

Why not? One evening last week the member for Eyre was grieving about the poor widow who had to pay \$50 000 in succession duties. What about the poor old worker? If he had one-quarter of that amount in assets, he would think himself very lucky. How do people who have to pay \$50 000 in succession duties collect property to such a value? Probably, during the depression years, when they have had a man, wife, and two or three children working for them they paid them 10 bob a week and keep.

Mr. Whitten: If they were lucky!

Mr. GUNN: I know the honourable member hates farmers and rural industry. Clearly, he is following the lead of the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries. He is a farmer basher. The member for Florey interjected, and said that the workers had been on bread and dripping, and the member for Price then continued:

They got the dripping if they were lucky. The policy of the A.L.P. always has been to look after ordinary people, not people like the member for Hanson.

Then he went on to talk a lot of nonsense. The member for Florey again made a reference about people exploiting the workers. The person I had referred to in that instance went out with her husband in the early days of their marriage, living in an iron shed, helping her husband to clear a scrub property. They had three sons and continued to work hard, and they had to pay \$50 000 in succession duties for the right to make an average living.

Mr. Whitten: Was it Mr. and Mrs. Gunn?

Mr. GUNN: No. I could tell the member in confidence and outside the House the name of the person. If he is concerned about justice, he should ask the Premier to justify the State Government's continuing to allow a situation where people cannot receive their dues from the Australian Barley Board. If three people are in partnership and one dies, the remaining partners cannot receive their part of the payment until the estate is wound up, even though the Succession Duties office has no claim against them. That is wrong. I have raised the matter many times, and I hope something will be done about it. The Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, the Government, and the member for Price should understand that the nation will collapse if primary industry does not survive. If anyone believes that this country can survive without a viable rural industry, he is living in a fool's paradise. The industry has suffered during the past few years, as the following quotation will demonstrate:

Income from the farming community had fallen by 40 per cent in the past two years, he said. The expected income from primary industries this year was \$4 000 000 000, still twice as much as the next largest national income-producing section.

The solution to the problems of primary industry was, first, to control inflation; secondly, to control irresponsible wage demands; and, thirdly, to re-examine the tariff situation in this country. Many primary producers are appalled, because their incomes are falling and their costs are rising. In the past nine years, the average

cost per acre has almost doubled on Eyre Peninsula, rising from \$7.70 an acre in 1964-65 to \$14.10 in 1973-74. That demonstrates by now much rural industry incomes had fallen, and yet farmers have had to pay increased taxation and increased wages.

The Premier has indicated that the Government will do something about land tax. I am pleased, because land tax has increased in many parts of the State, and I believe that, unless something is done about the system of valuation and the rate of tax, many people will be forced off their properties. I consider the Labor Party is adopting the old socialist philosophy of destroying a few people at a time; eliminate a few quietly and they will not make much noise, because there are not many of them but the socialist purpose will be achieved. I have received the following information from the Stockowners Association of South Australia, and I hope the Premier will consider urgently what the association has referred to him. A property at Mount Barker of 1293 hectares of rocky, hilly grazing land was taxed at \$18 000; another property had its land tax increased from \$200 a year to \$200 a week; and another owner has offered to lease 121 ha for the cost of land tax and council rates. Part 3 of the association's document forwarded to the Premier states:

Dating back to our earliest submission to you in 1970, we have emphasised that land tax discriminates unfairly against the rural producer we represent, because land happens to be a major and essential part of his investment. Approximate percentages of capital invested in land are: farming and grazing industry, 45 per cent to 65 per cent; private dwellings, 25 per cent; and commercial premises, 10 per cent.

I could quote at length facts about land tax anomalies. I hope the Premier is not doing his usual window dressing and will not try to pull the wool over the eyes of the people, as he did last year when he amended the Land Tax Act.

The effects of the drought in my district are now serious. In the western part of the district farmers are experiencing the worst drought conditions in my memory. I believe it is essential that the Government considers seriously how best it can co-ordinate the advice and assistance that can be offered to people affected by the drought. The Lands Department, the Agriculture Department and Samcor are all offering assistance of some sort, and it has become clear that the Government should appoint a group of people who can be available permanently to advise on what assistance is possible and how best it can be obtained. I believe a committee, comprising representatives of the Agriculture Department, Lands Department, the Stockowners Association, and the United Farmers and Graziers association, should be set up to discuss problems with Samcor, stock agents, and the barley and the wheat boards because supplies of barley and wheat may have to be put aside not only for feed purposes but for seed purposes.

Many farmers have spent large sums in preparing their land for seeding, some have applied superphosphate (for which they will get a rebate) and they have had to pay for diesel fuel. The real effects of the drought will not be obvious until next year, when the farmers will not have had an income for this year, and that is when many of them will be seeking assistance under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act. I hope the Government will adopt the Victorian system of paying a few dollars to people who destroy their stock, so that people living some distance from the abattoirs will get some relief for the stock they have to destroy. Many farmers

believe that if stock can be transported, it should be put to good use and not destroyed on the property.

The Agriculture Department issued a news release on August 2 headed "Agricultural Effects of the 1976 Budget to be Clarified". It is interesting to note that one of the speakers was to be Colin Hunt, who I understand is on the Labor Party rural committee. Is the Minister of Agriculture attempting to use his department for political purposes? Many people in my district have expressed concern about this, and I should like to know whether the facilities of the Agriculture Department are being used for political purposes. I have said several times that I am concerned about the attacks being made by this Government on the Commonwealth Government and on Sir John Kerr—

Mr. Max Brown: And the lawyers, too.

Mr. GUNN: Only a small section of lawyers. I believe the present Government of this country is tackling its problems in a systematic and responsible manner. We have sat in this House day after day and listened to Dorothy Dix questions being asked of Ministers, and every time in the reply they have blamed the Commonwealth Government. This Government is continually expressing the belief that the Commonwealth Government is starving it of funds, but what it is not telling people is that, if the Commonwealth is to supply more funds to the States, it will have to take more money from the pockets of the people. This is what this Government is failing to tell the people. This Government does not want the responsibility of taxing the people, so that it can spend the money. Why does the Government not come clean and say that if the Commonwealth gives it another \$50 000 000 that would be more money out of the taxpayers' pockets?

Ministers are taking the attitude that the Commonwealth Treasurer has a large pocket, and each time the State Treasurer goes to him, the Commonwealth Treasurer will give him more money. That was the attitude of the previous Federal Labor Government. Dr. Cairns turned the money printing machine faster and faster, and where did that lead us? We have record unemployment, record inflation, record high interest rates, and a record deficit of about \$5 000 000 000. It would be totally irresponsible for the present Government to allow that situation to continue. Not only would we have higher unemployment but it would be economic chaos and the total fabric of society would be destroyed. We know that Dr. Cairns and those people wanted to destroy the free enterprise system, and they knew they could use inflation to do that. The Fraser Government will protect the people from high taxation and it will allow people to spend their own money. We believe that people spend their own money far better than the Government spends its money. Industry has to be encouraged to reinvest. Incentives have to be given to people. Those are the sorts of policy that the current Commonwealth Government (the Government we will have for a long time in this country) is implementing. It has had difficult decisions to make, but it is far better to make the right decisions and suffer some short-term unpopularity than to make popular decisions and bring the country to the verge of chaos, as the Whitlam Government did.

Mr. Abbott: What do you reckon Fraser is doing?

Mr. GUNN: He is doing what is in the interests of this country. The honourable member ought to know that, if he has a skerrick of responsibility. Does he want the situation we had prior to 1972 to continue? To refresh the honourable member's memory, I have a newspaper report which appeared in the *Australian*, as follows:

Cairns sacked. Deputy Prime Minister refuses to resign, demands Caucus judgment.

Prior to that we had Crean, then we had Connor, and then we had Mr. Khemlani. Does the honourable member want that sort of situation to continue?

Mr. Abbott: You are quoting from the Murdoch press.

Mr. GUNN: If it was incorrect, legal action could have been taken. I have headlines here relating to a number of interesting statements. In one Mr. Dunstan said he was sick of the "trendy image". I do not know the significance of that. The member for Florey, when he was explaining how a person opted out of paying an affiliation fee to the Australian Labor Party (and I was most interested, because I thought the honourable member was a democrat, and we know the member for Florey is a decent member of the House), expected us to believe that the way the Waterside Workers' Federation conducts its affairs is democratic. He said that, if a member of an organisation did not wish to pay an affiliation fee to the A.L.P. but wished to pay one, say, to the Liberal Party, a stopwork meeting had to be called and the matter put to that meeting. That could be classed not as democracy but as mob rule. What would happen to the person if he stood up and said he wanted to do that? Would the members of the union have a vote, or as he put his hand up would they hit him from behind? I am sure the member for Florey does not expect us to believe that that is democratic.

Mr. Max Brown: You have no idea, have you.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member for Whyalla says that I have not any idea.

Mr. Max Brown: Really, you are so farcical. You haven't any idea.

Mr. GUNN: I think the honourable member for Whyalla, like many of his colleagues, is only a seat warmer.

Mr. Max Brown: Have you ever been to a union meeting?

Mr. GUNN: As I told the honourable member once before, I have been a member of a union and on one occasion I did attend a union meeting, but the only reason why I was a member was that, if I wished to stay in the job, I had to join the union. It was not a matter of choice but a matter of compulsion. If there is anything democratic about that, I should like to have it explained to me. I am quite sure the member for Whyalla could not explain it.

Mr. Max Brown: I am sure I couldn't explain it to you, because you wouldn't know; that's for sure.

Mr. GUNN: I pay a tribute to my colleague, the member for Frome, who has said he intends to retire at the next election. When I first came into the House I shared an office with the honourable member for three years and I realised after a short time that if one followed the honourable member's example in representing a large electorate, and the advice he gave, one would be successful. I followed the advice he gave, and at succeeding elections I increased my majority substantially. I think much of that was because I took that advice and watched carefully how the honourable member went about representing his large electoral district. I think the people of Frome are lucky to have such a member.

There has been much comment about what I intend to do in the political world. I intend to seek Liberal Party preselection for the new seat of Eyre if the new boundaries are confirmed. The reasons for that are quite simple. The majority of the 6900 constituents in my old district of Eyre are in the new district; my home is in the district, and my farm is in the district. Some areas of Whyalla are contained in the new district, and

also 6500 electors from the district of Frome. I believe it will be a most interesting district to represent, and I look forward to the challenges that lay ahead.

Mr. Allen: Maybe you can help the member for Whyalla.

Mr. GUNN: I thank the member for Frome for that comment. I think the member for Whyalla is in need of some help, and I should be pleased, on any occasion, to offer him assistance in any matter. I was asked that question by the honourable member's local newspaper, and I told them that I would look forward to helping the member for Whyalla on any occasion.

Mr. Max Brown: I look forward to it, too.

Mr. GUNN: I would be pleased to discuss with the honourable member any matter at any time. Whether he would understand what I was talking about, however, I do not know. I now make some comments about the trade union movement and the Labor Party in this State. Having read the Governor's Speech quite closely I think it is interesting to see the direction in which the Parliament and the people of this State are going to be led by the union movement. We have had a statement by the Minister of Transport that Government bodies must give first absolute preference to union members. The district council of Le Hunte wrote to the Government and the Minister saying that it believed that was discrimination in employment. I agree with the stand which that council has taken, as I consider it is discrimination in employment that a person has virtually to obtain a licence to work—to pay a fee to the Australian Labor Party to get a job. That is the sort of democratic system that this Government is attempting to inflict on the people of South Australia. This Government's Federal colleagues would have done likewise. What is the next step? This Government intends to bring about compulsory unionism by legislation. The Minister has outlined that: "Then we will have them all drafted into the unions, have them under the control of Mr. Scott, Mr. Apap and Mr. Nyland; we will force them into unions, we will not give them a secret ballot, we will take their money off them and we will set out systematically to take charge of the State."

Mr. Whitten: You are handling the truth very recklessly.

Mr. GUNN: If anyone has done that, it is the honourable member. We have been told that Parliament is to consider legislation to deny people the right at common law to take those officials to court so that those people can receive justice. We are aware of how the Government acted in the case relating to Kangaroo Island. People rightly took Mr. Dunford to court and he was fined, but the taxpayers have since had to pay. We are aware that Mr. Dunford stated that if anyone took legal action against a union official, he would break him, and that that had already happened to one person. The Government has not contradicted that statement, so it is obvious that the Labor Party supports that deplorable course of action. It was the Premier who had to advise the people involved in the dispute on the Port Adelaide wharves that the only course of action that could be taken, when Mr. Nyland refused to act in the dispute, was to decide who should move the steel.

In the little time I have left, I will turn to some local matters, one of which relates to the Ceduna school. For many years the school council, the district council of Murat Bay and the parents have been trying to have the school upgraded. Members are probably aware that about 700 students attend the school, which is the largest school in my district and which has been built up basically over many years by closing down small schools in outlying areas. The school's 50-odd classrooms are lined up like wooden

army huts, and it is a totally unsatisfactory situation. Unfortunately, it seems that the school will have to wait for a few more years before justice is done. I have received the following precis of the school's history, as follows:

In March, 1964, the school council decided to apply to the department for a new solid construction two-storey frontage to replace present small buildings.

In April, 1965, Headmaster reports that an architect had visited the school to prepare ground plans for the new school and tennis courts.

In May, 1966, the Minister of Education and Deputy-Director of Education visited the school, and among points to be raised will be the new school. During that year, visit was discussed by the school council.

April, 1969, Headmaster's report that, from 383 in 1963, students increased to 548 in 1969; an urgent need for new school.

July, 1973, Deputy Director-General (Resources), Mr. Dodd visits Ceduna and speaks to the council regarding new school.

September, the Minister of Education (Mr. Hudson) visits Ceduna. He said that a new school would be constructed in three or four years time.

October, Mr. Hudson's reply to a question I put to him in relation to the school.

April, 1974, Education Department states that "buildings are in fair state of repair although the accommodation must be regarded as significantly substandard". Department advises school council that the school would be built in June, 1977.

In 1975, master plan of new school arrives, showing location of building on site.

August, Mr. Hoggood writes to Mr. Gunn and says, "No definite date can be given at present."

In August, 1975, school council deputation meets Mr. Hoggood.

September, Mr. Hoggood writes member for Eyre, "provided that funds are available and there are no other schools with higher priority, it will be possible to commence school in January, 1976".

January, 1976, Mr. Hoggood writes that "other plans and document are expected to be available after April, 1976".

February, 1976, Dr. Tonkin and Mr. Gunn visit the school.

March, Mr. Corcoran had correspondence with the school and advised that the school was now on "C" list.

March, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris visited the school with me.

I hope that the Minister and his colleagues will give urgent attention to the problem, which has been virtually a serial similar to *Blue Hills* in relation to the proposal to build a new school at Ceduna, and I hope it will be completed soon.

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

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I wonder whether the whole debate does not seem a little like *Blue Hills* but it has, of necessity, to be something like *Blue Hills*, because each member has his particular aspect to mention. I have some things to say about the drought, which has been canvassed by other members, but each district has its peculiar aspects. Some things on a State-wide basis concern me greatly, and some things about my district need to be said.

I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. It seems that it is the opinion of other members (it is certainly my opinion) that they will miss the present Governor when he retires from that office. I am sure that we have all appreciated his wit and wisdom and the amount of public comment he is prepared to make. He has proved himself to be very much an individualist. We have appreciated his point of view and, in fields in which he is an expert, probably we have appreciated more particularly his point of view. I believe that some honourable member has said that his stay in South Australia has been something of a breath of fresh air, and I think there is a

wealth of meaning in that expression. In common with other members, I hope that His Excellency and Lady Oliphant will have a happy retirement. I hope that he has gained some satisfaction and sense of service from the service he has given to South Australia, and I hope that his retirement will be a long and happy one and that he will always have many pleasant memories of his Governorship in this State.

Dr. Eastick: In his home State.

Mr. WARDLE: Yes, and that is probably one of the most satisfying things about his appointment. He was coming home to be amongst his own family, and that, after having been away from them for many years, must in itself have been satisfying and pleasant for him.

I refer now to the late James Ferguson, who was a member when I joined Parliament. I knew him only slightly prior to my coming here, but I was pleased to find that he was the type of man I was given to understand I would find him to be. He was a simple man, in the best sense of that term; he never pretended to be something he was not, and he had a wholesome outlook on life. He tried to live up to the basic Christian philosophy of life, as he understood it, knew it and experienced it, and I think that that was one of the important things about him. He led an active and thoughtful Christian life among his constituents and fellow men, and I think that this would largely be from an inspiration of fulfilling his duties as the kind of man in the community who gave good service to the people. He attended not only to his constituents' problems but also to the problems of the people he served so well. He was a man of outstanding character who served his district and the State very well.

I did not know the other deceased members but I am sure, looking at their service from the point of view of one who has served the community now for nine years, that they, too, were men who served honourably and worked hard for their constituents in their day and generation.

The Governor, correctly, in the second paragraph of his Speech, referred to the dry autumn and early winter season. Unfortunately, that dry early winter has developed into a dry mid-winter, and it looks like being a dry late winter, too. As another speaker has said, this is probably the driest season on record. I believe that conditions are the worst that I have ever seen them in the Mallee area. I was seven in 1927 when my family moved into that locality. My experience in that part of the country has covered a fairly long period. In that time there have been many droughts, but the present drought is by far the most devastating I have experienced. When, with all the blessings of television, which brings out the horrors as well as the pleasant side of matters, one sees sheep eating wool from other animals, the situation becomes real.

Perhaps people living in the metropolitan area are getting a better view of what country people are experiencing at the moment than they have ever experienced before. I suppose it does not hurt metropolitan people to have a little better understanding of what problems are experienced in drought-affected country areas. At times, downright foolish statements are made by people living in the metropolitan area who have no conception of what conditions are like in country areas. When one's heart is yearning for rain and one meets someone in the metropolitan area sheltering from rain under a verandah and complaining about that rain, it is a devastating situation that those people do not understand to any great degree the problems of the country. Drought is affecting the Murray Plains and the Murray Valley, and no doubt the North of the State and

West Coast, too, so much so that I have received letters from three councils that were written to the Lands Department and the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries pleading for help. A letter was written by Mr. Coventry, the District Clerk of the Mobilong District Council, on July 23 to the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries. We must not forget that, as each week goes by, these circumstances become more difficult and more damaging to the countryside. This council is concerned with the drought conditions that exist in its area and asks the Minister to consider making available drought relief funds to people experiencing hardship because of the conditions that exist within that area. The letter states:

In support of the request, I would submit the following. The average rainfall for Murray Bridge and surrounding districts is 340 mm per annum. The average to June 30th, 1976, per annum, is 158 mm. To date only 83.6 mm has been received. Rain received during the period has only been spasmodic in distribution and many areas have received less than that mentioned above. The area has lacked a general soaking rain and consequently it has been difficult for many farmers to work back and seed their ground. With the continuing conditions, concern is expressed for the future harvest season, as in many places seeding has not been effected. Consequently with the above thoughts in mind your consideration to drought relief funds would be appreciated and this council offers its assistance in administering the scheme.

That letter was written almost three weeks ago, and a similar letter was sent to the Minister of Lands. The following letter was written by Eric March, District Clerk of the Mannum District Council, to the Lands Department on July 12:

I must apply for assistance from your department for the relief of persons suffering some hardship in this district brought about by the abnormally dry condition. Farmers have not commenced seeding in the district at this time, which means that not only the farmers are out of work but also the many people whom they would normally be employing. I would estimate that we could comfortably maintain a gang of 20 men which would cost \$2 734 a week. When I say comfortably maintain, I mean that I would estimate that there is quite easily 20 people in this district that could benefit over the next few months by being given work. Your favourable consideration would be appreciated.

Finally, I refer to a letter written by the District Council of Ridley, which is in an area well represented by the member for Kavel. The letter is addressed to the Minister for Lands, is dated July 19, and states:

The District Council of Ridley has been concerned for some time at the effects of the adverse seasonal conditions currently being experienced in this area and of course other areas throughout the State. The rainfall in this area has been very light and could almost be termed non-existent. The letter was written on July 19, so the situation has deteriorated considerably since that time. The letter continues:

It certainly has been of no value. There has been virtually no cropping done at all in the district, and what seeding has been done has not germinated. Paddock feed has become very, very scarce and the condition of stock is deteriorating rapidly. The council asks that you give very serious consideration to the declaration of this area as a drought area. As part of this declaration we ask that subsidies be made available for the transport of stock and stock feed, that grants be made available for the destruction of stock where necessary, and that funds be made available to provide employment for those families worst hit.

Members will be aware that many of these requests have been met. Although assistance, such as receiving 40c a head for the slaughtering of stock for meat meal at the abattoirs, has been of some help to farmers, the majority of stock is unable to be transported to the abattoirs for that purpose. I do not believe it would pay a farmer who lives more than 50 kilometres or 65 kilometres away from

the abattoir to transport stock to the abattoir to gain the 40c a head for his stock. Nor would it pay a farmer to transport his stock to a council area so that that stock could be destroyed. I do not see much value in the suggestion that the Government should meet the cost of councils destroying stock. Obviously, not many farmers are located close to the plant and machinery or to the headquarters of district councils, and they would find it cheaper and easier to destroy their stock and dispose of them perhaps in an old quarry on the property, or burn the carcasses beside a patch of scrub. It is a shame that the Government could not have given a better price, even up to \$1 a head for stock killed by the abattoirs, because it would have encouraged farmers to bring in stock from much further afield.

I was hoping that the offer to pay half the cost of transport might apply to stock transported to the abattoir in the same way as to stock agistment and to the cartage of hay to feed stock in drought affected areas. This would have been a real contribution in helping many farmers who are trying now to dispose of stock. It is quite staggering to realise just what a drought can do to a country in economic terms, and to read of the effect that drought conditions probably will have on Australian agriculturists. The figures show that this could be about \$1 500 000 000, with a figure in South Australia of about \$300 000 000.

This morning I telephoned a farmer in the north-eastern area of my district to discover from him at first hand just what the situation was. He told me that, even if about 100 millimetres of rain fell now, farmers in the area would not sow. Apparently, it takes about a four or five-bag crop to pay the expenses and cover costs of cultivating and seeding, superphosphate, and so on. Unless a farmer can get a return of five bags to the acre, it is not worth his while to take his machinery from the shed. Because of the short growing period remaining in the season from now until, perhaps, the end of October, a heavy crop cannot be grown. If it is impossible to grow, however wet the conditions, more than five bags to the acre, then it is not worth planting.

Referring to a part of the Speech, the member for Mallee made a practical statement of the existing situation among agriculturists. The member for Mallee is by far the most expert of all the experts on this side of the House in the matter of agriculture. Various silos have certain grain capacities, and it is extremely important that the Government should take stock immediately of those supplies and to ensure that no grain is transported from where it is held until a factual summary has been made of the estimates of future conditions. I believe it was in 1967 that it was last necessary to call on bulk grain supplies for stock feeding and for sowing crops in the following season.

Mr. Boundy: And the barley growers stood the cost, not the Government.

Mr. WARDLE: As I am reminded, there was not a great hand-out from the Government, either in freight or in assistance to purchase the grain for resowing in 1968. In 1967, certain silos became empty because grain was trucked away to central ports, causing hardship when it had to be brought back to some areas for resowing in 1968. I hope that early preparation will be made to ensure that grain is retained in many silos throughout the State, so that it will be easy for farmers who must replace grain to have it, if not from the local silos, then in silos not far from their properties. The Government could help tremendously in helping to meet the

cost of freight, and also in retaining the existing price of various grains so that, when it comes to next year's sowing, for those who have sown this year and who will not reap a crop, at least next year grain will be available.

Land tax has been referred to in this House probably more often than any other tax over the past 12 months or 18 months. Perhaps I am not able to add much to what has been said, except that I want to discuss matters referred to by the member for Florey when he moved the adoption of the Address in Reply. He gave a lighthearted summary of his attendance at a meeting at Mount Barker.

Dr. Eastick: I don't think he really understood it.

Mr. WARDLE: The comment by the member for Light, although he was not present, is so true. It is obvious from what the member for Florey said on July 27, 1976 (page 208 of *Hansard*), that he did not understand the subject. He spoke about everything that happened, except that he did not say that three-quarters of the meeting was used to present sound and factual material about hardships created by land tax in country areas. One sentence used by the member for Florey states:

Speaker after speaker did nothing but castigate the Minister, although they did not know what they were talking about.

Unfortunately, the Minister was ill and could not attend the meeting. Several remarks that were made were rude, and it would have been better had they not been said. If the member for Florey was referring to the two or three speakers who were well versed in the impact of land tax, the scope of land tax, and the increased cost of land tax to people, especially those living in the Hills, his comment was foolish, because that meeting was given factual information, which was supported by many people in the hall at that time. Especially in the Hills area, it would seem that the so-called hobby farmer has been able to pay large sums for land, because it is a small area and because he has been able to dispose of a city property in order to enjoy life in open surroundings, with his family being able to have a pony and room to roam. They have gone to live in the Hills and to commute to the city to work.

The purchase price of a Hills property would be no great hardship to the purchaser, but it has a damaging reaction for the remaining property owners in the Hills, because of the increased value of land and the present system that uses that valuation for land tax and other taxes. This House was not given a factual statement of what happened at that meeting. I hope the member for Florey did take the initiative to at least inform the Minister of some of the results of facts that were presented to the meeting. It is obvious there has to be some system of varying the assessments made of properties where they are used for agricultural purposes, and when they are used for other purposes, such as keeping race horses or for the enjoyment of a family unit. I am sure members on this side look forward to amendments being made this session to the Land Tax Act so that some relief will be given to country people from this devastating tax.

School libraries are valuable possessions: in many respects they are the centre of the school, the centre of learning and of interest, and they are becoming increasingly important because of the value of resource centres in the modern school. Like other members, I am pleased to see that school libraries will become the property of the community to a greater degree. It is tragic that so many millions of dollars worth of resource centres should be locked at 3.30 p.m. each day when the school programme

ends. I am sure all our new school projects will have resource centres built in such a way that physically they can be opened during evening hours without people having access necessarily to any other parts of the school. I am sure there is a greater readiness by the community today, than there was in the past, to make use of library resource centres. With the increase in adult education throughout the State, it is obvious that these resource centres are going to be used more by the community. I believe when the present generation (who are accustomed to using resource centres) are married and have their families, these resource centres will become the centre of family patronage and that the whole family will visit these centres and derive many benefits from them. Quite clearly more activities can be created around these resource centres, in the form of adult education, than are being created at present. I think these activities will probably be of greater benefit to communities in rural areas. There have been greater chances in the metropolitan area in the past for adult education and many small rural centres have not had these facilities, but they are being created in many such areas at present.

I move on to the matter of maternity and paternity leave. While I have no doubt that there will be some benefits derived from this legislation, I believe that, under the present economic conditions, these advantages are doubtful as an aspect of an overall policy. I was interested in what Max Harris had to say with regard to the economy of the country. I have watched Max Harris's career and the portrait he gives of himself through his writings in the *Sunday Mail*, and I think the change of attitude I have detected in his writings for some years has been interesting. If his statements of today are compared to his statements of a year or two years ago, they make quite interesting comparisons.

Whilst he does not attempt to be an economist, I find some of his observations intriguing and much to the point. He is reported in the *Sunday Mail* of July 4, 1976, as follows:

The Metal Trades Union is left-dominated. The leaders want to see the mixed-economy system destroyed. Yet I feel more sympathetic to the rank and file of that union than I do to the power-workers, the oil-refinery people, or even air hosties.

Of course a lump came into my throat, the tears welled up, and I silently sobbed into the sink when I contemplated the power-workers coming strike campaign for a 35-hour week. The exhaustion, the heat, the dirt, the sheer physical output of these fellows make it only just that they should do less work than others for their present amount of money.

Of all industrial campaigns the raw demand for shorter working hours (that is, less productivity) is the one that is the most horrifically stupid in Australia's present circumstances.

The national cake isn't growing. With Britain recovering, Australia is nearly the slobbiest and most retarded of Western democracies, wallowing in inflation and dismal productivity to the bitter end.

People who want to make the cake even smaller by producing even less are the harbingers of national economic disaster.

I know a lot of bum-sitting occupations have already achieved a 35-hour week. That is an evil precedent for which spendthrift government bureaucracies are to blame.

Governments, as much as muscle unions, will be to blame if we become so backward and unproductive that we finish up as economic coolies of the gritty Germans, Americans, Japanese and French who've worked their way out of inflation, recession and unemployment.

I am closely associated with a primary industry which provides much food for the South Australian housewife (and it is tasty, delicious food), and I am sure the honourable member for Light would agree with me in this instance.

Dr. Eastick: Good white meat.

Mr. WARDLE: Not that I hope to be quoted among my red meat friends to that effect. This industry, because of the threatened 35-hour week in the power industry, is probably faced with the fact that each farmer will have to install his own electric generator to supply his own power needs. It seems obvious that throughout the coming summer the poultry industry is to be faced with this additional burden of \$5 000 or \$6 000 expenditure, in order to provide an electric generator, probably a diesel unit of sufficient horsepower to generate enough power to run 50 or 60 fans, and five or six electric motors to operate feeding equipment. The housewife will pay more a kilogram for her chicken, because of the imposition of this additional expenditure on people involved in the broiler industry.

Turning to outdoor advertising, I notice the Government is to introduce a Bill to achieve more effective and co-ordinated control of outdoor advertising. I say, emphatically, that I believe the Government employs double standards in advertising. As I come from my house to Parliament, I pass three signs (which have been placed by the Government) directing passing motorists' attention to the Woods and Forests Department nursery, and to the Monarto site. These signs are within 2 metres of the edge of the bitumen: they are at least 2 metres long, and the Monarto sign is about one metre deep. Two or three years ago all advertising was removed from near the Princes Highway, and all private individuals were required to take down hoardings and advertising signs.

Yet, as I pass through the townships of Murray Bridge and Nairne, there are signs on railway property measuring at least 2 metres deep by 4 metres long and advertising various commodities. I believe that, if the Government compels private individuals to remove advertising signs from near freeways, it should give the lead and set an example by taking down hoardings and advertising signs from its own properties that face the freeways. I hope that, when this legislation is introduced, we will find that the Government intends not to have double standards for outdoor advertising, but that it is willing to abide by the same rules by which it expects private enterprise to abide.

Many provisions of the Planning and Development Act are inconsistent and not in the best interests of South Australians. I know that, as much criticism has been directed towards the Act, the Government intends to amend it. I believe that, in many respects, this action has resulted from Opposition agitation about anomalies that occur in certain districts, thus bringing pressure, as well as the weight of legal opinions, on the Government to amend the Act. For instance, I know of a case in Jervois, which is a scattered township and in which dairies are a short distance apart; they are grouped in a long line along the edge of the reclaimed swamp. An employee has been employed there for more than 20 years by a farmer. When this employee retires, the farmer wants to give him, as a long service leave gift, the house the employee has lived in for 20 years. However, the farmer is unable to make the gift, even after 20 years faithful service by this employee. Under the Planning and Development Act (paragraph 2 of Information Sheet No. 24), if a farmer wishes to allow, for example, his son or relative to erect a house on his land and secure a separate title for that house, the Director will approve of the plan of resubdivision, provided that the proposed allotment is no greater than one hectare and the land is held in a single certificate of title current on December 1, 1972.

It so happens that this farmer has not had a son for the past 20 years who has wanted to live with him and help in his dairying operation, so he has employed this faithful employee for more than 20 years. Surely, any Planning and Development Act should be able to take into account the human considerations of the experiences of people. I believe that any hard-and-fast rule that does not permit the Act to allow for such an action is unrealistic and certainly not in the best interests of the people who must live under its control.

The Housing Trust in my area (and undoubtedly in the areas of many other members) has done a most creditable job in house building. Since I have been a member there has been a waiting list of about 100 people in the main centre seeking houses, but the waiting time has not varied much (from about six months to between 15 months and 16 months), and there is always a great demand for the trust's houses. The trust should be able to require affluent people to move from its dwellings, and I know that the member for Fisher and other members have referred to this matter in the House. Surely, one of the basic benefits of the trust is to house people who have no deposit, or much finance, and, therefore, depend on rental accommodation.

With a husband, wife, and adult children working, the total bring-home pay is probably between \$500 and \$600 a week, and surely various loans are available whereby these people should be able to rent or buy a dwelling. Thousands of the trust's houses could be made available for people who are unable to afford a deposit to purchase their house, whereas there are people living in the trust's houses who have that kind of capacity. I should like to see the Government reassess its policy, or undertake an investigation into the kind of benefits that would flow to the community, if this basic principle were implemented.

I turn now to the proposal the Government is considering to remove from our Statutes the ability for civil action for damages to be taken in industrial disputes and the removal of the present limitation on the power of the Industrial Commission as regards absolute preference to unionists. Many employees in various industries throughout my district are concerned about this legislation, or with the Government's attempt to amend the legislation to produce the desired result. There is still a firm desire among many people to be able to choose whether or not to belong to a union, and I am sure that many workers would pay union fees but dislike being told that they must join a union. I believe that many of them would readily pay their fees, if they were assured that part of the fees would, on request, be paid to a charity or to another political organisation. I see no reason why unions cannot pay a part of those dues to any political affiliation named by the member. These are the few matters on which I wanted to comment, and I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I appreciate the chance to address the House in reply to His Excellency the Governor's Speech at the opening of this Parliament. Before referring to the matters I want to bring to the attention of the House, I extend sympathy to those families to whom the Governor referred in his Speech. I refer to the families of the late Messrs. Ferguson, Hogben and Macgillivray. It is with some regret to me that His Excellency is to leave his high office in this State. I, as member for Alexandra, have enjoyed his company in my district, both on its mainland and island sections, several times during his term in office. Indeed, Sir Mark has held that position with the esteem and dignity that it

deserves. He has applied himself in public not only as a representative of the Crown but also as a true gentleman. I have respected him and have enjoyed his company on the occasions he has visited my district and, indeed, on the occasions I have met him in the grounds of Government House. Without reservation, I add my congratulations to those which have previously been extended to him for his grand work and the contribution he has made in this State during the term of his appointment as Governor.

As has normally been the case, His Excellency referred to the rural sector of the State. On this occasion he began by referring to the dry autumn and early winter season that we in this State are experiencing. He said that stock in the pastoral zones were generally in excellent condition. He qualified those remarks by saying that that condition would depend on follow-up rains. He said that horticultural crops, although generally thriving, depended on reasonable seasonal conditions in the latter part of the year.

Having paid my respects to His Excellency, I should now like briefly to deal with to specific matters involving measures that will be forthcoming during the present session. The Governor mentioned about 40 Bills in his Speech, and some of those Bills captured my attention. In paragraph 6 His Excellency referred to a Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Without going into great detail. I assure the House that I shall be involved in the debate on that measure, because it has disturbed me to note already the recent comments and threats made by a member of the Legislative Council.

It is amusing that the Government should refer, through His Excellency's Opening Speech, to its intention to proceed irrespective with Monarto. Monarto is a bit of an ever-green. It bobs up each time an opportunity arises to mention proposed works to be undertaken in this State. Each time it is brought to our attention, there seems to be even less evidence to support it. In my opinion, as I have said several times, the need for Monarto is being eroded progressively. When the need for Monarto disappears, the basis on which it can be justified will also disappear.

The Governor's reference to the appointment of a committee to investigate alternative means of dealing with land acquisition and rating disputes was a matter of interest to me. His Excellency stated that the subdivision and, hence, the removal from production of some of the best agricultural land in the State for hobby farmers and rural living areas was causing the Government considerable concern. I congratulate His Excellency for raising that matter. Since I have been a member of this House I have expressed concern about the wide, valuable and productive areas of this State that are either being covered by concrete and bitumen or taken up by people who are not interested in pursuing productive pursuits. In fact, they are sitting on useful land and not exercising any effort to produce from that land.

The people of this State are restricted already by the limited extent of high rainfall areas. It is in our short and long-term interest to make the best use of such land. If it is uneconomic to develop land of that nature in a rural manner now, it should not be laid aside or destroyed for future use by hobby farmers. When I looked at the proposed legislation to be introduced this session I was interested to note that, although there was much talk in the press at the beginning of the last session of Parliament about legislation to control meat processing in South Australia, the subject has been dropped altogether this session. It was not referred to in His Excellency's Speech, and there has been little mention in recent months of it.

Just before the opening of the last Parliament there was much press coverage about Bills dealing with abattoirs and meat. On September 25, 1975, it was reported in a statement made by the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Chatterton, that legislation was to be introduced into Parliament during October, 1975, to control health standards in rural slaughterhouses. The Minister said:

Meat killed in many country slaughterhouses was a health hazard. He was concerned about the quality of meat being sold in the country and some city areas. Many people are under the impression that country-killed meat is better than city-killed meat.

I do not intend entering into an argument about whether country-killed meat is better or worse than city-killed meat. However, I do intend to speak for most of the time available to me in this debate on the subject of meat processing generally. I make no excuses for discussing that topic, as it applies to my district in particular. I have no doubt that the standard of processing meat for human consumption is a matter that should be reviewed constantly and controlled carefully. Every effort should be made to establish regional abattoirs in South Australia so as to allow in a practical way maximum health care, maximum abattoir killing control, and maximum inspectorial control. It is hopeless, in my view, to talk of introducing legislation to inspect meat on hooks under the system we have now. To try to legislate to enforce the inspection of meat at every licensed slaughterhouse in South Australia (and there are about 150 of them, some slaughtering for only small consumption areas), would be unpractical and uneconomic and would unduly load the cost of the product. After having travelled around the State on a study of this subject, I admit that some country slaughterhouses are far below par and need either upgrading in their own right or amalgamating with nearby slaughtering premises so that the expenditure for their improvement is justified.

The matter of regional abattoirs is of vital interest to producers, particularly those in my community. It is a factor that should be taken into account in association with other factors when designing the shipping link of the future between Kangaroo Island and mainland South Australia. To co-ordinate this factor with others to ensure a satisfactory shipping service, I have whenever possible inspected meat processing works, studied meat processing reports and other consultant views, and had discussions to a limited extent while on tour in the northern part of Australia to gain information prior to submitting evidence to the transport committee, which in turn will be submitting a report to the Minister.

It was interesting to note a reply we received from the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries when seeking to establish entry for our meat into the metropolitan area, if and when we are able to establish an abattoir on Kangaroo Island. This is probably the most up-to-date correspondence we have had at departmental level, although over a considerable period much work has been done to gain evidence to establish that one regional works in this State should be on Kangaroo Island. Naturally, it is important that, before spending money (either ours or someone else's, or both), whether public or private investment, a market for the product be established. In a letter to the Minister on May 10, 1976, the Secretary of the Kangaroo Island Abattoir Investigation Committee brought to the attention of the Minister that his committee wished to express support for the Minister's moves to establish meat classification standards and procedures throughout Australia in an endeavour to cut costs and guarantee a fairer return to the producers. He went on so say:

As you know, there have been investigations carried out on behalf of a body of producers on Kangaroo Island into the feasibility of establishing an abattoir on the island. These moves were initiated by our member, Mr. Chapman, and are continuing. The following are some of the reasons for this move:

1. To cut costs.
2. To minimise meat wastage caused by stock being too long in the yard.
3. To create local employment.
4. To enable producers to diversify, e.g., to fat lambs and pigs—

that is, instead of confining their activities to woolgrowing and facing the problems of disposing of their surplus aged stock—

5. To release shipping space for other needs, e.g., grain and tourism.

We have suitable land available for this project and are negotiating forms of management and financing and marketing. However, there is little more we can do until we have established from you what percentage of total kill we could get into the metropolitan area.

We therefore ask for a guarantee of unrestricted access to the metropolitan area in the initial stages for meat from the proposed K.I. export abattoir. This would enable us to get our works operating and establish export markets. We would point out that most of our meat is now going to the metropolitan market. Classification will help us. A regional abattoir with classification will help us even more. We look forward to your support in this way for our project.

I will not go into the rest of the detail produced by the Secretary of the committee, but I shall place on record the reply of the Minister. He gave, in return correspondence, a warning, with regard to the project of an export works on Kangaroo Island, that, although a feasibility study had been undertaken, regard to the high standards of construction and operation demanded by the Commonwealth authorities for export works would be a matter the committee should take seriously into account. He said:

In your letter dated May 10, you seek a "guarantee of unrestricted access to the metropolitan area" of meat from the proposed works. I regret that I am unable to give this guarantee because the quantities which may be brought into the metropolitan abattoir area are prescribed by proclamation under the South Australian Meat Corporation Act, 1936-1974. The proclamation provides that the quantity of meat which may be brought into the metropolitan abattoir area from country export works shall not exceed 50 per cent by way of the total slaughterings at the country abattoir during a prescribed period, or one-seventh of the total metropolitan consumption of meat in the same period, whichever proportion may be the lesser. It is not necessary to continue with the detail the Minister passed on to the committee, because the point has already been made. He has demonstrated that a restriction is placed on enterprising districts or communities representing districts that want to get on with the job. That community, over many years, has clearly displayed its ability to produce good quality products generally, and good quality meat in particular. Over the years, however, it has been retarded and restricted in its activity; in order to dispose of its surplus stock, its export item, its quality goods are deteriorating in transit, they are unattractive on arrival, and they do not return a fair and reasonable figure for the product as it was in its initial state.

Whilst that community is being denied the processing of its own products and any real form of industrial development, and whilst there is little or no encouragement for it, those primary producers will continue to be at a disadvantage compared to the rest of the State. Admittedly, they enjoy one of the State's best and most reliable rainfalls. It is an old community in terms of settlement, but a young community in terms of development. Its dirt can be made soil with the careful attention and effort that it is now receiving. In the meantime,

handouts and grants are not required in large amounts, but at least some encouragement, such as the sort of encouragement sought by the meat industry committee, could and should be upheld by the Government to allow the sort of secondary industrial development that is deserved.

I shall now deal with the relationship between the meat industry on the island and shipping needs. The Minister and his officers, particularly marine surveyors, have made clear that the m.v. *Troubridge* is nearing the end of its economic life. By 1981, that ship will have to be either replated or replaced. I understand from the department that replating the *Troubridge* would be nearly as costly as replacing it. Australian shipyard costs are so high that it would be uneconomic to try to rebuild the vessel. Before replacing the *Troubridge*, it has been necessary to investigate not only the question of a type of vehicular ferry but also some other type of sea transport craft.

In the course of investigations, a trip to Darwin was made by Mr. Phil Keal, an officer of the Transport Department; Captain David Gibson, the present captain of the *Troubridge*; Councillor Dudley Kelly of Kingscote; Councillor Trethewey of Penneshaw; Councillor Gibbs of Kingscote; and me. We flew to Darwin, where our attention was directed particularly to the barge service, which has been operating between Port Darwin and its offshore islands for some years. One of the barge operators, Mr. Perkins, suggested that such a vessel might be suitable for plying between Kangaroo Island and the mainland. He claimed that his type of vessel could provide an adequate and economic service. The party arrived in Darwin on March 8, 1976, and looked at several aspects of the barge operation.

On the first day, the party flew to Melville Island and landed near Garden Point, where we waited for the arrival of the landing barge *Forcroy*, operated by the Perkins company. There is no doubt that that and other barges operating in and out of Darwin provide a service suited to the local demand. In fact, Chairman Mathew, one of the Aboriginal members of the Melville Island community, remarked favourably on the service they enjoyed. He said that it was considerably better than the service that the people had received in the previous year, when they had had to wait for up to two weeks for the vessel to come with supplies. However, he said that the ship was now arriving not more than a week outside its time table. A report in the *Islander* directly after the trip described any impression of the service as follows:

Kangaroo Island rural production and the tourist industry is far too valuable to risk trading with any fly-by-night operator. Nothing but the best quality service should be considered acceptable. It would indeed be a retrograde step to sacrifice the present quality and regularity of service for what may be a slightly cheaper alternative system. The article went into the details of the Darwin barge operation. Other investigations have been conducted into hovercraft-type vessels, conventional ships and long-term and short-term operations for the future. My findings allow me to say now that clearly there has not been sufficient evidence put forward to indicate a better route between Kangaroo Island's port or ports than the route now traversed. The only feasible and economic alteration I would suggest would be to have a mainland connecting link at Outer Harbor, rather than in the Port River. If the evidence indicates that there may be more favourable sites south of Outer Harbor (for example, at Myponga Beach, Rapid Bay or Second Valley), I would be happy to study them. Clearly, before the details of the ship's design are decided, we should more carefully consider the future

type of cargo to be lifted to and from Kangaroo Island. We should also carefully consider the question of a meat processing works on Kangaroo Island.

It is fruitless to plan a long-term, permanent shipping service designed to carry livestock if, in fact, our livestock will be processed on the island and exported in a processed form. It is also foolish not to have regard to other cargo elements. I am aware that a separate shipping company is preparing a quote for the transport of the whole of Kangaroo Island's superphosphate from the mainland to the island. If superphosphate is removed from the cargoes of the Government owned shipping link, naturally the design of the ship will be affected. A careful study should be made of whether or not passengers should be carried on the vessel. Without appearing to favour any particular airline company, I would say that Airlines of South Australia has provided the Kangaroo Island community with a good service at a fair price.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN: Airlines of South Australia has provided a sound service to Kangaroo Island. Good services are provided by associated airline companies, Emu Airways and Port Augusta Air Services to their respective parts of the island. Airlines of South Australia should be protected in respect of its priority use of the main airport.

Mr. Boundy: How is the tarmac?

Mr. CHAPMAN: The tarmac is not the best. Regarding the future transportation needs of Kangaroo Island, I foresee the future sea service by a type of vehicular ferry, and hopefully such a transport vessel will be faster than the existing one. I hope it will cater for appropriate traffic. Some cargo could be better dealt with by other facilities. For example, livestock could be retained on the island for processing in an abattoirs, a matter to which I have already referred to at some length. Superphosphate could be transported from Adelaide to Kangaroo Island by separate contract. Passengers should be encouraged to use the air service whenever possible. A vessel of the swiftest and most sophisticated type should be designed to transport tourist cars (hopefully in large volumes), and general merchandise.

Having talked about the service, I now refer to the rates that should apply. As Kangaroo Island is a real and valuable part of South Australia, the service that I have outlined should be included as an integral part of the State's transport corridor and passenger, merchandise and cargo space rates should be parallel to the rates applying on country rail services over comparable distances.

I now refer to the other half of my district in the second half of the time allocated to me in this debate. It seems only reasonable that, when one has a geographically divided district, one should pay equal attention to each. The Fleurieu Peninsula is the most attractive and productive area of the State.

Mr. Mathwin: What about a casino?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am pleased that the honourable member has raised that subject. One of the first issues raised shortly after I entered Parliament in 1973 was the suggested casino at Victor Harbor. I did not know much about casinos, as I had been involved in gambling in a minor way only at racecourses and similar places. However, I took the opportunity available to me and visited the Wrest Point casino in Tasmania in early 1973. In a report in the *Advertiser* of May 16, 1973, my short stay in Tasmania was alluded to by a staff writer under the banner "Keep casinos out of South Australia, says gambling M.P."

Despite the fact that three years has since passed, in no circumstances do I move from that attitude. Despite the efforts of promoters of casinos, both within and without South Australia, no-one has come up with sufficient evidence to change my mind about the need for a casino in South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Why do you go to Tasmania every year to visit the casino?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I like it.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Why do you seek to deprive others of that right?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am not depriving them: Wrest Point is there for them to enjoy.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You will not agree to having one built in South Australia.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Not in South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You get a free fare to Tasmania; many people do not.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I will go into detail on this matter if I am pressed. However, I invite good reasons why we should have a casino here. The only reason that has been advanced by even the most skilled promoters so far is that a casino is a necessary part of a sporting and convention complex in order to make those other facilities pay. I am amazed that this should be the only basis advanced to justify a casino in South Australia. No mention has been made that it will be of useful benefit to any part of or the whole community.

The only promoting element in the whole of the exercise by the skilled consultants and interested parties is that it will make a profitable enterprise for investors, but no valuable points have been raised in order to promote it for any other reason. I cannot agree, on such flimsy evidence, that we should support the establishment of a casino in this State.

Mr. Allison: The investors say that they are doing it for the good of the State, and not for themselves.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I thank the member for Mount Gambier for throwing that in. Several potential investors have ventilated the attitude that they are really doing it only for the benefit of the people and not for themselves. We need still more evidence on that. I have never criticised the atmosphere that prevails around a sound tourist enterprise and I have never criticised the manner in which the Wrest Point casino is conducted.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You want to play yourself but you don't want anybody else to play. You want the whole of Tasmania's casino to yourself. I cannot go to Tasmania, so I want it here so that I can play here. Isn't that my right?

Mr. CHAPMAN: You are Wright by name but I do not know about your politics or nature.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I am not talking about politics; I am talking about the right to do freely what I want to do in this society.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The opportunity will be there for the Minister to exercise his rights and ventilate his feelings on this matter soon.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I shall be supporting it.

Mr. CHAPMAN: It will be interesting to hear the Minister and his supporting colleagues put forward the reason why he and they think it is in the State's and the people's interests to have a casino because so far they have not been able to come forward with reasons.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You support Tasmania's right to have a casino, so you can fly across there and play; you are a hypocrite.

Mr. CHAPMAN: It is not for me to say whether I support their right to have it; we do not have a say in that. They have, by legislation, allowed a casino complex to be licensed there, and it is still part of a free country and every Australian can go there. I take this opportunity of dealing with a few matters involving the rest of my district.

Mr. Langley: Have you any Aborigines in your district?

Mr. CHAPMAN: No, we do not have any Aborigines there. They were not there when I came into the mainland sector of the electorate. There are none on Kangaroo Island and I have not met any on the mainland sector of the district since becoming its representative. If and when any should desire to move into the area, I hope they fall into line with the climate that exists there—that they pull their weight and do a day's work for a day's pay; otherwise we do not want them.

Mr. Langley: What about those poor retired farmers living at Encounter Bay?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I do not know that we have that many poor retired farmers in Encounter Bay. We have a number of farmers there who farmed their land well, applied themselves well in their respective communities throughout the State, and chose to retire there, and what better place to choose than the South Coast? There are a few problems down there, one of which is in Victor Harbor itself, the district to which the honourable member has directed his interjection. We have the ordinary voluntary fire-fighting services throughout our community; they are to be commended for their work. However, I mention the rather run-down outfit in Victor Harbor itself. The premises and the equipment that have been provided to our local fire brigade in Victor Harbor are at a low ebb and, as I have limited opportunity, along with my colleagues in this place, to raise such matters here, I will take a moment or two of my Address in Reply speech to pursue this matter.

It has been a fairly long-term desire of that fire brigade organisation in Victor Harbor to have its equipment upgraded. Indeed, that is long overdue. We have a large hospital and a healthy community generally, and great assets that require protection. Some assistance from the Government in the provision of facilities in that township area would be well received and properly cared for and used by those people. It is a pity that the Minister of Works has slipped out of the Chamber for a moment. I had some matters that I wanted to raise in the House while he was present, but perhaps the Minister of Labour and Industry would pay attention to me for a moment while I refer to water supply services.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I listen to every word you say; you know that. I will contradict you if you are wrong.

Mr. CHAPMAN: We have heard the Minister of Works recently tell us how difficult it is to supply water to remote areas where the capital costs cannot be justified in relation to the ratable return.

Mr. Wotton: He was referring more particularly to the Strathalbyn district.

Mr. CHAPMAN: It applies in my district, too, in some cases where there is insufficient ratable property to justify such major expense. I call on the Government to investigate this matter closely, because these districts are being referred to by honourable members on both sides of the House.

Many of us are embarrassed about the lack of opportunity within the present policy ever to have a system in our remote areas. I believe a formula should be

prepared by the Engineering and Water Supply Department to allow for a greater contribution to be made by the respective ratepayers so as to enhance the possibility of having a scheme. Mount Compass comes to my mind. The Government has spent much money there in finding water and providing a bore that would supply sufficient water to cover the needs of the adjacent community. Having done that and then studied and costed the plan for supplying the township, it finds it is an uneconomic exercise to pursue, so the district is left with a bore and plenty of water but no distribution of it.

There is a classic example of where, if the Government was to amend or adjust its policy so as to allow a greater rate to apply to that small number of ratepayers, perhaps the scheme could be proceeded with. However, at this stage we have a State rating system but no flexibility of policy to allow any change where there are special circumstances. I have no doubt that the ratepayers in that community, in order to get this necessary service, would be prepared to enter into a special agreement with or without their local government authority.

Mr. Langley: Have you made a move to the Minister on that score?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Yes, I have.

Mr. Langley: What is the answer to that?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I should like the Minister to consider that and several other areas in my district on the same basis. We have put up at least four propositions to the Minister about a proposed supply to American River, and each of those propositions has been unacceptable, because we find that we are stuck with this basic policy of the department where 10 per cent shall be recoverable under the current rating system; that is, 10 per cent of the capital involved in the scheme. If ever we are going to supply water on an equitable basis throughout the State, enabling those in remote areas to receive these services, we must be more flexible in applying the scheme.

Another matter I will touch on is the vandalism going on in our South Coast community. In recent weeks several breakings and enterings have occurred; in fact, I had my own electoral office at Victor Harbor broken into recently.

Mr. Coumbe: So did I.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I recall that the honourable member told me that his office had also been entered by unauthorised persons. The jewellery shop, several other premises in the main street and an alarming number of houses were recently entered by unauthorised persons. I cast no reflection on local members of the Police Force; they are limited in numbers and resources, and are doing their best to keep this matter under control. For the purposes of at least drawing this matter to the Attorney-General's attention on this occasion, I ask that consideration be given to expanding the available Police Force and/or the facilities necessary to keep this vandalism and unauthorised entry under control.

I have had the nod from my colleague the member for Glenelg, who, I know, is anxious to get on with his contribution to the debate. Throughout my speech I have carefully refrained from being critical of the Government, because of the number of points I wanted to raise in relation to my own district.

Dr. Eastick: Haven't you something to say about the Minister of Labour and Industry?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I could go on and talk about him all evening. If I thought he would listen, I would seek to do so, but he does not take much notice of what I say.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the shearers on Kangaroo Island?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I tried desperately today to ask the Minister a question about shearers, but he—

Mr. Langley: Tell us about the Land Settlement Committee, so we know what's going on.

Mr. CHAPMAN: That is a bit unfair, because the honourable member knows that I am working with his colleagues and my colleagues on that subject, on which it is not fair to comment while the study is going on. He ought to know better than to raise that matter.

Mr. Langley: I thought you might give us a little insight.

Mr. CHAPMAN: One other matter that concerns me is the gross delays occurring in the State Planning Authority. Although I do not have much evidence with me in the Chamber to put before the House, I have one example of where it appears to me that there could be a shake-up in the authority or a revision of its policies in the handling of applications. A constituent of mine applied to establish a caravan park, and his application went before the District Council of Port Elliot and Goolwa in early September, 1975. He submitted with his initial application a sketch plan of his proposal, and on September 15, 1975, council wrote to the applicant and said that it agreed with the principle of the proposal and that, as the area was under interim development control, approval must be obtained from the State Planning Authority. The authority was duly furnished with an official application on October 27, 1975.

The applicant was called in, and discussions were held with the authority's officers on December 18, 1975. It would appear from the records that further information was required from the applicant. However, a further request was made for amended copies on January 27, 1976. About five months later, on May 27, 1976, along came an objection from the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and at or about that time an objection came in from the Environment Department. So, altogether, eight months elapsed between the time when the first application was made and the time when objections were received from the respective departments. To really rub salt into the wound the applicant was furnished with an official refusal from the State Planning Authority that had attached to it the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would not be in accord with the aims and objectives of the Outer Metropolitan Area Development Plan.
2. The proposed development would cause problems relative to the health, safety and convenience of the community.
3. There would be disadvantages to the community of developing the locality within which the land is situated.
4. The proposed development would adversely affect the conservation of the native fauna in the locality and the preservation of the nature, features and general character of the locality.
5. The proposed development would tend to increase pollution in the locality in which the land is situated.

Despite that long list of reasons for refusal, received eight months after the application had been lodged, the district council (the one body one would have expected to have some idea of the kind of development which was desired in the area, which would suit the area, and which would blend in with the requirements of the public generally), wrote to the State Planning Authority, and I have pleasure in supporting its view. The council, referring to the refusal to allow a caravan complex to be established on section 2198, hundred of Hindmarsh, North Goolwa (in the names of A. P. Quirke and R. Henley), stated:

I advise that the council is very perturbed at the refusal by the State Planning Authority with regard to this proposal. Council is of the definite opinion that this park could be an asset to the area and also of great benefit to the public in general, not only the ratepayers of this area, and we respectfully request that the authority recon-

sider their decision. Several councillors have lived in this area all their lives and are intensely interested in flora and fauna and have spent years of their lives on the Murray River in this area and we would be only too pleased to discuss this further with you.

That is what I regard as a gross disregard of local opinion and, more particularly, authority. It demonstrates also a gross delay in processing what would appear to be perfectly reasonable applications. Whether or not it is desirable to have the caravan park is up to the authorities concerned, but I close on this note of criticism of the State Planning Authority for having delayed its decision, thereby delaying those apparently responsible applicants some eight months. In my view, of the evidence supplied a decision could have been made immediately after receiving the original application.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): In speaking in support of the motion, in common with other speakers I first express my sympathy to the families of those former members of this Chamber who have died since the Governor made his Opening Speech last year. I refer to Mr. Jim Ferguson, whom I knew and who was a member of the Party on the Opposition benches. He sat close to me and, indeed, gave me good advice at times when I was only a new member of the Parliament. Although I did not know the other two gentlemen, I express my sympathy to the people they have left behind.

I also congratulate His Excellency the Governor, Sir Mark Oliphant, on his term of office, as the Speech he delivered on June 8 was the last Speech that he will have delivered to the South Australian Parliament. I pay him a tribute for the excellent manner in which he has performed his duties over the years. It has been a pleasure to listen to Sir Mark on many occasions. He has often promoted different matters for public discussion, and has not been, as some people originally thought he might be, a "Yes" man for the Government. Sir Mark Oliphant has done an excellent job as Governor, and I congratulate him and Lady Oliphant on the marvellous work they have done.

I now refer to paragraph 6 of His Excellency's Speech, which relates to a matter that has, of course, been a hardy annual for many years: the matter of civil actions for damages. In this respect, the Government is going to protect union members by ensuring that disputes relating to civil actions for damages should be resolved in the tribunals specifically provided for the purpose. A Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act will also propose the removal of the present limitation on the power of the Industrial Commission to provide in its awards for absolute preference to members of trade unions. Despite what the Premier or the Government says, this means that we are to have compulsory unionism. There is no doubt about it, and no-one can tell me the difference. Even Government members who have had much trade union experience cannot tell me the difference between absolute preference to unionists and compulsory unionism. The simple fact is that there is no difference. This means that, unless a person joins a union, he will be out of a job. It is as simple as that, and such a person will not be selected for a job.

Mr. Harrison: Not out of a job. They won't have a job unless they decide.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is the same sort of thing.

Mr. Harrison: It is a different thing altogether.

Mr. MATHWIN: I know that the member for Albert Park would argue this matter right out, but he knows as well as I do that absolute preference to unionists means

compulsory unionism and, unless a person joins a union, he is sacked and put out of a job. He must therefore join a union.

Mr. Harrison: The conditions of employment were fully explained by the member for Spence in his contribution to the debate.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am pleased that the honourable member referred to the member for Spence, as I was going to congratulate that honourable member on his speech. I believe it was one of the best speeches that I have heard from any Government member. Indeed, he was able to grasp the nettle in most of the things to which he referred. He drew attention to the findings of the Productivity and Promotion Council of Australia. Indeed, he is one of South Australia's representatives thereon. He referred to high productivity and said that, if this was achieved, it would promote a higher standard of living for everyone in South Australia. He pointed out, as well he might, and as we on this side of the Chamber understand it, that the responsibility in this respect lies with two sections of the community: the employers and employees.

So often, it has been found that, when employers have tried to introduce incentives, a bonus or other types of scheme, most union officials have been against them from the outset. Indeed, many unions, particularly the metal trade unions, will not support bonus incentive schemes in any shape or form, as Government members well know. Incentives and bonuses are dirty words to some of these people.

Mr. Langley: If they're more efficient, they drop—

Mr. MATHWIN: That is not true, and the member for Unley knows it. I am sure that when the member for Unley, in his previous vocation, wanted to give his men certain bonuses or incentives, as I did to my men, he did not do so to get his employees down to a certain price: he did it because he wanted to reward them for getting on with the job and producing more. That meant that it was better for him as well as for the State generally. I say that in all honesty about the member for Unley, and I presume he would say the same about me.

Mr. Langley: No, you are talking about process workers.

Mr. MATHWIN: I know that most people who receive incentive payments, whether they are in the toolshop or in other areas, enjoy taking home bonus pay, and getting higher wages in return for their work.

Mr. Langley: That is absolute nonsense.

Mr. MATHWIN: The member for Mount Gambier has reminded me that in Russia incentives are given to workers on the shop floor to encourage them to produce more. If it is good enough for the far-out communists, surely it is good enough for my socialist friends opposite.

Mr. Olson: How can you talk of incentives when you have got 460 000 people out of a job and increased productivity? Tell me that.

Mr. MATHWIN: If members of Parliament had to work in this way, Senator Cameron, a member of the Labor Party, would have had to retire from Parliament 12 months ago.

Mr. Olson: Yes, but he hasn't done so.

Mr. MATHWIN: That is so. However, I will not deal further with that matter. I refer now to paragraph 7 of His Excellency's Speech, in which the following appears:

The Monarto Development Commission is currently engaged on a study—

another study; we have had studies on Monarto, Redcliff, and so on—

for the redevelopment of the Port Adelaide central business area for the State Planning Authority.

We all know what happened at Port Adelaide not long ago in relation to the proposed Myer shopping complex. That is history, and what a sordid history it is! I wonder what on earth is going to be done at Port Adelaide. Is the Government going to offer to buy sections of the Port Adelaide area? How many of the shops there would be willing to sell out and go to a different site? Unless my guess is wrong, there would not be many. It will be interesting to see the double somersaults that the Government does if ever that scheme comes to fruition, which I doubt.

In paragraph 16 of His Excellency's Speech, one sees that the State Planning Authority is continuing its land acquisition programme for further open spaces in the metropolitan area and in some country areas. One wonders where and how the commission will go. The Premier often boasts about the vineyards that we have in this State. He has said that we are the only State in this country, and perhaps in the world, that has vineyards in its capital city's metropolitan area. He has said that we must preserve these vineyards because, once they go, we will never see their like again. He has said that they are a tourist attraction and that we must therefore do all we can to preserve them. But what has happened? At every given opportunity, and with a snap of the fingers, our vineyards are bulldozed flat. As honourable members know, this happened at Morphettville recently. Still another area in that vicinity is planted to vines and could be preserved by the State Planning Authority. Paragraph 18 of His Excellency's Speech states:

My Government is continuing to give effect to its intention to maintain and improve the public transport system within the State—

what a failure that is, too—

in order to provide an alternative to the use of the private car, and achieve a better balance between public and private means of transport.

An improvement at what price? Some time ago the Minister of Transport announced that it was Government policy to have no freeways in South Australia for the next 10 years. If the Government does not build freeways but closes many roads leading into main roads and builds median strips to stop cars from crossing from one side of a road to another, it will force more and more traffic on to roads that were not built, even in the wildest dreams of those who planned the roads, to take such a heavy traffic volume. The Government will say to people wishing to cross these roads, "It is all very well to try and get across, but you will have to take your chances. We have made a mistake; we have made freeways where people are not allowed to get in or out."

Brighton Road is a good example, because the Government is closing many roads that lead into that road and installing median strips in the centre of it. The Government has failed to get its priorities right. The Government's main idea now is to create a free flow of traffic on roads. If this is Government policy, the Government's first priority must be to install pedestrian-activated crossings to enable very young and old people to cross the roads concerned. It is no use the Government's providing for through traffic first and then saying, "If you want activated crossings at, say, Glenelg, Somerton and Brighton you must go on the priority system," because you could be number 138 in priority in South Australia.

In the meantime old people cannot cross main roads. That situation is occurring on Brighton Road. School-children cannot cross the road to get to school, because the traffic is so dense and because a crossing has not been provided for them to do so. Such a situation applies to

the crossing at Hove near the aged citizens' centre and the school. The experts we rely on so much because they know more and more about less and less tell us that median strips in the centre of main roads are a haven for people crossing the road. They say that the median strip enables people to wait in safety in the centre of the road until the road clears and they can cross to the other side.

I was in the unfortunate situation recently where I had to go to the rescue of an old person who was stranded on one of these median strips. She was petrified by traffic that was passing on either side of her. It is necessary for old people after reaching median strips to step up on to the island. Many old people suffer with cataracts and cannot see the step, and hence they fall over. Later, they must cross over the other half of the road. The Government has its priorities wrong, because if traffic is to be forced on to main roads old and young people must be catered for so they can cross in safety from one side of a road to the other. If that procedure is followed, by all means the Government can then proceed with its policy of free-flow traffic.

I have received several letters, one from Glengowrie High School and another from Morphetville Park school, concerning the bus depot in that area. Glengowrie High School is concerned about school lights being erected so that children can get safely from one side of the road to the other, and Morphetville Park school says that children will have to contend with extra traffic and that an activated crossing has not been provided for young people to cross the road.

The Governor in his Speech referred to the north-eastern section of the Adelaide metropolitan area. I understand that a review of that area is being carried out. The review for the first time seeks major public participation in the transport planning process not only from the potential users of the transport system eventually proposed but also from those who may be affected by its construction and operation. I suppose the Government will assess what people believe is needed, but will then do exactly the same as it did regarding the Morphetville bus depot—take no notice of the public and build it.

Many hundreds of people objected to the erection of that depot. The Government will, in the north-eastern section of the Adelaide metropolitan area, wash its hands of the situation, just as it did at Morphetville. A firm was employed on the Morphetville project to liaise between the Government and the public in relation to that project. The Government whittled down and blocked queries one by one until eventually the committee worked itself into a corner. The consultants' fees for the Morphetville bus depot were \$14 000. I asked a question recently and ascertained that the same people would be employed on this project. I suppose they will be employed for the same purpose—to soften up the public so that the Government can do what it wishes. That committee is costing the taxpayer money. If what I fear is to happen in the north-eastern area, I am sorry for the people who live there. I believe they should be warned about the tactics adopted in these matters.

People who are not used to this sort of treatment are easily taken in by it, and the situation can be easily turned around by saying, "It is no use objecting to it. The Government has the power to do it. If I were you, I would try to come to terms with the committee, tell it what I wanted in a friendly way, and not object too much. In that way things will be all right." I hope the people in

the area concerned take an interest in the project and ascertain from the Morphetville experience what happens in situations like this.

Mr. Coumbe: They are going through my district.

Mr. MATHWIN: Are they? The honourable member should tell his people what they are in for. I would be glad to talk to them. I was referring to the situation in which the Bus and Tram Division wanted the bus depot. It brought out an environmental impact statement, and passed it to another Government department to get approval.

Dr. Eastick: Is it similar to the Monarto commission's looking at the Adelaide Hills?

Mr. MATHWIN: It is a repetition of that. The Bus and Tram Division got the idea of how to manipulate it. The whole breakdown of the situation is that, with an environmental impact statement, it is quite ridiculous to have one Government department bringing in a report and another department assessing it and approving it.

Mr. Coumbe: It is like Caesar to Caesar.

Mr. MATHWIN: Just like that. I wonder whether the Minister for the Environment has stretched his wings to see what I could only call a monstrosity in this State. I have seen nothing so bad for many years. I am drawing to the attention of this Parliament what I call Rockville, a place fit for Barney Rubble and Fred Flintstone. I am speaking, of course, of the Parkholme overpass. I would be amazed if there was anything about that overpass of which the Government could be proud. The train line goes above the road, and there is an embankment of 5 m or 6 m of rock and rubble. One can see underneath the trains. When the express goes past, I would not be surprised if the children and workers go along and put the stones back. The poor people who live in the houses facing the embankment must wonder what sort of world they are in.

If this had happened 200 years ago, perhaps we could have been proud of its construction. If it had been constructed in a pass in India, we could have thought that it had been done with coolie labour, that they had done their best, and that it was a good job. However, in this day and age such a monstrosity is a disgrace to the Government. To talk about environment and then to look at that overpass would make any good Minister for the Environment, like the Sleeping Beauty, go to sleep for 100 years. That is what he should do. I wonder what will happen when the rats find that they can live in the rocks and that non-one can get at them.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It is a wonder you are not moving in.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is not in my territory, but in the territory of the Minister of Transport. Some time ago, I asked the estimated cost of the overpass and I was told that it was \$1 160 000. That was in February. I would say that if it had cost a cent it would have cost \$2 000 000. I asked how many tonnes of earth filling were used on the overpass and I was told that 50 000 tonnes of rubble and earth had been poured into it; I was not told how many tonnes of rock were involved. I asked whether tenders had been called for a precast concrete bridge or overpass, and I was told they had not been. Obviously, the Government believes that the liveability of people facing such a monstrosity need not be considered.

I wondered whether we were short of engineers and people who could build a decent overpass of precast concrete, as is done elsewhere in the world. It is not necessary, of course, to travel abroad to know what I am talking about. A few weeks ago I went to a function put on by

the Minister of Transport at the Highways Department. There I picked up a pamphlet explaining (with pride, mind you!) the types of bridge being built in South Australia. I had wondered whether the Parkholme monstrosity was too long, but the pamphlet explained that the object of the Bridge Design Branch was to design structures to provide adequate waterways for streams or clearances for vehicles on roadways over which bridges are built. It is stated that care is taken to ensure that each bridge is environmentally and aesthetically acceptable. The pamphlet explained that the Fleming bridge, at Noarlunga, had a length of 95 m. It is a precast concrete bridge, pleasant to the eye, with not a loose rock to be seen. The Pedlar Creek bridge has a length of 152.4 m, and it is the highest in the State. We can build high bridges, but we cannot do it in the city because we do not worry about the city people. The Swanport bridge is to be opened in 1978. It is to be a precast structure and will be the State's longest bridge, with a length of 744 m. Its simple lines will feature long spans to provide good riding qualities and to reduce expansion joint maintenance. The Kingston bridge is 239.3 m in length, and the Port Augusta bridge, built in 1972, is 545 m long. The Crafers interchange bridge is 46.2 m long. I also refer to the Stirling interchange bridge, the Old Mount Barker Road overpass, and the Carey Gully Road overpass, which is a continuous steel frame structure with a concrete deck. There is also the Bridgewater interchange bridge.

The Shepherd Hill overpass, which took a long time to construct because it had two men and a dog working on it, consists of twin concrete structures; at least it is worth looking at. So, we are able to build these bridges. Indeed, if the Minister had asked the Army to provide a Bailey bridge which would take a railway line, that bridge would have looked much better than the shocking disgrace that is there now. The Swanport bridge, which will be 744 m long, will be 137 m longer than the existing structure at Murray Bridge, which is currently the longest road bridge in South Australia. So, we have the ability, the engineers, the know-how, and the workers to construct good bridges and overpasses. The Swanport bridge incorporates two traffic lanes and a footpath. The new 10.3 m wide structure uses two 3.3 m deep continuous welded steel plate girders as the main structural elements and crosses over 244 m of river channel flanked on the western side by swampy flats, and by gently rising ground on the eastern side.

So, it is easy for the Highways Department to construct bridges and for the Government to call tenders for pre-cast structures. Admittedly, it would cost a little more to build a pre-cast concrete structure but, if it is to last for the next 300 years, surely some thought should be given to the environment before such structures are erected, instead of constructing the shocking rubble town that is there for all to see for the next 200 years. It is a disgrace to the Government. I invite any member, who has not been there, to inspect the bridge and to seek people's opinions on it; if that member later tells me that the bridge is beautiful, I will think that there is something wrong with either his eyes or his head.

Last year, I was upset about the Kirby report. Under the previous Federal Government, a demand had been made that kindergartens should diversify, to take in older children and latchkey children. If kindergartens had not done that, there would have been a financial problem in connection with 75 per cent of the salaries of kindergarten teachers. I objected on the ground that kindergartens catered for younger children and, if older children

attended kindergartens, the equipment would have been broken. This would have been unfair to the people who had provided the equipment. It would therefore be difficult for kindergartens to cater for these older children.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: They did not have to. The children could have gone into a toy library.

Mr. MATHWIN: I do not think that that is correct. However, the Minister may have obtained some additional information. I hope the Minister succeeded in changing the policy.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: The situation was more flexible than you are suggesting.

Mr. MATHWIN: I hope so. The matter has now been raised again. People from the Community Welfare Department and the higher echelons of the kindergarten organisation are saying that kindergartens must diversify; otherwise, they will not get any federal money. If they do not bring in outside welfare organisations, the kindergartens will have to close down. I asked the federal member for my district, Mr. Chapman, to contact the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security (Senator Margaret Guilfoyle), who replied:

On June 2, 1976, the Commonwealth Government established an Office of Child Care within the Department of Social Security, headed by Mrs. Marie Coleman, former Chairman of the Social Welfare Commission. This new office is to advise the Government on national policy for children and families. It will administer a comprehensive programme of services for children and families and will subsume the functions of the former Interim Committee for the Children's Commission.

The Government has set aside \$73 300 000 for children's services this financial year. It compares favourably with the \$64 000 000 spent on children's services in 1975-76.

So, there is a big difference between the \$64 000 000 provided by the Whitlam Government and the \$73 000 000 provided by the Fraser Government. Although Government members thump the Federal Government, there has been a continuing increase in allocations in this field.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: What about the year before?

Mr. MATHWIN: The Whitlam Government created inflation. This country did not know much about inflation until the Whitlam Government took office. Senator Guilfoyle continued:

Commonwealth assistance to pre-schools is presently 75 per cent of the salaries of agreed staff, subject to those services moving to extend their activities to provide for a wider range of childhood and family services from the pre-school. This can mean providing extra services, such as outside school hours care, parent education, occasional care or playgroup activities, or it can simply mean bringing other health, welfare and care services together at the pre-school.

Mothers and babies groups can meet in such centres providing small health care and welfare services as well as pre-school facilities. That is all that can be meant, and the panic that has been caused by some people in the community regarding kindergartens is wrong.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: It always was.

Mr. MATHWIN: If the Minister knows that is the case it is unfortunate that he has not told these people, because this matter comes under his wing.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That is exactly what officers of the Kindergarten Union have been telling people for over a year.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am sorry to say that that is not so, as I was at a meeting only two weeks ago, and that was not the case. I am not blaming the State Minister for this at all. However, I am saying that these stories are being spread, they are wrong and they should be stopped, and it is up to the Minister to stop them.

The Hon. D. J. Hoggood: I wonder whether there has been malicious misinterpretation on occasions?

Mr. MATHWIN: That could be so. Regarding road safety, I bring to the attention of Parliament a report in the *Advertiser* of July 3, 1976, under the heading "Space garb for police". Reference is made in this report to new waterproof suits for South Australian motor cycle policemen, as follows:

Silver suits were ordered from the British maker because they would be more visible during day and night traffic operations. The suits have a yellow and black stripe on the arms for added safety in low visibility.

Does the Government believe that silver is a safe colour? If that is the case, the Government does not know what it is talking about. Government members must be walking around with their eyes closed. Have Government members seen silver-suited motor cyclists or cyclists in the early morning or late afternoon or when the light is getting dim? Silver is a dangerous colour to wear. It is ridiculous to suggest such garb as the official police motor cycle uniform.

Police in most cases are there to be seen, whether they are on point duty, whether they are looking after schools or whether they are attending accidents. It is ridiculous for the Government to expect police officers to wear a silver-grey uniform. If South Australian police are to be seen wearing a safety uniform, it should be bright orange or yellow (I prefer yellow with a black stripe because they are the colours of the football team I greatly admire). I suggest that the Government examine this matter, because the new uniform constitutes a danger, not only to the police themselves but also to the people, whom the police try to protect. Silver-grey is a dangerous colour to wear, as it is hard to see when it is nearly dark.

While referring to motor cycle police, I draw the Government's attention to the safety helmets worn by these officers. Many motor cyclists would not in any circumstances drive without a full-face helmet, yet police safety helmets cover only the top and back of the head. This is dangerous. If the Government wants to protect its employees, the police, who certainly deserve protection, they should be provided with full-face helmets. How have the existing helmets satisfied the Police Force safety requirement when these helmets do not provide adequate protection.

Mr. Olson: What are the views of the Police Association on these points?

Mr. MATHWIN: I have not asked.

Mr. Olson: It might be advisable if you contacted it.

Mr. MATHWIN: I say what I believe is right.

Mr. Olson: You should consider the practicalities of the men who must wear these helmets before you make such complaints.

Mr. MATHWIN: We must protect the men wearing safety garb. Can the member for Semaphore say, as an ex-union secretary, that when spectacles or protective glasses were provided to employees that, if the employees did not want to wear them, they did not have to do so? Was that the principle followed by the honourable member?

Mr. Olson: If it were not for the unions, employees would not have got such equipment.

Mr. MATHWIN: I should have thought that the honourable member would be interested only in ensuring the safety of the individual. Certainly, the only adequate safety helmet for a motor cyclist is a full-face helmet. Comfort and appearance are not important: what matters is the protection of the man using the helmet. I am surprised that the member for Semaphore made such an

interjection because, as a union man, he knows the importance of protecting his union members. Surely he would encourage the use of safety apparel, and the same situation should apply in respect of police helmets and motor cycle suits.

In his Speech, the Governor had nothing to say about tourism, yet it has been the Premier's baby for so long that I would have thought some mention would be made of it. The Premier has often boasted about tourism in South Australia. How often have we heard about the Mediterranean-type restaurants needed to attract tourists to South Australia? We have often had raised in this House the matter of building in Victoria Square a hotel of international standard but nothing has happened about that. We have had suggested beds from many countries in the world; at one stage we nearly had Japanese beds. I point out that South Australia currently has no Director of Tourism, that position having been vacant since January 22.

Mr. Whitten: Would you like the job?

Mr. MATHWIN: I can think of worse people to give it to than I. Nevertheless, this important post has not been filled, and apparently the Government does not intend to try to fill it. The Premier has given this industry (and it is an industry to anyone who knows anything about tourism) the old proverbial push. The Premier now has a new baby: worker participation. It sounds good. It is an "in" word and the Premier has latched on to it because he believes it will do him some good. He has farmed off tourism to the junior Minister in the Upper House. Yet anyone who knows anything about tourism knows that it is an industry and in many oversea countries it is one of the biggest industries. We know it is the third largest industry in Switzerland, and it is high up in the scale in Italy and in other parts of the world. It is a multi-million-dollar industry but we see that that has been dropped. It was not important enough to be put into the Governor's Speech; it was not worth mentioning.

The Premier has gone into worker participation, worker co-operatives, or whatever else he likes to call it. He has had two trips to look at this. He has had a trip to the Scandinavian countries, and Germany and Holland. He had another trip only this year when he got into Yugoslavia where they have worker co-operatives and where, apparently, he must have learnt a lot because he came back and told us nothing; he is keeping that to himself. He has had a couple of goes at worker participation. He has had a go at it in the Housing Trust, and knows what the workers in the Housing Trust think about it: they want no part of it. He had a rough deal there. When he first brought it in, most of the unions were against him. One of the union representatives, a Mr. Barry Cavanagh, who was a union secretary or an organiser at that stage, said, "We will not have a bar of it; he can keep it—we don't want it." But we have had a little softening up process from the Premier since then, and he thought that he would give it a try in the Housing Trust, but he did not get very far with it.

Getting back now to tourism, one must look at the local scene. I will look at my local scene. I am glad the member for Torrens earlier mentioned the Bay tram. Several times I have mentioned the Bay tram in this House and what is happening to it. I have brought up the colour of the tram. I see we have a nice nut-brown now, and it has been like that for a couple of years. Obviously, to paint the Bay tram a colour like that, the Government must have had about 180 litres or 225 litres of brown paint left over from the last war and had to use it up on the

Bay tram. It never thought how dangerous the colour would be, that people could not see the tram at dusk. Many of my people down at the Bay, especially the older people, have been nearly knocked down by that tram because of its colour; it is a dirty old brown tram. It is worse than a dirty old man—it does not give one a chance to get on to have a ride. In Amsterdam the trams are a bright pastel green and primrose colour, and they look nice. But this thing here is brown with a bit of cream splashed on the front.

Mr. Whitten: How about black and white?

Mr. MATHWIN: If the Minister wants some advice on the colour of the tram, obviously it should be painted yellow with black stripes. That would, of course, indicate the great football team that comes from down at the Bay, and it would give everybody pleasure. Indeed, even the member for Henley Beach would be pleased to ride on that tram if it was yellow and black.

I will leave the Bay tram now because I shall not get any further with it. It should be painted a brighter colour. Either last year or the year before members of the Glenelg Retailers Association asked whether they could have a tram and paint it themselves in bright colours for people to use as a tourist attraction, from the city to the Bay. But could they get permission? Not on your life! They offered to paint the thing at their own cost but they could not get permission from the department. I believe the situation is pretty grim and it is time the Government woke up to the fact that something could be done and, if an organisation like the Glenelg Retailers Association is willing to do the job for the Government, it should be allowed to have a go and try to do something about it.

One would agree with me in this House that there are more tourist beds available in Glenelg than elsewhere in the State, and yet there is no service for the tourists to go from Glenelg on a tour of the Barossa Valley. I know that the Barossa Valley is second to Glenelg as a tourist attraction in this State, and it is obvious that, Glenelg having the most tourist beds in the State, people would wish to go from there to the Barossa Valley. We have an organisation called Transit Minibuses, an independent organisation that asked for my assistance last year. In October, 1975, I asked the Minister whether he would allow those people to have a licence as they needed a licence to carry people to the Barossa Valley. The Minister said there were three authorised operators holding a licence now to take people to the Barossa Valley. He failed to say that, of the three licences given to operators, two are owned by the Government and the other one is owned by Ansett Pioneer.

He refused permission for this minibus organisation to have a licence to run from Glenelg to the Barossa Valley. If people who come to South Australia and stay at the Bay want to go to the Barossa Valley, they have to take a taxi or the Bay tram or a bus to the city; they go on a tour from the city to the Barossa Valley, where they can partake of a little refreshment. They are then brought back to Adelaide at the peak traffic hour, and then they have the problem of getting a bus, tram, or taxi back to their accommodation at the Bay. This is absolutely ridiculous. If the Government thinks that is encouraging tourism in this State, it is falling well below what it should be doing about the matter.

At a recent crowning of Miss Glenelg, the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport in his speech said he would be willing to give any assistance to tourism in Glenelg; yet, when the proprietor of this tourist minibus organisation put the case to him about its wishing to

run a tourist bus to the Barossa Valley from Glenelg, after he had telephoned the Minister's office the reply was that the matter was closed as far as they were concerned and they could not do anything about it. A principle is at stake. It is obvious to anyone who has gone into this matter (it is obvious to me and to members of the Government) that the Government does not wish the private operators to operate any more; it wishes to put them out of business. In fact, it taxes them 5 per cent a head for each passenger they carry there.

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

Motion carried.

WATER RESOURCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): Last month, the Port Adelaide Centre draft report stage I was completed, and the section dealing with recreation and leisure states the following:

The provision of further facilities such as a large, modern library, concert hall, general purposes meeting rooms and cinema should be considered.

Not only Port Adelaide needs improved libraries—the whole of the western region of Adelaide needs them. In March, 1975, the Australian Labor Government appointed a committee to inquire into public libraries in Australia, and Mr. A. Horton, Librarian at the University of New South Wales, was appointed Chairman. The Horton committee, which reported to Senator Withers in February, 1976, said that the western Adelaide region was the most disadvantaged area in the whole of Australia in respect of library services. The local government areas that comprise the western region of Adelaide are Port Adelaide, Woodville, Hindmarsh, Thebarton, West Torrens, Henley and Grange, and Glenelg, the combined population being about 212 000. To cater for the library needs of these people we have one State-subsidised library and six institute libraries. As the other three regions of Adelaide have a total of 22 State-subsidised libraries, it can readily be seen why the Horton report stated that the western Adelaide region was the most disadvantaged area with regard to libraries.

Mr. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. WHITTEN: It is estimated that 12 or 13 libraries are needed to service the area, but the cost of the buildings alone would be prohibitive. The estimate of the cost of building and air-conditioning a library of 930 square metres would be about \$275 000. Therefore, to service the whole of the western region of Adelaide would cost about \$3 000 000 for buildings alone.

Mr. Nankivell: Surely it would cost more than that.

Mr. WHITTEN: No, it would not cost more than that. If we multiply \$275 000 by 10, we get \$2 750 000, so I do not think that my arithmetic is too far out. Some libraries could be adapted to serve the needs of the region.

The Port Adelaide Institute Library does a good job; it has been in existence for 125 years, and has served the people of Port Adelaide well. However, it is badly in need of upgrading. This library has 700 subscribers, and an average of 400 borrowers a week, taking out about 1 000 books a week.

Mr. Chapman: You might come up with a sum the same as you did last time.

Mr. WHITTEN: I am coming to that. The library's subscribers pay \$6 a year and are permitted to take out one book and one magazine each week. There are about 20 000 volumes in the Port Adelaide Institute Library, many of which are very old. The children's section of the library is very much out of date. The library is able to buy only 15 books a month from the money that is made available to it. The Horton committee, which considered the replacement of subscription libraries, made the following recommendation on page 110 of its report:

8. State Governments—

and this is important for honourable members opposite—should give priority to the replacement of subscription libraries by free public libraries, and a special allocation of funds should be provided to Queensland and South Australia within the proposed programmes to facilitate this change.

Those funds are to be provided by the Federal Government. I suggest that, had there not been a change of Government, this scheme would have been in operation now, the Whitlam Government having been committed to adopt the Horton committee's report. Unfortunately, a *coup d'etat* took place on November 11, when the Whitlam Government was thrown out of office.

The average provision of books in council areas in the metropolitan area is .35 books a person. In the western region of Adelaide, the average is .07 books a person, which works out at about one-fourteenth of a book for each person. A disadvantaged area reported to be comparable with western Adelaide is West Melbourne. The West Melbourne study points out that that area is also disadvantaged. It has nine libraries and a standard of one book a person. If they claim that they are disadvantaged, what do members think Port Adelaide is?

The western region of Adelaide has 23 per cent of the population of the four Adelaide regions, yet receives only 4 per cent of the money allocated through the State library system. The eastern region, with 20 per cent of the population, receives 36 per cent of the library subsidies. A comparison of the books held in the regions are: in the northern area, .08 books a head; in the southern region, .36 books a head; in the eastern region, .28 books a head; and at Port Adelaide, in the western region, it is .07 books a head. Recommendation 48, on page 115 of the Horton committee's report refers to a 10-year programme.

Mr. Chapman: What about a casino for Adelaide?

Mr. WHITTEN: That might come about, too.

Mr. Chapman: Will it have your support if it does?

Mr. WHITTEN: If we can get the honourable member's support for a casino (I know that he is a great supporter of casinos), I think we should have one in South Australia. However, libraries are much more important than casinos, even though the member for Alexandra may not agree with that. I know that he spends much time in casinos; he may not spend as much time in libraries. Indeed, it seems from the way he speaks in the House that he has not read much at all.

Mr. Chapman: You haven't answered the question.

Mr. WHITTEN: The only publication he reads is the *Farmer and Grazier*. If anyone was to look at the honourable member's property he would see why. All the

fence posts around the border of his property are painted white, but many poor farmers on Kangaroo Island are in dire straits.

Mr. Harrison: They couldn't even afford the paint.

Mr. WHITTEN: True. After 23 years of anti-Labor Government in Canberra that never looked after the people of Kangaroo Island—

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

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): I rise to grieve about the Government's approach to tourism in South Australia especially in relation to my district in the South-East. I do not intend to grieve about the sum the Government has spent on tourism as much as I intend to grieve about the Government's broken promises concerning tourism. Election after election the Government has made grandiose promises about financial assistance for tourism and what it would do for that industry. However, when one looks around the South-East it is amazing to see how much of the money spent in that area has been spent by private enterprise. The southern area of the South-East coast is a most attractive area and has great tourist potential not only for international tourists but also for tourists who leave the city for recreation purposes and to get away from the city humdrum and the factory work chain.

Mr. Chapman: It's comparable to the south coast region.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes, but that region has been well worked in the past 10 years or so.

Mr. Chapman: Well patronised.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes, but it should not be over-worked. The South-East is an area that can compete well with the south coast region.

Mr. Coumbe: What about Carpenter Rocks?

Mr. VANDEPEER: Even Carpenter Rocks could compete if we wished to make it a tourist area.

Mr. Chapman: All we want is a little Government co-operation.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes. When entering Kingston one sees that very little has been done—

Mr. Chapman: Is Kingston in your district?

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes. It is my home town.

Dr. Eastick: You're talking about Kingston on sea not Kingston on Murray.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes. Tourist attractions in that area are mainly concentrated on caravan parks. The Government should take a positive attitude towards providing larger parks instead of encouraging the setting up of caravan parks for only 10 or 15 caravans. If tourists from the city are to be catered for, much larger areas than that are needed to conform to the regulations laid down by the State Planning Authority. Sufficient land is available, and there should be a positive approach to this matter. We can forget about the land bought by a large Adelaide company to establish a hotel in the area, because I do not believe that that project will eventuate.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the lighthouse?

Mr. VANDEPEER: The lighthouse now at Kingston that was removed from Margaret Brock reef off Cape Jaffa is a great tourist attraction. Considerable assistance has been received to help bring the lighthouse into Kingston. Robe has always been known as a great tourist area.

Mr. Rodda: It's the jewel of the south.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes, where one never encounters a hot day. Robe has received little Government assistance. Big promises were made at the last election, as well as

the election before that, that about \$500 000 or \$1 000 000 would be spent to rebuild the old port of Robe.

Mr. Coumbe: Why was that done?

Mr. VANDEPEER: The Government was after a few more votes, but that announcement made little difference at the last election. The area has potential. It is one of the oldest ports in the South-East, and reconstruction of the old town along the lines of some Victorian towns is a good suggestion. However, it would be expensive, and we must look at it from the economic angle. I am objecting tonight to this Government's promises of \$500 000 or \$1 000 000 that have not been carried out.

Mr. Coumbe: It won't even do up the old gaol.

Mr. VANDEPEER: No. Many approaches have been made about the old gaol, and in the past few weeks the local council has been debating what the Government was going to do about it. The Government has prevaricated. It has allocated some funds, some digging has been done, and there has been work on one or two walls. It has made the area virtually unsafe, because the walls are not stable. Now, consideration is being given to removing the walls for safety purposes and making a barbecue area, putting up a sign to say that this is the location of the old gaol, and leaving it at that. The Government should put up the money or be quiet.

Mr. Coumbe: It should put up or shut up.

Mr. VANDEPEER: That is right. Further down the coast is Beachport, where there has been an argument about the jetty. It would be very expensive to repair the jetty, but it is a great tourist attraction for the working people from the factories, the people this Government is supposed to represent. Those people may not wish to go out in boats, and the jetty is very attractive for line fishing. However, half the jetty has been closed. It is the only jetty in South Australia from which one can catch crayfish, and I might say it is the only jetty from which one is permitted to catch crayfish. Its closing is hypocrisy, in my opinion.

Further down, we come to Mount Gambier. I will not interfere with my colleague's area, but I must mention the Princess Margaret Rose Caves, close to the Glenelg River. The road to the caves is in extremely poor order. A friend of mine recently went to the caves, having been warned that the road was in bad order. He found the caves and enjoyed looking at them, and then he proceeded home, near dusk. He was surprised to discover on his way home what he thought was a new mountain. However, it was just that, new to the area, he had taken a wrong turning on the bush tracks and had come into the town from a different direction. It took him about half an hour longer to get home, because he had got lost as a result of the road's poor condition and the equally poor sign-posting.

Mr. Coumbe: What about Carpenter Rocks?

Mr. VANDEPEER: I will not get on to that. For some time efforts have been made to obtain finance to upgrade the road. As usual, however, the Government is asking for a 50 per cent contribution from the council. That is grossly unfair when many roads are purely for tourism and are not used by the local people. When grants are made for district roads an 80 per cent contribution is willingly made, but when a tourist road is involved a 50 per cent contribution is required of the council. I believe that that is hypocrisy on the part of the Government. At present the Coast Protection Board has more finance available for tourist roads near the coast than has the department concerned with tourism. During election campaigns, the Government declared what it would do for tourism in South Australia, but it has certainly done

little for tourism in the Millicent District. The Government makes promises that would leave Paul Hogan speechless.

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

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): The matter that I wish to speak about is causing much concern not only to me but also to many residents of Woodville Gardens. I refer to the despair of the Lemondine children of Hookings Terrace, Woodville Gardens, who are trying to make a life without parents. The five children, all girls, are Janine, 17 years of age; Sonya, 16 years; Maisie, 15 years; Odette, 14 years; and Fiona, the youngest, only 12 years of age. Janine, the eldest, stays at home to housekeep and receives unemployment benefits. Sonya, Maisie and Odette attend the Angle Park High School, while Fiona, the youngest, attends Ridley Grove Primary School. Mr. Lemondine died in 1964, before Fiona's birth, and Mrs. Lemondine passed away last February, at the age of 43 years. Since then, the girls have been struggling on their own. The story of Mrs. Lemondine goes back a long way. The full facts are not all known to me, but I understand that Mrs. Lemondine's mother did not care for her, and she lived with her grandmother until she was about six years of age. Her mother then took her away and, apparently, she was not cared for properly.

She became pregnant at the age of 16 years and apparently married a Mr. Chapple. She had four children, two of whom were taken away by the Community Welfare Department. After leaving Mr. Chapple, she lived with Mr. Lemondine, first at the Gepps Cross hostel and then at Woodville Gardens. Mr. Lemondine was 20 years older than Mrs. Lemondine. However, she had another six children by this time. A boy was killed while they were living at the Gepps Cross hostel. Apparently, Mrs. Lemondine had never been able to cope with the home situation. When she became ill, or at least needed care, Janine, the eldest girl, was kept home from school to look after her. Unfortunately, Janine has never learnt how to cope with the home situation, either, and she just sits around all day and smokes. This, of course, is of no help to her younger sisters.

I recently visited the home with several other people. The conditions that this family were living in were absolutely appalling. It was a filthy home. The rooms were filthy and untidy, the furniture was broken and in need of repair, the blinds and curtains needed renewing, and plumbing and maintenance was required all around the home. It was a ramshackle house. After the death of Mrs. Lemondine, the five girls were left to care for themselves. How could they look after themselves if they did not know how? They were never taught how to cook, how to wash, how to do general housekeeping, and how to look after their own personal hygiene. How could they learn right from wrong?

They have been subjected to sexual activity, before their mother died and afterwards. The girls were always frightened to be on their own, and they kept all doors and windows locked. One room was not used because the lock on the window was broken, so they kept the inner door locked and refused to use that room. At present the Housing Trust is renovating the home, and the girls are staying with various helpers and friends. There have been many helpers, but most have given up in despair. Neighbours, Woodville Lions Club, Cheltenham Church of Christ, Community Welfare Department, the delicatessen owner in Ridley Grove, and my electorate

secretary have done an enormous amount for these girls. My electorate secretary has other responsibilities and has been unable to put in the amount of time with the girls that she would have liked.

Janine relies on a pension and unemployment benefits to clothe and feed the family and keep her four sisters at school. She receives \$112 a month from the pension, and child endowment payments are made every three months. The total income is about \$81 a week, which is nowhere near enough to keep a family of five growing girls. The sum of \$46 a month is paid in rent.

The owner of the local delicatessen, Mr. J. Robertson, has been wonderful to these girls. He provides part-time work for two of them just to help them out. The money they earn is used to buy clothes and help pay for school excursions and the like. The girls received about \$500 in back pension, and Mr. Robertson, in consultation with me, opened a bank account for them so that some sort of control was kept on how this money was spent.

Other negotiations have been conducted with Mr. Greenwood, the Cheltenham Church of Christ social worker, regarding some outstanding moneys that the girls built up from various areas. Mr. Greenwood was successful in having the debts wiped off. It is the Community

Welfare Department's policy to keep families together, and that is an extremely good policy, but each case should be judged on its merits. In this case the family history should have been thoroughly investigated.

It is disturbing that no-one is legally responsible for these girls, who require discipline and adult supervision. The girls need to know how to look after themselves and to learn how to use their spare time, how to make new friends, and how to live together in harmony instead of arguing with one another, as they have been doing. I should like to see the Community Welfare Department provide an adult housekeeper with the necessary responsibility to look after young children in such circumstances. Surely there are people in the community who would be willing to do this kind of work. All of the Lemondine girls deserve a chance to make good. Certainly, they have the potential to do so but, if they are not helped from now on, the situation will multiply if and when they marry and have children themselves.

Motion carried.

At 9.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 12, at 2 p.m.