

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, September 9, 1976

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

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 165 residents of South Australia, praying that the House urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that the present discriminatory position of blood relations be removed and that blood relationships sharing a family property enjoy at least the same benefits as those available to *de facto* relationships.

Petition received.

PETITION: SEXUAL OFFENCES

Mr. RODDA presented a petition signed by 125 electors of South Australia, praying that the House reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest or to lower the age of consent in respect of sexual offences.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Australian Water Resources Council is the body which co-ordinates aspects of water resources assessment, research and management that are of mutual interest and concern to the Australian States and the Commonwealth Government. It comprises the Minister with primary responsibility for water resources from each State, the Northern Territory, and the Commonwealth Government. At a meeting of that body held in July, 1973, the State Ministers expressed concern at how States should proceed with planning for rural water development programmes. The need was accordingly discussed for a policy statement by the Commonwealth Government on assistance for water development programmes and for accelerated studies on the assessment of usable water, and the action required to assess usable demand for water for all purposes to the year 2000.

As a result, the Commonwealth prepared a statement of its policy entitled *A National Approach to Water Resources Management*, and this was released by the then Federal Minister for the Environment and Conservation in October, 1973. After discussion of this document at both Ministerial and officer levels, a meeting of Government Ministers with responsibility for water resources management was held in February, 1975. General agreement was reached on a revised statement which it was believed would be acceptable to all Governments as a general statement of principles within which the development and management of water resources in Australia could be considered.

In October, 1975, the Australian Water Resources Council adopted the revised statement entitled *Proposed National Approach to Water Resources Management in Australia* as a proposed statement of national water policy. It was agreed that this document be tabled in the Houses of Parliament of all States and the Commonwealth. It

has already been tabled in the Commonwealth Houses of Parliament, and I will table it in this House. The statement lays particular emphasis on the necessity for modern principles of balanced water resources management to be observed, an emphasis which I strongly advocated from the beginning and throughout its preparation.

Particular stress is laid on the necessity in all water resources management and planning for account to be taken not only of the objective of economic efficiency but also of the vital objectives of environmental quality and social well-being. Furthermore, planning and management should embrace all beneficial uses of water and should be conducted with the involvement of the public. I participated in all Ministerial discussions leading to the formulation of the proposed national approach to water resources management in Australia.

In 1973, while preparation of the statement was in its earliest stages, I was able to establish and announce a new water resources policy for South Australia that included the main principles now presented in this document. This policy has already borne fruit in the Water Resources Act, which is now operating, and in the on-going management of such water resources as the Murray River, the Northern Adelaide Plains and Padthaway. I was also able to influence the Australian Water Resources Council itself by proposing that it expand its sphere of involvement so that it, too, would be in a position both to conform to and espouse modern principles of water resources management.

At its eighteenth meeting, held in Canberra on June 24, 1976, the council adopted new objectives, functions and structure in line with my proposals. At that meeting, council also resolved that copies of the statement be made available for public comment within each State. For this purpose, copies will be on display in the State Information Centre, 25 Grenfell Street, Adelaide.

Interested members of the public may obtain a copy by writing to the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, Adelaide, and comments may be forwarded to the same address. After collation within States, comments from all States will be co-ordinated by the Australian Water Resources Council before the development of a programme of activities leading to the adoption by the council of an agreed final statement of national water policy. I am certain that substantial benefits will ultimately flow from the adoption by all States and the Commonwealth of a modern enlightened policy developed in this manner.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: BETTING TRANSACTION

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. CHAPMAN: It is reported in the press that a member of Parliament drew attention yesterday to the contents of a document he claimed was signed and directed to him by a South Australian constituent. It was reported that the constituent wrote to him, the document having been signed at Port Augusta the day before, and also that the document declared that, while employed by W. E. Chapman of Kangaroo Island in 1970, "the employee placed a bet on a horse running in the 1970 Melbourne Cup". It stated that the money he bet amounted to \$100, and he further alleged that W. E. Chapman, shearing contractor, in

his capacity as S.P. bookmaker accepted the bet, and that other statements were produced to assist in calling on the Attorney-General to investigate the matter further.

I assure the House that as a registered shearing contractor since the early 1950's, a founder of the South Australian Shearing Contractors Association, the State Chairman for two years and, between 1954 and 1973, an employer of hundreds of men in that wool industry, I have encountered and been required to attend, assist and deal with many industrial, personal and even some unpalatable demands from the men and their respective families. Probably being the easy-going fellow that I am and always ready to help others, their demands have multiplied. Some were appreciative; others soon forgot. However, in order to negate any possible reflection that may be cast upon my myself, and particularly my family, and indeed my Party for the false implication in those reports, I propose briefly to separate the facts from what appear to be maliciously concocted references as reported in last night's *News* and this morning's *Advertiser*.

For nearly 20 years, prior to my entering Parliament, I practised a sound and reputable shearing contracting business with the help of some of Australia's top men in the industry, some of them being employed by me throughout the life of that business. From my wages records of 1970, I have located the carbon copy of an employee's earnings and expenditure statement. It is the statement of Bob Maczkowiack, from whom I have evidence and believe that this matter emanated. He was employed by me for a short period in 1970 as a shearer. He later became an organiser with the Australian Workers Union, and subsequently, in association with the earlier mentioned honourable member, was instrumental in applying the infamous black ban on my Kangaroo Island woolgrowers in 1971-72. The wage statement copy clearly shows all the personal effects purchased, shearing requisites, his advance of credit for investment in a horse, his liquor, his transfers, his group tax No. 1 S 175589, plus of course, on the credit side, his earnings and recorded balance of his cheque.

The wages statement I refer to is a typical example of a shearing contractor's recording of his employee's details while shearing at any Australian outback shearing shed or sheds. Under the Pastoral Industry Award, the employer is required to stock all such personal and working requisites for his men so situated and employed. Clauses 44b and 44d of the award clearly point out those requirements of the employer. Indeed, it has been the practice of shearing contractors across Australia to provide whatever service is reasonably within their capacity for their men and so ordered by those men.

Regarding bets on horses in the Melbourne Cup, some shearing teams organise a cup sweep, as is done in Parliament House, some choose to have a bet direct but, as members would appreciate, Melbourne Cups are run on a Tuesday, a working day, and the only way the men could have a bet on the cup in those days from Kangaroo Island, or for that matter from any remote area, was to have their bets lodged in Adelaide or phoned over to a known bookmaker or, in more recent times, to have them lodged with the Totalizator Agency Board.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I myself have had a punt, both by bet direct and by sweep, on previous Melbourne Cups, as I believe many people do, and I may do so again. However, six years ago, back in November, 1970, the wages statement shows that I debited Bob Maczkowiack's account for the advance of the \$100 in question, because that finance would have been covered by his earnings or

a trust against his capacity to earn at that time. Whilst I cannot recall now, six years later, who in the outfit made the particular call or with whom it was invested in the 1970 Melbourne Cup, it would indeed have been by written request from Bob Maczkowiack and by his initiative while in my employ during the 1970 shearing season. It may have been on behalf of and including other members of the team he was working with in a collective private arrangement with his mates, but I have no knowledge of that.

Never have I acted in the capacity of an S.P. bookmaker, and the former shearer, his Australian Workers Union colleague (Mr. Dunford), and hundreds of men employed by me over the years would know that only too well. The recent action taken by the two people is quite inexcusable but undoubtedly reflects back to my arguments with them during their blatant attack on my islanders, and I suppose it has been further aggravated by my recent critical statements about the actions of some militant trade union leaders in this State.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must ask for time to continue.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I seek leave to have a brief extension of time.

Leave granted.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Never have I attacked a genuine unionist or non-unionist worker in South Australia. I thank you, Sir, for the opportunity to call a spade a spade and, indeed, on this occasion to explain what I believe was a blatant personal attack on my character and on my Party and my family.

QUESTIONS

FILM CORPORATION

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say whether the Government will inject funds into, or guarantee borrowings by, the South Australian Film Corporation this financial year, to provide the corporation with sufficient working capital, and provide any other necessary assistance, to enable it to continue operating satisfactorily? On page 347 of the Auditor-General's Report, the South Australian Film Corporation is listed as having a deficit of \$441 022 for the last financial year, and the accumulated deficit brought forward now totals \$889 237. The consolidated balance sheet reveals a total net asset deficiency of \$184 740, which technically indicates that the corporation is insolvent.

As well, during the past financial year, the corporation borrowed \$400 000, making a total borrowing of \$1 700 000, of which only \$5 890 has been repaid. This all adds up to a most alarming situation. Although the financial administration of the Film Corporation has occasionally been questioned in the past, the high quality of its artistic achievement has never been questioned. As we know, it has some outstanding successes to its credit. The corporation owns the copyright of a number of completed films produced for sponsors, and future distribution revenue and planned sales of its films will provide continuing earning potential for the corporation, although no firm value can be placed on these. The fact remains that, until income from these films and rights is received, the corporation appears to remain insolvent, and urgent support seems necessary.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader has apparently not looked at the history of the Film Corporation or the statements made by the Government in respect of the corporation, because it was not expected that it would become

self-funding within a 10-year period. It was expected that it would therefore be necessary for the Government to support the establishment of the corporation over that period. In addition, it is necessary for the Government to support activities of the corporation, such as the film library, for which the corporation receives no effective payment. I do not know whether the Leader is suggesting that the State Library is insolvent because the State has to support it. The film library is part of the cost of the Film Corporation. Future funding of the corporation is under constant review by the Government. Members of the corporation having approached the Government about future borrowings, the Government has undertaken that the whole of the funding of the borrowings of the corporation for this year will be met from revenue by the Government. This will allow the corporation to have an injection of funds without the necessity of interest and debt sinking fund repayments. That is a sensible action for the Government to take. The corporation suggested that a specific injection of revenue funds should be made available. The Government, because of the restrictions made in other areas on its borrowing powers, preferred that the corporation this year use its borrowing powers, which do not need the approval of the Loan Council, in order to maximise the borrowing area of the Government. The Government will meet directly these debt and sinking fund repayments so that that will not be a charge on the corporation. For the Leader to say that the Film Corporation is insolvent is to ignore the entire history of the development of the corporation. As the Leader says, the corporation has had some outstandingly successful results, and that applies commercially as well as artistically. It will continue to have such results.

SWANS

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether a report about the poaching of swans from the Torrens River which appears in today's *Australian* and which implies that the blame could be on new settlers is correct? The report, headed "City's swans out of the water and into the oven", states in part:

Don Simmons, the South Australian Minister for the Environment, and John Roche, the Lord Mayor of Adelaide, are concerned that swans on the Torrens River are being poached by new settlers to make swan pie, a dish favoured by many ethnic groups.

Did the Minister say anything like that, and does he believe it to be true?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I am glad the matter has been raised, because there is no truth to the report at all. I have been quoted inaccurately and I believe this applies to the Lord Mayor, too. In fact, I have made no direct comment on the matter. The whole charade started originally in the *News*, quickly grew wings, and settled finally in the *Australian*, which these days does not possess much credibility. I believe the Minister of Mines and Energy was fairly generous when he attributed about 10 per cent accuracy to that newspaper's reports. A reporter from the *Australian* who rang my office a day or two ago asked for an expansion on a report that had appeared originally in the *News*. He was told quite unequivocally that I had not at any stage blamed ethnic groups, and that there was no evidence that they were responsible. It was only speculation that the *News* was presumably willing to promote for some reason or other. The *Australian* reporter was told not to attribute such an opinion

to me. Today, of course, out came just such an attribution as that referred to by the member for Tea Tree Gully.

I understand that the Lord Mayor is similarly incensed, as he has at no stage said and, having no evidence on the matter, he does not believe that swans are going into ethnic pies. Shortly before the House sat this afternoon, another section of the media approached my office seeking my comment on the *Australian's* reference; that section of the media was told that the reference was not correct. The comment made was that, if I was willing to say that swan pie was migrant diet, they would be willing to take up the matter but, if I would not say that, they would forget the whole matter. This is just another example of the way in which the press wishes to twist the truth to fit its idea of what is sensational.

To answer the honourable member's question more constructively, I point out that I took advice from the relevant curator at the South Australian Museum, who has a deservedly high reputation in these matters. I was told that there are probably two reasons why the swan population appears to be low at present on the Torrens River. The first reason, which has been pointed out by the council office, is that at present there is a low level in the Torrens River. The second reason, associated with the first, is that swans are nomadic and highly mobile; they are well known for these qualities. As the council office said today, the swans are not chained to the Torrens River: they are free to come and go as they please. It is highly likely that, for the moment, they have decided to find more salubrious spring quarters. I deny the report which quotes me as making specific statements about the disappearance of the swans: at no time did I make the statements, which are incorrect.

MEDIBANK

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Do the Minister of Transport and the Government intend to oppose the Australian Railways Union's claim to have the State Government pay the full Medibank levy for the union's 3 500 members? The A.R.U. State Secretary (Mr. W. W. Marshall) stated recently that the union intended to include this as an important item in a 13-point log that it will serve on the Rail Division of the State Transport Authority. In view of this, do the Minister and the Government intend to resist this claim, or meekly submit to the demands?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Deputy Leader shows a grave lack of knowledge of industrial matters, as he does of other matters. If he had any knowledge at all of industrial matters he would know that the Australian Railways Union, South Australian Branch, is a Federal organisation and that the log of claims is served federally, not on the State Transport Authority. So, the honourable member's question is irrelevant.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. WHITTEN: Is the Minister of Community Welfare concerned at the report in today's *Advertiser* that 40 per cent of the unemployed people in South Australia are under 20 years of age? Can he say what is being done to assist young jobless people in South Australia? The report on page 1 of today's *Advertiser* bears out what Government members have expressed concern about—the policies of the Federal Liberal Government are directly causing unemployment. Also, I draw the Minister's attention to the

article on page 3 of today's *Advertiser*, headed "Economic policies queried by M.P.'s." The article, referring to Federal M.P.'s, says:

A group of Government back-benchers yesterday questioned the Government's economic strategy in the face of rising unemployment Some of the back-benchers sought short-term relief for the large number of school-leavers who will join the work force at the end of the year, but the Government, through the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations (Mr. Street), said the present policies would continue.

It would appear that there is a revolt in the Liberal and Country Party coalition and that even its own members are waking up to the fact that the deliberate policies that have been adopted to try to counteract inflation are creating further unemployment.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It would be obvious to members and certainly to the South Australian public that I am most concerned (and so is the South Australian Government) at the situation outlined by the honourable member. The question of the unemployed youth of South Australia and, for that matter, the whole of Australia is one that must be occupying the minds of every thinking citizen in Australia, let alone in South Australia. A serious situation is already present, and it will be more serious a few months from now. What we have been able to do so far in South Australia is to establish a Youth Work Unit, and this has been set up under my colleague the Minister of Labour and Industry. I will not go into that matter any further but, if the honourable member wants any information in that respect, my colleague can provide it. The Government has also recognised the plight of those who are workless and who may well remain workless for some time unless there is a change in thinking in Canberra.

Mr. Gunn: What did the Whitlam Government do about it?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member can bray all he wants to, but he will not change that fact. The Government in power now has had long enough. As I will show the honourable member from the report that has been quoted, the Commonwealth Government is culpable in this matter and is not even sure where it is going. The State Government has allocated funds for the purpose of allowing job hunters' clubs to operate in the continuing financial year. However, sadly, those funds may prove to be insufficient unless there is a change of heart in Canberra. I do not relish standing up in the House and replying to this kind of question: I would much rather be seated and have the young people in work, so that this matter need not be raised.

Mr. Venning: You wouldn't know what you're talking about.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member may not have much longer to go, so I will not worry too much about anything he might say by interjection. The article quoted appeared in the *Advertiser*, so no question of probity is involved. It appeared not in the *Australian* but in our own respected newspaper, so I should be able to quote safely from the article in this journal under the Canberra byline of Brett Bayly, as follows:

Mr. Street is understood to have told the meeting there would be no "band-aid" measures over the plight of the unemployed.

If I detect there no real thought or worry about those unemployed at present or those who may well become unemployed if the economic policies of the Federal Government continue, I am sure that other people also detect the same. There is no mention or sign of any pity, or any real worry or concern, and I think it is shameful of the Minister concerned. I believe that the

most important part of the article, quoting Mr. Street, is as follows: "The overall strategy of reducing inflation was the first priority." I ask Mr. Street, in his war against inflation, whether the casualty rate among the young Australian unemployed is worth while, and whether he can sustain that kind of casualty rate in order to prove the worthwhile nature of Canberra's present policies. It is most unlikely that the Minister would be able to sustain such an argument. I am certain that the young people of Australia would certainly reject his argument. The article, again quoting Mr. Street, continues:

If this was achieved—

that is, the reduction of inflation—

the unemployment problem also would be overcome. The Federal Minister is on record there as indicating that he is by no means certain that the present measures will overcome inflation. He says, "If this works, we will be able to look at the other things", so I fear that the young people unemployed in South Australia and throughout the rest of Australia face a bleak future.

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Education inform the House of the attitude of the State Government and the Education Department to the announcement today by the Prime Minister of an inquiry into the relationship between education, the labour market, and the whole field of post-secondary education? I am vitally concerned and worried about the position of unemployed young people in my district. I appreciate the efforts of the State Government, through job hunters' clubs, through the Labour and Industry Department and the Education Department, to assist wherever possible to obtain employment for the young people of my district as well as other districts. I shall be interested to hear the Minister's viewpoint on Mr. Fraser's statement.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: We will, of course, co-operate with the Commonwealth Government in providing whatever data and other assistance may be needed in the carrying out of this inquiry. One could have hoped that fuller consultation with the States had taken place on the part of the Commonwealth before the announcement was made. I am not certain whether the Prime Minister's statement (not having seen it personally) carries detailed terms of reference, but as the administration of education is reserved to the States, as the various Education Acts are State legislation, and as any radical restructuring of education might well require State legislation to make it effective, one could have hoped for a more productive result by prior consultation with the States.

Mr. Millhouse: You are becoming quite a federalist.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am simply accepting that the Commonwealth Government would want to carry out its own philosophy in relation to federalism, especially as the Commonwealth Minister for Education is in fact the high priest of new federalism in the Federal Cabinet. As I understand it, that is one of his Ministerial responsibilities. I now answer in part what seems to be a feeling around the place, put about by some people, that unemployment at present is not the product of a sick economy, about which nothing much seems to be happening, but rather the product of defects in the education system. The argument usually goes along the lines that young people nowadays are over-educated, that there is too high a production of people for scarce clerical jobs, too many university graduates, and so on. So far as I can see, the typical young person out of work is out of work not because he spent too long at school but because of the old-fashioned reason that he has not spent long enough at school. If one goes around the job hunters' clubs (and

there at least people are sufficiently motivated to want to associate with others in the same predicament), one will find typically young people who left school at an early age with few skills of any kind, technical or academic. That does not mean that this Government will amend the Education Act to provide for a school leaving age higher than the present one. It means that, if an adolescent, with the co-operation (or perhaps the acquiescence) of his parents seeks to leave school at the age of 15 years, perhaps before completing even his second year at high school (year 9, to use the present way of describing these things), there is little that the education authorities can do about the matter. I would suggest two things. The first is that the competitive position of the young person in the labour market has declined in recent years, and that has little to do with the level of education experienced. It has much to do with the fact that he is paid the same amount as the older person who is competing for the same job. To that extent, his competitive position in the labour market has declined.

I also suggest that there is probably somewhat of a generation gap between the middle-aged employer and the younger, perhaps somewhat more hairy, seeker of employment. The chances are that the middle-aged employer will probably favour for this job the reasonably square 30-year-old who is unemployed rather than the 16 or 18-year-old who represents an entirely different culture, age group, and so on. I really believe that that is a factor which is operating these days but which did not operate previously. Also, there has been very little expansion in process work in recent years, and that typically was the area that tended to mop up into the labour market many young entrants who did not have any skills at all.

Secondly, if the outcome of this Commonwealth inquiry is more money for the Technical and Further Education Commission, that can only be very much to the good. Technical and further education is in an interesting situation in that, unlike the other post-secondary areas, the financing of it is shared jointly between the Commonwealth and the States. The unfortunate pattern over the past three years has been a decline in the Commonwealth input into this field.

I hope I have my figures correct, as I am plucking them out of my head. I believe that three years ago the Commonwealth Government's share of total expenditure in the technical and further education area was 25 per cent, and that it is currently 10 per cent. So, to the extent that there has been an expansion in the technical and further education area, which is the real area where people can be equipped for skills in the labour market, it has had to be financed almost totally by the States. That is an unfortunate situation. If, in fact, the message can be got through to the Commonwealth authorities that the Technical and Further Education Commission should be given the sort of support that it merits, the present inquiry will certainly not be a waste of time.

TAPLEY HILL ROAD

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Will the Minister of Transport give me what information he may be able to obtain in relation to pedestrian protection on Tapley Hill Road, near its intersection with Cheadle Street? Parents of children attending Fulham North Primary School have raised the matter of the dangerous area that children must cross to get to that school. They have pointed out that, in recent months, the road has been made a priority road

and, as the traffic does not have to slow down in this area to give way to cars coming out of the side streets, little protection is given to children crossing the road. I know that the department has considered the problem and has decided to provide a pedestrian refuge in the middle of the road to enable the children to cross the road with some degree of safety. Nevertheless, the parents are not particularly pleased about this. As they consider that the road is a busy one, as well as a dangerous one because of the problems that I have mentioned involving priority roads, they have referred the matter to me again. I ask the Minister whether he will consider the points I have made on behalf of the parents and find out what can be done.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I certainly will examine that location. I suspect, from the description the honourable member has given, that it is typical of other locations where there are problems, particularly for pedestrians and schoolchildren, so much so that last year we took the conscious decision of doubling our effort in providing traffic light protection. We have a programme for the current year, and I shall be presenting it to the House on Tuesday next in reply to a question asked by the member for Light. The programme will be included in *Hansard* in that day's proceedings to show the position. I am still not certain that we are doing enough, even though we have doubled our efforts. The big decision that must be made is, if we want further to increase our effort in that area, in what other area we must decrease our effort. Although I believe that everyone would support the view that we should be doing more in relation to traffic lights, I doubt whether many people would come up with a suggestion about where we might decrease our financial effort. We will be looking at the matter seriously, and at this area specifically.

LEIGH CREEK HOUSING

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say what is the nature of the additional housing at Leigh Creek for which provision is made in the Loan Estimates, and where this housing will be situated? A sum of \$1 000 000 has been provided and, considering the nature of housing at Leigh Creek, with a possible estimate of \$33 000 a house, about 30 new homes could be provided. I ask where they will be situated, because it is common knowledge that the township is situated on a coal seam and that, with the opening of the new excavation works south of the town, which I understand will last for about 15 years or 20 years, it may be necessary that some of the houses eventually be removed to open up the coal under the town. To my knowledge, a small surplus of houses has existed at Leigh Creek. Sometimes when I have visited the town I have seen signs of empty houses, mainly because the town has a large turnover of population. Yesterday, in reply to the member for Gouger, the Minister said, when speaking of the location of the proposed new power station in the North of South Australia, that there was a possibility of siting the power station at Leigh Creek. Is this housing in connection with the new power station?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The answer to the last question is "No". The present cost of housing in Leigh Creek is about \$40 000 a house, so the sum provided in the Estimates would cover about 25 houses. Whether or not any of those are replacement houses, I am not sure. The honourable member is correct in saying that the

township of Leigh Creek is sited on a coal seam and, if the coal (probably about 30 000 000 tonnes) is required, the township itself would have to be resited.

Mr. Venning: Put it down the pit.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't worry; they're not on a pittance now.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Rocky River is one of the most intelligent and valuable members of this House. That was a most useful interjection, and I thank him for it. I shall raise with the Electricity Trust the whole question of the siting of these houses because, when the northern power station is built, the production of coal from Leigh Creek will have to expand significantly. Leigh Creek then will be supplying Port Augusta A and B stations and also the new northern power station. At that time we can expect a significant expansion in the production of coal. Clearly, if there is a requirement to resite the town and if further houses are to be built this year, consideration should be given immediately to the location of those houses. I will take up with the Electricity Trust the matters raised, and provide a more detailed reply at a later date.

VETERINARY TREATMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I direct my question to the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Health. I think it may be the Deputy Premier, so-called, the Minister of Works.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The Minister for the Environment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I beg your pardon. Did you say the massage man?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, you're the chief inspector of massage parlours.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: From the notice that I have seen on his door, the Minister of Works seems to run the massage parlour down here.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I invited you in, and you wouldn't come.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am damn sure that I would not go in. No way would I go in there.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham must ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I beg your pardon, Sir; I was sidetracked. What provision will the Government make to prevent the suffering of sick farm animals and the spread of disease consequent on not curing the animal in the present economic climate, which has been induced by low prices, high costs and the drought?

Mr. Wardle: You need a good vet.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is precisely the point, as the member for Murray will soon hear. As you, Sir, will gather, I ask this question in my capacity as Leader of the new L.M., rather than as the member for Mitcham. I have been approached by a farmer in the area immediately north of Gawler who tells me that he has, in the past day or so, had the experience of having one of his best cows (I must refer to my notes, as I am not as familiar with this topic as I am with other topics) contract pneumonia. This man and his wife have in the past successfully administered injections of antibiotics to such animals.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Isn't there a good vet at Gawler?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am coming to that point. All this man wanted to get from the veterinary surgeon was the antibiotic, so that he could administer it, but he could not

do so. The firm of veterinary surgeons involved is Eastick and Partners. I mention that because I understand that, although the member for Light gave his name to this firm, he is not now a member of it. The veterinary surgeons will not give the man concerned the antibiotic, but say that they must go out and diagnose the disease before they can make a prescription. That will cost \$27.50 with travelling, and that is, I am told, about as much as the beast is worth. Therefore, if this is typical (as I am told it is) of the predicament of a number of farmers, it means that animals will just not be cured because it will not be worth curing them, and this can, of course, lead to the spread of disease. That is the problem.

I am told that this is a typical example of a firm of veterinary surgeons refusing to give, on grounds that it says are good, a prescription for application (I wonder whether that is the correct word) by farmers themselves, but saying that they must go out and diagnose the disease themselves. However, this is simply not worth while. I put this question to the Government in the hope that something can be done to ensure that what I understand was the practice in the past (there are plenty of members on this side who will know whether or not this is correct), in which the farmer could administer drugs of this nature, can be resumed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will certainly ask the Minister of Agriculture to examine the point that the honourable member has raised. It seems to me that the union to which Dr. Eastick belongs is acting in exactly the same way as the waterside workers would act in a case like this. In other words, it is a good union principle, and I would not necessarily argue with it.

Mr. Millhouse: Oh, come off it!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I wonder whether, if the profession to which the honourable member belongs was involved in something like this, he would jump up so readily in this place and be critical of a fellow professional. I seem to remember persons in his profession trying to protect the work which, probably for good reasons, they believed was theirs. I do not think the members of the profession to which the honourable member has referred in this case are doing any more than that.

Mr. Millhouse: What about the cost of the vet?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: What about the cost of solicitors? It is fair to ask that question if the honourable member wants to talk about the cost of the vet to the farmer. What would happen if they had litigation of some description, or if the poor farmer innocently rang the honourable member on the telephone? Does the honourable member think the farmer would get a bill in that case? Of course he would. Having said those few words, I will take up the matter with my colleague.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Dr. EASTICK: When I entered Parliament House this morning, I received from the messengers a green slip of paper informing me that a Mr. David Vigor, sometimes of Sandy Creek, had telephoned and would like me to ring him. This gentleman said that he had been told, not by a firm of veterinary surgeons but by his manager, that he believed that the cost of undertaking a certain operation would be about \$27.50. I was able to tell him that I was not a party to the practice that he had contacted, and that I believed that the figure to which he referred was completely fictitious in relation to the matter he raised. I took the opportunity immediately afterwards to telephone one of the partners in this practice and was

told that the matter had not been discussed in the detail Mr. Vigor had tried to relate to me but that there was a problem on the property because the property manager had not been paid for work done on the property and on stock by various service organisations in the district. I make this further explanation only because—

Mr. Millhouse: It is a scurrilous attack on someone who cannot defend himself.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: I have made this further comment only because the member for Mitcham saw fit to use my name during the explanation of his question. I indicated to Mr. Vigor that the Public Health Department, through the Minister of Health, in consultation with the Minister of Agriculture and his officers had, over a long period of time, undertaken studies on drugs likely to cause problems to humans who can suffer a drug resistance from contact and may not subsequently fend off diseases. Penicillin and other antibiotic residues in milk can have a serious effect on humans, causing sensitivities, including eczema. I indicated to this man that I believe he should contact Mr. Rod McCarthy of the Public Health Department, because he is the senior pharmaceutical inspector and would be in a position to advise him of the consequences of the matters he has raised. That it has been necessary to raise the matter in this place is unfortunate, but I should like members to know that the gentleman was told where he could obtain details about this important issue.

SUNDAY TRADING

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to introduce a Bill to amend the Licensing Act to allow Sunday trading and, if it does, when? Earlier this year press speculation suggested that Sunday trading would be introduced in this State. Subsequently, the Attorney announced that the Government had no immediate intention of amending the Licensing Act in this way. I have been contacted recently by representatives of two organisations that have opposed such a measure. Within these organisations there has been a renewal of speculation that the measure will still be introduced, so can the Attorney, by either confirming or dispelling that speculation, say what are the Government's intentions?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I can assure the honourable member that it is pure speculation. It seems that the two organisations may well have been feeding on their own rumors, because the Government does not intend to introduce legislation for general Sunday trading on liquor licences.

Mr. Millhouse: You were just flying a kite before, I suppose?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No. What I said some months ago was that the Government was considering widespread changes to the licensing laws and that one of these considerations was the extension of Sunday trading. The matter was further considered. The Government does intend to introduce in the next few weeks widespread changes to the Licensing Act. When they are introduced members will see the extent of the Government's intention in this area. The present Government does not intend in this session to introduce legislation for general trading of hotels on Sunday.

MURRAY BRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Education personally appoint a senior officer from his department to negotiate with a senior officer in the Public Buildings Department to repair 141 windows in the comparatively new Murray Bridge High School? Although there has not been a riot at this school, one can imagine how about 80 very irate teachers felt this week when another of their colleagues was away from school with a mangled hand. That colleague is the fourth teacher who, along with several children, have unfortunately been injured in the 3½ years the school has been open. The design of the window casements is unusual and largely to blame. The school is probably the last of the "Glengowrie-type" school that will be built. Wunderlich Limited made the windows, the top and bottom sashes of which are tied together and when one lifts up the bottom sash the top sash comes down. If the sash should happen to break not only does one window pane come down on one's fingers, as we have probably all experienced, but both panes collapse. The local office of the Public Buildings Department has given this matter some attention, as has the local repair man and the Regional Education Office. It can be imagined that, as 141 windows need repair, the work is outside the capacity of the local repair man to handle, when it is remembered that he has other local repairs to handle as well.

The pulley over which the sash passes on these windows is very small and the sash material consists of a light steel cable. The problem obviously lies in the window itself. I am disappointed that Wunderlich has not been willing to co-operate on this matter before now. I have talked to that company twice in about the past two years. I know that the Public Buildings Department has done the same. As feeling amongst the staff is running high owing to the number of accidents, because of the security problem and because on cold days it is difficult to keep the windows closed to keep the rooms warm unless a piece of wood is used to prop up the windows, I regard the matter as urgent. I believe, too, that the Minister will regard it as urgent, so I ask him to give it an immediate high priority.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will take up the matter with my officers as a matter of urgency.

WORKER PARTICIPATION

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier clarify current Government policy relating to the need for legislation for the introduction of industrial democracy in the private sector? I wish to read some of the Premier's current statements on this matter. In a letter to the *Australian Financial Review* on April 6 this year, the Premier said:

I have consistently rejected the need for legislation to achieve this aim. As I have said repeatedly, my Government does not intend to legislate on this matter. We hope example and encouragement will bring about this aim.

However, a press statement issued by the Premier's Department on May 5, 1975, stated:

We intend to legislate to ensure all firms and employee organisations recognise the democratic principles involved. Similar statements were made in the Premier's election speech last year when, on June 24, he said, about community participation:

From the lessons of the next three years, we should be able to lay down rules . . .

On September 26, 1974, a similar statement was made on the subject in a speech at the annual dinner of the Institute of Directors. On October 28, 1974, the Premier said:

The Government must look to the obvious alternative. Earlier, he had said that, unless this was adopted on a voluntary and co-operative basis, this alternative must be considered. On August 26, 1975, in Parliament, in reply to a Question on Notice, the Premier said:

A decision will be taken with respect to legislation after a trial period of three years.

Those statements are obviously inconsistent, deceitful and misleading. In a letter to the *Australian Financial Review* there is an obvious and deliberate lie.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speaker, I ask that that be withdrawn immediately.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the honourable member for Davenport to withdraw his last statement.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have pointed out to the House actual quotations taken from speeches. They are completely—

The SPEAKER: I must ask the honourable member to withdraw his last statement.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am pointing out inaccuracies that occurred.

The SPEAKER: There is to be no debate. The honourable member must withdraw the statement, or I will have to continue further.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The statements are completely conflicting. They are—

The SPEAKER: Order! For the last time I must ask the honourable member for Davenport to withdraw the last statement, or I tell him that I will have to proceed further.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I withdraw the word "lie" and replace it with the words "completely conflicting and misleading statements".

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has carefully gone backwards and forwards in time, in quoting statements made previously. He has not paid attention to statements made in this House explaining the evolution of Government policy on this matter. Early in the development of Government policy, the Government looked at what had been the experience in other countries in connection with the provision of industrial democracy programmes. In most other countries, legislation has occurred. At that time, we thought it would be conceivable that in due course legislation would have to occur here. In fact, that appeared in the Labor Party's working environment programme—that it would take about three years of experiment before rules, which might then be incorporated in legislation, could be laid down. It has been clear from further studies that that will not work. Consequently, the Government has made clear that it is proceeding to experiments in the public sector and in a number of areas in the private sector, but the experiments must be long term; it will be impossible in the foreseeable future to lay down rules that can be incorporated in legislation. It is therefore not the Government's intention to introduce legislation on this matter.

At 3.8 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SALARIES ADJUSTMENT (PUBLIC OFFICES) BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal

the Salaries Adjustment (Public Service and Teachers) Act, 1970-1975, and to make provision for the adjustment of salaries of certain employees and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill repeals the Salaries Adjustment (Public Service and Teachers) Act, 1960-1975, and makes further provision for the payment of retroactive increases in salary. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

REMAINDER OF EXPLANATION OF BILL

The repealed Act dealt with the situation that arose where a retroactive increase in salary of an office was provided for, and between the time that the increase was expressed to take effect and the time that the instrument granting the increase was made the officer or teacher concerned had vacated his office. The repealed Act provided that payment of that retroactive increase would be made if the officer or teacher retired or died but not if the officer or teacher resigned. In the Government's view this situation requires a remedy since it is inconsistent with the principle that a retroactive determination is intended to adjust the salary for work in relation to a period antecedent to the time at which the determination was made. It follows therefore that a person who was performing that work during that period is entitled to the salary as so increased notwithstanding the circumstances in which he ceases to perform the work. The present measure is intended to achieve this end.

Clauses 1 to 3 are formal. Clause 4 deals specifically with the Superannuation Act; in this case retroactive increases are not taken into account in adjusting contributions. Clause 5 makes it clear that rights to salary that arise apart from this Bill are not affected by the enactment of this measure into law. Clause 6 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of the measure. In general, these are self-explanatory.

Clause 7 provides that in all circumstances retroactive salary increases will be payable to people who occupied the relevant offices at any time during the period of retroactivity. Clause 8 is a regulation-making power in the usual form. Finally, it is pointed out that this measure does nothing more than make it clear that public employees are in no different position in this area to persons employed in the private sector. The "rights" asserted to in this measure have long been available to persons engaged in private as opposed to public employment.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOUSING ADVANCES BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to establish an Advances for Housing Account at the Treasury and for purposes incidental thereto. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill establishes an account at the Treasury to facilitate the advancing of certain funds for housing. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

REMAINDER OF EXPLANATION OF BILL

It authorises advances to be made to the State Bank and the South Australian Housing Trust, two agencies that have

for many years been involved in making housing moneys or houses available. This measure is essentially a machinery one, as it cannot, of itself, create housing funds.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 establishes the account and makes provision for crediting to it amounts appropriated by Parliament and repayments of principal and interest where advances from the account have been by way of loans. This repayment provision creates a type of revolving or self-generating fund and the present intention is that all principal and interest received will be so credited. However, it is recognised that the need for funds from the account may diminish in the future. Therefore, flexibility is provided for the Treasurer to wind up the account gradually by crediting repayments and interest to Loan or Revenue Account. Such sums would then become available for redistribution to other purposes subject to appropriation by Parliament. Paragraph (c) of subclause (1) of this clause merely ensures that any other appropriate funds will be available to the account.

Clause 4 merely authorises advances to be made from the Account to the named institutions. Clause 5 has a mildly retrospective effect to the extent that enables recent advances by way of loans to be brought within the scope of this measure.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

WAR FUNDS REGULATION ACT REPEAL BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal the War Funds Regulation Act, 1916, as amended; to dispose of certain moneys and assets under the control of the State War Council of South Australia constituted under that Act; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill repeals the principal Act, the War Funds Regulation Act, 1916. The principal Act constituted a State War Council which was given certain powers in connection with the conduct of the Great War which are, for present purposes, irrelevant. However, in addition, the council was given certain powers in relation to the management and control of "war funds" as defined in section 2 of the principal Act. The council, which has latterly been constituted of two Ministers of the Crown, has, over the past 50 years, seen the funds over which it has had oversight diminish or disappear. At present the only fund remaining is kept at the Treasury in a trust account. When certain securities are realised this account will have a balance of about \$4 800.

Dr. Tonkin: Were there regular meetings and lunches?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There were no regular meetings and no lunches. The only specific expense to the council over the past 50 years was for the acquisition of a seal—not the barking type. Upon the repeal of the principal Act it is proposed that the balance in the trust account will be passed to the War Veterans Home Myrtle Bank Incorporated since this institution seems an appropriate body to be the recipient of the residue of the moneys. During the operation of the War Council the moneys were paid out for Boer War veterans. The last veterans of that war having died, it is appropriate now to disburse these moneys. I introduce this Bill somewhat reluctantly. I always thought that the constitution of the State War Council could give us some protection at times against the depredations of the Commonwealth, but I have succumbed to other advice!

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 effects the necessary repeals. Clause 3 passes the residue of the trust account to the War Veterans Home at Myrtle Bank.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

URBAN LAND (PRICE CONTROL) ACT ADMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Urban Land (Price Control) Act, 1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: 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

The purpose of this Bill is to extend the operation of the Urban Land (Price Control) Act for a further two years and to make two other comparatively minor amendments to the principal Act. The Urban Land (Price Control) Act was enacted in 1973 at a time of very high inflation in land values. Since its enactment, the Act has had a significant effect in reducing spiralling land values, especially in developing areas. The Act has not had the dampening effect upon development that was feared by some members of this Parliament at the time of its enactment. Indeed, the Act had generally been welcomed in the community, even amongst land developers. The Government believes that the success of the Act to the present time, and the present indications that real estate values may be poised for a further bout of inflation, justify the extension of this Act for a further two years.

The Bill contains two clauses designed to facilitate enforcement of the principal Act. A new section is inserted in the principal Act enabling the Commissioner to call for documents and to make investigations to determine whether the Act has been complied with. This new provision is analogous to a similar provision in the Prices Act. A further amendment is included making it possible for prosecutions to be instituted at any time within two years after the date of an alleged offence. At the moment, this period is limited to six months by the Justices Act. However, frequently evidence of an infringement of the Act does not appear until after documents have been lodged at the Lands Titles Office for registration. This may be many months after the date of the transaction that constitutes the offence. Accordingly, an extension of the period within which prosecutions may be launched appears warranted.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 enacts a new section 27a in the principal Act. This new section enables the Commissioner, or a person authorized by the Commissioner, to require production of documents, or to require a person to answer questions relating to dealings in land. This power can, of course, only be exercised where the inquiry is relevant to the enforcement of the principal Act.

Clause 3 amends section 28 of the principal Act by providing that proceedings for an offence against the new Act may be commenced at any time within two years after the date on which the offence is alleged to have been committed. Clause 4 provides that the Act will expire on the thirty-first day of December, 1978. The present date of expiry is the thirty-first day of December, 1976.

Mr. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

RUNDLE STREET MALL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Rundle Street Mall Act, 1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: 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

This short Bill, which amends the principal Act, the Rundle Street Mall Act, 1975, proposes three amendments: first, it provides for a change of name of the mall from "Rundle Street Mall" to the "Rundle Mall". This suggestion arises from a unanimous recommendation of the present Steering Committee, which believes that the retention of the word "street" in the title of the mall was inconsistent with a "pedestrian-dominated area free of vehicular traffic".

Secondly, it increases the maximum liability of the Government by a further \$100 000 to accord with the final cost (\$1 200 000) of the construction of the mall. This increase in liability of the Government is in accordance with the existing agreement reflected in the principal Act between the Government and the Adelaide City Council as to the apportionment of costs of the mall. Thirdly, it clarifies certain powers of the council to make "delegations" under its special by-law making powers.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends the definition of "the committee" to reflect the change of name of the mall. Clause 3 effects the change of name of the mall. Clause 4 increases the council's special borrowing powers from \$600 000 to \$800 000 to reflect its share in the total cost of the project. Clause 5 enables the council to confer certain powers, given by its by-laws on the Rundle Mall Committee. Clause 6 increases the maximum liability of the Government in connection with the project to \$400 000. Clause 7 formally changes the name of the Rundle Street Mall Committee to the Rundle Mall Committee. Clause 8 is consequential on clause 5. I draw members' attention to the fact that, since I have been advised that within the meaning of the relevant Standing Orders this measure is a hybrid Bill, it will in due course be referred to a Select Committee of this House.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from September 8. Page 914.)

First schedule.

Other Capital Advances and Provisions, \$38 090 000.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): As I understand it, we are now discussing the two items under this heading that come after the Monarto Development Commission line. Accordingly, I look with great interest to the South Australian Teacher Housing Authority estimated payments of \$1 000 000. What rate of interest is the authority paying on those moneys?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning): I understand that it is the loan rate of interest that is not subsidised, apart from the fact that on any Government house a teacher occupies there is a subsidy in the rental. The Housing Trust is asked to assess the rental, given the rate of interest that applies, which is the commercial rate in this case. Then the teacher pays 80 per cent of the trust's assessed rental.

Mr. MATHWIN: Regarding the \$1 900 000 for the Land Commission, is this concerned with development mainly to the south near Noarlunga or in the area near Trott Park? Is money to be spent in acquiring additional properties near Trott Park and Hallett Cove or in the Noarlunga area?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The main activities of the Land Commission are spread over the metropolitan area. The current subdivisions, or those about to be current, are in the areas of Happy Valley, Chandler Hill, Aberfoyle Park, Salisbury, St. Agnes, Blair Park, and Elizabeth. I think there is a commission subdivision at Hallett Cove, but the bulk of the commission's land holdings is to be found in rural A land in the Noarlunga region, in the area of Modbury and Golden Grove, and in the area of the District Council of Munno Para. The current subdivisions taking place are not in the rural A areas but in the urban living areas. It would not be possible to identify precisely where this \$1 900 000 is being spent, because that is part of the commission's total programme.

I think that the Treasurer's Statement makes this point clear. The commission's programme for 1976-77 envisages the expenditure of \$23 600 000, so \$1 900 000 is small in relation to that sum. Of that \$23 600 000, the bulk will come from the Commonwealth, which is providing \$6 000 000, \$4 100 000 from semi-government borrowing, and \$1 900 000 from the State Loan programme. So, the commission's total borrowing this year will be \$12 000 000, and the remainder of the \$23 600 000 will come from revenue received from land sales. I do not think that the commission has any holdings at Trott Park. The commission's report is due to be presented to Parliament if not next Tuesday, the following Tuesday, and I think that the honourable member will see from a diagram in the report precisely where the commission's holdings are. Trott Park and Sheidow Park are distinctly defined areas. The commission does not have land there. I understand they are developments of the Jennings company. To the west, in the Hallett Cove area there is a commission holding, but that is relatively minor compared to the commission's holdings elsewhere.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister say what is the cost to the Land Commission of establishing in its subdivisions the services from broad acres to the finished allotment, and can he give the number and value of the allotments the commission has available for sale?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The development costs presently vary from \$3 323 to \$4 988 an allotment. The figures provided in the recent article in the *Financial Review* are incorrect, and I have written to the Editor pointing out the inaccuracies. The current prices range from \$6 500 to \$7 000, but inflation is taking place all the time. So, one can expect that those prices will tend to increase gradually as a consequence of inflation.

Mr. Evans: At what price do you expect the \$4 900 allotments to come on the market?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The current situation with regard to raw land costs has ranged between \$866 and \$1 742 per allotment. I have just written to the honourable

member about this but I do not have a copy of the letter with me. The commission's administrative costs per allotment are expected to drop from \$400 per allotment to less than \$200, with a greater turn-off of allotments. However, at the upper end of the range the total costs would be over \$7 000, and at the lower end of the range below \$7 000; it depends on the land, the problems encountered in providing services to the land, and the date of acquisition of the land. The date of acquisition and the date on which an allotment is developed will determine the actual incurred costs.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous—\$8 665 000.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I refer to transport research and development. I am particularly interested in how the induction motor is progressing. That was a big deal three years ago; in fact, it was the only item that the Minister could recall on which money was being spent. How is this \$960 000 to be spent on research?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. RUSSACK: I refer to the line "Effluent drainage—net balance as at June 30, 1976; estimated payments—\$1 450 000". How much money will be available to the Kadina council during this current year for the installation of such a scheme?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The amount is \$670 000.

Dr. EASTICK: Could the Minister indicate projects to be funded this year? If not, could he in due course make available to members of the House a list of specific projects? I am interested in the Williamstown-Lyndoch project, which may be one combined project or two separate projects, depending on the final planning arrangements.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The money for Williamstown is \$472 000.

Mr. MATHWIN: I seek information on the \$300 000 relating to the purchase of land for public parks and recreation areas, etc. I presume this line would enable local government to procure a building and have some of the cost returned by the Minister to it so that it could either make a park or preserve the building, or extend the areas that the council had. In Brighton, gradually the Brighton council procured houses along the Brighton Road and, with the aid of the Government, enlarged the area concerned. The sum of \$300 000 does not seem to be a very large amount if the purpose is as I have suggested. What is the Minister's programme in relation to these acquisitions and grants to local government authorities for the purposes of these parks, etc?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I understand that the tenor of the question is about acquisition in Brighton.

Mr. Mathwin: No, I am speaking generally.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Minister of Mines and Energy, who is the member for Brighton, made a pronouncement on that yesterday.

Mr. EVANS: Regarding the provision for the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department, can the Minister say whether any of this money is to be used for feasibility studies for sporting complexes, or whether it is to be used for indoor swimming pools and a general sporting stadium, a suggestion that was to the fore a few months ago? Are there any plans or feasibility studies being considered and, if so, what are they?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am a little puzzled by that question. I do not know whether the honourable

member is referring to one of those projects on which the Commonwealth Government reneged in providing money for sport, but I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister and see whether I can get some information for him.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister of Transport said that the Minister of Mines and Energy, the member for Brighton, made an announcement yesterday on the matters I raised. He has made announcements about matters in my electorate on many previous occasions, whether about parks, gardens, or reserves or about the erection of traffic lights and signals at pedestrian crossings. It is normal procedure for the Minister of Mines and Energy to trespass into my area, anyway. My question was not only in relation to Brighton but applied generally. I could refer to Bowker Street and other areas in my district.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will study the honourable member's question in *Hansard* and provide him with the information he seeks.

Dr. EASTICK: My question relates to public parks. We see under this item the words "and transfer to a deposit account of funds to be used for such purposes in the future". I take it that "in the future" is "in future financial years". This is a departure from normal. How will these additional funds be handled?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the honourable member will find it was adequately described in the Treasurer's Budget statement on Tuesday.

Mr. RUSSACK: I thank the Minister for his reply about effluent drainage at Kadina. Is that sum for the complete scheme or will there be further funding in the next financial year?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not have that information but I will get it for the honourable member.

Mr. EVANS: I want to be sure there is no misunderstanding about my earlier question addressed to the Minister for Planning. I was referring, first, to a public statement that a feasibility study would be made for a sporting complex to be built on the Samcor property. At about the same time, the Treasurer stated that there was a need for such a complex and that sites were being considered. I understand that Wayville was one site mentioned for a sporting complex, including a swimming pool, as well as possibly convention centres and an exhibition centre.

I am more concerned about a complete indoor complex in Adelaide to serve as a central point for sport, including an indoor swimming pool, with substantial seating accommodation. Earlier this year, the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport stated that the Federal Government had backed out in certain areas, and he mentioned the Marino quarry recreation centre, the Kadina recreation centre, the Blackwood recreation centre, tennis courts and a shelter at Port Augusta, clubrooms facilities for the North Adelaide Lacrosse Club, and an indoor cricket and sports centre at Bowden.

In fact, the Federal Government went on with all that, except in the case of the indoor cricket and sports complex at Bowden for the South Australian Cricket Association, and the association itself really decided not to go on. The State Government and the Federal Government were each to give \$63 000. The association was confronted with a bill for nearly \$300 000, and I understand that the association is now considering a project at the Adelaide Oval, costing less but with similar results. Mr. Casey stated that there had been a disgusting breach of faith by the Federal Government, but neither the Minister for Planning nor Mr. Casey has ever made a public statement

that Mr. Casey's original comment was wrong and that the Federal Government had provided \$453 000 for the sports complexes in question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will inquire about the specific matter that the honourable member has raised, but Mr. Casey's original statement was a comment on an announcement from Canberra about cuts made by the Federal Government. These cuts were announced by that Government, and I am pleased that some, at least, of the grants have been restored.

Mr. Evans: All of them.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Doubtless, the honourable member's method of communication is better. However, many cuts made by his Federal colleagues have not been restored, and the present Federal Government's record in respect of commitments that it was understood would continue has not been good.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister say what is proposed in regard to the provision made in connection with the two fishing research vessels mentioned?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get a report from the Minister of Fisheries.

Mr. RUSSACK: I refer to the provision of \$1 600 000 as estimated payments in respect of school buses in the Education Department. Can the Minister say how many buses will be purchased during the year, and will he state the Government's policy regarding the disposal of old buses? Last year I asked the Minister of Works whether consideration would be given to the public auction of some of these buses, to allow country operators a better opportunity to acquire them, rather than that the buses be disposed of by calling tenders.

I received a satisfactory reply from the Minister, who said that the request would be considered. I do not know whether that was only a temporary measure, or whether the method of disposal will become the permanent policy of the Government. I understand that the decision rests with the Supply and Tender Board but, so that country operators may benefit, I ask the Minister whether it is now the Government's policy in future to offer, by both tender and auction, buses no longer required. If the Government does not intend to do this, will it consider adopting that method?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will check with the Minister of Education the number of buses involved in this purchase. Regarding the sale of old buses, I will also get the information for which the honourable member has asked. I imagine that whether any buses can be auctioned depends on the number to be sold in a particular area.

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister explain the provision of \$155 000 for Port Lincoln freezing works rehabilitation, and can he say what work is intended?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think this is part of the longer-term programme in process, but I am not sure what is involved this financial year. I will check that and bring down a reply.

Dr. EASTICK: Is it intended that, in the area covered by the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport in regard to recreation and sporting facilities, funds will be provided for the racing industry in each of three codes, or is it intended that their requirements will be met entirely from the development funds within the general framework of the racing industry? Further, is any of this amount related to the Government's announcement earlier this week that it will pour \$500 000 into the racing industry?

Because these announcements have been made in the past few days, can the Minister say whether racing is completely divorced from this line or whether it is part of the totality of the line?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The racing industry is not affected by this line. An amount of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, one half of the Totalizator Agency Board turnover, is allocated to the various racecourse development funds each year, and the boards concerned with each code allocate the funds for particular developments. The headline about an extra \$500 000 for the racing industry was not entirely correct. Part of the arrangement proposed is that, during the period of difficulty the T.A.B. will have until computerisation is introduced, the various codes may use up to 50 per cent of the income going into each of the racecourse development funds to help with recurrent expenses. That accounts for about 40 per cent of the money involved in the announcement, so it is not a case of more than \$500 000 being poured into the racing industry by the Government; none of it is involved in this line.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister has referred to racing as an industry. I think we, as a Parliament, should know whether it is an industry or a sport, especially in relation to horse-racing.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It is not covered in this line.

Mr. EVANS: I am asking whether racing is being considered as recreation and sport or as an industry. If it is recreation and sport, there is a possibility that it comes under this line.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I gave the Minister and the member for Light a little latitude. The Minister's reply to the member for Light was, in effect, "No". Although I thought it was probably out of order, I did let the Minister continue. I do not want to get on to the matter of racing, because I think the Minister has already answered the question. If the member can be specific, he may ask a question.

Line passed.

Schedules passed.

Clauses 1 to 11 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GRANTS COMMISSION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 5. Page 458.)

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): The State Government's lack of enthusiasm for local government autonomy is summed up by its attitude to this Bill. State Premiers were asked at their conference last April to set up State Grants Commissions. The Federal Grants Commission published a special report on financial assistance to local government in May this year, in which was set out not only the arrangements which could be made but also the way in which a State Grants Commission could and should be set up. The Premiers all agreed that they would take that step.

The Minister assisting the Prime Minister in federalism matters, Senator John Carrick, who has been referred to this afternoon, also made clear to the States at that stage that the Federal Grants Commission would be more than willing to assist the States in this project. Because of our enthusiasm for the federalism policy and the new autonomy that it gives to the States and to local government, this Opposition offered more than three months ago to sit for

an extra two or three days if necessary in the one-week June sitting to expedite the introduction of the Bill, but the Government refused to take action even then.

The Minister has left his move until the very last moment, and by delaying has ensured that an interim commission will be appointed to act for the coming financial year, instead of having a permanent commission, which could have been put into operation by July 1. Perhaps he has some hopes that the Federal Government will be changed before the end of this financial year, and that a Government composed of his colleagues from his own Party will once again take over the reins of government of Australia. If that was to happen, all I could say would be, "God help us all." If that is not the case, he must still be living in the past, and still cannot yet adapt to the fact that there has been a change of Government in Canberra.

It was interesting to note in the press recently a report that Mr. Whitlam had stated that if he was elected to Government again he would carry on (and those are the operative words) in exactly the same way that he was carrying on when he left off last year. Perhaps that is what the Minister is depending upon, but I can assure him that it is most unlikely that Mr. Whitlam will ever again become Prime Minister, and it is certainly most unlikely that he will survive his one-year trial period as Leader of the Federal Opposition. I doubt whether he will be Leader of the Labor Party for much longer.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Who will take his place?

Mr. Becker: Professor Blewett.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Of course, Blewett's on the scene.

Dr. TONKIN: That matter may well be raised, although I have a feeling that someone else may have his eye on the same seat. There has been far too much publicity in the other States recently for one to think other than that.

Mr. Becker: What about Bob Hawke?

Dr. TONKIN: I remind members that Mr. Hawke was a South Australian at one stage of his career. The State Government's lack of enthusiasm for local government autonomy is evidenced by the Minister's second reading explanation (I was going to say "with which the Minister favoured us", but he did not favour us with much at all). Part of his explanation, which was one of bare bones only, is as follows:

The purpose of this measure is to establish a South Australian Grants Commission to recommend to the Minister grants to local government authorities. These grants are from funds provided by the Commonwealth under the new federalism proposals.

That was it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That was not a complete speech!

Dr. TONKIN: He went into detail from there on, but that was the speech. The Liberal Government's new federalism proposals were outlined by the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Fraser, in September, 1975. Regarding local government, he said—

Mr. Langley: Is he going well!

Dr. TONKIN: He is doing remarkably well. I am pleased to hear the member for Unley's endorsement of his action. Such a sincere compliment is worthy of being passed on to the Prime Minister. I undertake to do so, too. Mr. Fraser at that time said:

The Liberal and National Country Parties also propose to earmark a fixed percentage of personal income tax for distribution through the States to local government. This percentage will be shown for two distinct purposes:

- (i) a per capita grant to all local government bodies with a "weighted" formula in contemplation; and
- (ii) an equalisation or "topping up" grant to be distributed through State Grants Commissions.

This will be a vital new reform for local government. Under these proposals, municipalities and shires will have revenues of known dimensions to assist forward budgeting. At the same time, they will have very much greater independence of action. Artificial regions will not be forced on local authorities from Canberra. Local bodies will be free to establish formal or informal groupings from time to time for particular functional purposes, but regions will not be used by the Commonwealth as centralist instruments to by-pass the States, to amalgamate areas or to impose Commonwealth policies.

That was a significant statement: it was adhered to by the Federal Liberal Government when it was returned to office. It has been the basis of the entire federalism policy, whereby the Federal Government is willing to give the States and the councils as much say as possible in determining respective spending priorities. The Bill which we are now considering puts into effect these proposals for local government. It is of inestimable benefit to local government, and provides a guarantee of Federal funds for its use. That is the feature of the Bill. Local government authorities were being gradually squeezed out of existence under the previous Federal Government proposals for regional development. Anyone connected with local government will know what battles went on within individual regions for a share of the funds which were made available on that basis. It was quite apparent that, under the Labor Government's centralism policy, local government was not considered a necessary factor in the administration of this country. I hardly need to remind members on this side of this, and I am sure the three members of the Government occupying the benches on the other side during the passage of this most important Bill know all about the matter.

Mr. Becker: Maybe all the others have gone to an urgent Caucus meeting.

Dr. TONKIN: That may be so because there are all sorts of ructions on that side at present. I am sure Government members know what were the proposals of the central Government when it was under the administration of the Labor Party. Those proposals were that there was to be a central Government in Canberra with a second tier of Government administered through large regions. Existing councils were to be absorbed into those regions, and councils and State Parliaments were to be abolished. Regionalism as imposed—

Mr. Goldsworthy: That was their centralism.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, that was their centralism policy. Regionalism, which the Federal Labor Government attempted to impose, was no more than the establishment of larger geographic districts for administrative convenience and central domination. Since local authorities did not have their decision-making autonomy reinforced, Labor's proposals were in no sense a decentralisation of political power. The contrary was true. Regions were, and are, a threat to the autonomy and survival of local councils. There may be certain governmental functions which could be more efficiently discharged at a regional level either by groupings of local authorities or by delegation downwards from the States. But it is important that regions emerge through natural processes and not through the imposition of artificial boundaries by a Federal Government.

In a diverse country such as Australia there is need and scope for flexibility of approach to regional problems. Direct Commonwealth assistance for local government has been a relatively recent development. Before 1973, no Commonwealth assistance was provided specifically for local government. The rationale was that, as local authorities were constituted and functioned under State

laws, it was the job for State Governments to provide assistance. The Commonwealth provided general purpose funds to the States to assist in financing all State expenditure responsibilities, including local government authorities.

The Federal Labor Government in 1973 passed the Grants Commission Act, 1973, which repealed the Grants Commission Act, 1933. This Act laid down procedures for regional organisations of local government to apply for financial assistance from the Commonwealth and for such applications to be the subject of inquiry and report by the Grants Commission. The Grants Commission recommended grants for local government totalling \$56 400 000 in 1974-75 and \$79 900 000 in 1975-76, and further recommended that the grants be paid without conditions attached to their use by local government authorities.

Following discussions at the February and April, 1976, Premiers' Conferences as to how local government might share in the proceeds of personal income tax and the consideration of reports by the Grants Commission and a committee of Commonwealth and State officers, agreement was reached at the June, 1976, Premiers' Conference on a new scheme of general purpose assistance for local government. Under this scheme an amount of \$140 000 000 (an increase of 75.2 per cent on the amount of general revenue provided in 1975-76) will be provided to the States. Then a percentage figure would be determined by relating the amount of \$140 000 000 to personal income tax collections in 1975-76.

In 1977-78 and each subsequent year, the amounts of general purpose assistance to local government will be determined by applying a percentage to Commonwealth personal income tax collections in the immediately preceding year (excluding the effects of any Commonwealth or State surcharges or rebates). This \$140 000 000 will be distributed among the States on the basis of that percentage distribution recommended by the Grants Commission. South Australia's share of this \$140 000 000 is to be \$11 900 000.

We are required to devote a minimum of 30 per cent of each year's assistance to element "A" grants, which are to be distributed among all local authorities in South Australia on a basis which takes into account the population within the areas of each local government authority but it may also take into account area, population density, or other factors which will necessarily be proposed by the State and agreed to by the Commonwealth. The remaining assistance within South Australia is to be devoted to element "B" grants, to be distributed among local authorities, having regard to their respective financial needs, on the recommendation, once again, of the State Grants Commission. That is what this Bill is all about.

At the June, 1976, Premiers' Conference the Commonwealth expressed the view that it would be desirable if the distribution of assistance in each State could be such that no individual authority received a lesser amount of assistance in 1976-77 than it did in 1975-76. The States agreed that this would be an objective of the agreement. General purpose assistance to local government has increased dramatically this year by 75 per cent (up \$140 000 000). Looking at total amounts of all forms of financial assistance to local government, and I refer members to table 99 on page 123 of Commonwealth Budget Paper No. 7, it may seem superficially that there has been a cut-back in Federal financing from \$274 000 000 to \$195 000 000. This is the sum the Minister has been using, deliberately to mislead the public. This is exactly the same situation as we saw this afternoon in relation to public statements made on sporting and recreation facilities by other Ministers which subsequently have been proved to be totally without foundation. The Minister concerned

on that occasion was at least able to confirm, or perhaps it slipped through without his noticing, that the statements he made earlier were totally without foundation. This is part of a deliberate campaign set up by Government Ministers to use every half-truth and every snide reference possible about the Federal Government and its degree of support. When opening the Murray Lands Local Government Association annual general meeting the Minister said:

Local government throughout Australia last year received a total of \$229 000 000 through direct grants and a number of assistance plans. This financial year funding has been cut to not much more than \$140 000 000.

That is a blatantly dishonest statement. The \$140 000 000 refers to general purpose grants. Perhaps he may be able to explain later (and I hope he will, or at least try) where he has obtained his figures, as they are not validated by any of the official Federal Government Budget papers. However, the apparent cut-back in Federal finance to local government from \$274 000 000 to \$195 000 000 is solely due to the discontinuance of the RED Scheme, and the Minister knows that very well. Last year \$94 000 000 was paid to local government under this scheme, whereas only \$300 000 will be paid this year. In fact, local government is no worse off in its own right, in respect of funds which come to it.

The truly comparable sum for last year should be the total finance exclusive of RED finance, that is, \$180 000 000. Therefore, on a comparative basis Federal finance for local government has increased from \$180 000 000 to \$195 000 000. That is a far cry from the not much more than \$140 000 000 the Minister was quoted as saying at Murray Bridge. Undoubtedly the Minister, as usual, will use any excuse or reason to criticise the Federal Government, but he should do it honestly. In this case, it is the discontinuance of the RED scheme that he should be criticising if he wants to criticise at all: it is not the reduction of actual funds for council or local government purposes. Certainly he should not claim a cut-back in local government funds, as he did on August 20 at Murray Bridge. To say that Federal funding to local councils had been reduced "almost to a trickle" was deceitful and dishonest.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Is he doing that for Gough?

Dr. TONKIN: There is not much anyone can do for Gough. The principle of general revenue grants, as opposed to specific purpose revenue, is a fundamental one in strengthening and preserving the power of local government as a vital part of the three-tier system of government in this country. The core of the new federalism proposals is that Canberra should not meddle with power-hungry hands at levels where local knowledge and talents can perform so much better. We must recognise and provide for the growing demands of individuals and community groups to be heard and to participate meaningfully in the democratic process. On local issues, this can best be done at a local level, through local government.

In 1975-76, only 29.1 per cent of Federal finance to local government was in the form of general purpose assistance—that is, in a form where local government could make up its own mind as to its own priority in spending and decide how that money should be spent. Local affairs were effectively coming more and more under central Canberra control. This year, by sharp contrast, 71.6 per cent of federal finance will be in a form in which local government can make its own decision on how it should be spent, and this is how it should be. Exactly the same trend was seen this year in federal finance to State Governments, where specific purpose grants are to become a far smaller percentage of total federal assistance

to the States, while general purpose funds will become increasingly more important. Local government is the best form of government to administer local affairs. The Opposition welcomes the federalism policy and this manifestation of it as being in the best interests of people throughout the community at the local level. I support the Bill.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I support the measure and would like to echo the Leader's comments on the federalism policy of the present Commonwealth Government. There is no doubt that the previous Government ignored the States and local government. I recall that, when Mr. Whitlam was Prime Minister—

Mr. Gunn: We all remember that.

Mr. RUSSACK: —he was attending a local government conference in Alice Springs, when he stated that he was the lucifer of centralism and had come to the centre of the Commonwealth. Here, the lucifer of centralism was to open a conference on how local government would be controlled from the centre in Canberra. Therefore, the policy of the previous Federal Government was definitely to by-pass the States and not even recognise the State Administration.

As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, regions were organised and it was openly stated by the past Prime Minister that the State boundaries were mere lines that should not be considered, that local government should be administered by regions, and that this was well under way. I recall vividly one night in this place when it was found that the Minister of Local Government in South Australia was ignorant of the fact that certain funding was made available to local government without the knowledge even of the Government of this State. The Minister admitted it; the record is in *Hansard*. This is the path which was being taken by the previous Federal Government in relation to local government. I have no doubt that, if this had been carried to its ultimate, if the policies of that Government had been taken to their conclusion, State Governments would have been dissolved and what we know today as local government would have been administrative areas administered from a central Government in Canberra.

In the Liberal Party's policy speech of 1975, it was stated that in government the Liberal Party would establish a States grants commission. That is what is happening in this Bill. Therefore, we support it and the establishment of such a commission, which will distribute to local government moneys that will enable it to be more autonomous, to handle the affairs of the local community, and to appropriate finance that is being channelled through what I would say are the correct channels from the Commonwealth Government through the State Government to local government, which is the government closest to the people. In local government, councillors will be able to determine how the money made available for councils' general accounts may best be spent. The Leader has mentioned that in 1974-75 an amount of \$56 400 000 was made available to local government from Federal funding and that \$79 900 000 was made available in 1975-76. We know that in the present financial year \$140 000 000 has been made available for local government throughout the Commonwealth, and that is an increase of more than 75 per cent.

I, too, should like to comment on the State Minister's attitude. Not only does he make statements that the Federal Government is not providing as much finance as the former Federal Government did: now he, by letter, places the blame on the present Federal Government

for the lack of funds. I go back to the point so ably outlined by the Leader, namely, that there has been an increase, not a decrease, in the amount of money available from the Federal Government. South Australian local government will benefit by \$11 900 000. Of that amount, 30 per cent will be in element A (so about \$3 600 000 will be available in that element), and this will be distributed on a per capita basis.

I understand that it was the responsibility of the State to decide whether there should be some weighting in the area of element A, but that it was decided that the money would be made available on a purely per capita basis. The other 70 per cent will be provided for element B on a needs basis, similar to the method adopted by the Commonwealth Government so far as the States and their needs are concerned. The amount available on a needs basis will therefore be about \$8 400 000.

About two or three months ago it was my privilege to travel, with other members on this side, to the northern area of the State, out of hundreds or out of district areas. I hope that people in those areas will be considered in regard to the per capita grants. I realise that, for the distribution of such money, a committee such as a progress committee or a similar body in the area must be responsible. The Bill defines a council as follows:

"Council" means a council as defined for the purposes of the Local Government Act, 1934-1976, and includes any person or body prescribed as a council for the purposes of this Act.

I hope that that definition will be of assistance to people in these communities, where a person, an organisation, a body, or a progress league might be appointed, and that consideration will be given to the funding of people in the communities in these areas.

This legislation is a step forward in the federalism policy where we have a Commonwealth Government, State Governments, and local government, and where, through this avenue, funds will be made available so that local government will have greater autonomy. I am sure that the personnel of the interim Grants Commission which is handling the funding this year are doing a commendable job, that the distribution of funds will be made in an equitable manner and that, when the Grants Commission is established, the continuation of the system will prove most beneficial to local government in South Australia.

Many times in this House I have paid a tribute (and I do so again on this occasion) to the amount of time provided on a voluntary basis by those who have undertaken the responsibilities of local government, whether as councillors or in other activities. These people do great work, saving the Government of the State and of the Commonwealth much expense. They make great contributions to the communities in which they live and work. I am sure that the procedure laid down in the Bill and the establishment of the Grants Commission in South Australia will be some form of satisfaction and some recognition of the work of these people, who almost demand, by their enthusiasm and sense of responsibility, consideration in handling money in a way that gives them autonomy. The Bill is a recognition of the ability of most people who have accepted voluntary responsibility in local government. I pay my respects to them and congratulate those involved in this work. I agree with the comments of the Leader, and I support the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I have great personal pleasure in supporting this measure. For many years I have advocated the principle of local government having access to its own funds, being funded from an outside

body, because of the increase in the duties and responsibilities of local government placed on it by this Parliament and by the natural upsurge of activities within the community in general. Having promoted this type of administration for many years, I am delighted to see that, under the Bill, it is being given concrete and legislative authority. The details have been spelt out by the two preceding speakers, but I shall raise one or two specific points which I hope the Minister will mention when he replies. I mention them merely to clarify the position, because I give my complete support to the measure.

True, an important aspect of this measure is that the commission which is about to be set up must report each year to Parliament. That is a necessary provision, and I assume, too, that it will be subject to report by the Auditor-General, although that is not specifically mentioned in the Bill. I believe it should be subject to his scrutiny. Categories A and B have been mentioned by honourable members. The 30 per cent and 70 per cent respectively were matters of conjecture and discussion among the various constituent councils in this State when the matter was first considered. Although there is a ratio of 30 per cent to 70 per cent, it was considered that a ratio of 40 per cent to 60 per cent might have been better. However, there is nothing to say that in future this ratio may not be changed as the commission in its wisdom thinks fit.

I should like to have one or two points clarified. Clause 5 provides that to the credit of the South Australian Grants Commission Account shall be paid in each financial year such moneys as are received or receivable from the Commonwealth Government for the purposes of the Act. Clause 6 provides that the Minister shall, as soon as practicable after the commencement of each financial year by notice in the *Gazette*, specify the total amount available from the account for the payment of all grants made pursuant to the Act. That clause then goes on to deal with per capita grants and the needs.

Under clause 6, the Minister is empowered and obliged to specify the total amount that is available from the account for the payment of all grants made pursuant to the Act. One sees in clause 5 that money coming from the Commonwealth Government must be paid *in toto* to the special Treasury trust account, which is fair enough. However, clause 6 refers to all grants that will be available. I wonder whether these figures will coincide, and I should like to receive an assurance from the Minister that they will. The Bill does not spell this out, but merely says that the Minister shall tell the commission what sums it will have to dispense in various ways. I should therefore like that point clarified. It is also a function of the commission to approve special grants, which is an important aspect.

Provision is also made in the Bill for the Chairman and Deputy Chairman and members of the commission to receive such fees and allowances as the Governor may from time to time determine. That is the normal provision that appears in this type of legislation setting up such a commission or committee. I should like the Minister to say whence these fees and allowances will come. Normally, in a Bill of this kind, there is some sort of reference to whether the fees shall come from general revenue or from a miscellaneous allocation, or whether they shall be met by the State. In the absence of such a specific clause, I ask the Minister regarding clause 12, which deals with remuneration, whether grants are to be made by the Commonwealth, with the net, not the gross, figure being made available for councils. In other words, are the fees

and running expenses of the commission to be deducted from Commonwealth grants? I hope that the costs of running the commission will come from the State's general revenue in the same way as happens with other committees and commissions operating under other legislation.

Clause 21 provides that the commission shall consider and report to the Minister on any matter relating to the financial aspects of councils which are referred to it by the Minister. Under the Local Government Act, the Minister has the power in certain circumstances to investigate the conduct or financial handling of matters by a council. I can call to mind certain instances in which misappropriation or misconduct has been involved. It could be an all-embracing clause whereby such matters could be referred to the Minister, or the commission could decide that the book-keeping methods or financial handling of the affairs of the council are not up to the standard required, and therefore may be reported by the commission under this clause. That is all I wanted cleared up now rather than in Committee. It gives me personal satisfaction that the Bill has been introduced.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): I am sorry that the Leader made the uncalled for remarks that he did make about the presence in this House of members when he has not been in here since he delivered his speech. I am sure the Leader has a good reason for being elsewhere. I am criticising him not for his absence but because he criticised other members for doing exactly what he is doing now. The Leader made great play of the fact that the Government did not take up his offers to sit for an additional period in the three-day session on June 8, 9 and 10 so that the Grants Commission legislation could have been introduced. I am sure that the Leader knows as well as I do that it was impossible to do that because, at that time, the ground rules for the Grants Commission were still subject to discussions by the Prime Minister and the Premier at the Premiers' Conference.

It was not until the Premiers' Conference on June 10 that the States were given their riding instructions (if I can use that term). Let us not have any of this nonsense that the State should have set up the Grants Commission during the June session: the Leader knew he was flying a kite, and he should desist from that sort of action. Likewise, he said (and I believe the member for Gouger repeated it) that the federalism policy of the present Federal Government was outlined by that Government when it was in Opposition in September, 1975.

Mr. Russack: I said that it was in our last policy speech.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I know, but I thought the honourable member also said that the federalism policy had been outlined when the present Government was in Opposition. The Leader certainly made that statement. I wish to heaven that, if the Leader knows so much about the present Government's federalism policy, he would pass on that knowledge to the officers and Ministers of the Federal Parliament. Officers in this and in other States are meeting constantly to ascertain what is that policy. Another meeting of a group of officers will be held in Melbourne to discuss and pursue the federalism policy to try to ascertain what it means.

The Leader referred to the Local Government Ministers' Conference and to the fact that Senator Carrick (who is the Minister assisting the Prime Minister) was present and that he explained the federalism policy to those Ministers. Senator Carrick did not explain that policy. What he said in Melbourne (and it can be read verbatim) was as follows:

We are still working on documents on our federalism policy, and as soon as possible we will tell the States what it is all about.

So, there is a good deal of hypocrisy in so much of this. The question of the amount of finance deserves a brief comment, simply because the Leader raised it. He accused me of misleading the public at Murray Bridge. What I said there was exactly the same as what I have said at every other local government function I have attended since the announcement about the \$140 000 000 was made. I have never said that there has not been an increase in the direct assistance by way of grants to local government. How could anyone do anything but acknowledge with a great deal of gratitude that the \$80 000 000 was increased to 140 000 000? But by the Federal Treasurer's own document, to which the Leader referred, on page 123, table 99, it is clear that the financial assistance (I do not care what tag people put on it: money is money, whatever the tag) is down from \$274 000 000 last financial year to \$195 000 000 this financial year. There is a 29 per cent drop in the funds that local government will get.

Dr. Tonkin: I thought you'd say that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am quoting Phillip Lynch's figures.

Dr. Tonkin: That is why I quoted them in my speech the other way round.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased that the Leader has come back. If he can convince local government that it is better off with a 29 per cent reduction, he is a better man than I am, Gunga Din. Local government is not accepting the philosophy that the Leader and the Federal Treasurer are expounding, that local government is getting a 75 per cent increase. Local government is acknowledging the fact of life—that there is a 29 per cent reduction in this current year in funds provided.

Dr. Tonkin: How much are they getting?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is no point in going on with an argument with the Leader. He knows he is wrong, but he does not have the courage to admit it. He is simply following the course he adopted a few months ago—Fraser is right, without question. I turn now to a matter raised by the member for Gouger, who said he hoped we would be able to provide out of this allocation funds for areas—

Dr. Tonkin: I'd have thought you'd be pleased to see the Bill go through, rather than carry on like this.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sorry that the Leader is not interested in hearing information that his own members asked me to provide. The member for Torrens and the member for Gouger sought information, and if the Leader had been here he would have known this. Regarding areas outside local government areas, the Prime Minister, in the transcript of the Premiers' Conference, made plain that the funds being provided were being provided for local government and that they could not under any conditions be made available for use in areas where local government did not operate. We are stepping up the activity we have been engaged in over a number of years for the purpose of trying to get local government established as quickly as we can because, under that ruling from the Prime Minister, South Australia is losing \$200 000 this financial year. I do not think that is funny.

The member for Torrens raised two matters. First, he raised the question of what appears to be a clash in the meaning of clauses 5 and 6, but there is no clash. Clause 5 is a straight-out simple statement that there must be a declaration of the total funds received. Clause 6 is simply an acknowledgment that the two may not necessarily

precisely coincide, because we will not try to divide the \$25 surplus among the 104 local governing bodies at 53c each. There may always be some small sum there. Secondly, no provision is made for fees to be paid from the fund. Obviously, they will be set by the Government and paid from general revenue.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister explain the definition of "council"? Does it give authority to a person on behalf of a council or body to receive funds?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): We may be able to establish a commission similar to the Whyalla City Commission and the Garden Suburb Commission, rather than local government in its wider sense.

Mr. RUSSACK: Is this a projected move to consider those that lie outside of districts and hundreds now?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Conditions of membership of the commission."

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

Clause 10, page 4, after line 3—Insert—

(6) The office of a member of the commission shall become vacant if—

(a) he dies;

(b) his term of office expires;

(c) he resigns by written notice addressed to the Minister;

or

(d) he is removed from office by the Governor pursuant to subsection (4) of this section.

This was an oversight in the drafting.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 11 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—"Functions of commission."

Mr. COUMBE: As I understand it, this clause is dealing with special grants. Am I correct in assuming that all councils, if they so apply, will receive, first of all, a basic grant on a per capita basis?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: If they apply.

Mr. COUMBE: In the normal course of events, all councils will receive a grant, and those councils that prove their case under the special provisions will get a special grant. The Minister knows that some councils in the past working under the amended Commonwealth Grants Commission, when it was amended to cover councils, did not receive any grants. Two of those councils happen to be in my district, and they have complained about it. I take it that now all councils will get a certain basic grant and, according to needs and the case made out, they will get a sum of money over and above that; am I correct in that assumption?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think that is a reasonable assumption. I do not think we can go so far as to guarantee that every council will participate in the 70 per cent grant but, because it is a weighted one or determined on needs (I hope I am not pre-empting the commission on this), I should be surprised if every council did not get a grant.

Clauses 17 to 19 passed.

Clause 20—"Information to be supplied to commission."

Mr. RUSSACK: Does this clause apply to councils requiring special grants? The other per capita grants will be automatic?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clause 21—"Financial report."

Mr. COURCEL: If a council is misappropriating funds, can it be reported in the same way as under the Local Government Act, or is the provision simply so that differences between council and council in their accounting methods can be narrowed by a recommendation of the commission?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Local Government Office is the principal area around the commission and it is responsible for seeing that the financial affairs (and, in fact, the whole workings) of councils are properly conducted. I imagine this clause is simply an overriding provision if the commission sees things that perhaps have not been brought to the notice of the Local Government Office; it would have power to act.

Clause passed.

Clauses 22 and 23 passed.

Title.

Mr. VENNING: I ask the Minister whether the Bill is uniform legislation for the whole of Australia, in regard to the various States setting up—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member can ask only whether this is the proper title of the Bill.

Mr. VENNING: Is this the proper title? Is it a Bill simply to establish a Grants Commission in South Australia? Has the commission been set up for South Australia through the Commonwealth Government? Just what is the position regarding this Bill?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Every State is required to set up a Grants Commission and our Bill would not be dissimilar from others, but it would have the flavour that South Australia needs.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) moved: That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I rise to grieve on a matter which is important to the effective operation of the Parliamentary system and which should cause some concern to the Australian Labor Party, that is, that Ministers are making announcements in matters on which Opposition members have sought information by question or by letter, and the member who has done the groundwork is ignored by the Ministers, who are, by making public statements through news releases and by other methods, giving information that should have been passed on, at least at the same time if not before, to the member who had done the groundwork.

I refer particularly in the first instance to the South-East, to Mount Gambier, where the Government is putting in much effort. We know that that is because there was a big swing to the Liberal Party in that area at the most recent election, and the Labor Party would like to win it back. If that is done by fair means that stay within the bounds that in the past have been considered to be ethical, there is little harm. I believe that even the Premier and the Deputy Premier would be embarrassed, if they really thought about the situation, by some of the things that have happened. In the South-East, approval was announced for additional help for the radiographer at the Mount Gambier Hospital after questions in the House and correspondence had been directed

to the Minister concerned. The public announcement was made in the South-East, and, although the local member was not informed, members of the local news media were. The appointment of a resident magistrate at Mount Gambier was the subject of questions in the House and correspondence. No information was passed to the local member, who was by-passed and ignored. We all know that, under normal ethics, Ministers in the past have sent a letter to the member concerned so that it would arrive at about the same time as the news release hit the street. I believe it should go further: the member (whether Liberal, Labor, Liberal Movement, or Country Party) should be informed of the decision at the same time as the information is released to the news media. That could be done with modern methods of communication.

In relation to the Modulock factory, the Minister made an announcement in Adelaide and did not even notify either the South-East press or the member. Information about the unemployment relief grants made to the Mount Gambier City Council and the Mount Gambier District Council, amounting to \$500 000, was not passed to the local member. He was ignored. The same situation has applied in other instances where the member was ignored, and of course he was ignored for political reasons. However, that is insignificant in comparison with what is taking place with one Minister, especially, to my knowledge. If others are involved, they should be ashamed. I am sure the Premier and the Deputy Premier could not be proud of the Minister of Transport, who is also Minister of Local Government, and the way in which he is using his office and his departmental officers for political purposes. On August 25 a news release was distributed from the Minister's office, as follows:

Traffic signals are to be installed at two more locations in Whyalla, the Parliamentary representative for the area, Mr. Max Brown, announced today. Mr. Brown said Transport Minister Geoff Virgo had advised him that tenders had been called for the installation of signals at the intersections of Norrie Avenue with Nicholson Avenue, and Norrie Avenue with McBryde Terrace.

That release was produced in the office of the Minister of Transport. Another news release relates to the District of Tea Tree Gully. It was typed in the Minister's office, and states:

The South Australian Government is to hand over almost \$8 000 to the Tea Tree Gully council for a reserve in the Fairview Park area, the Parliamentary representative for the area, Mrs. Molly Byrne, said today. Mrs. Byrne said that Local Government Minister Geoff Virgo had advised her that the money was for 0.136 hectares of land situated at Hartog Street, Fairview Park.

That was released on September 3. A similar situation applies to the Minister of Mines and Energy, who is the House of Assembly member for Brighton. In relation to matters in his district, a news release on September 3 from the office of the Minister of Transport states:

The South Australian Government has given a \$10 000 grant to the Brighton City Council for the purchase of land to extend Brighton Oval, Mines and Energy Minister and Parliamentary representative for the area, Mr. Hugh Hudson, said today.

The same situation applied in Henley Beach. A news release, also dated September 3, states:

The South Australian Government is to hand over \$11 000 to the Henley and Grange City Council for a reserve in the Grange area, Parliamentary representative for the area, Mr. Glen Broomhill, said today.

That was produced in the office of the Minister of Transport. Also, on August 25, the following release was made:

The news came from the Parliamentary representative for the area, Mr. Terry McRae, who said Transport Minister Geoff Virgo had given the go-ahead on work to co-ordinate traffic lights at three intersections. They are Main North

Road/Kings Road/McIntyre Road; Main North Road/Frost Road/Clayton Road; and Main North Road/Park Terrace/Smith Street. A new set of lights, to be erected at the Main North Road/Golden Grove Road/Saints Road intersection, will also be linked to the co-ordinating unit.

That, too, was produced in the Minister's office. At the same time, a news release emanating from the Minister's office on September 3 stated:

The South Australian Government has given financial assistance to the District Council of Angaston for the upgrading of land in the centre of Angaston.

However, when it involves the district of a Liberal Party member, in whose name is the announcement made? The press release continued:

The news came from Local Government Minister Geoff Virgo today, after he had approved a \$3 000 grant as the Government's half share in the cost of purchasing 488 hectares of land situated at Dean Street, Angaston.

Mr. Langley: What happened when you were in Government?

Mr. EVANS: That never occurred. The Minister of Transport has used a Government department and all its facilities to promote a political Party, and he is the only Minister, to my knowledge, who is doing this. Members know that this has been happening for a long time. When an announcement involves the district of a Liberal Party member, the Minister of Transport makes the announcement in his name. However, when it involves the district of a Labor Party member, the Minister produces, for political purposes, the news release with the assistance of public servants, typistes and press secretaries, employed by a Government department. This is one of the most rotten tricks that can be played in the political game, which I do not think the Premier or the Deputy Premier would accept. The Minister of Transport owes an apology to the Parliamentary system, and should cease this practice. His colleagues should point out to him that there should be some ethics in the Parliamentary scene, and that it is up to him to uphold some of those ethics.

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): I do not wish to grieve or to knock as the member who has just resumed his seat did. He said when he first got up to speak that he wished to grieve, but he then started to knock. I suggest that he got his material out of the garbage tin. If he wants to get down in the gutter, someone else may be willing to accompany him, but I do not want to do that sort of thing. Rather, I want to talk about my district of Port Adelaide and, particularly, its redevelopment.

Mr. Becker: How will you go in the grand final?

Mr. WHITTEN: Port Adelaide will win another final, without doubt. I pay a tribute to the Monarto commission and the assistance it has given the State Planning Authority and the Port Adelaide Joint Centre Committee.

Mr. Mathwin: Tell us about Queenstown.

Mr. WHITTEN: I could do that, and it would not do the honourable member much good if it came out in this place. I should like to trace some of the history of the redevelopment of Port Adelaide. What happened when a survey was last taken in 1962, in the Playford era, is not to the credit of members opposite. The results of that survey were shovelled under the carpet by the then Liberal Government, just as it shovelled everything else under the carpet. However, in December, 1975, the State Planning Authority, in conjunction with the Port Adelaide City Council, set up a joint committee to inquire into the redevelopment of Port Adelaide. In January, 1976, the Monarto Development Commission was engaged to assist in planning. The terms of reference were to investigate and prepare schemes for redevelopment as an

on-going urban management. Since that time the commission has done a remarkably good job. I pay a tribute to Allan Hutchens from the commission, because he has been the guiding light behind the survey.

In March, 1976, it was made clear at a public meeting that the people of Port Adelaide wished Port Adelaide to be redeveloped and brought back up to what it was 30 years ago—a thriving centre in the community. In April this year a display van was provided by the community council. It visited schools and shopping centres to obtain submissions from people. I am pleased that the commission has seen fit to involve people in the scheme, because, unfortunately, over the years when surveys have been conducted ordinary people have not been approached. That is not the case at Port Adelaide. Arising out of the display many written submissions were received. Last month the stage 1 report was presented.

That report was on view for a fortnight in a large marquee outside the council chambers. Only yesterday I asked the Minister about the results of that survey as far as the department was concerned. About 350 to 400 people visited the marquee and viewed the draft report that was on display. Large sheets of paper were provided at the display on which people could make comments. Some of those comments were interesting.

Mr. Rodda: "Port for premiers"?

Mr. WHITTEN: "Port for premiers, 1976," was a comment. A problem faced at Port Adelaide is that up to 600 tankers use St. Vincent Street each day, and when they turn around Black Diamond corner I fear that there will be an accident and that many people will be hurt. It was suggested in a submission made at the marquee display that the problem could be solved by erecting a new bridge in Port Adelaide to connect with Commercial Road or for traffic to go towards Wingfield to connect up with Grand Junction Road so that these tankers and semi-trailers could be diverted in a northerly direction. I am sure people from the farming community would support that suggestion, because they bring sheep from the country to Outer Harbor to be taken overseas on the *Ocean Atlas*. I am concerned about the high traffic noise level in St. Vincent Street. It was noticeable when the display to which I have referred was opened by the Mayor of Port Adelaide that he had to stop several times during the course of his speech because of traffic noise in the area. One submission was that St. Vincent Street should be turned into a mall.

Mr. Mathwin: It's mall like pal, not mall like ball. Maul is what you do with your hands.

Mr. WHITTEN: The only Mal I know is a bloke for whom I have no time—he is in Canberra. Retail trade in Port Adelaide has dropped off dramatically. An objection brought forward in the survey related to the lack of library facilities at Port Adelaide and in the western region of the metropolitan area.

Mr. Becker: We have a good library.

Mr. WHITTEN: I am sure the honourable member will support me, because he can see the benefit of the West Torrens library, and I compliment the West Torrens council on it. Why can we not have libraries in other parts of the western region? One of the most consistent and readily demonstrated needs is the need for a library and information centre at Port Adelaide. I compliment the Port Adelaide community council on its efforts to set up an information centre, which we hope will be in St. Vincent Street (later to be St. Vincent Mall, perhaps). Such a centre would allow the many tourists who visit Port Adelaide to know what is in the district.

The Public Works Committee and the Marine and Harbors Department have been considering proposals for a seven-storey office block, which will greatly benefit Port Adelaide. The police at Port Adelaide have been operating in archaic premises which were built over 100 years ago. Today, when the tide rises, water seeps into some cells. The office space provided for the police at Port Adelaide is intolerable, and it is no wonder they have some complaints. When their new building is erected (it should be started soon) it will greatly help the police and the people at Port Adelaide. A branch of the Motor Registration Division of the Transport Department and a branch of the State Government Insurance Commission should go hand in hand at Port Adelaide. When accommodation is provided in Dale Street, the people of Port Adelaide will greatly appreciate it. The Public Buildings Department has plans for a building that will house some of these departments. It will greatly assist the Community Welfare Department.

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

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I take this opportunity to congratulate a young journalist from the *Advertiser*, Miss Heather Olsson, who recently won a journalism award. It was surprising (she is an able reporter) because, if the award was for reporting the goings-on in this place, she ought to have won a medal. It would be very difficult for any reporter to report successfully the funny things that go on here. I draw attention to an advertisement in the *Advertiser* headed "Now, bus travel is even easier". The advertisement says:

Because the bus and the tram people have recently inherited many more bus routes, the "Route number only" system is to be used.

When I read the headline, I wondered whether one could be forgiven for thinking that we would have an easier ride or that the bus steps would be made a little lower to assist aged people who find it virtually impossible to mount the high steps of buses, resulting in their being unable to use this form of transport. What will the situation be? If the buses show numbers only, not the destination, it will be very confusing. It was stated in the advertisement that using the destination signs is most confusing, because many of the areas now are not known. How could it be confusing if buses simply showed the terminus name? In most cases this would be a better indication of where the bus was going than a number would be. I cannot see how people could be expected to remember the numbers, because there could be between 40 and 50 of them.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Don't they use numbers in England?

Mr. MATHWIN: I am pleased that the honourable member said that. It is obvious that the ex-Minister did not read the advertisement inserted by his colleague's department. The advertisement states:

Numbers only on the buses seems to work well in Paris. Anyone who knows Paris would know that many things go by a flick of the eye, a mere glance or a cold stare. Paris is different from Australia. The advertisement also states:

But in London the names as well as the numbers are used. The London buses indicate their destinations. I cannot see how it will be easier for people to try to remember the numbers that indicate the destination of buses. The advertisement states that each bus stop will have a little signboard showing the numbers of the buses and their destinations. That will be a marvellous Eldorado for the

vandals on which to write their names and whatever else they write. I do not read them. It will also be handy for people wishing to post their bills and election campaign posters. The Government Party has used them for this purpose in the past, thus causing an environmental problem and an offence to the eye in many cases. I am talking mainly about the aged, because they are the ones with whom I am concerned. First, they will have to put on their glasses. Imagine what it might be like on a hot or cold or windy day. They will have to sort out the number of the bus they want to catch and where it starts and finishes. That is a marvellous suggestion from the Minister, who is absent from the Chamber! No doubt it is his brainchild, and we all recall his brainchild of not long ago: the dial-a-bus, and its fate.

Mr. Max Brown: What about the bee-line bus?

Mr. MATHWIN: That costs a considerable sum to operate. If we are going to call the Minister "Mr. bee-line Minister", I suppose he will accept the knighthood he expects to receive after performing in the mall last week. Numbers on the buses will be a complete failure, especially to visitors to Adelaide and to country people who come down once or twice a year. What about the influx of tourists we will get as a result of the Premier's record being plastered over the Tourist Bureau in Sydney? How will they get on? They will be waiting for a bus and expecting to see the Premier's picture all over the place. I was unfortunate enough to go to the opera a couple of weeks ago and to spend 80c on a programme there. I opened the programme out and saw on the first page a picture not of the leading soprano, not of the leading tenor, not of the producer or of the conductor, but of the Premier leering up at me. It ruined my night. It is a wonder the artists performed so well. It was obvious to me they had not even seen the programme; if they had, the performance would not have been half as good as it was. It was a very good performance.

I bring again to the attention of the Government the way in which it treats some of the smaller schools in my area. The Government is not doing the right thing by the Catholic primary schools. I draw the attention of Parliament to a recent newspaper article as follows:

The football squad will train at Railways Oval at 4 p.m. each Monday beginning on June 7, and the netball squad at 9.30 a.m. each Sunday starting on June 6. To be eligible, boys and girls must attend a State-controlled primary school affiliated with the South Australian Primary Schools Amateur Sports Association, and be under 13.

If children are attending a Catholic school, they are ineligible to be chosen and to be given an opportunity in this State squad. It is a shocking situation that this Government condones the fact that, if children attend a Catholic school, they cannot play and train for a State team in football or netball. That is discrimination by the Government; it is a disgusting state of affairs. I think the Government should alter this at the earliest opportunity, because these children, no matter how good at sports they are, are refused selection for State teams just because they attend Catholic schools. That is wrong, particularly in the present situation where the staff and principals of both State and Catholic schools are working well together for the benefit of the children in their schools in general and of the State in particular.

Motion carried.

At 5.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 14, at 2 p.m.