

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 18, 1976

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

## PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. LANGLEY presented a petition signed by 80 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that 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: INCEST

Mr. DEAN BROWN presented a petition signed by 39 electors of South Australia, praying that the House would reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest.

Petition received.

## PETITIONS: SEXUAL OFFENCES

Mr. EVANS presented a petition signed by 26 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.

Mr. DEAN BROWN presented a similar petition signed by 19 electors of South Australia.

Petitions received.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WAGE INDEXATION

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: In today's *Advertiser*, there seems to have been some confusion or misunderstanding on the part of an industrial reporter, Bill Rust, whose report states:

South Australian employers have applied to the South Australian Industrial Commission to block any attempt to apply the latest national wage increases to over-award payments. The employers' move was disclosed yesterday on the eve of today's Full Commission hearing to flow-on the wage rise to nearly 200 000 workers employed in South Australia under State awards and agreements. The applications by the employer organisations—the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the South Australian Employers Federation—differ significantly—

that was the word used by Mr. Rust—

from that filed by the Minister of Labour and Industry (Mr. Wright) on Friday.

The Minister's application asks that all adult pay rates of \$166 a week and less be increased by \$2.50 and higher rates by 1.5 per cent. Both employer organisations propose instead that: rates between \$98 and \$166 a week be increased by \$2.50 a week, and by 1.5 per cent thereafter.

I challenge anyone, including Mr. Rust, to explain the difference between those two applications. There is no difference in the applications, except that I have

asked for an increase in the minimum wage, and that is appropriate and in accordance with the decision of the Federal Court.

The approach I made as Minister of Labour and Industry to the South Australian Industrial Commission for a flow-on of the national wage case decision embraces no more than what was in the Australian commission's decision. This Government has said on several occasions that it supports wage indexation, and it therefore follows that applications that it makes for flow-on should follow the decisions of the Australian commission. That is what has happened on this occasion. It is up to the Full Commission in South Australia to interpret and apply the Australian commission's decision in the light of the arguments put to it.

As I think it important that all members are aware of the exact terms of my application to the court, I set out the grounds of my application as follows:

1. That all ordinary adult award rates up to and including \$166 a week (or where expressed as an annual award rate, up to and including \$8 660 a year) be increased by \$2.50 a week where the rate is expressed as a weekly rate and by \$130 a year where the rate is expressed as an annual award rate.

2. That all ordinary adult award rates in excess of \$166 a week (or where expressed as an annual award rate, in excess of \$8 660 a year) be increased by 1.5 per cent.

3. That all junior award rates (other than those for which there are prescribed percentages of adult rates) be increased by 2 per cent.

4. That all leading hand rates be increased by 2 per cent but that such increase not exceed 20 cents.

5. That all shift allowances expressed in an award in money amounts be increased by 2 per cent.

6. That in awards which contain provision for an adult minimum wage and in awards in which, having regard to the wage prescriptions therein contained, it is appropriate that provision for an adult minimum wage should be inserted, the amount of \$98 shall be applicable except in the case of employees when employed within an eight-kilometre radius of the chief post office of Whyalla and Iron Knob or the schoolhouse in Iron Baron in which case the adult minimum wage shall be \$98.50.

That is the only difference that I can see between the two applications. The terms of my application continue:

7. That in making the computations required to give effect to the preceding orders herein set out:

(a) in the case of weekly award rates and weekly shift allowances the new rates shall be calculated to the nearest 10c, less than 5c to go to the lower amount and 5c or more to go to the higher amount;

(b) in the case of shift allowances where the allowance is payable per day or per shift the new rates shall be calculated to the nearest one cent, less than 0.5 cent to go to the lower amount and 0.5 cent or more to go to the higher amount;

(c) in the case of annual award rates the new rates shall be calculated to the nearest dollar, less than 50c to go to the lower amount and 50c or more to go to the higher amount.

8. That the principles of wage determination enunciated by the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in its decision dated May 28, 1976, in the National Wage Case, May, 1976 be and are hereby applied and given effect to with the modifications that:

(a) the principle referred to as principle 7 (c) be not applied and

(b) it be appropriate for any proclaimed wage fixing authority (as defined in section 3 of the Industrial Commission Jurisdiction (Temporary Provisions) Act, 1975) to hear and determine cases in conformity with the guidelines more particularly set forth in the written reasons of the Full Commission as embodied in Print No. 92 of 1975 and Print No. 22 of 1976.

9. That these orders shall operate from the first pay period to commence on or after August 15, 1976.

AND the applicant seeks such further or other orders as the Full Commission thinks necessary or appropriate.

The grounds upon which this application is made are:

- (a) The Minister of Labour and Industry makes this application pursuant to section 36 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-75.
- (b) On August 12, 1976, the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in the National Wage Case, August, 1976, made a decision affecting or likely to affect the wages and other remuneration payable generally to employees subject to its awards in the State of South Australia.

## QUESTIONS

### MONARTO

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say whether the Government now intends using part or all of the \$27 000 000 accumulated surplus to finance his expressed determination to proceed with Monarto; from what other sources funds will be obtained; and what is now the estimated total cost of the first stage? The Whitlam Government's decision to axe support for the Monarto project was announced in the Hayden Budget last year, and that this decision was sound was confirmed by the Budget announced last night. The Premier has stated that he will go it alone, in spite of a great many unfavourable reports and considerations, not the least of which is an inability of Monarto to attract any significant industrial base. These adverse factors have all been canvassed in this House before. The Premier announced that the \$27 000 000 accumulated surplus was to be held in reserve to avoid the need for any increase in State taxation next year. The total cost of the project has been quoted as \$600 000 000, and it appears that the Premier now intends to saddle South Australians with this colossal debt, for a project that most people regard as a white elephant, at the expense of many other community projects of greater priority and importance. Obviously there is great concern in the community as to who will be paying for the Premier's obsession, and the inescapable conclusion is that it will be, of course, the South Australian tax payer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has taken no decision about the timing or amount of construction expenditure to commence at Monarto. We have said, however, that Monarto will go ahead. We have kept substantial moneys in reserve as against what the Federal Government is doing to specific purpose grants for the State. The Budget last night left unanswered a number of questions about the specific purpose grants area.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Including Monarto.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, including Monarto. The Leader has said that the Federal Government has axed money for Monarto. It has not provided—

Dr. Tonkin: The Whitlam Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Whitlam Government provided a lot of money for Monarto, a very considerable amount indeed.

Dr. Eastick: Not much in 1975-76.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Last financial year the Federal Government provided \$500 000. Although there has been nothing in the Federal Budget for this financial year, I received a telex from the Prime Minister saying that discussions in relation to growth centres were to proceed and that there was no final decision by the Federal Government about this matter since it relied on decisions

to be taken at a later stage. Apparently the communications between the Leader and his Federal colleagues have broken down somewhere. The Government has not decided on a further commitment of funds to Monarto for major construction expenditure at this stage, because of the uncertainties with which the State's finances are faced. The proposal for the development of Monarto is not simply, as the Leader would have it, an obsession of mine; it is a decision responsibly taken by the whole of this Government upon the best advice available and with the urging of the Environmental Protection Council.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And ratified by the Parliament.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The decision to proceed with Monarto has been ratified by a unanimous vote of this Parliament.

Mr. Millhouse: It is time it was revised.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On this subject the honourable member has joined with members opposite—

Mr. Millhouse: That's all right with me, I was the first one to say it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Whoever was the chicken or the egg in this matter, I shall leave to the argument between the chicken and the egg.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Some chicken, some egg!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite seem to believe that something political is involved in opposing what is the only sensible planning decision for the maintenance of the standards of Adelaide's present metropolitan area. It is their shortsighted political opinion. If the Opposition believes that it can play politics on this issue, I would encourage it to go ahead, because the Government will continue to make responsible decisions on behalf of the people of the State.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Does the Minister for Planning intend to disband the Monarto Development Commission and transfer its staff to departments associated with planning and community development? As the finance for this project has been refused by two separate Federal Governments, all members and the public would like to know about the future of the Monarto project and of the staff connected with it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The answer is "No". The Federal Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development (Mr. Newman), who was in Adelaide the week before last, discussed the matter with both the Premier and me, and made clear that the question of growth centres and their future policy had not been determined by the Commonwealth Government, and that any decision by the Commonwealth about Monarto, especially, would not be available for some months yet.

Mr. Millhouse: Did he seem enthusiastic about it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He was enthusiastic enough to arrive here in a V.I.P. jet from Darwin, and to hire a helicopter to fly over the site. He indicated that he was impressed by the site, that the Adelaide Hills required to be preserved, and that there were several unsatisfactory features as to what had already happened in the Hills. He could not have been described as being unsympathetic, but whether or not that means that support would be forthcoming—

Mr. Millhouse: I don't think you have answered my question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Is the honourable member saying that I am a liar?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The position is clear, and Mr. Newman confirmed the same attitude that had previously been adopted by Senator Greenwood, that the Commonwealth Government, although it is not providing money for Monarto this year and is providing funds only for Bathurst-Orange and Albury-Wodonga for already existing land purchase commitments, has yet to determine decisions regarding its future policy and the nature of that policy. In those circumstances it is not possible for the State Government to decide how we will proceed with the Monarto project.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether it is planned to provide facilities to assist unemployed youth in the Modbury and Tea Tree Gully districts? The Minister will be aware that Modbury and Tea Tree Gully are fast-growing areas containing many young people, some of whom are unemployed. He would also be aware of problems that have arisen, and of my personal representations to him on this subject. As I understand that the department has been investigating the needs of the area, I should be pleased if the Minister would outline what plans are intended to help the young people concerned.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: As suggested by the honourable member, I am well aware of the situation. Unfortunately, about 300 people under 21 years of age in the Modbury area are now unemployed. I have referred to the plight of young people throughout Australia who cannot get employment. For this reason it is intended to form a job hunters' club in the area, based on the Modbury district office. A youth services assistant, who will be responsible for operating the club, will be appointed to the district office on Monday next, August 23. I am sure the honourable member would be pleased to hear that news because of her well-known interest in youth matters generally not only in her district but also throughout South Australia. As most members know, the aims of the job hunting scheme are to try to sustain the interest of unemployed young people to continue to seek work by maintaining and restoring self confidence. I am almost tempted to suggest that, after yesterday's Commonwealth Budget, that confidence will have to be sustained for some time. However, I do not want to digress too much.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: If members opposite would like further information on the unemployment situation in Australia, I will oblige them by referring to matters that they would probably not wish to contest, because it is unlikely that they would come out of such a contest too well. The department is preparing a submission to the Public Service Board for the appointment of a neighbourhood youth worker who will also be based at the Modbury district office. If the department's submission is approved, which I hope it will be, the appointment will further improve the facilities available to young people in the area. I am sure that they will help train interested young people in this area who may wish to give their services and help with the problems faced by these youths.

#### DUKE OF EDINBURGH AWARD

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say how well the Duke of Edinburgh Award scheme is functioning in South Australia? Some time ago it was

announced that the administration of this scheme had been transferred to the Community Welfare Department, following the merging of the National Fitness Council with the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department. Since then, I have not heard any news about the awards, and I hope that this does not mean that interest in them has declined.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am pleased to say that the award scheme is alive and well, and that it may well receive a good "fillip" next year when the Duke of Edinburgh visits South Australia. Hopefully, having been forgiven that sally, I advise the honourable member that 700 youths are now participating in earning awards, and that, for the past 10 years, awards have averaged about 100 a year. Already this year 40 awards have been made. The success or otherwise of the scheme is obviously contingent on the award committee, which is well headed by Canon W. R. Ray, who, I am sure, would be well known to most members. Among other notable members of the committee is Mrs. Ann Millhouse. The committee is doing a great job and I say publicly that the Government is grateful to its members for the time and effort they have expended. I have been honoured with an invitation to present bronze awards next Friday evening in the Police Auditorium, which is on the eighth floor of the building, for anyone who is thinking of attending. I think there will be something to go on with to help the proceedings.

#### SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education say what plans the Government has for the participation of parents in matters relating to school curricula? Mr. Jones, the Director-General of Education, in a recent press statement has said that parents should be more actively involved in areas of school life, including the school curriculum. This week, members on this side have been sent material by the headmaster of a primary school in Adelaide who is most disturbed at material given to his son in a sex education course. The material is detailed and explicit and, besides numerous spelling errors, it includes detailed drawings (one depicting copulation) and such topics, in a fairly extensive list, as these: What is orgasm? What factors influence its occurrence? Include pressures on a woman to reach orgasm. Another topic is as follows: What is masturbation? Is it necessary to masturbate? If you were going steady, would you masturbate or have sexual intercourse? Why? The material was given to year 10 students, that is, 14-year-old students, without prior notice or consent of parents. Approval was sought from parents about two weeks after the material had been given to the students, but it was by chance that the headmaster discovered that it had been given to his son. The Opposition believes it is essential that parents should be consulted before such material is used and, indeed, we would welcome any moves to involve parents more closely in operating schools. What plans has the Government to bring this situation about and to avoid occurrences such as the one I have outlined?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: In a sense, the honourable member has asked two questions: I could spend considerable time on the instance he has cited, as well as enlarging at length on the philosophy behind the Government's concept of parental involvement in schools. I will do the best I can with both questions without unduly delaying the House. First, the honourable member seems to have been somewhat misled as to the exact background of what has

occurred in this instance. A course was launched at the school some time ago along the lines of the document circulated. The headmaster of another school, whose child attends this school, took exception to the contents of the course, and contacted the headmaster, who in turn induced the staff members involved to withdraw the course *pro tem*. On hearing what had occurred, the school council, backed by most parents, protested to the headmaster over the withdrawal of the course. What the honourable member has before him is the objection of an individual to the next chapter in this episode, which is a perfectly responsible attempt by the headmaster to circularise parents to inform them as to the content of courses, and to obtain from them their attitude as to the mounting of the course. I have before me the document to which the member has referred, and I notice that on page 2, after a general preamble as to the nature of the course, we read:

Please detach and return to the school on Friday, July 2, 1976.

(Name of child) .....

(Class) .....

\*I give permission for my child (name follows) to participate in this section of the science course.

\*I wish my child (name follows) to withdraw from the class when this section of the course is studied.

\*Delete as appropriate.

(Signed) ..... (Parent)

Mr. Goldsworthy: The headmaster told me he got that a fortnight after the course had started.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am afraid the honourable member has not been listening. All this happened after the course, on a trial basis, had been introduced to a class and then withdrawn as a result of pressure placed on the headmaster by the gentleman who has circulated this material. The headmaster is now, in turn, consulting parents about the reintroduction of the course.

Mr. Mathwin: As he should have done in the first place.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: That is what it is all about. Concerning the general position of parents and curricula, I remind members that this Government gave statutory recognition to school councils and their right to debate and be involved in all aspects of schools, including discussions about the content of curricula. The evolution of curricula is a most involved matter. I would not want to suggest that any one individual should determine the content of curricula, least of all the Minister of Education.

Mr. Coumbe: He is barred, anyway.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: If what the member says is true, that is perfectly proper. I have no desire to be the arbiter of what is taught in schools, but there is a growing acceptance of the need for this type of instruction. Honourable members will be aware of the activities of the team behind the health education curriculum. I invite them to visit the offices of the health education curriculum project at the Wattle Park teachers centre, and to discuss what is being done. I also invite honourable members to suggest to school councils in their districts that they should have speakers from this project visit their schools so that the council can be properly informed about what is happening. Obviously, it is not always possible (nor indeed is it necessary in all cases) for parents to be fully consulted before a course is introduced. That must always be a matter of judgment for the school itself, and that judgment will be more finally honed as schools become more and more used to the concept of having parents on their school councils wanting to have a real say in what happens

in schools. In this case, I believe that the principal, having circulated this material, acted perfectly properly. As to my personal viewpoint, I certainly hope that the course proceeds.

#### SEATON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. HARRISON: Can the Minister of Education indicate whether school projects in connection with which announcements have been made that it is not possible to proceed with as urgent works will maintain their priorities if and when the financial situation improves? In 1974, the then Seaton Technical School was made co-educational, and it is now known as Seaton High School—Co-educational. As a result, certain necessary alterations and additions were agreed to in five stages. The first two stages have been completed, and it was recently announced that the third stage had been cancelled. What is to happen now is causing much concern to students, teaching staff, and parents. First-year high school students (eighth-year students) were taken in, with the object of building up finally to Matriculation stage. It is necessary, with the children coming in, that no delay should occur in the work to be carried out so that the school can cope with the progressive stages of the education of these children as they proceed to the various classes.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: My answer is a qualified "Yes": qualified in one particular, assuming, of course, that the enrolment picture in the area does not change. Knowing the honourable member's district as I do, I do not think there will be much alteration and therefore the demographic profile that brought this demand for additional accommodation will certainly remain. Certainly, these schools will maintain their priorities, provided enrolments do not alter dramatically. In the event of any unlikely dramatic depopulation of the Seaton area, we may have to reconsider the situation, but I do not see that happening. As the honourable member raised this matter in a general way as well as in a particular way, I draw his attention to the Ministerial statement I made to the House last week in relation to the Thebarton community school.

#### LONG SERVICE LEAVE

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry details of payments required to be made by employers and employees in relation to the long service leave provisions in the building industry? Much recent publicity has been given to the intended introduction of long service leave provisions to apply to that industry, and much concern has been expressed by people in my district who hold builders' licences and restricted builders' licences about their obligations to contribute to a fund to cover employees who have worked for them for several years.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It has been the policy of the Labor Government for some time now to ensure that those workers who spend their lives in a particular industry be suitably rewarded through a long service leave scheme similar to that already in operation for those employees who work a specified period with the one employer. As a result of this a committee of inquiry recommended that such a scheme be introduced into South Australia.

The Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act, 1975, was assented to on March 4, 1976, after much debate and after much discussion at Select Committee level as, I am sure, the honourable member recalls. As a compromise and as a direct result of an attempt by the Opposition in

another place to delay the operation of this reform, the Government had to accept an operating date further into the future than it expected, namely April 1, 1977. The Act will apply to those persons and bodies who directly employ labour and whose major business activity is one of involvement in or direct supply to the building construction industry, which definition also includes the maintenance and renovation of buildings and other major works. Thus, the honourable member will see that this Act applies to all persons and bodies involved in the defined industry, including subcontractors, where those persons or bodies are direct employers of labour as defined in the Act.

The administration of the Act provides that a fund, to be controlled by a Long Service Leave (Casual Employment) Board, will be established with equal representation of both employers and employees with an independent chairman. All employers will contribute on a regular basis at a prescribed percentage of total wages paid to building industry workers in their employ during the immediately preceding month. From this fund will be made long service leave payments to those workers who, in terms of the Act, qualify for such payment. The Government has been at pains to ensure that the administrative costs are kept to a minimum, by having a small nucleus staff in the Labour and Industry Department with considerable assistance being afforded by other departments of Government with the required facilities. In addition to that cost saving, the Government has seen to it that employers will, in addition to the regular return accompanying payment of the contribution, be required only to provide details of worker service on an annual basis as at June 30, each year plus returns relating to the commencement or termination of service as it occurs, and no later than three months after such occurrence.

The Act provides retrospectivity clauses relating to payment for service accrued by a worker with a particular employer as at April 1, 1977. The Government ensured that no employer would be immediately financially embarrassed, by providing that employers may enter into an agreement with the controlling board to spread retrospective payments over a period not exceeding five years. Another point that I should refer to is the situation that has arisen because of the date of operation being so far into the future. I repeat that the employers' representatives in another place must bear a large proportion of any criticism that may come from workers because of this extended commencement date. What could happen is that some workers could find that contracts for which they are now engaged will wind down before April 1, 1977, and they will be dismissed from employment before their present employer is obligated to contribute for them. This places workers at a disadvantage, and the responsibility falls quite clearly at the door of members in another place.

The Government, however, in an attempt to secure as much justice as it could for such workers, had inserted in the Bill section 40 (2) which provides penalties for any employer who dismisses any worker for the purpose of avoiding an obligation to make contributions under this Act.

Mr. Gunn: How do you prove it?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: What are you talking about? The onus of proving such dismissal was in contravention of the Act lies, where it should, with the employer. I would like to thank the honourable member for asking his question, because it has enabled me to set out clearly the main administrative provisions for this long awaited, desirable, and worthwhile awarding of long service leave to one section of an industry that for so long has been deprived of such facility.

Employees will not be required to make any contribution: they will be under no obligation to do so. This Act is in accordance with similar Acts. As it is based on other State and Federal Acts, it gives an employee no more and no less than other Acts provide.

#### RUNDLE STREET MALL

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister of Transport say what arrangements have been made in relation to public transport after the Rundle Street Mall has been completed? The mall is nearing completion, and no doubt many promotions will be made by stores within the mall area that will put pressure upon the public transport system at the time of the opening of the mall. Has this aspect been considered, and when will the mall be opened?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The mall will be opened officially by the Honourable the Premier on the first day of spring, September 1, which I think is an appropriate time. I am sure it will bring to reality a desire on the part of the Premier, me, and many other people of seeing this become a fact of life. We have taken some special actions in relation to public transport to coincide with the opening. All buses travelling into and out of the city from September 1, will fly pennants advertising the mall.

Mr. Becker: More waste of money, when my people are looking for houses.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Hanson believes anything spent on public transport is a waste of money: he also holds the view that the mall is a waste of money. That is backward thinking. I am sure he will be the only member of this House who will think it is a waste of money to provide four buses to travel into and out of the city from various suburbs between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m. each day to the mall at no cost to the passengers. I am sure he thinks that that, too, is a waste of money, but we do not; nor do the Adelaide City Council, the mall committee or the traders of Rundle Street.

Mr. Mathwin: Are you going to fly a flag on the Glenelg tram?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You could put an advertisement on saying that you opposed it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think we might even do it for him. I know that he will be even more upset when I tell him that we intend to have an advertisement on the Glenelg tram stating, "This tram leads to the mall." Also, all of the buses that now terminate in Victoria Square will be going on so that they can take their passengers to the mall. I am sorry if this has upset the member for Hansen, but I am sure that it will be acclaimed as a first for the people of South Australia.

#### MASSAGE PARLOURS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was going to address my question to the Attorney-General, but I see he has gone away into the gallery.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: He's on the way.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am complimented to have him back. Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to do absolutely nothing about massage parlours?

Mr. Langley: How did you go when you went there?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Gunn: They might have thought you were an inspector.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have had some experience in this already.

Mr. Gunn: I know.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I brought my army training to bear on the problem.

Mr. Langley: Unarmed combat.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I assure the member for Unley, and other honourable members, that it did not get to that stage last time.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What about the first time?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yesterday, the Premier gave what he, no doubt, would regard as answers to some Questions on Notice I had put on this matter. I asked what the policy of the Government might be. All the Premier did was answer a number of points that I had made publicly about this matter, apparently coming to the complacent conclusion that no control of massage parlours was required at all. I have directed my question to the Attorney-General because a number of sections in the Police Offences Act could be used in connection with brothels. Indeed, the heading in the Act is "*Brothels*", as I remember it. Apparently these sections have not been used with regard to massage parlours, and I can only take it that the tenor of the answers I received from the Premier yesterday was that the Government proposed to do nothing about massage parlours in our community. He describes as "ludicrous" a suggestion that I have made with regard to names and addresses. I understand (and I did not get this at first hand) that it is the system used in Singapore, a State to which I understood the Premier had been attracted. I therefore ask the Attorney-General whether it is intended to do anything pursuant to the—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: This is a question of Government policy.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I see; it is too dangerous so the Premier will take the question. I ask him, whether it is proposed to take any action pursuant to the various sections of the Police Offences Act, or any wider action at all, on what is (I am sure from the reaction I have had to the remarks I made) an acknowledged problem in our community.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speaker—  
*Members interjecting:*

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, the honourable member has asked, in effect, what is the policy of the Government in this matter and has addressed his explanation to an answer that I gave.

Mr. Millhouse: That is a good enough excuse for you to get on with it now!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was only answering what was coming from honourable members opposite.

*Members interjecting:*

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member asked what action the Government was taking in relation to massage parlours, and drew the attention of the House to certain sections of the Police Offences Act. Apparently, he has not taken any notice of that part of my answer in which I said that where evidence had been obtained prosecutions had ensued. We have discussed prosecutions in this area with the police and, where we have been able to obtain evidence, prosecutions have ensued. The honourable member has put forward no proposal whatever which lead to prosecutions under the Police Offences Act.

As I understand the honourable member (and he will correct me if I am wrong), he has been reported as saying it is necessary to take some action in relation to the licensing of massage parlours.

Mr. Millhouse: That was not the overall proposal.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In other words, he was saying that it was necessary that we take some action for the legalisation, in effect, of a brothel activity.

Mr. Millhouse: It is better than the hypocrisy you are practising now.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am afraid that the achievement of something in this regard is not simply a matter of satisfying the public whether the Government, the honourable member, or anybody else, is hypocritical, because that is not the question in issue. The question is whether anything effective can be done to achieve a certain object of public good. On that score the honourable member has so far produced, in answer to the matters which were set forward in the answer to him yesterday, absolutely nothing. If the honourable member has some specific proposal other than the ridiculous one to which he referred, we would like to hear it. So far, however, I have not heard it from anybody.

Mr. Millhouse: Will you give me an opportunity in this House to do so?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has had his opportunity: I propose now to answer the matters he raised. The honourable member has said that in Singapore there is provision for people to put their names and addresses in some book or other. That is not something I have investigated in Singapore, I will admit. It is not an area to which I have referred. If the honourable member has specific knowledge of this area, perhaps he will be able to give it from personal experience, because he has taken such an interest in the inspection of these types of premises.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: There would be a lot of Robin Millhouses in Adelaide!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member thought that putting a book in one of these places and getting people to write their names and addresses in it would achieve anything, he is wrong. I am sure the name of Mickey Mouse, or the honourable member's own name (not put there by him: I am not alleging that), would be put there by other people who would not in any circumstances be writing their own names but would be writing some name they thought appropriate in the circumstances. If the honourable member thinks differently, then he has no sense of what the average citizen will do. The honourable member has endeavoured to grab a series of headlines by saying that something must be done. The only thing that he has proposed so far is exposed as quite ineffective and ludicrous.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you say licensing is ineffective and ludicrous?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The only questions of public policy which have been raised in relation to these matters occur in the headings to the answers to the questions that the honourable member put on notice. In relation to none of these matters will a licensing system alter the situation.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And he knows it.

Mr. Millhouse: I do not believe your supporters are convinced about that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, the honourable member is mistaken in that, because the matter has been discussed with members of my Party, it has been discussed in Cabinet, and it has been discussed over a considerable

time between me and police officers concerned with this area of law enforcement. I have brought reports to Cabinet and Caucus about this matter. The honourable member is again in error. If he has a practicable proposal relating to the matters of public concern which are set out in the headings of the reply to his question, perhaps he would do us the courtesy of letting us know what are those practicable proposals. So far, he has failed utterly to do so.

#### INTERIM GRANTS COMMISSION

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the appointment of members to the interim Grants Commission has been considered? This commission is required to recommend to the Minister the distribution of funds to councils. Because of the important role the commission will play, much interest exists regarding its membership.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The members of the commission have been appointed. I previously informed the House that the Chairman and one member had been appointed. The Chairman is Dr. Ian McPhail, whose services we were lucky enough to obtain, and one member Mr. G. Foreman, who I believe is an economist in the Premier's Department. The third member of the commission was appointed on Monday by Cabinet. He is Mr. Colin Wirth, District Clerk of the Stirling council.

#### FRASER PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Education tell me what buildings are to be erected as stage II of Fraser Park Primary School, when it is expected that each of the four-teacher units will be completed, and whether the total building programme will be completed to enable the buildings to be occupied on the first day of the new school term in February, 1977? The Minister is probably aware that this school began operations this year, but it began without its upper grades, which are still part of the Murray Bridge South school and which is about one kilometre away. I assure the Minister that parents and the school council of Fraser Park Primary School are delighted that the second stage is on its way. However, they would like it to be completed and ready for occupation if possible on the first day of the new school term in 1977. It is wondered whether all the units planned for this school will be built as part of the stage II development.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I understand that on present planning the additional accommodation to be built in Demac will be available in March next year, which would miss the beginning of the school term, but not by much. I will take up the matter with my departmental officers to see whether it is possible to advance completion sufficiently to meet the deadline, which would be most desirable, of the beginning of the school year. Regarding the specific facilities to be provided, I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

#### BURRA COMMUNITY SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Education say when work will start on the new Burra community school? Provision has been made in the Loan Estimates for work to begin on this project this financial year. I have been asking questions about this subject ever since I came into

this House about nine years ago. The new Burra school has an unfortunate history. One of the first tasks I performed on being appointed to this House was to inspect a site that had been chosen for the school. The site had been chosen and purchased, plans were drawn up, but the site was rejected by the Public Works Standing Committee. Another site was chosen and plans were drawn up, but it was considered that the cost was excessive. Those plans, too, were sent back for review. When a cost for the school was announced, it was much higher than the previous price. The present cost of the school, as set out in the Loan Estimates, is \$2 900 000. Can the Minister therefore say when work will start on this project?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes; work will start in mid-September. I am sure the honourable member will be pleased to know that, as a result of the beginning of work, a demand will be created for skilled tradesmen and labourers, who will, as far as possible, be recruited locally. The honourable member probably will not mind if I put in a commercial plug for a function with which he will be associated on Friday evening—the buy a brick appeal. The school council has committed itself to raising \$10 000 as its part of the project. Local people are to be congratulated for their initiative. If it is not straining the honourable member's bipartisanship, he may like to extend my greetings to the assembled multitude. I hope the evening will be a success. In addition, the local council is to provide \$10 000 towards the project, most of which will come from having successfully tendered for site work.

#### FISHING FLEET

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say whether the Government has considered establishing a fishing fleet in South Australia and, if it has not, whether it will consider the suggestion? I understand that the waters around Australia, particularly off the South Australian coast, are fished heavily by fishing fleets from foreign countries. If South Australia had a fishing fleet that could fish in its waters, not only would South Australia benefit but so too would Safcol, which is the biggest co-operative of its kind in the southern hemisphere. I put forward the suggestion because of the difficulties being experienced at Whyalla in the shipbuilding industry. Such a fleet would need an ocean-going mother ship of about 5 000 tonnes, and several other vessels would use the mother ship. This system would be similar to the system used by Japanese fleets that operate in our waters. I put forward the suggestion as a means of establishing a fishing fleet for the State and of creating work for the Whyalla shipyards. If such a fleet were established, South Australia would be able to benefit by catching fish that breed in our waters before they go out into the ocean.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: For some time discussions have been taking place between the State Government, the South Australian Fishermen's Co-operative Limited and the Polish Co-operative, Dalmor, which has an extensive expertise in deep-sea fishing. An application has been made to the Commonwealth Government in respect of it. I received a letter from the Prime Minister yesterday which, unfortunately, was decidedly discouraging, but the matter is being pursued.

#### NOISE POLLUTION

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister for the Environment say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to control noise pollution in the non-industrial



sector? The Minister will be aware, as I am, of the position regarding industrial noise control and of the regulations under the Act, but I refer him to the problem of domestic or commercial noise, which is growing worse year by year, or even week by week. I cite such items as noisy lawnmowers, particularly on Sunday mornings, noisy motor vehicles and the emission from their exhaust, entertainment, and the like. As somewhat similar legislation exists in New South Wales and Victoria, I ask the Minister what plans the Government has to introduce similar legislation in South Australia and when it is likely (if that is the Government's intention) that it will come before the House?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Although the Government intends to introduce legislation this session to control noise, I do not know exactly when it will be introduced, but I hope that it will be introduced before the end of the session. The Government intends to include in that domestic noise, which covers such matters as the amplification of electronic equipment, etc. Legislation will also be introduced under the Police Offences Act to control domestic noise between midnight and 7 a.m., and that will enable the police to act on a neighbour's complaint about noise made during those hours. The anti-noise Bill to be introduced will be all-embracing to take into account not only industrial noise but also the type of noise to which the honourable member has referred.

#### WORKING HOURS

Mr. DEAN BROWN: My question follows a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition on August 4 concerning a 35-hour working week in the power industry. Will the Premier say what is the Government's specific policy on a 35-hour working week in the power industry and whether the Government has yet determined the economic effects on the whole of South Australia's industry if such a working week were adopted not only in the power industry but also in other industries? For some time now there has been a dispute in the power industry over this matter, although I understand that the effects of the dispute are now somewhat minimised. Recently, I understand that a delegation from the Trades and Labor Council was due to see the Premier in order to put pressure on the Government to adopt such a week in the power industry. Reliable sources (equally as reliable as "Deep Throat" himself) have told me that one State Minister has put pressure on the Electricity Trust to adopt the policy of a 35-hour week in the industry. I am not casting "dispersions" on the trust's management, because I believe that it will adopt its own policy, but I believe that the State Government has been putting pressure on the trust. If this is so, I think that the economic effects on the trust would be most unfortunate.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating the question. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know how to cast a "dispersion".

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Do you know about "Deep Throat", though?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know too much about that; however, we will not get back to the massage parlour situation. The honourable member has asked what is the Government's policy in relation to hours worked in the power industry. The Government has made its position clear: it was willing to offer agreement to a 37½-hour week in the industry in return for an increase

in productivity. That is the position the Government adopted in negotiation after consulting with the trust and with the trust's concurrence, but no pressure has been put on the trust by any Minister. For the honourable member to say that some unnamed reliable source has said this is in line with many of his other utterly unsupported statements and allegations.

Mr. Dean Brown: Do you deny that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I deny it completely. A deputation from the Trades and Labor Council is due to see me about this matter, and I shall see it. The policy that the Government has adopted in this matter has been previously publicly stated.

*At 3.11 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

#### ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1975. Read a first time.

Mr. MATHWIN: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

In doing so, I ask for the full support of honourable members. This short Bill needs little explanation. It repeals section 51 of the Road Traffic Act, which provides that a person shall not drive a motor cycle with or without a sidecar attached carrying any person in addition to the driver at a speed greater than 70 kilometres an hour. The reasons, I believe, are obvious. The present speed limit of 70 km/h (which is equal to 47.3 miles an hour) is a safety hazard to the motor cyclist and the pillion passenger, as well as to other road users, because any experienced motor cyclist knows that a motor cycle has much better stability with a pillion passenger than if the rider is riding solo.

Any experienced motor cyclist also knows the danger that this practice entails when other road users on the open road are permitted to drive at a speed of 110 km/h. One sees cars with trailers and caravans hooked on to them, mainly at weekends and during holiday time, and heavy transports, semi-trailers, and buses permitted to travel at 110 km/h. The riders of motor cycles with pillion passengers must, to keep alive, break the law on the open road. I would say that all of them at some time have exceeded the legal speed limit of 70 km/h on the open road. In the main, these are good and responsible people. We have some excellent motor cycle clubs in the State and most are members of the main association, the Federation of Australian Motor Cyclists (South Australian Branch), under the chairmanship of Mr. Bob Gaston, and whose Secretary is Mr. Peter Gray. I understand that both gentlemen and the association have communicated many times with the Minister of Transport, as they have with me. They have put their case to me, and I am sure to the Minister, extremely well. I understand that the matter has been placed before a committee of the Highways Department, the Road Traffic Advisory Board, under Mr. Bishop, and I believe the board has recommended in favour of speed limits being increased and brought into line with that of other vehicles using the road.



The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Did you understand what the Minister said publicly a month ago?

Mr. MATHWIN: I understand that the Minister has not done anything about it, and I have.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Do you understand that there has not been Parliamentary time up until now to do it?

Mr. Dean Brown: Whose fault is that?

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. MATHWIN: That is not a very good excuse. In presenting my Bill, I draw to the attention of members that in Queensland, the Australian Capital Territory, and in Tasmania the speed limit has been increased to that of other traffic on the open road. Victoria is not a good example: the speed there has been raised from 70 km/h to 80 km/h, but I do not think that serves much purpose, and seems to be a waste of time. Clause 1 is formal, and clause 2 repeals section 51 of the principal Act. All I ask is that motor cycles carrying pillion passengers should be allowed to travel at the same speed on the open road as do other vehicles, and I ask for the support of honourable members.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. MATHWIN (Glennelg) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1975. Read a first time.

Mr. MATHWIN: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It amends the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1975, and, in presenting it to the House, I ask for the full support of all members, Government and Opposition. The Bill emphasises the problem of workers in South Australia. The dilemma with which they are faced is increasing each day, because of the Government's policy of absolute preference to trade unionists, which really means compulsory unionism: join or starve. Incidentally, according to a recent survey 60 per cent of people do not believe in compulsory unionism, whilst 71 per cent of unionists in that same survey said that they had to join unions. In such cases, the person concerned is then branded as a socialist, when in fact he may be a good Liberal, or he may belong to the Country Party, the Democratic Labor Party, the new Liberal Movement, or even the Communist Party. Does any member really believe that all trade unionists vote Labor? Of course not: voting figures show that this situation would be ridiculous, yet we see that unions pay a sustentation fee, and in some cases a political levy (in some cases both) to the Labor Party.

The sustentation fee is a levy of 60 cents a member. If a rank-and-file trade union member does not wish to pay this contribution to the Labor Party, he must contract out. That means he must approach the Secretary of the union and say, "Look, I don't want to pay this money." The member must give reasons for doing so. Can anyone imagine what would happen if he or she said (if they dared) that he or she was a financial member of the Liberal Party, or of any other Party? To take it one step further, if an employer was helping a union by collecting fees, and if it became known that an extra 60 cents was being paid, and if, when the employer was confronted by an employee, he said that

he had affiliated the workers with the Liberal Party and that that was the fee for the affiliation, what would happen? The place would be in uproar, and there would be black bans on in no time. We all know the answer. I believe that hundreds of workers do not know that they are paying this fee to the Labor Party. That is borne out by the figures from a recent survey, which stated that 29 per cent of unionists said that they did not know whether their union was affiliated with a political Party. Many who thought they knew were mistaken. The most common mistake, made by 17 per cent of unionists, was to think that their union had no Party affiliation when in fact it was affiliated with the Australian Labor Party. This situation became known from a recent survey conducted by the Roy Morgan Research Centre. What is needed to protect the pay packets of workers is that they should be given the right to contract in. I am sorry the member for Florey is leaving. I thought he would—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: I know it might hurt in the wrong place, but one has to endure these things at times. Let us consider the situation. Union bosses pay sustentation and political levies under the system of contracting out. How it works is well explained in the A.E.U. rule book, in which rule 22, at page 50, provides—

Mr. Whitten: How old is that rule book?

Mr. MATHWIN: It is the only copy I could get.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. MATHWIN: I know it is in the Act that it should be available to every person.

Mr. Whitten: An amalgamation took place five years ago: there is no A.E.U.

Mr. MATHWIN: I know it is in the Act.

Mr. Whitten: There is no organisation with the name you are quoting. There is no A.E.U.

Mr. MATHWIN: If the honourable member just sits down and keeps quiet he might learn something. This was the only book I was able to procure; although the Act states that any member who wishes to have a rule book from any union should be able to purchase it for \$1, such books are impossible to purchase. I went to the Parliamentary Library, which by law ought to have a copy of all the rules and regulations of all organisations in the State, but it did not have one union rule book. This rule states:

Every member of the union has the right to be exempt from the contribution of the political fund. To become exempt he or she must inform the State Secretary in writing that he or she does not desire to pay the political levy. The State Secretary is then required to discontinue charging the member for the levy from the commencement of the next ensuing quarter.

That means that the levy is being stopped out of the worker's pay without his permission. He is working for his money, so why should he have to tell his employer that he does not want the deduction to be made? He should get his money first.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Who wrote that speech?

Mr. MATHWIN: If the Minister would listen he would hear that I am not union bashing. All I am trying to say is that the Labor Party, through the unions as its mouthpiece, is taking money from the workers, and that is not right. I am bashing members of the Labor Party, not union members. Under normal business arrangements, it is quite reasonable to assume that one must give written permission for money to be stopped from one's pay packet. That being the case, workers should be given

the chance to say what happens to their pay, and by this I mean they should have the right to contract in. The contract in system is as I will now describe. Each year members are given the opportunity to sign a form to say that they wish to pay a sustentation fee, or levy, or both. If there is any justice in sustentation, people should be allowed to contract in. It is little wonder that some migrants are told that they are workers and they must vote Labor, because of course they pay the sustentation fee. They pay in money to the Labor Party anyway, so that makes them members. It is little wonder that they get mixed up and very worried about the situation. It is little wonder that they do not wish to join a union, because it affiliates them to the A.L.P., which they are against. No wonder the Government insists on compulsory unionism.

At a recent A.C.T.U. congress a decision was made that the union policy would be that by 1978 union membership would cost 1 per cent of the basic award rate. The Australian Metal Workers Union has 150 000 members. The new policy will bring it an income of about \$9 000 000 a year from those members. What will the union do with this money: where will it go? Will it go in sustentation fees and levies to the socialist Party, which needs money for election campaigns and so on? Would one be wrong to imagine at least much of this \$9 000 000 could well go into the coffers of the socialist Party?

I repeat that I support trade unions, and I have always done so; I was once a member of a trade union when I worked in the building industry, but I do not support politics in unions and unions becoming political. It is one of the most absurd myths of our political life that we on this side do not support trade unions. The Liberal Party is not hostile to trade unions, but we believe in a strong and responsible trade union movement. It must be strong to protect and represent the interests of the people at work, and it must also be responsible in the way in which it uses its power, concerned not only with today's pay and conditions of service but also with creating a flourishing commerce and industry that will provide jobs and prosperity for all.

Most of the important rights given to trade unions were supported by the right-of-centre Parties. The right to form trade unions was given by a Conservative Government in 1824. The right to peaceful picketing was given also by a Conservative Government Act, and the right to strike was also finally established by a Conservative Government in 1875. For that Act, a vote of thanks was passed by the T.U.C., at its Congress in Glasgow in 1875, to the Conservative Party Home Secretary.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What year was that?

Mr. MATHWIN: The United Kingdom trade union movement was the basis of the Australian union movement: the honourable member cannot disagree about that. It is nice to know that the Government Whip is dealing with these questions. One of the first questions I asked in 1970 was to him as Minister of Labour and Industry, and I could not get an answer. Since then he has been moved three Ministries and now he is on the back bench.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: How can he answer you when he cannot understand you?

Mr. MATHWIN: The member for Mount Gambier will always help in a case like that. I could go on at length about the advantages and rights that have been given or supported by the right-of-centre Parties. If some members believe that I am a loner on the matter of trade unions paying sustentation fees and money into a political fund, I will quote the sum of the findings of a survey commissioned by the Australian National University and conducted

by the Roy Morgan Research Centre. More than 2000 people were interviewed. Most of the unionists interviewed disapproved of some union activities, including union affiliation to the Labor Party. Three-quarters of the unionists, of course, say they are quite satisfied with the way the unions are run. However, the survey produced the figures I will now cite in relation to affiliation to the A.L.P. To the proposition that unions should not support a political Party, 68 per cent of all people, 67 per cent of union members, 68 per cent of non-unionists, 56 per cent of A.L.P. voters and 79 per cent of Liberal and National Country Party voters agreed. To the proposition that unions should support a political Party, 23 per cent of all people, 27 per cent of union members, 22 per cent of non-unionists, 34 per cent of Australian Labor Party voters and 15 per cent of Liberal and National Country Party voters agreed.

To the proposition that unions should always support the same Party, 21 per cent of all people, 23 per cent of union members, 21 per cent of non-unionists, 29 per cent of Australian Labor Party voters and 16 per cent of Liberal and National Country Party voters agreed. There was a further question in which people were asked whether they would object to unionists taking specific action of which they disapproved, such as having strikes against the Government's economic policy. To the proposition that unions should continue negotiating for better conditions, 90 per cent of all people, 95 per cent all union members, 89 per cent of non-unionists, 93 per cent of Australian Labor Party voters and 89 per cent of Liberal and National Country Party voters said "Yes."

In answer to the proposition that unions should negotiate for higher wages, 77 per cent of all people, 85 per cent of union members, 74 per cent of non-unionists, 82 per cent of Australian Labor Party voters and 72 per cent of Liberal and National Country Party voters said "Yes." A statement that appeared in the survey is as follows:

Most unionists disapproved of some time-honoured union activities, including union affiliation to the Labor Party. Three-quarters of unionists, however, said that they are satisfied with the way their union is run.

We can see from that report that commitment to a political Party, especially in the form of an affiliation, is unpopular with most unionists, even those in the A.C.T.U. When asked whether unions should be affiliated to a Party, 13 per cent of all unionists, 16 per cent of A.C.T.U. unionists and 5 per cent of non-unionists said that they should so affiliate.

In answer to the proposition that unions should have no ties with any Party, 79 per cent of all unionists, 76 per cent of A.C.T.U. unionists and 92 per cent of non-unionists said there should be no ties. The answer is plain from that survey, and it cannot be argued about by the Government. It is obvious what the general public of Australia thinks about the matter. In the matter of contracting in and out, the political levy is a contribution which members of a trade union pay separately from ordinary contributions for the support of certain political objects. This is a levy.

All members of a trade union which sets up a political fund are liable to pay the levy unless they individually decide to contract out. To do this they must notify in writing the union secretary of their objection to paying this levy. However, the member must continue to pay the levy until the commencement of the next ensuing quarter. This may seem a simple, normal procedure, but there is far more to it than that. It means that a member is forced to disclose his political antagonism by having to

contract out, and this in itself is an abuse of the member's political freedom. Remember, we have secret ballot for political elections.

The SPEAKER: Order! I take it that the honourable member is not reading his speech, but rather is refreshing his memory from copious notes?

Mr. MATHWIN: As is usual, Mr. Speaker, I was asked to deliver a copy of my notes to *Hansard* and to the Minister. It is usual when a Minister is delivering a second reading speech to have prepared notes. I think that is the only time that that is done. I am only following procedures laid down by Ministers. I am using parts of the notes to refresh my memory.

Mr. Wells: Why don't you let the member for Davenport read his own speech?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Florey is out of order: he must resume his seat.

Mr. MATHWIN: If the honourable member for Florey had been here earlier, he would have heard me say that in 1970 (before the member for Davenport was in this House) I was asking questions about this matter, so all I am saying is from my own research and knowledge of what happens in these matters.

Members contracting out are therefore liable to victimisation, and it takes a brave man to claim exemption on these grounds alone. The old story started by the socialist Parties that all who labour for a living must be Labor supporters has no foundation at all, as the recent flop of the general strike has shown. Far too many workers defied the union order to strike. Indeed, there are many unionists who are in complete disagreement with the inclusion of politics in unions, as is proved by the figures I quoted from that survey. It is no hardship to any member who wishes to contribute to the socialist Party to be forced to declare this fact, and he is then obliged to notify the secretary in writing in the usual manner.

Let us look at the position very clearly. The socialist Party needs money for its election campaigns, and what better method of getting it than from the pockets of union members? This is why this Government and all socialist Governments refuse to change the present system from contracting out to contracting in. This Government has almost blackmailed local government authorities into giving employment to trade unionists only. Before members of the Government deny the word "blackmail" I will quote the following part of the letter sent to the councils by the Minister of Local Government:

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

Note the word "determined". The industrial instruction reads, in part, as follows:

A non-unionist shall not be engaged for any work to the exclusion of a well-conducted unionist—

whatever a "well-conducted" unionist may be I do not know: I presume the Government feels he would be an indoctrinated unionist—

if that unionist is adequately experienced in and competent to perform the work. This provision shall apply to all persons (other than juniors, graduates, etc., applying for employment on completing studies and persons who have never previously been employees) seeking employment in any department and to all Government employees. However, before a non-unionist is employed the employing officer shall obtain in writing from him an undertaking that he will join an appropriate union within a reasonable time after commencing employment.

We know the answer to that question. The Government is forcing everyone to belong to a union with its policy of absolute preference to union members. I believe that is compulsory unionism. Union members must pay a sustentation fee to the Labor Party. They will therefore be the Government's paymasters in this State.

I will now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 allows the person to contract in by giving his or her consent in writing to the payment of a fee to any political organisation, which enables them to voluntarily pay a levy if he or she desires, so that in future they will not be forced to pay finance to a political Party they do not either support or are especially opposed to. I ask members to support the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electoral Act, 1929-1973. Read a first time.

Mr. COUMBE: I move.

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It seeks to overcome an anomaly that exists in the Electoral Act, which was no doubt caused by an oversight in preparing the extensive amendments to the Act in 1973. Following those amendments, a common roll was adopted for elections for the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly. Unfortunately, in the rush of legislation following a conference between both Houses, amendments were not made to section 110a of the principal Act to allow it to apply to Legislative Council elections. Before that time members of the Legislative Council were elected on a different franchise, and the voting was voluntary.

Section 110a provides that, where an elector believes his name should be on the roll for the House of Assembly elections and discovers that this is not the case, he may approach the Returning Officer to have his vote recorded in the prescribed manner. Unfortunately, this facility does not apply to electors who wish to vote for the Legislative Council. Obviously, as a common roll is now used, this right should be available to all voters. Many complaints were received following recent elections, and confusion obtained, when electors for the Legislative Council found at the polling booth that their names had been removed from the electoral roll for a variety of reasons, and that they could not claim a section vote for the Legislative Council yet they could for the House of Assembly.

This Bill seeks to rectify this position. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 110a of the principal Act by deleting all references to Assembly districts and subdivisions and refers to the elector's present place of living. Last session when I brought this matter before the House, the Bill was adjourned from time to time. Eventually I was forced to discharge it because the Government did not proceed with it before the time in which private members could raise matters elapsed. The equivalent of section voting will apply for council elections under the recommendations of the Select Committee on the Local Government Bill, a matter the House will soon consider. The provisions of this Bill will enable all types of government elections held in this State to be conducted on a common basis as far as this aspect of voting is concerned. I commend the Bill to members.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO secured the adjournment of the debate.

## INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should introduce a Bill to provide for a Decentralised Industry Incentives (Pay-roll Tax Rebates) Act as a matter of urgency to assist in alleviating the financial plight of industries in rural areas and to provide incentive for further development of decentralised industries.

I have raised the issue of pay-roll tax several times in this House. I first brought the matter to the attention of the House in 1973, when I asked the Premier to introduce legislation in this State similar to that which exists in Victoria so that the same benefits would flow to the people of this State that flow to Victorians. Pay-roll tax is one of the most iniquitous taxes that exist in this country. Basically, it is a tax on productivity and not on profit. The need for such an Act as my motion requests in South Australia is evident if I use, as an example, Riverland horticultural industries. The fruit-growing industry and the growers involved in that industry pay to the Government more than \$1 000 000 annually. That sum is a direct deduction from growers' profits and is, in turn, a direct deduction from the money that is readily available to maintain an area such as the Riverland.

Pay-roll tax is costing growers who grow fruit for the canned fruit industry in the Riverland about \$6 for each tonne of fruit produced and delivered to the Riverland cannery. In many cases, the total pay-roll tax paid indirectly through the co-operatives and private companies in the area by primary producers to the Government would be far in excess of the average sum they now pay to the Federal Government as income tax.

Berri Co-operative Packing Company in 1975-76 paid \$57 500 in pay-roll tax, Berri Co-operative Winery paid \$33 000, Berri Fruit Juices paid \$95 000, Renmano Wines paid \$30 000, Renmark Fruitgrowers Co-operative paid \$25 800, Barmera Co-operative Packing Company paid \$12 100, Kingston-Moorook Packing Company paid \$7 200, Loxton Co-operative Producers paid \$23 000, Loxton Co-operative Winery paid \$8 200 and Riverland Fruit Products paid \$81 000. One can readily calculate that \$1 000 000 is being paid directly to the State Government at a time when the Riverland cannery (from which the State Government is deducting about \$6 a tonne) has been able to pay only about 70 per cent of its original F.I.S.C.C. price set for canned fruit. Consequently, the grower is receiving well under the cost of production. At this stage to relieve the company of pay-roll tax would, in effect, place another \$6 a tonne in every grower's pocket that would then become readily available not only to the grower and his family but also to the commerce of the whole district.

I emphasise that it was a pledge of the New South Wales Labor Party before that State's most recent election that, if it was elected to Government, it would introduce legislation exempting pay-roll tax in New South Wales similar to the Decentralised Industry Incentives (Pay-roll Tax Rebates) Act of Victoria. It is not as though this initiative has not been taken already. Victoria has had the benefit of this pay-roll tax rebate since 1972. I refer to numerous examples that have been placed before me by companies in the Riverland that are seriously affected by this tax. A letter I have received from Berri Fruit Juices Co-operative Limited states:

We refer to the matter of incentives for rural industries in the form of pay-roll tax rebates, which is to be debated in Parliament on August 18. We wish to strongly support this move and make the following points regarding the additional costs involved in conducting an industry in a rural area:

1. Freight costs of both raw materials in and finished goods out to city markets add additional costs to the product. Such freights have been increasing regularly with the rising costs of wages, workers' compensation, fuel, registration, and insurance.
2. In an industry such as the one conducted by this company expertise is required in the fields of production, engineering, chemistry, and administration, including electronic data processing with our local computer. Each of these activities needs to be headed by a leader in their field, and it is extremely difficult to attract the required person away from a capital city. In most cases it means that a salary above the norm has to be offered, and as such people are reluctant to purchase a home in the area, it means that the company has to provide suitable housing. This involves considerable capital investment and additional costs.
3. Telephone and travelling costs are proportionally greater because of our geographical location, requiring interstate trips on a regular basis for most of our executive staff to attend industry meetings, visit customers, and keep up with industry matters in general.

We must also point out that our competitors who are decentralised within Victoria are receiving such incentives, and as they are much closer to the large and important markets in Melbourne and Sydney, we have considerable difficulty in remaining competitive in the market place. It is extremely important that we be competitive and remain a viable organisation, as in processing some 70 000 tonnes of citrus fruits our contribution to the survival of the citrus industry in South Australia is vital.

That indicates the company's position. A letter I have received from the Berri Co-operative Winery and Distillery Limited states:

As you are no doubt very much aware the wine industry in South Australia has been very much disadvantaged compared with its counterparts in the Eastern States for a number of reasons, and nowhere is it more apparent than here. The industry in South Australia suffers a number of additional disabilities due to decentralised operations. This has been recognised for some years by the Victorian State Government, and to give some assistance to industry in the Mildura area, for example, pay-roll tax has not been payable for several years. Amongst the disabilities we have at present are comparative grape prices, freights, pay-roll tax, and the brandy duty, and sales tax on same are certainly hitting country wineries and distilleries extremely hard, to the detriment of hundreds of growers in country areas such as ours.

That letter indicates not only the situation relating to the citrus industry but also as it affects the wine industry in the Riverland and in South Australia. Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Limited was forced to pay about \$6 a tonne to the State Government on every tonne of fruit delivered to it for processing, and I have received the following letter from that company:

You are well aware of the difficulties facing the fruit canning industry and we believe that the rebating of pay-roll tax would be of major assistance to Riverland Fruit Products since most other deciduous fruit canners now receive this rebate.

The company is referring to canners in Victoria who receive the benefits of the decentralised industry pay-roll tax rebates that exist in that State. The Loxton Co-operative Producers Limited (a dried fruit packing company) has written as follows:

This company paid \$22 000 in pay-roll tax during the last financial year and anticipates a payment of \$30 000 to \$35 000 this year. An exemption from pay-roll tax would mean that our shareholder-growers would directly benefit by this amount.

It is extremely important that the shareholder-grower members would benefit directly by that amount. I have received a letter from the Berri Co-operative Packing Union that states:

The direct effects of the down-turn in the fruitgrowing industry revolve very significantly around very high labour costs incurred by this labour-intensive industry. As one result, there are, for example, enormous difficulties in competing on export markets or, for that matter, even remaining competitive with imports from other low labour cost exporting countries.

We have seen a continued decline in exports of fresh citrus. For citrus juices, the problem is one of imports of lower cost juice concentrates; although the Federal Government has recently taken action to give some relief in this area (by acting on the recommendation of the Temporary Assistance Authority) this sector remains in a precarious position with very real doubts as to long-term stability.

The letter concludes:

. . . action to eliminate pay-roll tax is by no means the complete answer to our problems, but it does provide the Government with an opportunity of providing some positive measure of relief.

I fully agree with those sentiments. It does not provide solutions to all the problems facing the industry, but it does enable the State Government to assist in this direction and to provide some relief. I have many other letters received from grower organisations and companies operating in the Riverland, but I will not refer to them today, because generally they are in keeping with those to which I have referred. If the Government is genuine in its concern for the plight of rural industries and in its concern for decentralisation, I believe this is a positive action that it can take to provide a real incentive not only to existing decentralised industries but also to other industries to establish in areas outside the metropolitan area.

Victoria is one of the most successful States in decentralisation, and was the first State to initiate this type of legislation. On August 6, together with many shareholder-growers of Riverland Fruit Products, I attended a meeting at Berri, and a telex message was received from the Minister of Agriculture in which he stated that the growers should not be asking for pay-roll tax rebates, because the State Government had already done so much for the fruit industry. The assistance provided at present by the State Government to the canned fruit industry is by way of interest-bearing repayable loans, so that the assistance is simply a business undertaking: the money must be repaid by the grower, and he must pay interest on the loan. We have to decide what is real incentive and assistance to decentralised industry at this stage. The adoption of the Victorian type of pay-roll tax rebates would do much to stimulate confidence in rural areas. I commend the motion to the Government and to the House, and I trust it will receive unanimous support.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### WATER RESOURCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### EXPLANATION OF BILL

It is designed to give some real power to the Water Resources Appeal Tribunal set up by Division III of Part II of the principal Act in dealing with appeals under section 65 of the Act. Under the principal Act a licence is granted

or refused by the Minister on the advice of the appropriate advisory committee. A right of appeal to the tribunal against the refusal to grant a licence, *inter alia*, is given by section 64. The power of the tribunal in the principal Act is to uphold or quash the decision appealed against. There is not the power, given to most appellate bodies, to substitute its own decision for that appealed against. This means that even after a successful appeal the Minister could maintain his refusal or at any rate could certainly first grant the licence and then revoke it.

Thus, there can arise the ridiculous situation that an applicant can go to the trouble and expense of an appeal, win the appeal, and then lose because the Minister can again refuse or at any rate can certainly grant the licence and immediately revoke it. This, in practice, makes the tribunal almost useless. If an appellate tribunal is set up, it should be not mere window-dressing but should have some power. One would have thought that the administration would act on the decision of an appeals tribunal, but the case of *G. H. Michell and Sons (Australia) Proprietary Limited v Minister of Works* (judgment of the Full Court on an interlocutory application given on March 28, 1974) is an example of a case where the applicant successfully appealed to the tribunal and still had his application not granted. He won, but he still lost.

That case was brought under the now repealed Underground Waters Preservation Act, 1969-1975, but the appeal provisions are similar. It should be noted that the old Underground Waters Preservation Act, 1959-1966, did give the appeal tribunal the power to substitute its directions for the decision appealed against. I am conscious of the need to prevent an appeal tribunal from becoming in effect the policy-making body. Therefore, the method I intend in this Bill is to empower the tribunal to quash the decision appealed against with such directions as to the tribunal seem necessary or desirable, and to provide that the Minister shall comply with any such directions.

While I think it is generally undesirable to allow an appeal from merely administrative decisions of a Minister, the principal Act gives the Minister some discretion which go beyond mere administration and which are properly the subject of an appeal. In any event, it has long been accepted in legislation on this subject that there should be an appeal tribunal. In such a case, the decision of the tribunal should have some real effect.

The governing council of South Australian Fruitgrowers and Market Gardeners Incorporated, which is very interested in water resources, has stated by letter that it approves of the principal of this Bill and considers that the Minister should comply with any direction given by the tribunal. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 is the operative clause. It repeals section 64 of the principal Act and substitutes a section 64 that enables the appeal tribunal to give directions on quashing a decision and directs the Minister to give effect to such directions.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### PRE-SCHOOL TEACHERS

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I move:

That this House express its satisfaction with the present Commonwealth 75 per cent funding arrangements for pre-school teachers' salaries and approved support expenditure; note with concern recent statements attributed to spokesmen for the Commonwealth Government to the effect that this arrangement will be renegotiated, and call upon the

Commonwealth Government to adhere to the existing system, or, if it finds this proposition unattractive, to at least make funds for childhood services available to the States on a block grant basis, which would be consistent with its much vaunted federalism policy.

I am sure that members of the community have noted with disquiet and dismay the announced intention of the Fraser Liberal-Country Party Government—

Mr. Gunn: And a good Government it is, too.

Mrs. BYRNE: The people will decide that in the future. It has announced its intention to renegotiate the current funding basis for the salaries of pre-school staff throughout the country as at the end of this year. This publicly announced intention is, in my opinion, ominous. It means, to me and to members on this side, only one thing: the Federal Government presumably is going to break another election promise and renege on an agreement undertaken by the previous Labor Government. From information filtering back to the States from well-informed sources, there is every reason to believe that the Fraser Government is seriously considering a substantial reduction in support from the present 75 per cent of salaries of pre-school staff to 50 per cent.

It may be valuable to remember that the Fraser Government confirmed the present scheme as recently as from January 1 of this year. That was done against the background of pre-election promises made by that Government that it would not interfere with the unqualified promise of the previous Federal Labor Government that such a level of support would be provided. The proposal to renegotiate can be construed only as an unjustified breach of faith to the electorate. On the basis of the actions and promises of the Commonwealth, our State Labor Government provided complementary State funding so that we were able to abolish pre-school fees as from January 1 this year, an action welcomed by all parents. Any significant variation in the level of Commonwealth funding will threaten the reintroduction of fees in pre-schools, because it will be most difficult for the State Budget to meet the significant short-fall in funds that undoubtedly would arise.

The present proposal hardly accords with any reasonable interpretation of the new Government's federalism policy. It must be a matter for the States to ascertain local needs and to determine the most appropriate means of meeting them in practical terms. One needs only to examine newspapers to detect an already mounting groundswell of indignation from the various States to the letter from the Director of the Office of Child Care, in Canberra, dated July 23, and a letter from the Acting Prime Minister, dated June 28. These letters do not spell out exactly what is contemplated, but there can be no doubt that what is euphemistically referred to as renegotiating the formula could well mean that the States would be met with a unilateral decision to reduce Commonwealth funding to 50 per cent. It heralds a clear negation of the publicly understood pre-election promise of the Commonwealth Government, and will present a severe Budget strain on pre-school operations. It could give rise to a need to impose substantial fees or, where appropriate, increased fees after the introduction of the present scheme as recently as January 1 this year. In South Australia the reduction of the funding level to 50 per cent would result in a loss of recurrent revenue to pre-schools of about \$2 000 000, and this will steadily rise as salaries increase. On present budgetary planning there does not seem to be any way in which such a sum could be absorbed consistently with the preservation of

any degree of development of multi-purpose childhood services in line with the State Government's pre-election promises. As I have previously said, it would almost certainly give rise to a need to seriously consider reintroducing fees in our kindergartens if a programme of some expansion is to be feasible. I am sure all members will agree with me when I say that this would be a deplorable retrograde step. The announced new policy sets up a needless distinction between pre-school and child care. The policy of the South Australian Government, in line with that of the Whitlam Government, the old interim Children's Commission, and, indeed, the present Commonwealth Government (if some of its statements are to be believed), is for integrated childhood services. We no longer build pre-schools, but build integrated facilities providing whatever services are required in that particular area (pre-school, child care, play groups, and so on).

To announce a diversion of funds from pre-schools to child care is to use language that has been outdated at least for more than 12 months. No-one denies that there are pockets of demand for child care, which can be adequately catered for through the integrated services approach. Figures are available to demonstrate that South Australia is now over-provided with commercial and subsidised child-care centres. All members would, nonetheless, be aware of the continuing demand for expansion of pre-school places. As a member for a developing area I am certainly aware of this need. Pre-schools are extending and diversifying their range of activities, and a vigorous campaign is now under way to develop this concept rapidly. Some of our pre-schools are as yet a distance from providing an adequate range of desirable services, especially for day care, but this is not to say that significant actions have not been taken in many instances.

Some limitations and problems arise from the existing physical facilities and staffing, but short of a massive injection of capital and recurrent funds from the Commonwealth then progress in this area will necessarily be steady rather than spectacular. What we want in this State is a dramatic demonstration of this. The burden of cost for any rapid development in this regard should clearly be met by the Federal Government, and not the States. In another debate the member for Glenelg quoted from a letter from Senator Guilfoyle. A relevant part of the letter was as follows:

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 of play group activities, or it can simply mean bringing other health, welfare, and care services together at the pre-school.

That is fair enough so far as it goes; in fact, it is completely in line with A.L.P. policy as announced by Mr. Bowen, its spokesman in the Whitlam Government. However, the present Commonwealth approach to this extremely important aspect of community activity constitutes nothing less than an insidious and carefully thought out method of achieving in practical terms a significant reduction in the level of Commonwealth Government pre-school funding. Government members consider that, if this is federalism at work, it is nothing more than a shoddy exercise and could be classed as a confidence trick on the parents of pre-school children in Australia. I am sure that this State Government will refuse to agree to any alteration to present arrangements and, if Opposition members are wise, they will support this motion.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I have pleasure in supporting the motion so ably moved by the member for Tea Tree Gully. It is also relevant for me to do so because my district, like hers, contains classes of people who are likely to be affected by the measures to which the honourable member referred. In a public statement to the *Australian* on July 31 this year the Minister for Social Security (Senator Guilfoyle) said that her Government wanted a broader range of services for children, especially those of single-parent or low-income families. I do not quarrel with that general objective, nor could anyone. If it were possible to achieve with the available funds a continuation of the system we now have and that aim announced by Senator Guilfoyle, so much the better and I would be the first to applaud it. The Minister continued her statement as follows:

To achieve these priorities within the funds available for the programme, it will be necessary to review the present basis of the Commonwealth's recurrent assistance for pre-school education, so as to ensure that most help goes to those in greatest need.

With the greatest of good will, I am willing to accept that the Senator must have misunderstood the situation as it applied in the various States, because she referred first to highly desirable priorities. If she had gone on to say that the intention of her Government was to maintain the level of assistance to pre-school activities as well as to provide for the other areas it considered to be important, then there would have been universal support. However, the Senator's sinister second paragraph stated that to achieve the priorities the funds available for the programme would have to be reviewed. Putting it at its best, it would seem that the Senator has misunderstood the situation. Putting it at its worst, it would be no less than a confidence trick, because all that would be happening is that, in order to achieve one pre-election promise (children who are admittedly in need would be looked after in day-care centres of one kind or another), to compensate for that expenditure there could be cut-backs in other committed areas.

I would hope, giving the Senator the benefit of the doubt, this situation has arisen because of a total misunderstanding of the situation. If, in fact, it is the second proposition, then that is totally deplorable, but I am not willing to accept that it is the second proposition without further evidence. It is important to note that the motion is carefully worded to call upon the Commonwealth Government to adhere to the existing system. Why should the Commonwealth Government adhere to the existing system? I think there are very good reasons why that should be so in all States, but particularly in South Australia. If there is an issue that is strongly supported by both sides of the House, it is the provision of free education for all sections of the community. Both sides also agree that school buildings, no matter what age of children they cater for, because of the enormous capital investment should be made the most use of.

Members would have noted the consistent policy of the current Minister of Education and his predecessor of making use of the schools for community purposes as well as for direct teaching purposes. That has applied to primary and secondary schools to an ever increasing degree, and people have been pleased that that sensible course has been adopted. The same situation has obtained in respect of pre-schools, and in most areas of Adelaide there are extensive kindergartens which have been constructed and which are eminently suitable for activities other than the direct teaching of children. For instance,

they can be adequately used for play groups. I was always sceptical about these play groups, because I imagined they would get hopelessly out of hand or serve no purpose, but at the kindergarten at Salisbury East (which is a credit to the Education Department) play group activities are functioning very well; it is not a harem-scarem activity. The children benefit from meeting other children of their own age, even though they are very young. Mothers in the area are pleased to take advantage of these occasions. By this means the Government has been able throughout the education area to make maximum use of its education capital investments. What will inevitably happen under Senator Guilfoyle's proposal is that the excellent programme that has evolved to the extent that no charge is made for pre-schools will be placed in jeopardy, all in the name, according to the statement made by the Commonwealth Minister, of getting priorities right. That is an extraordinary way of getting priorities right.

The next paragraph of Senator Guilfoyle's statement leads to the disquiet to which the honourable member for Tea Tree Gully referred, because there is a specific statement that the Commonwealth Government intends to renegotiate the current funding base in respect of the salaries of pre-school staff as at the end of this year. Furthermore, consideration is being given to reducing that funding from 75 per cent to 50 per cent. I do not believe that, up to this point at least, Senator Guilfoyle has been made adequately aware by the people of South Australia of the satisfactory arrangements which exist and which I have just outlined. Nor has she been made aware that, if this proposed funding change is brought to fruition by the Commonwealth Government, parents of pre-school children in South Australia will be called on once again to meet a burden.

In the member for Tea Tree Gully's district and my district (and we would not be the only ones in this position), many parents have been delighted to take advantage of the pre-school opportunities for their children and the other opportunities I have explained, on the basis of their being no expenditure by them. That is, I believe, as it should be. The Premier of this State was able to abolish fees for pre-schools in January of this year because of the existing promises of the Fraser Government. The current position is that, almost inevitably, there will be a need to reintroduce fees in pre-schools because of the inability of the State Budget to meet the present situation. I think that is very wrong indeed.

The statement by Senator Guilfoyle does not take into account the variations from State to State as to the factual situation. In her statement she lays heavy emphasis on the demand for child care (in the very wide sense) in the metropolitan areas of Australia. Research and planning in the Adelaide metropolitan area have indicated that there is nowhere near the demand for child care (in the very broad sense of the word) as is suggested by the Senator or her advisers. If that cannot be totally substantiated (and I maintain that research done by the Education Department would substantiate that position), at the very least one would be able to maintain, in comparison to Sydney and Melbourne, that there is nowhere near the demand for child-care centres in Adelaide that there is in those cities.

I should like to see the situation as set out in the motion: namely, a maintaining of the current funding arrangements in pre-schools. If the Commonwealth Government is in a position under its budgetary arrangement to provide additional benefits, it should provide this State with the total sum and let this State Government work out the priorities. There is little doubt that on the funding



arrangements pre-schools would be maintained as they are now, without fee. In addition surplus funds can be used to provide for child care where it is proved to be of the greatest need.

What alarms me most is the Senator's statement in relation to this funding. Throughout this speech I have been careful not to suggest bad faith on her behalf, but rather to suggest that there has not been sufficient investigation of the position by her officers. I join with the member for Tea Tree Gully in demanding further investigation. It especially disturbs me, as a federalist, that a Federal Government that advocates federalism has its Minister making a statement like that, even if it is by mistake. If it is a mistake, all right: I have been saying all along, "Let it be put right." If to honour what a Senator thinks is the politically most advantageous of two promises there is a cutting back in relation to another promise is not a mistake, it is outrageously dishonest. I hope and maintain that it is a mistake and that it will be corrected. It is for that reason that I fully support what the member for Tea Tree Gully has said, and I hope this motion will be carried unanimously and that the message will be passed on to Senator Guilfoyle and the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### IMPOUNDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Impounding Act, 1920-1975. Read a first time.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Section 4 of the Impounding Act provides:

(1) Any council may establish and maintain within its district one or more public pounds, and may appoint fit and proper persons to be keepers of such pounds.

(1A) Any council may join with any other council or councils in the establishment or maintenance of any public pound, notwithstanding that such public pound is not within the district of such first-mentioned council.

The effectiveness of impounding straying stock, which is the basic purpose of establishing such authority in councils and erecting such pounds in council areas, has recently worn a little thin. Theoretically, the Impounding Act sets out the desired reasons why straying stock should be controlled and, where necessary, impounded. The Act also sets out the penalties that will apply when such straying stock are identified with an owner. With due respect, I believe that the Impounding Act, as it appears on the Statutes, is incomplete as a result of changing circumstances. Circumstances have so changed in the rural sectors of this State that the principal Act needs to be updated.

This Bill is fairly self-explanatory, notwithstanding the brevity of proposed new paragraph 45 (a). Accordingly, my second reading explanation will also be brief. Ordinarily, a person or persons practising rural pursuits as a business either reside or arrange for an agent to reside on the property concerned, especially where cattle and sheep or even horses are grazed. However, growing numbers of people are seeking and, in fact, procuring properties at and about commuting distance from their respective metropolitan or township residential base. For example, many people based in Adelaide have either acquired whole farms or subdivided portions of farms on which to enjoy an association with livestock, but they do not necessarily carry on a truly economic farm or grazing practice.

Before identifying the real reason for introducing the Bill, and before identifying the principal culprits, I hasten to say that some hobby farmers, whilst enjoying the aesthetic benefits embodied in such practices, are responsibly discharging their obligations in the areas of stock management, bush fire and noxious weed control, and other associated community responsibilities. Indeed, some hobby farmers are carrying out well their responsibility in the community. I do not deny their right to share the benefits that our rural climate provides.

Unfortunately, other hobby farmers and, I suppose it is fair to say, some farmers, too, have failed miserably in this regard. They have failed, first, by paying unrealistic prices for their farmlets in the first instance with a consequent effect on surrounding land values resulting in catastrophic ratings and land taxing pressures. I do not need to pursue that point, because recently we have heard about the pressures to which I refer. They have failed, secondly, to contribute to and share the ordinary basic effort recognised and practised among rural communities since the early settlers settled the land.

Some hobby farmers, certainly within and, I understand, outside my district, are reported to be inexperienced with livestock habits and requirements. Indeed, they do not appreciate how much experience in stock husbandry is required before entering such a practice. Serious problems are reflected by the practice of depositing entire stock on unattended farmlets. This problem is grossly aggravated where inadequate fencing or feeding is provided for those animals. It could be that, on buying, say, six steers at the market to become cattlemen, hobby farmers ascertain that there is, among the initial herd, an uncut animal. Without appearing to be too cynical, I believe that some metropolitan-based hobby farmers would not know the difference between an uncut animal and an ordinary animal. I assure members that, where farmers have developed a well bred and cared for herd, especially where controlled mating is part of the ordinary stock management programme, it is indeed disappointing to find straying stock of any other breed or quality stuffing up those herds. I am gravely concerned about the growing practice of hobby farming in our extremely limited high rainfall areas in this, the driest State in Australia.

I am especially concerned about breeders who now or later are likely to be subjected to the effects of unmanaged entire stock. The Impounding Act provides appropriate fines when the owners of straying stock are identified by the authorities. That is where the problem lies: identifying straying stock with an owner. I respect the attention and effort that council officers throughout the State direct towards this matter. However, it is almost hopeless to identify stock with a certain owner, particularly in the current economic climate, because owners, when they find that their stock has strayed, are smart enough to realise that the value of their stock can in no way be related to the fine that would be imposed. It is therefore difficult to locate owners.

An Act that is almost parallel to the Impounding Act is the Brands Act, which provides the means by which growers can identify their stock. I say provides the means because even the Brands Act does not require a stock-owner in South Australia to identify his stock with either a brand or an earmark. That provision is embodied in section 7 of the Brands Act, which provides:

(1) Any person may, in manner hereinafter provided, obtain the registration of a brand for the purpose of branding his horses and cattle, distinct from the brands of owners of other horses or cattle.

(2) The registration of such brand shall entitle him to the exclusive use thereof.

Clearly, although the invitation is there for a stockowner to register a brand, there is no requirement by law for him to do so. To begin with, we find that stockowners are not required to register a brand. Stock, even where a brand is registered, are not required by law to be so branded. The only requirement under the Brands Act in relation to identification is that an owner shall register a brand before he chooses to make use of a brand. The whole situation is loose in that regard, because responsible local governing authorities set out to control and subsequently impound straying stock but, in trying so to do, they find themselves in the awkward position whereby there is little identification mark to follow and, even if they find some identity between the stock and an owner, unless a registered mark appears on the stock, as I said earlier, the owners do not want to own them.

I believe that the Bill, simple as it may be, will have a desirable effect in making the principal Act workable and useful in that part of the community to which I have been referring, because clearly not only will the owner of a bull or entire horse above the age of one year or a ram above the age of six months keep that bull, horse or ram on any land, but also he shall be required to have that land enclosed (by "enclosed", I mean with adequate fencing), and the owner or an agent responsible for the supervision of the bull, horse or ram must ordinarily be resident on that land or within 10 kilometres of that land. If he fails to comply with those amended requirements, the penalty shall be \$500. I believe that the Bill, if adopted, will overcome the growing concern in the rural sector of the State and that it will be well received by the farmers of and the controlling authorities in the community, namely, our responsible district councils, and, indeed, it will in the long term become useful to and in the interests of the hobby farmers to whom I have referred.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

### INFLATION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I move:

That this House condemn the Government of South Australia for the continual attack by its Ministers on the Commonwealth Government, and support the Commonwealth Government in its responsible efforts to curb inflation and to restore economic stability to this country.

This seems to me to be a most appropriate time at which to be moving my motion, in view of the highly regarded and widely accepted Budget the Federal Government brought down last evening. When one compares the responsible efforts of the present Federal Government with those of its predecessor, one cannot do other than support my motion. I do not think that this Government's Ministers would deny that they have seized on every opportunity to attack the Federal Government. Many of the situations have been illusory; they have been fabricated and commented on with only one purpose—to discredit the Federal Government's commendable efforts.

Obviously, no Government can make major decisions without making an occasional error. If we take a track record of the Labor Administration, which lurched literally from crisis to crisis, and take the track record of the Fraser Government, I believe that all fair-minded citizens would agree that the attacks by this State's Ministers (many of them snide and indirect) have been completely unjustified and unwarranted. We have only to cast our minds back

to the days of the Whitlam Administration to realise this. I think, fortunately for him, that the public's memory is not as long as one might expect it to be but, if members of the public simply cast their minds back to the days of the Whitlam Government, they would have nothing but praise for the responsible efforts of the present Federal Government. I will refresh the minds of the few Government members who have taken some interest in these matters by citing some of the highlights of the Whitlam Administration that culminated in its seeking to govern Australia without money until its demise in December, 1975. One of the outstanding features of the Labor Administration was that it could not find a Treasurer.

Mr. Wardle: They found one.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: They could not find one who had any measure of competence and that strikes me as one of the highlights of the Whitlam Administration. That Administration searched its ranks for a Treasurer and could not find one, but what happened to Australia during the term of office of that sorry succession of aspirants to control the Treasury? I have almost forgotten the list of aspirants, because it grew month by month. We probably had one of the most commendable of its front bench stalwarts in Dr. Cairns, who was one of a succession of Treasurers until he was assassinated by his Leader. He was assassinated by the only one who seems to have survived in all this and who has kept his knife sharp (although I do not know that it is clean), the present Leader. They would love to sack him, but the only one who could possibly fill the job, Hayden, will not take it. There was a succession of Treasurers, and we finished up with the country in an unholy and appalling mess.

Mr. Venning: Why do you think Bob Hawke has not tried the water?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: A fair bit of internecine warfare is occurring in the Labor Party, and one needs pretty good weapons to fight one's way to the top. All the old stagers are jealously guarding their positions, and they do not like an up-and-coming person like Hawke poking his nose in. He has to work his way up, and they hope it will take about 30 years.

Mr. Venning: He has to try the water.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. Fairly outstanding qualities are necessary for a person to work his way up in the Federal Labor Party. No-one doubts Mr. Hawke's ambitions.

Mr. Venning: What did you think of Crean?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr. Crean gave it away. He was one of those who would take an oversea appointment. Probably the most highly regarded and influential member of the Labor Party to reach the Treasury in recent times was the infamous Dr. Cairns, but Mr. Whitlam managed to assassinate him. We recall that Dr. Cairns got within a handful of votes of tipping out Whitlam. This was one of the highlights of the Labor Administration. It lurched from crisis to crisis, from Treasurer to Treasurer. Then we had Whitlam sacking one of the other heavies in the Party, Mr. Rex Connor: he had the experience of being axed by the great Leader, basically, as in the case of Cairns, for misleading Cabinet and Caucus. Mr. Whitlam is the only one who seems to have survived with his skin lilywhite.

We think of the Arab money that was going to finance the Labor Party campaign and of other instances in which, of course, Mr. Whitlam must have known of the negotiations: he had breakfast with a couple of the Arabs. However, the only one with the consummate skill required for

survival in the Labor Party is the present Leader. The highly regarded Mr. Cameron, of South Australia, was axed by Whitlam. Heaven only knows why, but obviously Mr. Cameron's demise was in line with the fate of other senior members on the Federal scene. These were the people who were running the country, and that is the background against which we must judge the present Administration, at which this carping criticism, in this House and publicly, is levelled by State Ministers. In the interests of Australia, the sooner the public forgets the disaster of the Whitlam Administration, the better.

The Labor Party has major problems. It would dearly love to axe Whitlam, but it cannot get anyone with quality or ability who can survive the Party rat race. Even Bill Hayden, who seems to have been one of the least unsuccessful of the Labor Treasurers, will not take it on. The record of the Whitlam Administration was abysmal. It led to an election in which a majority was achieved that was a record since Federation. It ill behoves Ministers to attack the record of the Fraser Government. The Premier is proud that he will battle with anyone for South Australia. At times we have heard muted criticism of the Whitlam Administration by the Premier, but the only occasion I can recall when the Premier really tried to shrug off the Whitlam Government was during the July election campaign last year. In that election, you, Sir, were successful in defeating one of the endorsed Labor candidates. I do not wish to embarrass the Speaker. I am glad he managed to buck the machine. It is no reflection on your office, Sir, but the Speaker was one of the few in the Labor Party who managed to buck the machine. During that election campaign, we saw for the first time a real attempt by the Premier, for obvious reasons, to shake off any association with Whitlam and company. I believe that, if the Premier had not shaken them off to some degree, an Independent would not have had the balance of power in this House. When he could see the ship sinking, the Premier decided he would shrug off the great burden the Labor Party had been carrying because of the hopeless inadequacy of the Whitlam Administration. We know the dire state of the economy: we were heading for a deficit of \$4 700 000 000. The mind boggles at the enormity of the economic absurdity of the Whitlam Administration.

One of the outstanding achievements of the present Government is that it has been able to come to terms with this deficit. As a result of the efforts of the Fraser Government, about \$1 000 000 000 has been sliced from the projected deficit. We know that Ministers of the South Australian Labor Government take every chance to blast the Federal Government. Let us examine, for instance, the comments of the Premier following last night's Budget. It was an outstanding Budget, which has been accepted with great commendation by the Australian public. It was remarkable that a Government, in such a short time, could produce such an outstanding Budget, giving tremendous tax relief—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Tax relief!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Full indexation proposals have been implemented, giving tremendous tax relief, and there has been no increase in indirect taxation or sales tax. We remember the astronomical taxes levied under the Whitlam Administration. We have only to think of the record increases in postal charges to remember what the Whitlam Administration did.

Mr. Langley: What about the pensioners?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The pensioners are to have indexation under the Budget. The report of the Premier's comments is headed, "State will be hit as predicted—Dunstan". Dire straits have been predicted for South Australia under Liberal Administration. The report states:

From the South Australian point of view, the Budget will hit South Australia's budgetary position very much as we forecast in May.

Then he whinged about Monarto. We all know Monarto is a dead duck and that the Whitlam Government effectively killed it last year. The Premier went on to say:

It seemed unfair that South Australia had not got any money for Monarto while other growth centres had received money in the Budget. We were obviously singled out for attack . . .

What garbage is the Premier churning out! We know that this Government wanted about \$10 000 000 last year, but the Whitlam Government gave it \$500 000: that would not have paid the salaries of the Monarto commission, which is costing about \$1 000 000 a year. The Government is saying that the Liberal Government has singled it out yet the Whitlam Government knew—

Mr. Evans: That \$1 000 000 would go a long way towards providing another school, wouldn't it?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That \$1 000 000 a year would go a long way towards providing essential services in South Australia, and some of the sewers the member for Fisher has been waiting for for 12 years. All the Premier can do is whinge and carp about the Federal Government. If he were half a man, he would acclaim what the Federal Government has done. In this evening's *News* the Premier is quoted as saying:

By cutting the spending in the public sector, and forcing the States into cutting construction expenditure, the Federal Government has made sure we are going to have 400 000 to 500 000 unemployed at the end of the year . . . We will also face an inflation rate of 14 to 15 per cent.

What a prophet of gloom! I wonder what he would have been facing under Whitlam and company, if enough Ministers could survive to make up a Cabinet. Even the Minister of Planning in a moment of weakness has admitted that inflation was the greatest enemy of our school-building programme. Fancy him saying a thing like that: what a slip of the tongue. We know who lit the fires of inflation in Australia.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: And it only happened in Australia and nowhere else in the world?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have said that Australia has one of the highest rates of inflation in the world, but it should have had one of the best records because of its resources. Other members of the O.E.C.D. have reduced their inflation and we are only just getting our inflation under control as a result of the sacking of Whitlam and company. I believe efforts of the present Federal Government in the economic area have been astounding. Tough decisions have had to be made, and they have been made.

Dorothy Dix questions have been churned out by subservient backbenchers to the Ministers in order to give them a chance to blast the Federal Government. I remember the Attorney-General had a go at legal aid; the Minister of Community Welfare has had a go, and I think that probably the Minister of Transport has been the most vociferous. They have all got into the act: they have all had a go at the Federal Government. One of the first instances I turn to is a question about road funds asked by the Hon. G. R. Broomhill and reported on page 357 of *Hansard*. The Hon. G. T. Virgo, in reply, said:

I would be delighted to say that we were getting another \$20 000 000, but in fact the \$20 000 000 Mr. Nixon referred to last evening is the same \$20 000 000 included in the roads legislation enacted by the Whitlam Government when Mr. Jones was Minister. The same \$20 000 000 seems to be announced over and over again. Last night's announcement referred to the Canberra approval to enable South Australia to undertake the work that previously South Australia had decided on for itself. The new federalism policy we are hearing so much about (I think it is called co-operative federalism) means that the Federal Minister (Peter Nixon) decides where the money will be used and how it will be spent, and the State must co-operate by following his instructions.

That is not the most trenchant criticism, but we would like to get the record straight. It was Mr. Jones who introduced this policy, which almost caused the Minister to have an epileptic fit here one evening.

Mr. Venning: It was a show worth watching.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He almost needed medical aid. He could not get on the telephone quickly enough to tell Charlie Jones what he thought of him. It is no good his trying to blame Mr. Nixon for the sins of his predecessor.

Mr. Venning: He didn't use ordinary Australian language, either.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The next page of *Hansard* I turn to has Mr. Harrison asking the Hon. R. G. Payne a question, which reads, in part, as follows:

In the announcement it was stated that the Government was concerned about duplication and overlapping of Commonwealth services and wanted more co-ordination. In view of the Federal Government's record in this field and the composition of the committee, what is the Minister's attitude?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In view of the current record of the Federal Government, I suppose that my attitude is that I would have very grave doubts about any benefits being likely to accrue from the committee to the people of South Australia. Perhaps that is a bit unfair, with regard to the committee. Possibly, a better and, albeit, fairer way to answer the question raised by the honourable member would be to consider the matter in that light.

That is not the most trenchant criticism either, but it indicates the attitude of the Minister; he has no confidence at all in the Federal Government.

Mr. Harrison: He is not alone either: there are a few more of us here, all of us this side.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr. Virgo had something to say at page 415 of *Hansard* in answer to a question about railways by Mr. Olson:

Time and time again, the Premier and I have said that, until that provision is completely satisfied there will be no finalising of the transfer; we will not allow the Federal Government to use employees of the South Australian Railways for political purposes. That, regrettably, is what is happening at present.

The Minister is asserting that the Federal Government is using employees of South Australian Railways for political purposes: that is complete garbage, and the Minister knows it, but he still makes that accusation. We all know that the Hon. Mr. Simmons is well down in the Labor pecking order. I have much respect for his integrity, but he could not help getting in the act. Mr. Langley asked a question on "Sports medicine clinic", and in reply the Minister said:

I should have hoped that more action would be taken in this area before now.

He is referring to the Federal Government. He continued:

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 should think that that particular organisation is feeling the draught as a result of the complete incompetence of the former Whitlam Administration. We have had the Deputy Premier and the Premier casting doubts on the future of water filtration in South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Scare tactics!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course, but it is an unwarranted attack and, in many instances, an insidious attack on the integrity of the Federal Government. This action from a Party whose Federal colleagues showed the most complete lack of integrity of any Government since Federation. What other Government had to sack senior Ministers? We all know that Whitlam is tarred with exactly the same brush and that, if they could sack him, they would. I forecast that it is only a matter of time before Hawke finds his way through the maze of pre-selection into the Federal Government, and we will see a shake-up there. In several newspaper reports we see doubts being cast on the future of water filtration in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much cross interjecting between the benches.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: A press report on March 31 this year stated:

Cash doubt bar to filtration—the State Government will press ahead with the filtration of Adelaide water supply—with or without Federal Government help. This assurance was given today by the Deputy Premier and Works Minister, Mr. Corcoran.

Three cheers for Mr. Corcoran, but keep your eyes on the Federal Government, it is crook!

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Too right! Hear, hear!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is the implication of that article with the Minister subscribing to the nonsense. A press report of April 1, stated:

Doubt over water plan—"Poor communication with the Federal Government was making it difficult for South Australia to plan its water filtration programme," the Minister of Works (Mr. Corcoran) said yesterday. He said the former Labor Government had promised \$100 000 000 to supply the entire metropolitan area of Adelaide . . .

We also know that the Whitlam Administration (before it was swept out of office) gave cause for some doubts about the water filtration scheme, because a press report dating back to the days of that Administration, July 25 last year, stated "Cutbacks threaten our filtered water". I believe that the fears in that case (in view of the broken promises of the Whitlam Government) were well founded. That report also stated:

"The State Government's plans to provide filtered water supplies to Adelaide and northern towns could be threatened if the Federal Government cut back its water programmes," South Australia's Works Minister, Mr. Corcoran, said today.

The report continued:

Mr. Corcoran said today he was concerned any cuts in assistance for the water treatment programme could delay these plans. He said he had telexed the Federal Minister of Urban and Regional Development, Mr. Uren, on the urgency of the matter.

If there were any doubts, they went back to the days of the Labor Party's Federal colleagues in July last year. Government members have carried on with this charade: obviously, they have not been noticing the statements coming from Canberra. I will refer to those statements soon. The Premier got into the act on February 5 this year, and a press report of that date is as follows:

Filter plan in danger. Funds in doubt—Dunstan. The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, has been unable to get an assurance

from the Federal Government that it will honour promises by the previous Whitlam administration to finance the scheme.

We know that those promises were not worth a crumpet. A press statement issued by the Hon. Mr. MacKellar, the Commonwealth Minister, on May 20 this year set out realistically the attitude of the present Federal Government to these matters. Criticism of the water treatment and filtration plan was made after this announcement, so obviously our Minister has not been well informed of the position. Mr. MacKellar's press statement is as follows:

The statements by the Prime Minister and the Treasurer on the Government's policy strategy for combating inflation and restoring employment apply particularly to proposed expenditure in the areas encompassed by the environment, housing and community development portfolio. The Government has had to review programmes in the light of the overall budgetary position and bearing in mind such matters as:

That those who can afford to should pay their own way;

That to be effective assistance must be directed to those in greatest need;

That matters which are seen as the primary responsibility of other spheres of government should be undertaken by them;

That the activities of government wherever possible should not overlap or conflict with activities more effectively performed by the private sector.

Accordingly, the Government has examined the suitability of the programmes as an effective means of achieving its objectives, and it has considered and will continue to consider alternatives to present programmes. As indicated in the Treasurer's statement, the Government is continuing to review a number of programmes and activities, so that as a matter of urgency it can take decisions based on a knowledge of all the facts. These programmes include the growth centres, land commissions, the national sewerage programme, rehabilitation of the Glebe Estate, area improvement, assistance for leisure facilities, and support for sporting and recreational bodies. In the meantime the Government will, of course, fulfil all existing legal commitments.

I ask members to take note of that statement about what the Federal Government will do in the meantime.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Big deal!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is more than the Whitlam Administration was willing to do. There has been an honouring of some of the irresponsible commitments of the Labor Government. Mr. MacKellar's statement of May 20 also referred to water treatment, as follows:

The previous Government agreed to provide financial assistance to South Australia for a scheme to improve the quality of the water supply to metropolitan Adelaide. Some \$14 200 000 has already been provided over the past two years. Further assistance will be provided in 1976-77, up to the limit of the Commonwealth commitment to the project. Latest information is that \$9 400 000 will be required. The departmental forward estimate proposed an additional \$5 000 000 to enable work to be commenced on the next stages of the scheme.

So much for all this poppycock put out by the Premier and the Minister of Works about the integrity and honesty of the present Federal Government in regard to honouring commitments to this State Government. Last evening, in the Commonwealth Budget, \$9 400 000 will be provided to South Australia for a water treatment scheme.

Dr. Eastick: Do you think this State Government is deceitful?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not think that that word is strong enough. What acknowledgment do we get from the Premier about that \$9 400 000 coming from the Commonwealth Government for water filtration? He is strangely silent on that matter, but he goes on with carping criticism about Monarto, when it was the Whitlam Government that effectively sounded the death knell on that. If

we go through all the areas of Government administration in this State and all the Ministers, we find that in every area the Fraser Administration has been criticised. The following is a press report in regard to housing:

Housing plea rejected. Government refusal sparks outcry from Dunstan.

Another report of a statement by the Premier is as follows:

Housing cash not enough. The Federal Government refusal to increase South Australia's allocation for home building this financial year was completely unrealistic, the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said yesterday.

It is no wonder that he does not want to accept his responsibility and join in the federalism policy, whereby he would have to bear some responsibility for making decisions on financial matters. It is easy to shrug off responsibility in these areas and condemn the Federal Government, when it is grappling with the most horrendous economic problems that are not of its making but are of the making of those of the political ilk of the Premier. Another headline referred to the cut in the school-building programme, but that was axed in the time of the Whitlam Government. A headline on a report of a statement of the then Minister of Education is as follows:

Valuable pause in educational plans.

The matter is so ludicrous as to make one laugh. Because the present Federal Government has come to grips with economic reality, we get nothing but carping incessant criticism and Dorothy Dix questions here and in the other place, and press statements day in and day out, but the most disappointed people in Australia about the outstanding Federal Budget are members of the Labor Government of South Australia. I have been told that last evening the Premier went around with his face as long as a fiddle for a couple of hours after he had heard the Federal Budget, because he did not have anything to hang his hat on. The Government was hoping desperately for a really tough Federal Budget so that it could blast hell out of that Government this morning. However, the Budget was so outstanding that all that the Premier can do is whinge about Monarto.

This is one of the most pathetic efforts that I have known of in a long time. I remind the House of the outstanding record of the Fraser Administration, and it is timely to review some of those outstanding achievements. In the short period of eight months that it has been in office, after the long three years of the Labor Administration, the Fraser Government has made outstanding achievement, and I will refer to them now.

It promised an intensive campaign against inflation, and the Budget delivered last evening continues that campaign. For the year ended June, 1976, inflation was 12.3 per cent, compared to 17 per cent for the previous year, and that reduction has been outstanding. We know who is responsible for the inflation and unemployment in this country, and we know well where to sheet the blame for that, just as we know perfectly well who scared off investment and who clamped down on business. It was Mr. Crean's aim as Treasurer to transfer resources from the private sector to the public sector. He said so in a Budget speech. Where did that policy get us?

Mr. Mathwin: It got us \$5 000 000 000 in debt.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: As usual, the honourable member is perfectly correct. The present Commonwealth Government promised to eliminate wasteful and unnecessary Government spending. We know it was Mr. Crean's aim to increase the size of the Commonwealth Public Service. On May 20 this year the present Federal Government announced savings of \$2 600 000 000 against forward

estimates. It also promised to reduce the size of the Federal bureaucracy in Canberra. In fewer than six months the Government succeeded in reducing the number of Federal public servants by more than 3.4 per cent. Further cuts were outlined in last evening's Commonwealth Budget. I do not believe that that aim will be disapproved by the public of this country.

The Public Service in South Australia has grown by 19 per cent, a significantly greater growth percentage than occurred in the Commonwealth Public Service or in the Public Services of other States where they grew by 3 per cent or 4 per cent. The growth in the public sector in South Australia has been phenomenal under Labor. Public Service increases caught up with the Labor Party in the Federal sphere. The present Federal Government promised to reduce the public sector, which it has done. It also promised to end the hidden tax of inflation by indexing income tax. Full tax indexation was introduced this financial year. That is an outstanding achievement.

Labor Governments are high-taxing Governments. The philosophy of socialists is to conduct a great levelling down process so that people with energy and initiative to earn something for themselves and their families are taxed heavily, and in the end no-one has the incentive to get up and go. Wage indexation causes about a \$1 000 000 000 revenue loss to the Federal Government, but the Liberal and National Country Party Administration in Canberra is pleased with that situation, because it believes that income tax should be indexed.

When inflation is considered, wage earners suffer as much as those who receive higher incomes in the professional income groups. The Federal Labor Government did not take action of this kind. It is an outstanding achievement of the Federal Government in the present economic climate to have introduced full indexation of income tax. The Government also promised to reduce the highly inflationary Budget deficit, which was estimated to be 4.7 billion dollars.

Mr. Mathwin: People don't understand billions. What is a billion?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In this instance it would be \$4 700 000 000, which is more than the total Commonwealth Budget of three or four years ago. At the end of June this year the actual deficit amounted to \$3 580 000 000, a saving of more than \$1 000 000 000. Who can deny that that is an outstanding achievement? Government members are strangely silent now these facts are brought out. The present Commonwealth Government promised to bring the money supply under control. Monetary growth under Labor was about 20 per cent a year. I think it was Cairns who was the financial genius who introduced the idea of simply printing money because large deficits existed. That is the most inflationary exercise on which any country can embark. That was Cairns's answer to the problem of a money growth of 20 per cent facing Australia, until Whitlam assassinated him.

Mr. Venning: How did he die? Did he die comfortably?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He certainly did not die quietly.

Mr. Mathwin: He was stabbed in the back.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: As it did with Mr. Cameron, Labor managed to kill off Cairns, too. Do not let me be sidetracked, however, because I wish to hammer home the present Federal Government's achievements to the Ministers of this State who continue with their carping criticism of the Federal Government. The present Federal Government has managed to reduce the rate of monetary growth from 20 per cent to 9 per cent and, at the same

time, it has reduced the inflation rate. To these achievements we can add the encouragement of wage restraint (which was recognised on Thursday last by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission), the investment allowance, and the new family allowance that provides assistance to those most in need.

The family allowance is one of the most imaginative social reforms that has been introduced in this country in living memory. It encourages a wife to stay at home, whereas the pressures of society were so strong that a two-income family was a necessity. It was a realistic social reform for people with larger families where a wife could not go out to work. That family formerly was condemned to a life of poverty. The family allowance scheme was far more imaginative than anything dreamt up by the Labor Government.

The allocation flowing to local government has increased by 75 per cent. Mr. Hayden and others churned out nonsense about the Labor Government including Regional Employment Development scheme money and the stop-gap money in its allocations injected into councils. The 75 per cent increase is a real increase. It is not a stop-gap measure to try to plug a hole where, under Labor, a hole would spring from somewhere else in the ship. It is a real increase in the flow of funds to councils. Greater flexibility for State Governments, and the introduction of the home savings grant to assist young home buyers are other achievements. We believe that young people should be able to own their own house, because if people own something they have a stake in their country and they are likely to be more interested in what happens to it. Under Labor, people formed longer and longer queues to obtain welfare housing.

An outstanding scheme of the present Administration is the home savings grant to encourage young people to save for their own house. Although the present Federal Government inherited the situation created by the Labor Government, it has implemented outstanding achievements while working under the most adverse situation one could imagine. It ill behoves Ministers of this State to harp on day in and day out in this House about the alleged parsimony of the present Commonwealth Government. This motion must commend itself to all fairminded members.

I hope that the Commonwealth Budget will quieten members on the front bench opposite. We know they are disappointed because the Budget is so outstanding. We know that, unless inflation is controlled and a semblance of financial sanity is restored to the finances of this country, Australia will be saddled permanently with a level of unemployment above that which now exists. For the many reasons I have given I believe the motion deserves the support of the House.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I second the motion. The Deputy Leader is right in saying that the Government set out, as from July 27, to build up a campaign coming up to the Budget, in order to attack the Federal Government on a scale even greater than previously. I believe members opposite learned about a week ago that perhaps the Budget would not be as severe as they would have liked, so they started to back off a little. They knew that the Fraser Government accepted the responsibilities given to it, and they realised that it had the ability to rectify the problems and disasters created by the Whitlam Government.

Because of the Premier's great ability to act and perform, he had the stage set for his greatest performance. Unfortunately, however, the rest of the cast was not with him

after the events of last night, nor was the audience willing to listen to him, because the Fraser Budget was a good one. Much more could be said, but other private members' business is on the Notice Paper, so I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1936-1973. Read a first time.

Mr. JENNINGS: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

I must apologise if my speech seems familiar, because this is the third occasion on which I have introduced the same Bill.

Mr. Mathwin: It is rather a hardy annual.

Mr. JENNINGS: Unfortunately, it has been, but it has been passed on each occasion by this House with the support, I am glad to say, of some members opposite. It has not, however, been passed by the Upper House.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: The Chamber of troglodytes.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, but that Chamber is now rather differently constituted. They are not all troglodytes up there now, so I am hoping that on this occasion I will have greater success. The Bill is a simple one which, if carried, will repeal section 7 of the principal Act. Section 7 allows the hunting or coursing of hares to continue, despite other strictures of the Act. Indeed, this Bill is identical with the one introduced by me in 1974 and carried overwhelmingly in this House, but amended in the Upper House in a form making it unacceptable to me. It was not further proceeded with because of time. Many excellent speeches were made in support of the Bill in the 1974 debate. It was ably supported by the member for Fisher, the member for Tea Tree Gully, the member for Mitchell, and the member for Light. The member for Frome led the opposition to the Bill in this House, and I could not help feeling that he was acting on behalf of coursing organisations rather than expressing his own personal opinion.

Mr. Allen: I have been involved with coursing all my life.

Mr. JENNINGS: There is still time to change. I hope that on this occasion, as he has announced his impending retirement from Parliament, the honourable member might vote this time in a way more in character with his attitude to most things. Many of us believe that nothing exists today to justify the continuation of a so-called sport that inflicts unnecessary pain or suffering on any animal merely for the gratification of society, and in this case a small minority in our society. However, amongst those people who support this practice are many who are not by nature cruel or barbarous but who perhaps have followed this so-called sport for many years or have inherited an interest in it from their fathers. These people, I believe, are not truly aware of the pain inflicted on an innocent animal, and they are prepared to cultivate something they have just grown used to. I believe that, in time, they will realise that legislation of the kind I am introducing enriches our society as it ennobles it. When such legislation is discussed, it is amazing how many completely extraneous matters are brought into the argument. People talk about trapping

rabbits, and things such as myxomatosis, and so on. These people cannot seem to differentiate, or perhaps they do not want to do so.

Mr. Rodda: You are not suggesting that myxomatosis should be exported, are you?

Mr. Gunn: It could be brought into the House, to wipe out the Government.

Mr. JENNINGS: It would be quite impossible, however, to confine it to one side of the House.

Mr. Slater: It would be twice as dangerous on the other side.

Mr. JENNINGS: We would be more likely to find people on the other side affected by it because, as I think the member for Rocky River once said, God looks after his own, or something like that.

Mr. Mathwin: Now you are splitting hares!

Mr. JENNINGS: We would be all right. This subject always introduces completely extraneous arguments. Surely those people who say we cannot pass such legislation because it would be inconsistent with what is permitted in other spheres are the people who are themselves inconsistent in that they do not see any difference between vermin control and blood sport.

Mr. Mathwin: He will be talking about bull fights next.

Mr. JENNINGS: The Hon. Dr. Springett, when a member of the Legislative Council, in his excellent speech (I am only sorry he is not here now) said that such a matter as this always raised talk about bear baiting and bull fights, and so on, matters completely extraneous to this argument.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Until you hear the contribution from the member for Glenelg, you might need to fight a bit of bull opposite.

Mr. JENNINGS: That sort of bull we are used to in this place. Certainly the world is cruel and nature is cruel, but we should always try to make a distinction between what is necessary for our own survival and what is merely pandering to our lower instincts for some purely ephemeral self-gratification. Our society improves as we, the constituent members of it, improve. What hope have we of stopping wars, hunger and greed if the animals that share this domain with us are used merely as our play things, bereft of feelings of their own and not worthy of our consideration in any way at all?

Let me quote (I am sorry I have quoted this before) from a report to the Secretary of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals from its staff inspector following a coursing meeting at Murray Bridge held on June 22, 1974. The inspector begins:

I used my own private conveyance and wore plain clothes. On arrival at approximately 10.45 a.m., I gained admittance to the grounds upon the payment of \$1. After parking my vehicle, I obtained a printed programme of events from Mr. Colin Viney, an official of the National Coursing Association, and at about 11 a.m. the first course was run. During the course of the day, I observed the running of each elimination heat of the two events listed on the programme, namely, the South Australian Oaks and No Flag Stake (whatever that means) with the aid of binoculars.

Each elimination heat was contested by two greyhounds chasing a live hare released into the coursing area. Points are awarded to the dog leading in the run to the hare and for turning it, etc., until the hare escaped under the fence at the end of the coursing arena or was killed by the dogs. During the running of the South Australian Oaks, the dogs caught the hare in the fourth heat, the second round and the final. During the running of the No Flag Stake, the hare was caught in the first heat, first round, second round and final, making a total of seven catches for the day from a total of 36 heats. I observed the running of the heats from the mound near



the bookmakers' stand and each time the hare was caught during the elimination heats it appeared to have been killed within a matter of a few seconds after it had been caught. The dead hares had been carried from the coursing area and placed on the ground near a gate leading from the arena.

A few minutes before the running of the final heat of the South Australian Oaks, I decided to walk across to the gateway leading from the coursing area through which the dogs are brought back and near where the dead hares had been placed, in order to examine the bodies of the hares. I was a few feet from the gateway when the final heat of the South Australian Oaks was run. The dogs quickly caught the hare during the final heat. I could hear the hare squealing as both dogs held it. The handlers of the dogs ran out on to the area and caught the dogs and retrieved the hare from the dogs. One of the handlers carried the hare from the arena and placed it on the ground outside the gate, at the same time informing me that it was still alive.

Mr. Allen: Are you going to read it all again?

Mr. JENNINGS: In answer to the member for Frome, let me say that there are members here who did not hear it last year or the year before last. The report continues:

The injured animal was breathing, its eyes were open and it was obviously conscious, although immobile. I drew my pistol and destroyed it immediately. I then made an inspection of the near vicinity, and found the bodies of four hares making a total of five, including the one I had destroyed. The bodies of the dead hares did not appear to be severely mutilated. Whilst I was examining the dead bodies, I was approached by a spectator who informed me that he had seen a hare that had earlier been caught by the dogs, apparently recover sufficiently to get up and run off into open country. It would be impossible to assess this animal's injuries or chance of survival. As the meeting was then concluded I walked straight back to my car and left. Let me interpolate here (and I did not do this last time) that, of course, the inspector had no idea whether that spectator who came up and talked to him had seen anything at all. Nevertheless, I suppose he would not have any reason for doing this unless he had seen it. The report continues:

I had at the start of the meeting been approached by Mr. P. Alsop, President of the National Coursing Association, who welcomed me to the meeting and treated me with the utmost courtesy.

I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 5.57 to 7.30 p.m.]

#### EIGHT MILE CREEK SETTLEMENT (DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Eight Mile Creek Settlement (Drainage Maintenance) Act, 1959-1970. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It amends the principal Act, the Eight Mile Creek Settlement (Drainage Maintenance) Act, 1959, as amended. The principal Act casts a duty on the Minister of Lands to maintain a system of drains and drainage works in the area defined in the Act and, at the same time, provides for the declaration and levying of a special rate on the landholders in the area. The proceeds of the rate are required to be used to make a sufficient contribution towards the cost of the maintenance of the works that the Minister is obliged to carry out.

The reasons for adopting this scheme of rating were canvassed by the then Minister of Lands in his speech moving the second reading of the Bill for the principal Act

(see 1959 *Hansard*, Vol. II at pp. 1850 and 1851). In its present form, the principal Act adopts a five-yearly rating period. Before the commencement of each such period:

- (a) all ratable properties are valued and, after a suitable period for appeals, the valuation remains fixed for the five years of the rating period;
- (b) an estimate is made of the total maintenance costs in relation to the five-year period; this estimate is then reduced to an annual average cost, and the rates for each year of the period are fixed in relation to that cost.

The substantial change proposed by this measure is that the estimate of costs will be done on an annual basis instead of on a five-yearly basis. To some extent this will reduce the impact of inflation on the rates. No change of substance is proposed in relation to the valuation provisions. The only other change of importance proposed is to remove references to the Director of Lands in the measure. Aside from the fact that the title of this office has changed to the Director-General of Lands, it is clear that his functions were formal ones that could be better discharged by the Minister.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 2 of the principal Act by inserting a definition of "rating year". The insertion of this definition will facilitate the annual estimation of expenditure upon the drainage works. Clause 3 substitutes in section 3 of the principal Act a reference to "the Minister" for a reference to "the Director". Clause 4 performs a similar function in relation to section 4 of the principal Act. Clause 5 repeals section 4a of the principal Act, which is an exhausted provision.

Clause 6 amends section 5 of the principal Act, first, by providing for annual estimates of expenditure; and, secondly, by substituting in appropriate circumstances references to "the Minister" in lieu of references to "the Director". In addition, proposed new subsection (3) has been inserted from an abundance of caution to ensure that the substitution of references to "the Minister" do not affect the validity of previous actions by the Director. Clause 7 amends section 8 of the principal Act, and is a consequential amendment. Clause 8 amends section 11 of the principal Act and is again consequential on the amendments previously made by this measure, as are clauses 9, 10, 11 and 12.

I might add that another reason for the amendments relating to the Director and Minister is that, now that the Water Resources Act is on the Statute Book, it is intended that, along with the responsibility for the South-Eastern Drainage Board, responsibility for this legislation will be transferred from the Minister of Lands to the Minister of Works. Therefore, anything to do with water, whether it relates to drainage, control of water, or management of water resources, will come under the aegis of the one Minister.

Also, a certain problem has arisen in relation to the maintenance rates obtaining in these areas because of the need, under the present Act, for a rate to be struck for the next five years. It is obvious that, with the inflation that has occurred in the last few years, it is not practical or sensible for a five-year rate to be struck. It is much more sensible for a rate to be struck annually. I take this opportunity of assuring the House that the recommendation made to Cabinet to have this Bill drafted also contained a recommendation, which was approved by Cabinet, that the maintenance rate applied to the Eight Mile Creek drainage area for the year to May 1, 1977, will be the same as the maintenance rate struck for the past five years.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The Opposition supports the Bill. Indeed, its members were grateful to discuss with the Minister the need for passing this Bill, which we realise needs to be passed speedily. As the Minister said, the principal Act casts a duty on the Minister of Lands to maintain a system of drains and drainage works in the area defined in the Act, which is known as Eight Mile Creek. This area, which was developed for war service land settlers, was formerly a deep, heavy, peat swamp. There are now about 24 properties in the area. I was associated with this matter as a Lands Department officer about 25 years ago.

The drains involved have done much valuable work, having brought into production some high-class dairy country. Of course, much valuable water runs through the drains into the sea, and this is a part of the mystery that attaches to the Blue Lake system. I do not think the phenomenon attached to this area has ever been properly understood. It is the policy of the Opposition that, when it assumes office, it will abolish drainage rates. I emphasise that for the benefit of the people of the South-East and of the State generally.

As the Minister said, there is a need to pass this Bill quickly. The enactment of this legislation will enable rates to be struck annually. In Committee, the Opposition will seek assurances from the Minister regarding changing to the one-year rating period. An examination of the rates paid indicates that the average rate imposed on these properties is between \$350 and \$400 annually. As the Minister also said in his second reading explanation, inflation is imposing a burden on people who engage in dairy farming. An estimate is made of all maintenance costs over a five-year period, and it is then reduced to an average annual cost for the period involved. It is important that these people be charged on a basis that will reduce the impact of inflation on the rates.

The only other important change is to remove references to the Director of Lands in the legislation. Apart from the fact that the title of the office has been changed to the Director-General of Lands, I point out that the officer really made recommendations to the Minister. So, this is merely a machinery provision that streamlines the legislation. The Opposition supports the Bill. I hope that in the ensuing years these people will not face excessive charges. I support this Bill, which provides that the estimate of costs will be done on an annual basis instead of a five-yearly basis, which would be disastrous for the settlers.

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): I, too, support the Bill, which is necessary to relieve the financial burdens of settlers in the Eight Mile Creek area. This Bill is being rushed through the House partly because of some lack of organisation on the part of the Government in connection with this matter, which has concerned the settlers for a considerable time. I would have hoped that, if legislation was to be introduced concerning these settlers, it could offer more relief than is provided for in this Bill. The Eight Mile Creek settlers are in a soldier settlement area that has proved to be extremely difficult to work since it has been drained. The area has some of the richest soil in South Australia, possibly the richest soil in Australia. However, the area has experienced, and is still experiencing, many difficulties.

When soldier settlers on such properties encounter such severe difficulties, the Government's charges seem somewhat iniquitous. The Government should therefore be considering the complete removal of this drainage rate; or, rather than being charged a rate, the settlers should be

allowed to take over the maintenance of the drains. They claim that this would be possible with the equipment that they have on their farms and that they could do it very much more cheaply than can the Government department involved. The water resources legislation transfers the operation of the maintenance crew to the Engineering and Water Supply Department, but it will still be a costly venture for the settlers.

The passing of this Bill will not mean that the charges for the drains cannot be raised in the future: the Bill simply relieves the financial pressure at present experienced. As the Minister has said, the rate for the ensuing year will be no greater than it was in the previous year but there is nothing in the Bill that prevents the Government from increasing the charges in future years; considering the small proportion of the total cost that is now raised I feel this is a possibility. I support the Bill because it provides some measure of relief to the settlers, but I hope that in the future the Government will reconsider the financial situation of the settlers.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I am a little surprised that this matter has been brought up so quickly, partly because there was a meeting only this morning at Eight Mile Creek regarding the drainage rates and also because I received a letter from the Minister of Lands only last Monday saying that the matter was currently under review, with no intimation that a Bill was imminent.

Mr. Millhouse: But you are not complaining, are you?

Mr. ALLISON: Not really; it is par for the course.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What was the date of the letter?

Mr. ALLISON: I received it on Monday. In 1948 or 1949, Mr. Shepherd, a former member of this House, took a deputation to Eight Mile Creek to look at the area for soldier settlement purposes. He took with him members of the Victorian Government. It is on record in the *Border Watch* and the *Advertiser* at that time that the Eight Mile Creek land would prove to be some of the richest dairying land anywhere in Australia. For seven or eight years after that, the farmers made a struggling go of it, because of drainage problems and because they had difficulty in finding adequate pasture. The area became waterlogged in winter, and it was dry in summer. During the 1956 floods, the whole area was under water to the extent that 14 or 15 farmers had to row across their paddocks to inspect their cattle. It was impossible for the farmers to milk their cows or manage their farms. By the end of that winter, eight or nine farmers cut their losses, walked off their farms, and left the Government to dispose of the farms. Since then, a number of farmers (not all of them were soldier settlers) have gone on to the properties and some have left the properties. A succession of men have tried to make a go of it.

These people need some concessions in so far as they have a highland plot, to which they take their cattle in the winter, and a lowland plot, which is peat and extremely heavy and badly drained; this applies to 14 or 15 farmers, and it means that they have to be provided with two dairies, and they now have to have two sets of refrigeration plant. This will break many farmers, who will not be capable of continuing in dairying. Some farmers bought in, in the knowledge that this might happen, although they had a commitment from a local cheese manufacturer that he would take canned milk for 10 years. However, shortly afterwards he moved into Mount Gambier where

he will manufacture his cheese, instead of at Eight Mile Creek. So, that move by the cheese manufacturer compounded the problem.

The drains are shallow, and there is a slight fall moving toward the coast, where the land rises slightly and impounds the water on the coastal, low-lying peat lands. The heavy winter rains are not necessary to flood the land, because the whole of the coastal area is a natural spring area. So, water flows into the swamp lands in winter even if the rainfall is moderate. Therefore, there is a consistent annual problem. If this Bill is designed to help the farmers (having read the Minister's second reading explanation, I have no doubt that it is), I ask the Minister and his department to consider the method of draining the whole area at the lowest possible cost; at present, that is not so.

Men employed are not necessarily fully active all the year. Further, fairly expensive vehicles, such as utilities and land rovers, and heavy equipment are lying there for most of the year not being used. If that material was placed at the disposal of another department and the men were employed by another department, with their work being put into the drainage scheme for part of the year and the rest of their labour charged to a department elsewhere, that would be one way to drain the area at the lowest possible cost.

I say that because, with so few farms and the fairly high cost, if we divide the cost among those farmers every year and say they have to pay that money every year, they will be paying a high annual drainage charge. The other alternative is to allow the farmers or a private contractor to move into the area and find out whether that would enable drainage to be done at low cost. This is not a political issue; it is a matter of helping these people drain the land at the lowest possible cost. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill, if the Government intends to find some way to lower the annual drainage cost and keep the farmers there on a competitive basis, because it is a rich area, with the problem of the highland, lowland drainage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This Bill took me by surprise. I did not know until it was introduced that it was coming in but the Minister has since explained to me the reasons for the Government's action, and I accept them. I do not castigate the Minister for not having let me know about the Bill in advance. I support the measure. The only matter that worries me is the fact that the administration of the Act is to be transferred from the Minister of Lands to the Minister of Works. In other words, the Minister who has introduced the Bill here is adding to his empire at the expense of one of his valued colleagues in another place, and I am afraid that soon the poor old Minister of Lands will not have anything to do.

He has been consistently stripped of the administration of Acts, one after the other, and the Minister of Works has given no reason for changing the administration of this Act, except to say that all things connected with water should be under his Ministerial control. I do not know whether he regards himself as being wet.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: You know I am, don't you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did not say so, though. When the Minister replies to the debate, as I hope he will, I should like an assurance that the Minister of Lands does not mind losing the administration of this Act, and I hope that the Minister will say why the Government has found it necessary to transfer its administration.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): First, I express my appreciation to the Opposition members for their co-operation and assistance, and I also express it to the member for Mitcham.

Dr. Tonkin: He is in the Opposition, too.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, but I single him out for special mention because he sits on the cross benches and we are never quite certain which way he will jump. Of course, we know that he will jump.

Mr. Millhouse: But if I jump your way, that's all right.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, and if the honourable member jumps the other way, he is wrong. Be that as it may, I appreciate the co-operation that I have received. True, the Bill has been introduced hastily, and I point out for the benefit of the member for Mount Gambier that the recommendations to draft the legislation were decided on in Cabinet only last Monday, so that shows how quickly we can move when we have to do so.

Regarding the Minister of Lands, I will put the mind of the member for Mitcham at rest. I do not want to take anything away from my colleague. I would prefer to leave the administration with him and discard some matters that I control if I could do that, but it is good sense and wise administration to place this Act under the Minister who is responsible for the Water Resources Act. I do not think the honourable member will argue about that.

The Minister of Lands is not being stripped of all his responsibility, because the reorganisation of his department (and he now has a Director-General, Mr. Taeuber, who has been appointed recently) now involves the Valuer-General's Department, the Lands Titles Office and all matters dealing with land in that sense. The departments concerned are fairly large and they are additional to his other administrations, so, whilst he is losing in one direction, he is gaining in another. He is like the member for Mitcham, who loses in one sense and gains in another, but always seems to be around.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Interpretation."

Mr. RODDA: The estimate of costs will now be done on an annual basis instead of a five-yearly basis. In his explanation, the Minister states:

Clause 2 amends section 2 of the principal Act by inserting a definition of "rating year". The insertion of this definition will facilitate the annual estimation of expenditure on the drainage works.

This is the gravamen of the Bill, and it is what is concerning the settlers and the member for Mount Gambier. I think that appeals are being heard on this matter, and the valuation over the five-year period gave a rate that the settlers will pay in that quinquennial period. I ask the Minister what will be the situation at this time in this current year regarding rates.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I again state categorically that the rate that was paid for the last rating year will not be increased. Even though new valuations have been struck in this area (and they are subject to appeal at the moment), and have a bearing on the rate that may be struck in any year, this year they will be ignored. The amount of money paid for rates will be the equivalent of that paid last year. Nevertheless, it is important that the people concerned continue with their appeals on valuations, because that could have a bearing on the rate struck in future, even though it will not have any effect this year. It may be the basis of rating for 1978-79, and so on.

The reason why we have not changed the five-year period of valuation is that that is the period set down for valuation anyway, and that is consistent with other Acts. The important thing regarding payment of rates is that it is not only a matter of the valuation: it is the amount that the Government is prepared to bear towards the total cost of the maintenance. Whilst various percentages were borne by the Government in previous five-year rating periods, I think the Government is bearing now about 80 per cent of the total cost. That factor is always considered when the Government is setting the rate. That has always been the case since I have been associated with the Eight Mile Creek area, and I have no reason to believe the position will change. The base on which the rate is struck is the valuation referred to by the honourable member, and that is what is subject to appeal at present.

Mr. RODDA: Is the Minister saying that the rate this year will remain unaltered? He seemed to suggest that in future a settler's ability to pay would be considered. Is that the position?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That has been the case, and it is the present position.

Mr. RODDA: It has not been so in many instances.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I would not be amending the Act, if they had the ability to pay under the old Act.

Mr. RODDA: Will the settler's ability to pay be a prime factor in future considerations?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The reason for these amendments being introduced has been stated by the honourable member. We are aware that people in the Eight Mile Creek area could not afford to pay the rate struck under the existing Act, as the formula applying would mean about a 350 per cent increase. We are aware of the problems these people are facing, as it is a severe time for them. If the Act is to mean anything in future, there has to be a basis on which to rate, and that is the valuation to which we are referring. It is a base that is used in almost every rate. It has been my experience, especially when I was the member for Millicent (and this problem was centred in my district), that Governments of both political complexions have considered the ability of the settlers to pay. That has not been ignored. In each case the Government has made a substantial contribution, and clearly this contribution has been made by the Government and not by the settlers.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): First, sub-clause (b) strikes out the definitions of "the Director" and "the Minister", and there is continued reference to these definitions throughout the remainder of the Bill. In his second reading explanation the Minister said that the position of Director is being replaced by that of Director-General. He also made the bland statement that the duties could be better carried out by the Minister rather than by the Director-General. The emphasis that has been creeping into legislation in the past four or five years, certainly, during the term of this Government, means that Ministers are being given more and more power in almost every jurisdiction.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister has always had it.

Dr. TONKIN: I agree with the Minister, but in this case, why is it necessary to make a change? Why should the substitution not be "Director-General" instead of "the Minister"? Secondly, and I do not wish to cause the Minister any embarrassment, why are we considering this

Bill on August 18, 1976, when the rating year ended on April 30? The Minister did not explain the point adequately in his explanation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I explained that to the Leader when I approached him on this matter. The rate should have been struck in accordance with the Act on May 1. I do not want to hide the position. The Auditor-General has already questioned the department on this aspect, and doubtless will make an observation on it. This position should not have arisen, but it has. Regarding the question from the Leader, if he had listened to the added explanation of why the Director had been replaced by the Minister, he would know that the Director is superfluous because he merely makes a recommendation to the Minister for his approval. Moreover, this Act will move from the jurisdiction of the Minister of Lands to the control of the Minister of Works under the Water Resources Act.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Can the Minister say why the Lands Department will not supply settlers appealing against the amount of maintenance to be paid, based on their valuation, with the criteria used to determine the valuation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot tell the honourable member because, without being rude, it has nothing to do with this Bill. The valuation is a fact when we consider rating, and the rate is based on that valuation. If the honourable member wants the valuer's formula given to these people, he will have to approach the matter at another time and in a different way.

Clause passed.

Clauses 3 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Appeals to Minister."

Mr. RODDA: With the transfer of control to the Minister's department, and its specialists with expertise in water use, will the department be examining how additional and proper use can be made of this water? Many megalitres of water that run into the sea could be used: for instance, the dairying industry could use much of this valuable water.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I assure the honourable member that the present assessment has been continuing for some years. The assessment by the Engineering and Water Supply Department into the water resources of the whole State involves an examination of the matter raised by the honourable member. With much respect, it is a matter that has nothing to do with rating. However, I know the honourable member's interest in this subject, and assure him that it is being investigated, and that eventually, when assessments are completed, recommendations will flow to me that will probably be referred for examination to the South Australian Water Resources Council. True, thousands of megalitres of high quality water flow out to sea each year. As the honourable member would appreciate, because of the topography of the South-East, surface water storage is difficult to achieve, and whether water could be stored underground is another matter.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—"The annual drainage rate."

Mr. ALLISON: When the Minister declares an annual drainage rate will he avail himself of the rather extensive correspondence that has passed between residents of Eight Mile Creek and the Minister of Lands, and to a petition that questions not so much the rate but the basis of rating—the valuation? Mount Schank land, which is only a few kilometres away from the area concerned, is fetching double the price that land at Eight Mile Creek is fetching, and settlers are questioning the basis of the valuation.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (9 to 12) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION BILL

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare) brought up the report of the Select Committee recommending amendments, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

That the report be noted.

I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 17. Page 684.)

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I noticed in my examination of the Loan Estimates that the sum of \$1 600 000 has been allocated to Education Department, school buses. When we consider the lines, I will ask whether this sum relates to the replacement of buses normally used for city and country schools, or whether it means that additional buses will be needed and that some country schools that are adjacent to cities will be closed. It was a contentious point in Mount Gambier when it was intended to close a certain school last year. At that time parents of children attending that school lobbied extensively for it to remain open.

Regarding expenditure on tourism, recreation and sport, Mount Gambier has several projects operating, one of which is the Blue Lakes sports park, a rather massive and expensive project that we hope will be supported financially by the Government. Other relatively minor issues by comparison with the sports park have arisen over the past year or two where local groups have asked for assistance from the Minister but with comparatively little success.

In 1974, the Young Men's Christian Association reported that it was in trouble with its heated pool, which must be kept at a temperature of 29.4°C. That temperature is causing excessive condensation which is causing timber beams to sag, thus endangering the ceiling. It is therefore necessary to strip the ceiling and replace it. Officers of the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department told the Y.M.C.A. to obtain a quote from an engineering firm for the repairs. A quote was obtained from a Melbourne firm of consultants at a cost of several hundred dollars, on the assumption that a grant would be forthcoming from the Minister. So far that grant has not been forthcoming, and the situation has been further compounded.

The pool could be run at a much lower temperature of 21.1°C with a saving of about \$2 500. However, officers from the Education Department, who have investigated the matter in conjunction with the Y.M.C.A., said that, if the temperature was reduced to 21.2°C, they would recommend that all school-children be precluded from using the pool. In order to ensure that school-children continue to learn to swim in the only heated pool in Mount Gambier, its temperature must be maintained between 27.8°C and 29.4°C, which is considered to be the minimum temperature range for use by school-children.

I am told that in European pools the temperature ranges from between 32.2°C to 35°C for teaching young children to swim. If that temperature range was to be used in the Y.M.C.A. pool at Mount Gambier, it would create further problems for the committee. I know the Government has problems in financing organisations such as the Y.M.C.A. from Government funds, but it has made grants in the past.

Whyalla Y.M.C.A. was funded extensively by the South Australian Government. The Y.M.C.A. complex in Mount Gambier is unique: it is one of the finest in the Southern hemisphere. It was one of the largest in Australia when it was built by subscriptions of \$100 000 raised by Mount Gambier citizens, and it still carries a mortgage of about \$42 000. This year, for the first time, it is operating at a deficit of about \$5 000, and cannot afford the \$28 000 to \$30 000 needed to replace the pool ceiling.

The pool is used to provide extensive swimming tuition for students in the South-East, and is considered to be an essential part of the community's sport and recreational facilities. I have already asked the Premier and the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport three or four times for assistance. Deputations from the Y.M.C.A. board of management have discussed this matter with the South-East Regional Consultative Committee, and they have recommended strongly that something should be done. There is no lack of support in the South-East. People there are not neglecting their own duties. The Y.M.C.A. is organising a large appeal to help itself, following the \$100 000 foundation appeal. The district is not reliant on charity, but this is one of those public institutions which goes under the name of the Y.M.C.A. and which is deserving of some subsidy. I ask the Government to give some assistance in the Budget, if possible, particularly in view of the previous indication of the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport, who had considered this matter to the extent that his officers had asked the Y.M.C.A. to obtain an engineer's report.

I have been asked to bring another matter to the attention of the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport. This is a matter in which the Deputy Premier gained some political capital when he opened the West Gambier Football Club complex some time ago. At that time, great play was made in the press that a \$40 000 loan was being prepared for the club, and many people in the Mount Gambier area were under the impression that the Government had extensively assisted the club. I place on record—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It was guaranteed.

Mr. ALLISON: The loan was never made available. The club did not qualify for it. I asked the Secretary to bring in all the papers that were in the office, and he said there was no qualification.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I think you had better go back and check the facts.

Mr. ALLISON: He said there was no qualification.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I don't care what he said.

Mr. ALLISON: It is certainly an issue. In any case, they have had no financial assistance.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You will check the facts, won't you?

Mr. ALLISON: It was not financial assistance. No money has changed hands, that is obvious.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I am referring to a Government guarantee of a loan, not a loan. You check that.

Mr. ALLISON: I will check that. There is no indication in the papers of the club.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It enabled them to borrow the money at a reasonable rate of interest.

Mr. ALLISON: It is news to me that the club has had no assistance at all.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You don't seem to understand that they would not have got the money at all if—

Mr. ALLISON: I understand what the Deputy Premier is saying, but this was not made clear to me by members

of the committee. I will check it, because it is a most important issue. The city corporation has been far-sighted in providing extensively for tourism and recreation by buying land, inside and outside the city, in order to provide parks and sporting areas. I should like the Government to consider assisting the city council further in the development of these areas, but there again public service organisations in Mount Gambier are civic minded and are coming forward to help with development projects.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't lay it on too thickly. It is a delightful spot and my family came from there.

Mr. ALLISON: I cannot recommend anywhere else in the State, because I do not represent any other place. I admire Adelaide, but I was put into Parliament by Mount Gambier people. Apart from that, it is the only place in Australia where I have ever resided and, after 21 years, I have a certain amount of parochial pride. Another issue on which we have approached the Government is the provision of rail trucks from the Northern Territory for taking cattle from local South-Eastern markets. There is a desperate shortage of trucks. The railways department has succeeded in winning back a considerable amount of traffic, because the stock transporters with trucks are not able to cope. They cope with sheep, but they do not cope adequately with cattle. When markets reach a certain stage, there is often a time when the South Australian Railways must say that it does not have enough trucks to take stock from the market, and sales begin to decline, generally about mid-afternoon. People who are already having strife in getting rid of cattle are further handicapped by not having sufficient transport to get them to markets. About 80 per cent of the stock goes to the Victorian markets, and more rail trucks are needed.

The Federal Government, which is taking over the South Australian railways, has 70 or 80 trucks in the Northern Territory that it is ready to ship to Alice Springs. It is willing to road freight them down but, after having lobbied the Minister of Transport on behalf of the southern stock agents, we find another difficulty, in that the South Australian Railways bogies are not quite the right height for the rail trucks available, and some money must be set aside for alteration of the bogies. I should like to think that that would be treated as a matter of urgency in the forthcoming Budget, because it will greatly help primary producers in the South-East.

The Treasurer has referred to the matter of Federal Government policies. I would like to draw attention to the actions of another socialist Government, the Government in the United Kingdom, a Government the Treasurer strangely ignores. He quotes Yugoslavia, Norway, and a host of other countries in Europe, but not the British Government, which is reporting a sharp fall in the inflation rate and a dramatic fall in strike figures. A special wages contract has been arrived at, a policy of wage restraint by the unions. Extensive reports available from the British High Commission in Canberra show how, by Government and union co-operation, these problems can be and are being solved in Britain, where the problem was far worse than in Australia. If trade unions and the Australian Labor Party would face reality and copy the example being set in socialist Britain and agree, not on indexation, but on a voluntary policy of wage restraint, I have no doubt that inflation could be conquered far more quickly, to everyone's advantage. Obviously, it is essentially a political issue, not one on which we are readily going to obtain co-operation. I deliberately bring to the attention of the House that this is being done in one European

country where the situation was far worse than it has been in Australia, where inflation was raging, and where left wing unions were in absolute control. They have received a tremendous smack in the face, and have been told that a policy of voluntary wage restraint will be followed. I should like to think that that could happen in Australia.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): Much has been said in this debate by Government members about the so-called good housekeeping supposedly carried out by the Treasurer. We have been hearing for some time about the surplus Budget the Dunstan Government would present. Again, we have been told that this is purely as a result of good housekeeping. As has been said in other debates today, nothing has been said about many of the State's assets that have gone down the drain in this supposedly good housekeeping.

Mr. Becker: They have sold the dining-room furniture.

Mr. WOTTON: The dining-room furniture and half the farm. Nothing has been said about the sale of the South Australian Railways and the selling off of many of the State's assets. In a debate today concerning the Fraser bashing that has been going on recently by the Government, much emphasis was placed on the situation in which the Whitlam Government found itself about 12 months ago, just before the announcement of the Budget. Mr. Whitlam and his Government were in severe financial difficulties, completely enthralled in their over-spending, and with a completely unsympathetic attitude towards the States. In discussing Federal-State relationships, I go back to the Bank of Adelaide report issued last year, and I refer to part of the Chairman's address. It is as follows:

Within Australia the policies of the Labor Government have given rise to significant changes in the style of the Australian economy. Increased Government spending, on welfare and social services, has increased the supply of money. There has been little or no investment in the private sector and undoubtedly this will have serious repercussions on future productivity capacity.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Who is the Chairman of the Bank of Adelaide?

Mr. WOTTON: I think the Minister knows who he is.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I do not know who he is.

Mr. WOTTON: His comments are extremely relevant; that is why I draw them to the attention of members opposite. I appreciate that he is a former member of the other place and a gentleman who has given much to the betterment of this State. The Chairman's comments continue:

More importantly, prospecting and development in the mining sector has been at a standstill for the past two years, an extraordinary situation when one considers that it is a consequence of deliberate actions of the Federal Labor Government.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I do not think it is a reliable source.

Mr. WOTTON: I think it is an extremely reliable source. It is an extremely reliable bank, and he is still an extremely reliable Chairman. The report continues:

The activities of the manufacturing sector continue at a low ebb. The motor car industry and the consumer goods industry, so important to South Australia, have been severely hit in the past 12 months by industrial unrest and competition from imported goods. The outlook in this sector continues to remain uncertain.

There was much concern at that time about the uncertainty of the issues that were supposedly being handled by the Whitlam Government. On the other hand, it is encouraging to see the comments that have been made in

newspapers today reflecting on the Federal Budget introduced last evening by the Fraser Government. I should like to quote from a couple of articles, one of which appears in the *News* this evening, as follows:

Canberra: Manufacturing and commerce groups today swung their full weight in support of last night's Federal Budget. Director of the Associated Chamber of Manufactures of Australia, Mr. Bill Henderson, today hailed the Government's move to implement the first stage of the Mathews Report which grants tax relief to private companies, stimulating further investment. He also paid tribute to the Treasurer, Mr. Lynch, for not raising the level of indirect taxation. "This helps the consumer and, in the long run, the business world as well," Mr. Henderson said. Australian Chamber of Commerce president, Mr. S. F. N. Hickson, called the Budget a "return to responsible fiscal management". "Through its tax measures, the Budget should provide incentive for business and consumers to enter new spending commitments with reasonable confidence," he said.

I would point out that this confidence was greatly lacking this time last year. The article continues:

"Such incentives are critically important as it does not automatically follow that reining in Government expenditure will produce an equal and opposite expansion in the private sector."

Further on in the article, we read:

In Adelaide, the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry's general manager, Mr. Colin Branson today described the Budget as "an appropriate approach to assistance for all levels of the community".

"Mr. Lynch is to be commended for keeping inflation cuts as the No. 1 target," said Mr. Branson. . . . Industrial director of the South Australian Employers' Federation, Mr. T. M. Gregg, said the Budget gives hope, both for existing and future businesses.

It was an exceptionally good Budget, and I think that Australia generally has accepted that it was a very good Budget and what the people of Australia were looking for. As I said earlier, much has been said in this House (and it is reflected in the Treasurer's statement in the Loan Estimates) in relation to his supposedly good housekeeping. I believe that, in this State particularly, small business is at a very low ebb. It has been the backbone of the State and of Australia for most of the life of this country. At present, we find, however, that small business is caught in the squeeze between rising costs, industrial disputes, falling revenue, and massive increases in capital taxation.

At the end of last year Mr. Stewart Cockburn, writing for the *Advertiser*, also gave some interesting quotes. I should like to refer to two of them. Under the heading "Rough times for small business", Mr. Cockburn said:

Australian socialists used to have nightmares in which they were overwhelmed by hordes of home-owning little capitalists who ran their own businesses and wore "Free Enterprise" slogans on their T-shirts. Those days seem almost over. It's the little capitalists who now have the nightmares. They can no longer easily afford to build or buy their own homes. Real financial rewards in small business are dwindling. Incentives to work hard in them are disappearing quickly.

Mr. Whitten: Are you referring to Fraser?

Mr. WOTTON: I am not referring to Fraser. I am referring to the situation that we had some 12 months ago under the Whitlam Government.

Mr. Whitten: You are saying "work harder for less money"?

Mr. WOTTON: I am not saying that at all. Mr. Cockburn, if the honourable member was listening, was making the point that everybody is entitled to work hard for a good return.

Mr. Whitten: Work harder and longer for less money.

Mr. WOTTON: If the honourable member had been involved in working in small business, he would know just what the people who are working in small business

are now going through, from the point of view of hard work.

Mr. Coumbe: The honourable member never had to meet a pay-roll in his life.

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

Mr. WOTTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that at present one of the basic problems facing people in small business is a feeling of uncertainty.

Mr. Whitten: What do you term a "small business"?

Mr. WOTTON: By small business, I mean the person working in the shop on the corner, the person who is employing, or in the past has employed, two or three people but now finds he cannot do it, mainly because of the increase in taxation and in costs.

Mr. Whitten: He has to work himself—that's the trouble.

Mr. WOTTON: If the honourable member had been involved in that kind of activity, he would know exactly what was going on and would not be making the ridiculous statements that he is making at present. The continuing intrusion of the State, and the State Government in particular, into the affairs of private enterprise has brought about a strong feeling of uncertainty in small business today. As I mentioned earlier, the two words we heard about and were seen as nothing more than dirty words—"profits" and "incentives"—in the Whitlam Government are now to be brought back and given their true meaning as a result of the Fraser Budget announced last evening. The uncertainty and the effects of Government policy, and particularly its attitude to industry, are very much reflected in small business today. There are the worries they have about cost pressures and the worries about high wages, and the concern that management has about the workers who are everlastingly calling for higher wages and shorter working hours.

Mr. Slater: Unfair competition from big business?

Mr. WOTTON: I would say that the business community today is scared. I refer to small businesses in my district, many of which are experiencing liquidity problems. Most or all of them are faced with massive problems associated with inflation, which was brought about during the term of office of the Whitlam Government. They are indeed concerned about union demands, and particularly about worker control.

Mr. Whitten: What union problems are there in your district?

Mr. WOTTON: Businessmen in my district are concerned about worker control.

Mr. Whitten: In your district?

Mr. WOTTON: Yes. For the honourable member's information, I do not have cows and horses only in my district. I have quite a bit of small industry which, in the past, has flourished. It has begun feeling the pinch only recently. If the honourable member has the time to travel around my district, I would be only too pleased to take him to see a couple of businesses.

Mr. Coumbe: He might even get tanned.

Mr. WOTTON: He might. I refer again to the statement made by the Chairman of the Bank of Adelaide regarding worker participation. He said:

There have, in recent times, been considerable discussions relating to worker participation in Australia generally, and in South Australia in particular. At the State Australian Labor Party Convention in June of this year, the Premier of South Australia (Mr. Dunstan) proposed what he had previously called worker participation, but was subsequently described as a scheme of "industrial democracy".



Mr. Whitten: Do you mean this year or last year?

Mr. WOTTON: I am talking about last year.

Mr. Whitten: You said "this year".

Mr. WOTTON: I am merely quoting from the address made by the Chairman of the Bank of Adelaide.

Mr. Whitten: Do you think that would be a particularly authoritative source?

Mr. WOTTON: I agree that it would be more beneficial if the honourable member—

Dr. Eastick: Went back to sleep.

Mr. WOTTON: Yes. The Chairman of the Bank of Adelaide said:

The Premier has said that during a trial period over the next three years he proposes to introduce this scheme in the public sector, and that willing members of the private sector will be asked to co-operate.

Mr. Whitten: "Willing members will be asked to co-operate". Is that fair?

Mr. WOTTON: Obviously, the Treasurer thinks that it is fair. The report continues:

The proposal is that boards of directors would be of three groups of equal size, the first elected by the shareholders, the second by the workers, and the third, persons trained and appointed by the Australian Labor Party.

Now, we get to the interesting part, as follows:

The Premier has also stated that, after experimentation, he proposes to legislate in a few years time to apply this principle to all South Australian companies. This, of course, means not just participation but total worker-Government control of companies. To me it implies "take-over without compensation" or "shareholder-extinction" under the guise of "industrial democracy" rather than worker participation. I do not know of any country other than communist countries where such a control exists.

I, like many other South Australians, have always been dedicated to the idea of keeping a South Australian identity for South Australian companies. Despite this, I must warn that, if the Premier pursues his extreme and highly dangerous ideas of so-called "industrial democracy", he is likely to find that major South Australian companies would thereby be compelled to depart from the State of South Australia. I believe that we are already seeing that in action at present. As I said earlier, the business community is running scared. Inflation, rising wages and costs have been the main killers for businesses over the past two or three years, as a result of which businessmen are working about 80 hours a week, in many cases, for a pittance.

Mr. Coumbe: That is often the case.

Mr. WOTTON: That is so. Often, the boss, who may have struggled for years to build up a business, is lucky at present if he collects half as much as his employees take home. It is vitally important for South Australia that small businesses provide a reasonable return to those involved, who are willing to use their initiative as an alternative to a vocation on the production line or in a Government department.

Another matter on which I wish to speak this evening is the effect that succession and death duties have had on people in my district recently. I say this, appreciating what the Treasurer said in the House on Tuesday about easing the burden on surviving spouses in relation to succession duties.

Mr. Whitten: What easing? It was the abolition.

Mr. WOTTON: Very well. The abolition of death duties will make it a little easier for surviving spouses. In the debate on Tuesday—

Mr. Arnold: It's our policy, anyway.

Mr. WOTTON: I know. The point has been made many times in the House that that policy was identical to the Liberal Party's policy.

Mr. Whitten: Why don't you make representations to Lynch to abolish it as well?

Mr. Mathwin: It took us long enough to convince you.

Mr. WOTTON: I do not think we have convinced the member for Price, so I will not worry too much about that. I was extremely pleased to see in the Commonwealth Budget that was brought down last evening that the Fraser Government was to raise the death duty allowance. In future, the first \$90 000 will not count if all the estate is left to the spouse, and the amount is \$50 000 if part of the estate is left to the spouse. Although this will help the situation, much more has still to be done in relation to death and succession duties.

I refer now to two matters that have been brought to my notice recently in my district, one of which involves a visit paid to me in my office recently. A gentleman of about my age—

Mr. Mathwin: A young man.

Mr. WOTTON: Yes, I was a little hesitant there. He told me an extremely tragic story that had involved him personally. This person had been brought up on a property by his father, the property having been brought from absolutely nothing. The father was willing to put all he had into working the property, with the idea of handing it over to his one and only son when the time was ripe to do so. Because the father of the lad who came to see me was relatively young, he had not completely covered all the ramifications in relation to handing over the property to his son. Unfortunately, the parents of the man who came to see me were killed in a car accident in New South Wales about two years ago. He asked whether I could do anything for him, as he was faced with an account of \$200 000 for succession and probate duties.

Mr. Whitten: What a lucky man!

Mr. WOTTON: I point out to the member for Price that the property involved is now on the market, and that the gentleman concerned would probably be more worthy of carrying on in primary industry in this State than many others would be, as he has had an exceptionally good education right through to university and to Roseworthy Agricultural College. He could easily carry on working the property, even at his present age. However, because of the situation to which I have referred, this gentleman has been forced to put the property on the market. It is being divided. We will have the problem that we are experiencing in the Hills at present, where such properties are having to be divided because of the problem of rising values and increasing taxation.

Mr. Whitten: What price is it on the market for?

Mr. WOTTON: That has nothing to do with it. I assure the honourable member that by the time the property is sold and by the time the account for more than \$200 000 is paid, there will not be a great deal left. My point is that that man has been forced to leave the farm: he is now driving a milk tanker.

Mr. Whitten: Is it worth \$1 000 000?

Mr. WOTTON: No. My point is that the value of that property has been built up because this man's father spent all his time in developing the property and spent all his money on building a family house on it, yet he finds himself in the situation I have outlined. That is only one example of a situation that is widespread.

I wish to deal now with land tax. The Treasurer has stated publicly that the Government will change the land tax legislation, yet we still find that, because of land tax, people are being forced off their properties, particularly in the Adelaide Hills. I gave an example last week of a property near Meadows which was being divided because the owner was unable to pay his land tax and he was not willing to work as he had

been working for a pittance and pay land tax to the Government to enable him to eke out some sort of existence.

Mr. Vandepuer: In many cases, these people are the very people who are trained to overcome the problems we will face in the next few years.

Mr. WOTTON: I could not agree more. I will refer now to sewerage connections. While Hahndorf people appreciate that they now have sewerage facilities, I have received many letters complaining about the astronomical connection fees for sewerage in the area. A gentleman had two properties that he wished to subdivide, again because of land tax. He was forced to sell his land, and he decided to split it up, because it was on two titles. He wished to sell the properties separately, but he decided against it when he was told of the connection fee that would be involved. Later, I will bring forward correspondence on this matter. In relation to housing, the Loan Estimates document, at page 6, states:

For Housing Trust activities, the housing agreement lays emphasis on the construction of rental housing and restricts to 30 per cent the proportion of family dwellings which may be built for sale out of the welfare housing funds. Even in these cases the sales may be made only to persons who meet the means test specified for eligibility for a rental home.

I am continuing to receive complaints (as are other Opposition members and, I presume, Government members) from people who have to wait for low-rental accommodation from the Housing Trust. In reply to the member for Price, who is shaking his head, I say that I, too, realise that it would be impossible to provide housing for everyone who needs it, but I believe that much of the housing currently held by the Housing Trust, supposedly for low-rental accommodation, is being occupied by people who can well afford to pay for their own dwellings.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: There is a means test.

Mr. WOTTON: This is not happening. People may occupy the houses on the basis of a means test, perhaps because the husband has a menial job and is on a low income. Later, the man's wife and child may go out to work. They can then well afford to finance the building of their own houses, rather than occupying Housing Trust houses.

Mr. Whitten: Do you mean that two-income families should be thrown on to the street?

Mr. WOTTON: No, but I believe that Housing Trust houses should be used for the purpose for which they were originally built; that is, for low-income families who could not afford other accommodation. Such people are being refused Housing Trust houses because too many such houses are occupied by people who could well afford to pay for the construction of their own houses.

Dr. Eastick: Extra rental could be turned into building more houses.

Mr. WOTTON: Yes, that is a very good point.

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

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): In accordance with tradition, I suppose I have to support the Bill.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: But not very enthusiastically.

Mr. EVANS: True. I will start where my colleague finished, because for many years I have been concerned about the use to which Housing Trust houses are put. I admit that recently the trust has changed to a system of means testing. Through a Question on Notice, I have asked the Minister about the basis of the means test. I hope

that I am told, in reply, whether it is on the basis of the main breadwinner in the home or whether it is on the basis of all people in the home who are receiving income.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: The legislation has been ratified.

Mr. EVANS: I will state one area where the State Government has failed to agree to a change that could have been made. Income declaration is an important step in the right direction; this may overcome the problem. I admit that the problem started in the days of the Playford Government, when people who could well afford to pay the normal rental were allowed a reduced rental. Further, some people could afford to buy the house they were in, or they could be given the opportunity of moving out, say, within 12 months, and buying their own house or renting a house in the private sector. Now, the Fraser Government has changed to a method by which people can obtain a voucher, obtain a house for rental in the private sector, and receive a subsidy if their income is not at a level that would warrant paying the rental asked for in the private sector. It is an experiment that should be tried. I do not guarantee that it will succeed, but at least courage has been shown in finding out whether it will work, with the assistance going to the individual, not to the house. I hope that members opposite believe in people before houses, and that is the Federal Government's approach.

At present, the Victorian Government is the only State Government in Australia that has signed an agreement with the Federal Government to apply the progressive income assessment or test to people who had obtained money, because of their low income in the first instance, to purchase a house. Money is available at 5½ per cent or just over 6 per cent interest to people below a certain income level, repayable over 30 years. We could not go on supporting that principle. By the agreement that the Victorian Government has made, if a person's income increases because of improvement in his profession, because he starts in business, or because he becomes a member of Parliament, if you like, that person is expected to pay about the normal interest paid in the community. That system is fair. We make money available originally at low interest to people who cannot afford to pay high interest but, when their income increases to where they can pay that high rate, we should require them to pay it so we can help other people who cannot afford to do so.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Indexation of debts?

Mr. EVANS: If the Minister wants to use that term, good luck to him. He may have gained money by the method I have mentioned. I do not know whether he has, but if he has good luck to him. It is fair and reasonable to tell people that we will help them when they are in a difficult position but that, when they improve themselves in life, we will expect them to pay the normal rates so that we can help other people who cannot afford the high interest. A system will never be perfect, and the Minister of Works has challenged me on a similar basis in relation to water rating.

At present, the school situation in the District of Fisher is critical. I thank the Minister for inspecting the Aldgate Primary School and the Belair Primary and Infants School, where there are accommodation difficulties. At Belair the situation is so serious that children who have attained the age of five years cannot be taken there. The activity room has 38 students in it, so it is not available to the other students as an activity room. Another 25 children who cannot be fitted into the school are still at the kindergarten, so that another group of children cannot go to the kindergarten. The Hawthorndene Primary School

has 17 young students in a corridor, because all the rooms are full. Right through the Fisher District, most of the schools are in dire straits regarding accommodation.

Mr. Slater: Poor representation!

Mr. EVANS: I point out to the honourable member that the former Minister of Education inspected a school in my district, and we had some luck. I hope that we will have as much luck with the present Minister. I would appreciate it if the member for Gilles pushed the Minister of Education into seeing that students in my area received as good a go as students in the District of Gilles receive. The Government claims that it has a credit balance of \$27 000 000 to look forward to this year. We know that the Government has robbed about \$10 000 000 from Loan Account so we know that it needs to keep \$10 000 000 of the \$27 000 000.

The Government may have problems later in the year because of its inability to budget on the long term. Therefore, if we allow the Government \$2 000 000 for that and \$10 000 000 for the deficit in the Loan funds it has been digging into, that means that the Government will have another \$15 000 000 that could be spent to reduce the problem in the school area. I know that all of that money would not be spent in the District of Fisher, but it could be spent throughout the State to overcome the shortage of classrooms. The position at present is worse than it has ever been previously since 1968, when I came into Parliament. Yet the Government is constructing a building in Adelaide for the Education Department and \$2 771 000 has been allocated for work on that building this year.

The building must be completed, but the department knew how many students would be seeking accommodation and it knew of the shortage of schools in the State. Further, plenty of office space is available in Adelaide, yet we are going on with a monstrosity like that building. The department may need it, but which matter should we put first? Should we put first the children who have no accommodation available, or should we put first the Education Department building in the centre of the city? The Government puts first the building for the Education Department, but I issue a challenge to the Government. If there was available, near the primary schools or high schools that are short of accommodation, some building suitable for use as a classroom and if it was owned by private enterprise, the Government would not hesitate to use that as classroom accommodation, and to pay rent for it, so why not do something similar regarding office accommodation in the city? If office accommodation is available, why go on with a building that will cost the equivalent of, say, five to seven new primary schools?

At the same time, \$2 955 000 has been allocated for the Transport Department building. Is it really needed now, when we have such a shortage of classrooms? What should we do first? In about 1970, the member for Brighton (Hon. Hugh Hudson) was saying that there was a crisis in education, with a shortage of accommodation, and that the money should be spent on those matters. However, now he is sitting back as the so-called Minister of Mines and Energy, not putting any energy into achieving what he said previously should be done. He is not forcing his Government to catch up the short-fall in the education field that we all know exists. The Transport Department and Education building for this year will cost about \$6 000 000. There is enough money available to allow the Government to spend more on education than it says it is likely to spend.

In a speech like this, an area of concern that some of us have about Government departments is worth recording. I am not talking merely about the Education Department. I will challenge the Government later about its so-called policy of open Government. It is worth recording the reply given yesterday in answer to a question about employment in the Education Department. In reply to the member for Davenport, the Minister of Education stated:

There are 371 positions in the Education Department and 77 positions in the Further Education Department carrying an annual salary of \$18 000 or more.

I do not deny that these people might be entitled to such a salary; I am not a fit judge of that. However, such a salary is about the same as the base salary paid to a back-bench member in this Parliament. Collectively, there are 448 people receiving a salary above \$18 000 a year. It was also stated that there were seven unfilled positions at a salary of \$25 198. How far are we going in this direction? Are we creating too many super heads? Are too many top positions being created?

Dr. Eastick: Are there too many chiefs and not enough Indians?

Mr. EVANS: The member for Light makes that point. I raise this matter because it will give to the public an idea of the sort of salaries that are being paid in some areas of the Public Service. Yesterday, the Leader asked the Treasurer the following four questions:

- (a) On what dates did the Government enter into contracts with advertising agencies and public relations firms;
- (b) what was the nature of the advertising or public relations work contracted;
- (c) what were the names of the advertising agencies and public relations firms involved in each account; and
- (d) what was the amount involved in each case?

We are now examining the Loan Estimates, the funds being spent in the State. The Government came into office, as did its Federal counterpart, claiming it believed in open Government, and the Treasurer's reply to these four questions should be known, especially if we are to have proper budgeting within government. The funds that have been spent in each department should be known at any time, yet the Treasurer stated in his reply:

The considerable amount of work involved in extracting this information is unwarranted.

How can the Opposition challenge the Government on such a basis? How can the public assess what is happening if a Government believing in so-called open Government will not disclose such information? There is no way that a Government that hides basic information about the monetary running of the State can be supported. Certainly, members of the community making an assessment of the situation will believe that the Government was hiding something. Is it hiding the fact that the firm that obtained the main benefit of these contracts was the firm used by the Australian Labor Party in its election campaign? If that is not the case, I would like to hear from the Government what is the true position. Such an approach by a Government elected by the people to manage the State funds is not justified.

I refer to questions I asked about land at Mount Lofty summit known as Mount Lofty House. In reply, the Treasurer admitted that the Botanic Garden Board had the opportunity to purchase part of that property. I believe the board had the opportunity to purchase the whole property, as did other Government departments. In the reply he gave, the Treasurer did not answer the question about other departments, but I assure the Government that

other departments were aware that the property was for sale. Mr. Hill had it on the market for a long time, but the Government refused to take up the challenge: instead, it rated him out of the area with land tax and other charges and then condemned him because he cleared a section of that property. Not once did the Government members in this House or in another place admit that the Government had the opportunity to purchase that area in the initial stages: they avoided that subject.

Regarding roads, I remind the House of a tallow spillage on the South-Eastern Freeway earlier this year that caused some inconvenience.

Mr. Wardle: There have been several spillages.

Mr. EVANS: Yes, the most serious spillage resulted in the diversion of all traffic from the freeway of Mount Barker Road to subsidiary roads through Summertown and Piccadilly and through Hawthorndene, Belair and Blackwood. After this accident I wrote to the Minister and asked for certain information, and the following part of the Minister's reply was of great interest:

The Commissioner of Highways has advised that the use of lanes for fast and slow traffic during the temporary closure of a portion of the Mount Barker Road was considered by the Highways Department and the Police Department, but was rejected in the interests of the safe operation of the road. The partial closure of the direct route to the South-Eastern Freeway, via Mount Barker Road, offered an opportunity to observe the undesirable environmental effect of traffic diversion on to other routes, which in their existing form are inadequate to handle such additional traffic. The increased use of these alternative routes will be the inevitable result of growing congestion on the Mount Barker Road as traffic volumes increase. It is not considered that the diversion of heavy vehicles via Upper Sturt Road, along the National Park boundary to Belair and thence via Main Road No. 11 to Blackwood and down Shepherds Hill Road would have had any serious impact on the Hawthorndene area.

In other words, the Minister has said that he is satisfied in his own mind that the roads should be upgraded to carry the traffic, and that there would be no adverse effect on the quality of life in the Hawthorndene area. I point out that the Health Department had a report at the time traffic was diverted concerning the increase in pollution in the Hawthorndene area. If the Minister checks with that department, he will find that an increase in air pollution did occur there, let alone all the noise pollution and other inconvenience that occurred. The roads used in the diversion as a result of the emergency carried the traffic reasonably well.

I now refer to the Hills Roads Committee, which the Minister of Transport hoped would fade out of existence about two years ago. Fortunately for the community of Mitcham Hills, the committee did not fade out and, unfortunately for the Minister, the committee still exists. The Minister appeared on television and thought he would ridicule the committee by attempting to put over some false impressions about the real purpose of the committee. I should like to read the following letter which appeared in the local press on August 4, so that the Minister can be aware of what the community thinks about his comments on television and about the overall issue. The letter states:

Sir—With reference to your appearance on ABS 2 *This Day Tonight* on July 13, the Hills Road Committee challenges certain statements made by you concerning an arterial road through Mitcham Hills.

- (i) You said Belair, Blackwood people "are trying to preserve the area for themselves"—implying they are selfish!
- (ii) "They are trying to prevent other people having access."

(iii) You infer this road is being opposed by a minority group of Hills people only!

(iv) You said the Highways Department "needs to buy land along proposed route to keep its options open for whatever may happen in the future. To not be inhibited by the fact there is a very expensive building or multi-storey building on it."

In reply: 1. We refute it is selfish—

- (a) To strive to preserve the natural charm of a semi-rural Hills suburb so close to Adelaide. Not for local residents only but those from crowded inner areas, who now enjoy a leisurely drive through the district.
- (b) To want to protect Belair National Park from the adverse environmental impact of a 4-6 lane highway along its entire north or south boundary.
- (c) To endeavour to stop more industrial traffic and its pollution, being funnelled on to Adelaide's price-less water-shed!

The second point made by the committee is as follows:

2. Your accusation that we are trying to keep others out is not only untrue—but appears a deliberate attempt to stir up division and mistrust in the community. The Highways Department has by-passed towns from Gawler to Willunga; Adelaide to Hahndorf with its major roads, yet you as Minister apparently approve an arterial road through the heart of Belair or Blackwood. When in Opposition (March 1970) you condemned plans for an arterial road through your district, yet now censure our opposition of one through Mitcham Hills.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Is the letter signed?

Mr. EVANS: Yes. The Minister would know that, when the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan was discussed there was no stronger advocate in favour of protecting existing communities, and the quality of life against building arterial roads and freeways than the Minister of Transport. He called public meetings in his area, stirred up the news media, and attacked the plan because he said it would affect the quality of life of people in his area and the value of their property. Yet what is he doing now? He is saying that it is all right to put roads through another community, regardless of who represents the area, because it is not in his own backyard. That is a double standard—the Minister knows that and so does the Hills community. The letter continues:

3. If, as you infer, it is local minority group opposing this road how is it that:

- (a) At each of the last two local government elections a Hills Roads Committee member was elected to Mitcham council on an anti-highway ticket. The last candidate, Mrs. P. Kaye Beckwith, polling the most votes ever recorded on that council.
- (b) The Sheoak-Gloucester Highway has been condemned by outside bodies such as—Stirling council; Mitcham council; Mount Lofty Ranges Association; Conservation Council South Australia; Native Conservation Society South Australia; National Fitness Council; Naturalist and Bush Walker Groups; and noted scientist Sir Mark Oliphant, K.B.E.
- (c) At a mass rally at Belair Park, February, 1975, over 1 000 visitors from outside areas signed objections to an arterial road either alongside or through Belair Park.
- (d) Over 2 000 objections were lodged opposing Sheoak Road as an arterial road—when shown as such on S.P.A. Supplementary Plan No. 5, released December, 1974.

4. You claim it is necessary for the Highways Department to buy up land along proposed arterial routes to "forestall erection of expensive buildings", etc. Why? Under the Road Widening Plan Act, effective from January 1, 1974, no building or extension of building can be carried out on land needed for possible future road widening, without prior consent of the Commissioner of Highways! (Ref: Metropolitan Adelaide Road Widening Plan Act section 6—item a.) The Hills Roads Committee feels your statements on ABS 2 program *This Day Tonight*, re an arterial road through Mitcham Hills, to be both confusing and designed to mislead the public.

The letter was signed by many of the members of the Hills Roads Committee. The Minister of Transport and the Highways Department know that other alternatives are available. I am thankful that the Federal Government has recently made money available to upgrade further that section of the Mount Barker Road that joins the freeway to the Glen Osmond tollgate area. I hope that the Minister of Transport will adopt a more responsible attitude towards this issue—the sort of attitude he adopted in his own area.

South Australia has money in its coffers that could be used in one or two areas. Funds for sewerage are about \$5 000 000 below what the Government would like to spend in that area. The Government really has sufficient funds to use in that field or in the education field, but I ask the Government to draw a limit on the sorts of priority it has for erecting buildings that need not be erected until we catch up the backlog in school buildings. It is no good saying to people in a community, "Your children cannot get into school because we don't have enough room." It is the first time in eight years in my district that that situation has arisen. More funds have been poured into education in the past six years than ever before. No-one would deny that.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Have children started school—

Mr. EVANS: The Minister is trying to ask me whether that situation has occurred because children can start school on their fifth birthday. I agree that that is a problem. However, more money has been poured into education than ever before. An example of where money can be saved is in Bellevue Heights, which is a good residential area with a good standard of house where people take as much pride in their houses as other people do. Those people were willing to accept Demac buildings at the new Bellevue Heights Primary School, which is being built in my district. The Minister's department said to those people, "If you want solid construction you may have to wait." Those people were willing to take a prefabricated Demac construction school so that their children could attend school. The project will cost \$767 000. At the same time, in the Minister's area at Flagstaff Hill, he made sure that his constituents got a brick school valued at \$1 200 000.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That happened before I became Minister of Education.

Mr. EVANS: I am not saying that the Minister did it when he was Minister of Education; I am saying that he guaranteed through Cabinet that it would be built.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I guaranteed nothing; I had to fight for it.

Mr. EVANS: That school is worth \$500 000 more than a school in my area. However, I am still pleased that the Bellevue Heights Primary School is being built.

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

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): There are several projects in my area that are continuing very well, the major project being the breakwater at Port MacDonnell, which was referred to by the Treasurer in his explanation. The project, which is valued at over \$1 000 000, is making extremely good progress. The mild weather this winter has enabled more progress to be made on the project than was expected. People in the area are well satisfied. Because reference to the Millicent and District Hospital is included in the Loan Estimates, tenders can be called for the construction of additions to that hospital, and not before time. As I said in a question I asked last week, the hospital has been trying to obtain finance for these extensions for the past four years. I am pleased to see that the Government

has allocated money for this purpose and I hope that it will allow local contractors to be involved in work on the hospital. Contractors capable of doing the work are there and, if given the chance, would be willing to accept it. Other projects mooted include a multi-purpose hall for the school in Millicent which we understand is about to be announced and which we hope will proceed. We have a considerable problem with young unemployed people in the district, and the hall could be used for training and for sporting facilities after school, to keep these young people involved in education or sporting activities whilst they are unemployed. The hall would be of great benefit to the area.

The Kingston hospital has not been so fortunate. In last year's Loan Estimates it was suggested as a community welfare centre, which was not forthcoming. The hospital does not appear in the Loan Estimates this year, and that is extremely disappointing. Kingston is the centre of a large area. Meningie is 145 kilometres away along the Coorong. The closest hospital centre is probably Naracoorte, about 95 kilometres away, with a large area between Meningie and Naracoorte served by the Kingston district and the Kingston hospital. The hospital must be maintained in first-class condition with first-class facilities and it is a great disappointment that the hospital and the welfare centre are not referred to in the Loan Estimates.

An example of a lack of foresight in Government planning can be seen at the Beachport school. We are fortunate in having a new school just completed, but it is now full to overflowing. The department should examine its forward planning, because the best time to make additions to a school is when it is being constructed. I would like to make some criticism of the Teacher Housing Authority, which this year has been granted \$1 600 000. I think the amount allocated last year was \$900 000. In the matter of activity or visible assistance to teachers in the department, this authority is a dead horse. With the sum allocated this year, I hope we will see some action that will give a little more satisfaction to country teachers, many of whom are living in Housing Trust houses that have not been upgraded to the standards required by the Education Department. A great discrepancy exists in the type of houses the department is supplying for its teachers. The authority was set up to overcome this problem, but it is far from achieving its object. In debates in this House in the past year, we have been told that the authority was new and was still settling in, but that period has long passed, and in the next year, with \$1 600 000 in its budget, we want to see some action.

In a grievance debate a week or so ago, I was critical of the department and its school buses, sometimes described as "yellow perils". With the amount allocated this year, I will have to ask a question of the Minister to ascertain how many buses the department has purchased in the past 12 months and how many it intends to purchase in the next 12 months.

Mr. Coumbe: You will not get an answer.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Rest assured we will get a reply one way or another. From my observations, I doubt that many buses have been purchased in the past 12 months. It would not cost much to repaint them, but all the buses I have seen are old. I have not seen any new ones in my area or in my travels, and I would like to see some action in that respect. South-East drainage is an old chestnut, but one area concerns me, largely because of a lack of action by the South-Eastern Drainage Board. I refer to Southend, where a large drain enters the sea. At the mouth of the drain considerable erosion has occurred on the beachfront and also on a block of what is now good building ground. The drain has eroded the

area, and has probably cost the owner the value of eight or 10 building blocks, which could be worth \$3 000 to \$5 000 each, and possibly more, at today's inflationary rates.

Mr. Becker: The water would be better in the Coorong.

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes, but it would be difficult to get it there from this area. I should like to see more of the water in the Coorong and that area should be considered. The drain has eroded the banks of block 4001. I think the Minister knows the block to which I am referring, and the damage has cost the owner a considerable sum. The erosion has been stopped by the Drainage Board with a hideous row of lumps of Mount Gambier stone of various colours. It is not pleasing to the eye and does not beautify our beachfront or make any attempt to maintain the environment, or keep the area looking as beautiful as our South Australian countryside should look. It is a pity, and the board will have to spend more money in this area. The sums in the Loan Estimates will fall far short of what is necessary for this project. We have a considerable problem in the beachfront with sand drift, but I am concerned at present with the erosion of private property and the attitude of the Drainage Board, which seems to have no intention of doing anything about it. Valuable building blocks in the area have been lost. It is an area suitable for houses or for a beachfront motel: the situation is perfect.

Mr. Becker: But not a casino.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I will not agree to a casino. We can do with houses, but we can do without a casino. I have one or two casino sites in my area but I do not think any of them will come to fruition. Speculators have been in and purchased one or two blocks.

Mr. Coumbe: Can you bet on that?

Mr. VANDEPEER: Are you saying betting on the casino or betting in the casino?

Mr. Coumbe: You are speculating.

Mr. VANDEPEER: They have been in and have been doing a bit of betting, but I think they will lose their money.

Mr. Whitten: Don't you like casinos?

Mr. VANDEPEER: No. I must admit I am not pleased with the idea of casinos. I am afraid they do not achieve much. They are rather similar to the present lottery.

Mr. Whitten: What about massage parlours?

Mr. VANDEPEER: We will not get on to that. I will leave it to the member for Mitcham, who is the expert at present. The casino is rather like the lottery. When it first came in, people said it would build many hospitals, but we have not seen any action in that regard. Also, a lottery does not generate any extra income, which is something that many members opposite do not really understand. When we want to establish a new project, our first consideration is that it generates new income, but all that lotteries do is to make us run around inside the circle and burn up unproductive effort, and in the end we are worse off than when we started. Casinos may bring in capital, but that is the only real advantage the State will receive, and the disadvantages will far outweigh the advantages.

Mr. Jennings: How many tickets have you taken?

Mr. VANDEPEER: In the lottery?

Mr. Jennings: Yes.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I am not ashamed to admit that I have never had a ticket in the State lottery.

Mr. Jennings: Neither have I.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I cannot afford it. I now say something about the lack of respect that this Government

has for the rural areas and their present position. With only about 13 days to go before the end of the month, soon we shall be into September. By that time it will be almost hopeless to expect rains of any description to give us any sort of crop. Our crop expectations are much reduced, probably down to a record-breaking low level. In this situation, a Government with a policy of high capital taxation, which takes so many of the goodies in the good years, should be much more willing to assist those people in the bad years: this is one of those bad years coming up, or it seems to be. Perhaps it will rain in the next few days and, if it does, the situation will be relieved considerably, but the prospects of that happening are not good. If this Government continues with this policy, it will completely break the rural economy.

My colleagues this evening have been speaking about land tax and its effects. It is valid that land tax today and many other capital taxes are destroying those farmers who have the education, the ability, and the finance to overcome the problems that will surely come their way in the next few years. In many sections of our rural industry, these problems are already with us, and it is those people who can survive it and can show the rest of us how to survive it who are being hit hard with this capital tax and being put completely out of business. Many of them are moving to other areas, obtaining what capital they can for their properties and moving out before they lose the lot. That is a ridiculous situation and policy, and it is time the Government considered this matter closely before it completely destroys our rural community or makes it inoperable.

At present, if the South Australian Government would allot more finance for the tuberculosis and brucellosis programmes, I am sure the Federal Government would be willing to back it up, but at present I understand this Government has money in reserve that the Federal Government has allocated in this area, and the Federal Government will not allocate more money until that money is spent. When this Government shows a positive action in that direction, I am certain it will be supported by our Federal colleagues. But our Government will not take action, so the programmes remain semi-stagnant or are progressing only at the rate of 10 years ago. We now have a situation where it would be a great advantage to all, the whole State and the stockowners, if the programme was stepped up perhaps three, four or five times. But no—the Government will not do this and it continues to allow stock going to slaughter that are possibly good clean stock, whereas we should be destroying the poorer quality stock and retaining the best quality stock.

It is a wonderful opportunity to do it, and we shall never do it more cheaply, but the Government will not accept this challenge. To me, it is typical of a socialist Government and of the socialist thinking of this Government that it is not willing to accept those challenges. With our overseas markets, we have been told that we need to have our herds cleaned up by, I think, the year 1984. If they are not free of tuberculosis and brucellosis, our meat will be rejected from those markets by that time or we shall have to negotiate specially with the overseas purchaser to compensate for the risk or to agree to extend the time beyond the year 1984 by a couple of years. We do not want to do this, because we as producers want our herds clean and our meat free of all bacteria that may be a danger to human health, as much as anyone else does, but we need assistance to do it, and it is up to the Government to come to the party. I support our rural industries in their approach to the Government to obtain more

assistance. As it will be an extremely trying time, I hope my words will have some effect on the Government, and we shall see more action in the next few weeks.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In the absence of any willingness on the Government side to proceed with the business of the House, perhaps the House should be adjourned.

The SPEAKER: Order! We cannot move in that direction.

In Committee.

First schedule.

State Bank, \$5 900 000—passed.

Highways, \$1 470 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I should like the Treasurer to outline the purpose of this allocation and the works involved.

Dr. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. It is obvious that the Minister in charge of this Bill is not in the Chamber. The Opposition cannot be expected to ask questions of a Minister who obviously is not qualified (and I am not blaming the Minister for the Environment for this) to answer these questions. I suggest that, if we are to proceed with this measure in Committee, the Treasurer or his deputy should be in the Chamber. I therefore move:

That progress be reported.

Motion negatived.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: As I see that the Treasurer has now returned to the Chamber, I presume that my question will be answered.

Dr. TONKIN: I rise on a further point of order, Mr. Chairman. I take it that Standing Orders are explicit regarding the number of times that a member may rise to his feet to ask questions on certain lines.

The CHAIRMAN: No, there is no limit. However, I point out to members that the Minister does not always have to reply to a question.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will again take the floor. I am pleased to see that the Treasurer has now shown the Committee the courtesy of being in the Chamber and that at last the Government is almost organised.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member should ask his question and not stray from the line being debated.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I again ask the Treasurer how the allocation for the south-western suburbs drainage scheme will be spent. What is the purpose of the programme involved?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): It involves the tidying up of the completion of the scheme.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Surely, this Chamber deserves a far better reply than that. In what areas does the Government intend to spend money on stormwater drainage? Does it involve work that is now being done by the Highways Department on Kensington Road in relation to Third Creek? I may be wrong about that, and that is why I ask the question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As the Minister of Works has a schedule of works, a written reply will be provided to the honourable member.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I had a query regarding the State Bank. As the Treasurer was not in the Chamber when that matter was called on, I could see no point in asking the question at that stage. However, now that he has entered the Chamber, I ask whether the line can be recommitted so that I can ask the Treasurer my question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not keen to recommit the line at this stage. However, if the honourable member moves now to report progress I will think of some way of allowing him to ask his question.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I thank the Treasurer for his indulgence. I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Florey.

Mr. Dean Brown: Oh, they're giving you a go.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): I choose my own battlefield, so members opposite need not worry about that matter.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You were gagged yesterday.

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

Mr. WELLS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the honour and privilege of being able to participate in an extremely important facet of the activities of the House such as this grievance debate.

Mr. Gunn: You've got plenty to grieve about with this Government.

Mr. WELLS: I have plenty to grieve about in relation to the Opposition's actions, and that does not exclude the member for Eyre. Indeed, he plays a prominent part therein. Normally, I think it could be said that I am a calm and kindly type of person. Rarely do I feel it necessary to be emphatic or to press a point to any degree. This is because of my kindly nature, as my friend and colleague on the front bench has said. I am disgusted (in fact, it is probably true to say that I have been hurt and my feelings injured) when I hear members opposite directing a diatribe of vindictiveness, bitterness, and hate towards a most honourable and dignified section of our community, the trade union movement. There is no doubt that this attack, of which we have seen so much in this Chamber in the past few days, has been designed for a specific reason. One must ask, what is that reason? Of course, Government members realise that it is merely because the Opposition considers that there is an urgent need to throw up a smokescreen, and to draw a red herring across the path of members of this House and people outside, in its futile and stupid attempts to shield the Fraser Government against its shortcomings. I refer, too, to the viciousness that has been directed toward the working class of this country by the Fraser Government in its efforts to bolster and benefit the people to whom it owes allegiance and the people who pay for the services they receive from that Government—big business, wealthy graziers, and wealthy farmers.

Mr. Wotton: How many wealthy graziers are there?

Mr. Dean Brown: Perhaps you should mention a large section of the trade union movement, too.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WELLS: Perhaps I should turn to a topic that has received much attention in this House during the past couple of days. It is rather flattering that, whenever I speak, Opposition members resume their seats, probably because they do not like to be outside when they are named in their electoral capacity. Much has been said by members on both sides about the drastic situation evident at present in Whyalla, where 35 per cent of the residents are engaged in the shipbuilding industry. Because



of the refusal of the Fraser Government to increase the subsidy for that industry, these people at Whyalla are facing unemployment and the resultant misery that will follow. I believe that people are incorrect in assuming that there should be a battle; some solution must be found to the problem. Admirable though the suggestion may be, I believe that it is not feasible, because the Fraser Government is deliberately setting out to sabotage the shipbuilding industry in Australia. The Fraser Government does not want a shipbuilding industry in Australia, perhaps because many members of that Government have oversea interests.

Mr. Gunn: What about Charlie Jones?

Mr. WELLS: He is an admirable person; further, he was a capable Minister who would do anything within his power to assist the shipbuilding industry in this country.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Does the honourable member realise whether it was Charlie Jones who set the existing subsidy?

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr. WELLS: The honourable member would not know enough about industrial matters to realise that an increase in the subsidy is needed. I often wonder when the honourable member will realise that his crass stupidity and his ignorance of industrial matters are bringing him to the point where he is being ridiculed. The honourable member delights in saying, "A Liberal trade union member came to me and told me something." If Liberal trade unionists want to go to that honourable member for advice on industrial matters, it is no wonder that the Liberals are running around looking for someone to assist, because any advice the honourable member could give would be valueless. He knows nothing of the trade union movement in this country, other than how to try to denigrate it.

He would never succeed in doing that, and at times I feel embarrassed for him, when he makes statements in this Chamber that can be blown to pieces by any member on this side. Any Government member would be too strong in arguing against the member for Davenport on industrial matters. I am pleased that he is the shadow Minister of Labour and Industry, because this merely shows the absolute weakness and bereftness of the Opposition Party in its search for capable shadow Ministers. If he can be given such a position, God help the back-benchers, because they must be fairly weak.

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

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The member for Florey reflected on the back bench of the Liberal Opposition by saying that we must be fairly weak. I remind that honourable member that, as a Liberal and a member of an association (we did not call it a union), I was proud to serve my fellow workers, as I am proud to do now.

I believe that the Government has failed to arrest the situation in the community involving children and adolescents. I am alarmed to think that the system has broken down somewhere. Recently, the Minister of Community Welfare gave us information on the cost of keeping people at various centres, and that information is as follows:

Centre	Cost a day \$	Cost a week \$	Cost a year \$
Brookway Park . . . . .	79	553	28 882
Lochiel Park . . . . .	34	241	12 581
McNally . . . . .	51	362	18 925
Vaughan House . . . . .	56	397	20 706

The average cost of keeping a child in some of our training centres is \$55 a day, \$388 a week, and \$20 273 a year. Yet, the cost of keeping a prisoner in an institution such as Yatala is about \$9 000 a year. What is wrong with our system and our society when we must spend so much money to look after young people in institutions of the kind to which I have referred?

I put the blame fairly and squarely on the Government, because it is responsible for the morals in the community, and it has been systematically and progressively lowering those morals. With the emphasis on freedom of choice of the individual, particularly of younger and more impressionable people, and on the relaxing of laws relating to pornography, anything that disciplines and stabilises society, particularly the authority of the family unit, is being undermined. This is the crux of the issue: the family trying to meet the demands of modern society. Problems are being created for our law enforcement agency. When the police try to come to grips with the problem, they find that, when young people are taken before courts, in many cases they are dealt with far too lightly. If the children are committed to some institution the State must then bear the great cost of looking after them. The daily average cost of children accommodated within Community Welfare Department centres in recent years is shown in the following table:

Year	Children a day	Annual Cost a Child \$
1967-68 . . . . .	514	2 763
1971-72 . . . . .	523	3 880
1973-74 . . . . .	428	6 363
1974-75 . . . . .	351	11 383

What has gone wrong? Is it the change in the department's policy, or is it the change in the policy of the court? I believe there must be an investigation by the Minister and the Government into these costs. Members of the community want to know why it costs so much to supervise, retrain and rehabilitate young people and why this situation has come about.

The responsibility comes back to the Government, and it is a real responsibility. It has been suggested that the name "community welfare" is a deterrent against people approaching various agencies within the department. Perhaps the Minister of Community Welfare ought to re-examine the title of his portfolio and change it to, say, "Minister for the Family". In this way I believe that much more could be achieved. If we had a Minister for the family, the interest area of that portfolio would be taken closer to the family unit.

Another matter that has concerned me, and I know it has concerned not only many of my constituents but also many people throughout the State, is the Government's attitude towards the incidence of rape within the community. One of my constituents, who is a member of the Police Force, has put together startling information on this matter. He states:

For those who believe that justice is alive and well in South Australia regarding rape, the following is a run-down of what happens to the female victim and the male offender:

The woman suffers from the brutality and degradation of rape; reports it to the police; submits to a medical examination; gives a full and detailed statement, reliving the rape; waits for the police to arrest the man; if they do this, she may have to pick him from a line-up; waits for the committal proceedings; at the committal proceedings she gives evidence on oath and is cross-examined; if the man is committed, she then waits for about a month for the trial; at the trial she testifies on oath and is cross-examined about her intimate past and her sex life, being virtually called a prostitute; and at the end, which may be six months at least from the time of the rape, she goes

home—frightened, tormented. If she is married, it may be the end of her marriage. If she is single, she may be "turned off" of men for life. She will be afraid to go out alone and to open a door at night. All this because she reported a rape.

He goes on to say:

The man is arrested by the police; calls for a solicitor who advises him not to answer any questions; is charged fingerprinted and released on bail to appear in court next morning; and appears in court with his solicitor and is remanded on bail for about four weeks until the committal. At the committal, his solicitor cross-examines prosecution witnesses. If the man is committed, he is only required to say, "I reserve my defence". Another month or so and he appears at the Supreme Court. He will have a hair-cut and wear a clean new suit to look like the "boy-next-door" to the jury. His solicitor cross-examines the woman. He gives an unsworn statement from the dock. This immunises him from cross-examination. If he is found guilty, his solicitor will give submissions on his behalf such as he has a sexual problem, his family life was traumatic or he can't communicate with girls. If his solicitor explains these points well enough, the man would probably get a suspended sentence and a bond. He is free to walk the streets.

Unfortunately, that is the system in the view of a young policeman who has considered the whole problem of the incidence of rape. It all revolves around the breaking down of morals in our community. The Government is responsible and must take the blame for not encouraging people to continue to uphold a decent standard of living in this State.

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): The member for Hanson has just made out an interesting case, a case that is rarely raised in this House or anywhere else in the community. Although I sympathise with what he has said, I believe that perhaps he has not considered the other side of the story, that these days things are rather different from the prosecution side from what they were before. These days policemen, with exceptions, are not out to get a conviction. A prosecuting officer does not by any stretch of the imagination or in any circumstances subject the girl concerned to any sort of travail. I know much about this matter. I have never raised the subject in the House, and I do not know whether I should raise it now, but my son is a senior criminal court prosecutor, as probably anyone who reads the newspapers knows. He rarely discusses these matters with me.

Mr. Gunn: I don't blame him.

Mr. JENNINGS: I would not expect him to do so, nor do I discuss these matters with him. Over the years, while he has been in this position, he has assured me that the day has long gone when girls involved in this sort of situation are subjected to answering embarrassing questions. I know there are exceptions to any rule. Although the matter is not totally what we would like (and to that extent I agree with the honourable member), nevertheless it is infinitely better than it used to be in the days when people

like Sir Roderic Chamberlain believed it was their duty, when someone was in the dock, to obtain a conviction and that nothing else was good enough. That no longer applies. It is no longer a principle that is regarded by the Government as essential, and it is something not sought by the prosecutors. This might be accepted now by members. I will not continue with this subject: it was embarrassing for me to have to mention it. However, I believe I may have done some service by having spoken of it. I realise that the honourable member felt obliged to raise the matter, and I think no less of him for having done so, because he did it from the best possible motives.

Mr. Chapman: On the casino issue, are you in favour of that?

Mr. JENNINGS: When a casino issue or anything of that sort is before the House, I will discuss it with members with whom I have some general interest and for whom I have some respect. The honourable member would be the last person with whom I would discuss anything. I do not know how he got the casino on his mind. I did not think he had anything on his mind; in fact, I did not think he had a mind to have anything on.

Mr. Max Brown: You are being charitable.

Mr. JENNINGS: As always. I was very upset, because I had expected that tonight I would be able to criticise Mr. Lynch. However, I am sure he has done a marvellous job, except that we will know all about it when we know what he said; most of it is incorporated in things that are not in his speech but are to be introduced later. It was the longest Budget speech in years, and took two hours to deliver. Like a few members on the other side of this House, if he had not used so many words he would have got it through in about half an hour and we would have known much more about it.

Mr. Evans: He had to explain it in detail so that you could understand it, and you still don't understand it.

Mr. JENNINGS: I understand it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: We do not understand you.

Mr. JENNINGS: I would not expect the honourable member to understand anything. On July 27, the Government policy was challenged. The corner that the Australian economy was supposed to have turned may lead to a blind alley. The Australian and New Zealand Banking Corporation group's suggestion that the economy might have turned the corner was challenged by a business group, the Australian Industries Development Association, which said it could see no grounds for delight either about the prospects of a clear emergence from the 1974-76 slump—

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

Motion carried.

At 10.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 19, at 2 p.m.