

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 15, 1976

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

PETITIONS: SEXUAL OFFENCES

Mr. GUNN presented a petition signed by 28 electors of South Australia, praying that the House would reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest or to lower the age of consent in respect of sexual offences.

Mr. LANGLEY presented a similar petition signed by seven electors.

Petitions received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. LANGLEY presented a petition signed by 109 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.

**MORPHETT VALE AREA WATER SUPPLY
EXTENSION**

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Morphet Vale Area Water Supply Extension.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTIONS**DRUGS**

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General say what legislative action the Government intends to take to counter the recently reported escalation of heroin use in South Australia? At the time legislation on this subject was introduced in the House in 1970, I said that the incidence of drug dependence in Adelaide was relatively low, but that it was likely to increase with time if we followed the trends of drug dependence in other countries. The situation as reported shows that heroin use has escalated now to an alarming degree and that oversea patterns are being repeated in Adelaide. The present legislation provides maximum penalties for drug pushers which are substantial in terms of imprisonment, but meaningless in monetary terms when it is considered that heroin pushers in Adelaide are said to be making more than \$5 000 a week from selling drugs. As well as increasing the maximum penalties, it has been suggested that minimum penalties should be written into that part of the legislation dealing with drug peddlers who are not themselves dependants. This is an unusual and a drastic move to make, and it should be made only in the most drastic circumstances but, bearing in mind that a person who becomes dependent on heroin may well have a life expectancy of less than a year, drastic

measures must be taken to curb the activities of drug peddlers. In my view, they are guilty of potential murder.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Government has the matter of penalties for drug peddling under review. The Leader no doubt saw the recent article in the *Australian* in which the Minister of Health indicated that we, as one of the State Governments, were in contact with other State Governments and the Federal Government, and that the Ministers of Health throughout Australia had a committee examining this problem. I understand that the committee's report is well in hand and will be presented at the next Health Ministers' conference to be held soon. Until this attempt at a uniform approach to this problem has been further investigated, the Government does not intend to take any immediate action, but I can assure the Leader that the Government is concerned about this matter. He may well have noted from various press reports that the South Australian Police Force is concerned, too, and has been pursuing drug pushers to the utmost. In defence and support of the police, I point out that the force has been most successful in South Australia in curbing the dramatic increase in the use of hard drugs.

DANGEROUS WEAPON

Mr. WELLS: Will the Attorney-General ban the sale and manufacture of a weapon known as a nunchaku? Recent publicity in a newspaper and last evening on a television segment indicates that this weapon, which is deadly when used in martial art, is being sold in Adelaide, and will be sold in other parts of the State. It would be an atrocious weapon to fall into the hands of our citizens, because it is purely and simply a weapon of assault, and not defence. A report states:

A weapon banned in some American States, because it caused a spate of deaths, is on sale in Adelaide. The weapon is apparently two pieces of wood joined at the centre by a length of chain, and the report states that a person may quickly be trained to kill with it. The report continues:

Several attacks have taken place in the Eastern States, the most recent in Melbourne, where five teenagers used them to assault a railway attendant.

A weapon of this nature should not be permitted in South Australia. It should not be permitted to be on sale in any shop, nor should manufacture of the weapon be permitted, because it would lead to tragedy if teenagers gained possession of and eventually used it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that he is now debating the issue.

Mr. WELLS: I apologise, Sir; it is perhaps because of my feelings in the matter. I reiterate the danger of the sale of this weapon and ask that the Attorney-General ban its sale or manufacture in South Australia.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Although I will certainly have this matter examined, I do not know whether it would be in the province of my Ministerial responsibilities to arrange for the banning of this item; I think that that is more likely to be within the ambit of the Chief Secretary's activities. However, I will certainly look at the matter and refer it to him. The possession of such a weapon in South Australia, if the weapon is as described by the honourable member (and I have no reason to believe that his description is wrong in any way), could constitute an offence, so people should be wary about purchasing such an item, because, if found carrying this weapon, they could find themselves in serious trouble and being brought before a court for carrying an offensive weapon. I do not know whether these weapons are being

manufactured in South Australia: I doubt that that is the case. If they are being manufactured here, we will certainly look closely at the matter. I will refer the matter to the Chief Secretary and ask him to obtain a report for the honourable member.

MINES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy consider taking action to see that disused mine shafts are covered in the interest of safety? The recent report of a schoolboy falling inadvertently into an old mine while on a school expedition highlights the very real danger to the public of these uncovered mines. A young lady on the staff of Government House was also seriously injured when she stepped back into an open mine some months ago. I realise that this was in an active mining area and indicates that this type of accident can also occur there. Will the Government therefore take action to see what can be done to protect the public from this danger?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The matter raised by the honourable member was being investigated before the accident referred to occurred. Amendments will be introduced to the Mines and Works Inspection Act in order to ensure that, when a situation arises like the one described by the honourable member, and where we are aware of it, we will have additional powers over and above those that now exist. Under the provisions of the Mining Act, we are now virtually in the situation where, unless we can get a court order requiring a person to do certain work, (even then, we have no assurance that that work will be carried out), we must take action to remove the lease from the mine operator. That sort of action is being considered in this case. Powers are needed to enable the department to arrange for work to be carried out and for the work to be charged against the mine operator where it has not been possible to get the work carried out in other ways. Concerning the circumstances surrounding the accident that occurred yesterday, I have received only a partial report at this stage. A Mines Department inspector is visiting the site today, and I hope I will receive a detailed report tomorrow.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The amendments will cater for old mines?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The amendments are designed to give the department authority to carry out work. Where a mine operator has refused to carry out that work and where the Government arranges for the work to be carried out, we can try to recover the cost involved.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Some of these have been closed for years.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Quite. However, this mine has not been closed for years, and it is in a tourist area. We believe that it should be closed and that it should be reserved from the provisions of the Mining Act. If that takes place, it is likely that money will have to be spent to ensure effective safety of the mine. I agree completely that a mine in this situation is dangerous, especially as it is likely to be visited by many people, thereby increasing immeasurably the chances of an accident occurring. I will try to provide the honourable member with additional information as soon as it is available. In the meantime, I can assure the honourable member that the department and I, as Minister, take a very serious view of the matter and will endeavour to take appropriate remedial measures both administratively and by legislation to cover the situation in the future.

JUVENILE OFFENDERS

Mr. OLSEN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether he has received any recent figures on the number of juvenile offences committed in South Australia? I understand that some figures are now available for 1975-76. Are any trends visible in relation to particular offences?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I do have some advanced figures for the past financial year. These figures will, of course, appear in more detail, with other statistics, in the Juvenile Court annual report, which is normally tabled in this House. The figures are interesting; I do not wish to add to the list of famous last words, but I believe there is reason for cautious optimism. There has been a small increase in the total number of offenders, but a substantial fall in the rate of increase. I am sure this information will be welcomed by all members.

The total number of juveniles who appeared before the Juvenile Court or a Juvenile Aid Panel was 6 962, an increase of 3.2 per cent. However, the 1974-75 figures, by comparison, showed an increase of 28.8 per cent on figures for the previous 12 months. The number of neglected children placed for the first time under the care and control of the Minister of Community Welfare was 24 compared with 57 in the previous year, a drop of 58 per cent. I am sure that reduction is welcomed by all members. The number of children appearing before the Juvenile Court in 1975-76 who had previously appeared before a Juvenile Aid Panel (and I am sure the Leader would be interested in these figures) in the four years since July 1, 1972, was 1 002, or about 9 per cent—slightly fewer than in 1974-75. The figures appear to indicate that the Juvenile Aid Panel system is working because, of all the children appearing before a panel, fewer than 9 per cent subsequently appeared before a court.

MARREE

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Premier read a report which appeared on page 3 of yesterday's *Advertiser* and which was headed "Marree—Forgotten town of the north"? If he has read it, can he say whether the Government intends to take any action to solve the problem? The report highlights a situation that I have been expounding in this House for more than six years. It could be argued that the population of this town will fall when the narrow gauge line is closed. The general opinion is that the population will not fall because other people are prepared to move in to replace the workers in the town. There is no sealed street in this town, as the report pointed out. The Minister of Transport promised about three years ago that a grant would be put aside for the sealing of this street, but this has never eventuated. The Minister has photographs taken by me showing the condition of the street during a rainstorm. Only three towns in South Australia do not have a sealed street running through them. Although the airstrip was mentioned in the report, I realise that this is a Commonwealth matter. However, I believe the State Government should assist in this case because the airstrip runs diagonally to the main road and aircraft taking off sometimes clear the main road by only five or six feet; this makes the airstrip dangerous. The report also states:

On a recent trip to the North of the State, the Premier visited practically every town, but he bypassed Marree.

Had the Premier shown me the courtesy of telling me that he was visiting the area, perhaps I could have persuaded him to visit Marree to allow him to see for himself the

difficulties associated with this town. The Marree community has an application before the Premier for a grant towards a community hall. Recently, when the Premier visited Coober Pedy he promised \$10 000 as a grant towards the community hall in that town and a \$1 for \$1 subsidy for the completion of the hall. The Marree folk consider that they are in much the same position as that which applies to Coober Pedy and, as I have said, have applied to the Premier for a grant. Will the Premier consider the situation as it affects Marree?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certainly, I will consider the situation as it affects Marree. The problem concerning the sealing of roads in towns that are out of local government areas in the State is a continuing one for us. Unfortunately, the attitude of the Federal Government towards local government assistance grants is that those areas in South Australia outside local government will get no consideration. Consequently, we have been studying means of providing local government areas so that they may claim for their share of income tax not only on a per capita basis but also on a needs basis towards the needs of the towns. The honourable member has said that I did not visit Marree on my last trip to the North of the State. There were other towns in the North that I did not visit.

Mr. Venning: You didn't go to Farina.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not only did I not go to Farina: I did not go to the towns along the north-eastern line.

Mr. Allen: You went to Beltana, though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, because it was close to Leigh Creek.

Mr. Mathwin: Did you sell any records while you were up there!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I made a few, but I did not sell any. I went to the towns to which I had been specifically invited by local organisations, and I had not received an invitation from Marree. I have visited Marree previously, and I hope that I may visit there before very long.

Mr. Mathwin: And you hope the aircraft doesn't get a flat tyre.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sure that I will be able to settle down in Marree perfectly adequately, as I have been able to do when I have been there.

Mr. Allen: Will you let me know when you are going?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite seem to be terribly interested in my whereabouts outside South Australia. I am the Premier of this State, and it is natural that I should visit areas throughout the whole of the State, and I shall do that from time to time.

Mr. Mathwin: You never told me—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not been told by Opposition members when they have made incursions into my district from time to time, and I would not expect to know from them, either.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They don't do any good, anyhow.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They do not do too well.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They even drive through your district without permission!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is right. I will examine the honourable member's questions. I appreciate the problems of Marree in relation to the airstrip, but that is a different problem from that concerned with the sealing of roads in an area out of local government. In those areas, the problems of the Highways Department's priority lists have to be accorded due regard. The question

of sealing roads normally revolves around the question of user, and those roads get highest priority in relation to sealing that can show the greatest demand.

Mr. Allen: It's the main street of this town.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that. Of course, if Marree were to petition for local government and be in a position to make its own contribution from its citizens on a local government basis, it would be a totally different scene, and the honourable member must appreciate that. Simply to take money from the rest of the taxpayers in the State to treat Marree differently from those areas that are under local government is a difficulty, when the roads must compete for general Highways Department money as against greater requirements for usage. That is the situation with which we are faced. I have discussed the situation in Coober Pedy and Andamooka, and I shall be happy to discuss it with the honourable member's constituents in Marree.

Mr. Gunn: It's been promised since you went to Andamooka years ago.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has had many things done in Andamooka. The facilities that the Government has put there are considerable; in many cases they are better than those existing in towns of larger population elsewhere in the State.

Mr. Gunn: There's a very good member.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think the honourable member got the school put there, and he certainly did not get the subsidy that I promised for the local hall.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This series of interjections that turn out to be questions must cease.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I try to accommodate honourable members but I appreciate your ruling. Regarding the airstrip, as the honourable member has said, it is a problem where the Federal Government has responsibility. We have tried to assist the provision of air services in the Northern area of the State, as the honourable member knows. Special assistance has been given by the State to air services to the North, as a result of representations made to the Government by Mr. Whyte, M.L.C. We will have a look at the situation concerning the Marree strip. I have made representations on behalf of other districts to the Federal Government in relation to assistance from that Government for the development of needed strips, and I will certainly take up this matter for the honourable member.

KLEMZIG BUS SERVICE

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Transport say whether his department will consider upgrading the bus service from the city to Klemzig and Windsor Gardens? Before the Bus and Tram Division of the State Transport Authority took over this service, it was operated for some years by a private bus operator. The service now (as it operated previously) is only from Monday to Friday during the day and on Saturday mornings. Many requests have been made to me from people living in the area for the upgrading of the service to cater for passengers during the evenings and at weekends. Can the matter be considered by the Minister and the State Transport Authority?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to have the question examined, and I will bring down the information the honourable member seeks.

ECLIPSE

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health whether the Government, through the Public Health Department, is taking action to warn people of permanent eye damage that will occur if the sun is looked at during the total eclipse that will take place on October 23? As October 23 will be a Saturday, many thousands of people will be outdoors and exposed to great hazards. A segment shown on the current affairs programme *This Day Tonight* one night last week showed a device that was being promoted in this State for viewing the eclipse. The segment pointed out the dangers of using such equipment, which, I understand, has been banned from sale in Victoria. Various ways of viewing the eclipse are available, but much ignorance seems to be evident amongst people who want to watch this strange phenomenon. A total eclipse will occur at Mount Gambier and in the south-eastern part of the State, while the eclipse will be only partial in the rest of the country. It is necessary for the public to be warned. I understand optometrists and eye specialists are particularly concerned about the matter, and past experience has shown that permanent damage can be caused to the eyes by such an eclipse. Will the Minister undertake a thorough programme of publicity outlining the dangers to which the public will be exposed, and will he investigate the device which is being advertised and which was brought to the notice of the public on the television programme I have mentioned?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Although the honourable member has directed his questions to my colleague, in general he asked whether the Government was doing anything about this matter. I think I can recall at least one reference to this matter in the press from the Minister of Health, so something has been attempted, at least. I did not see the television programme to which the honourable member referred, but it has been mentioned to me. I appreciate his concern about the possible danger to eyesight, especially that of young people and children who might not understand what is involved. I agree that the matter is important, and I shall bring it to the attention of my colleague. I am sure he will fully consider the suggestions put forward.

MEDIBANK

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare take up with the Minister of Health the matter of requesting that State offices of Medibank should remain open until at least 5 p.m.? I refer particularly to the office in Whyalla, as well as offices in other industrial areas of South Australia. I have taken up this matter previously on behalf of my own district, but my request has been refused. I understand one of the reasons for the refusal related to the provisions of the award covering the public servants working in Medibank offices. Although the Medibank administration has not agreed to my request, I believe the circumstances have changed since I first raised the matter because of the possibility of private insurance companies becoming more involved in medical and hospital cover. Could the Medibank offices be adversely affected, because most employees work until 4 p.m. or 4.30 p.m., by which time the Medibank offices would be closed? Will the Minister see whether the matter can be further investigated?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I appreciate the honourable member's concern. It would be most unfair if, in this way, private insurance funds were able to gain an advantage.

Since the workers would benefit most from being in Medibank, it is important that they should have access, at least on an equal basis, to Medibank offices. I should have thought that flexi-time, as worked in Commonwealth departments, might well be the best way to solve this problem. I am not sure when the first approach was made by the honourable member, but I know that some Commonwealth departments now work full flexi-time, allowing for the most flexible arrangements in the hours worked over a given period. I thank the honourable member for raising the matter, and I shall refer it to my colleague for his attention.

MAIN ROAD No. 237

Mr. WOTTON: Will the Minister of Transport look into a request made on February 12 of this year, and again on July 29, by the Strathalbyn District Council to the Highways Department, concerning financial assistance for the reconstruction of the access road between the Monarto quarry and the Woodchester to Callington Main Road No. 237? On neither occasion has the council received from the Highways Department a reply to its letters. Cartage of quarry products from the Monarto quarries at Hartley to the South-Eastern Freeway route along this road (which is paved only for light traffic and certainly not as a haul road used continuously by quarry trucks) has resulted in several problems which have been brought to my notice recently, including the matter of the ford over the Bremer River on that road and the dust nuisance, which is causing much concern. Unless this road is sealed, it will deteriorate rapidly and require grading perhaps as frequently as once a week. It is estimated that the cost of this work would be about \$4 000 a year, indicating that sealing would be the most economic long-term solution. Failure to seal the road would be unfair to ratepayers who live near it, and who are at present suffering the attendant problems.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to look at the details and to see whether any further information is available, but I should have thought that the information the honourable member gave in his explanation probably provided the answer. I have already informed the House that, this year, we are suffering a reduction in the real amount of money made available to South Australia by the Federal Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Members opposite do not want to accept that we are getting less money; they want to go on believing that we are still getting the generous payments that we received when the Whitlam Government was in power. That has stopped. We have been told by the present Federal Government that we must cut our costs. The position is as simple as that. If the honourable member could use any influence with his colleague (if members of the Federal Country Party are colleagues of the members of the State Liberal Party), and induce the Hon. Peter Nixon to provide South Australia with additional funds, I should be delighted to ask the Highways Department to see whether the project at Strathalbyn to which the honourable member referred could be fitted into the additional money that would be forthcoming. If no further money can be made available, I am afraid the programme already adopted by the department and endorsed by me, as required by the Act, must stand. The programme has been supplied to Parliament through the Speaker, and two copies are available for the Opposition. The only other way in which we could get money for that road would be by

taking it away from some other road. If the honourable member would nominate the road on which work ought not be done so that the money could be put into the road to which he has referred, I will consider that, too.

NEIGHBOURHOOD YOUTH WORKERS

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say what has been achieved by the neighbourhood youth workers who were appointed by the Community Welfare Department earlier this year? Some months ago the Minister announced that trained youth workers were being appointed to help youth services throughout Australia, and the areas to which they were being appointed included Woodville, Port Adelaide and LeFevre Peninsula. As I recall it, the idea was that they would work with local committees and groups to improve existing facilities and projects, to establish new ones and to help in the training of local part-time volunteers. Can the Minister give any further details?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member was kind enough to let me know in advance that he would appreciate information on this activity of neighbourhood youth work, so I was able to have my officers take out some information, which I think he will be pleased to have. As applied in relation to the family care programme, at the beginning there have been no spectacular happenings. Eleven neighbourhood youth workers have been appointed, and the early period since their appointment has been mainly occupied in gaining the confidence of young people in the areas where they have been appointed and in working out what facilities for youth already exist in the area. I can now say that a groundswell of youth activity is arising throughout the State. I am sorry that the Deputy Leader is not present in the Chamber, because I mention that I went to Mount Gambier on Friday last, and I also went to Millicent. For the Deputy Leader's information, I can say that the members for those districts were aware of my visit. The member for Millicent attended at least two functions in Millicent that I attended.

In Mount Gambier, I had occasion to visit the district office of the Community Welfare Department and heard that the neighbourhood youth worker who had been appointed there had been doing good work both in East Gambier and in Nangwarry. I can give the honourable member who has asked the question some detailed information concerning the area which he represents and which, to some extent, overlaps into the area represented by the member for Semaphore. Some examples of youth activity in the area are that the youth worker appointed has been helping to organise functions for young people at the LeFevre Peninsula Community and Youth Centre and has been stimulating the establishment of a youth group to work with children in the Largs North and Taperoo area. There has been the development of a motor maintenance training course for young people in Birkenhead and nearby districts, a project particularly aimed at helping Aboriginal youth. The youth worker has also established and taken part in a training course for local youth leaders in the Semaphore Park area. That is typical of some of the activities that have been sponsored, stimulated and organised by neighbourhood youth workers wherever appointed throughout the State. I draw attention to the fact that every activity I have outlined has indicated considerable local community support, and that is implicit in the Government's community welfare policies and programmes.

MEMBER'S ENGAGEMENT

The SPEAKER: Before calling for the next question, I should like, on behalf of all members, to offer to the member for Flinders our congratulations on his becoming engaged. I am sure that all honourable members would like me, on their behalf, to extend our best wishes to him and his fiancée.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): Mr. Speaker, I support your remarks and add the Government's congratulations on the event that has just occurred. It has taken Peter a long time to get around to it, but I think that he is the kind of fellow who, having made the decision, would be certain of it. I thought that it might have been that the big city had done something to him when he came here from Port Lincoln but I find on investigation that his fiancée was a teacher at Tumby Bay, which is not far from Port Lincoln, and where I had much trouble over a jetty some years ago. I wonder whether his fiancée was there at that time. Mr. Speaker, I support what you have said and wish Peter and his fiancée the very best for the future. If he wants any advice at any time, not only about having children but also about rearing them, I shall be pleased to make myself available and to give him the service he may desire.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I have much pleasure in supporting the remarks that have been made. I heard a comment from behind me "Yet another good man lost", but that is not true: I think it is probably the case of another good man saved, because, as most members well know, we would not be able to discharge our duties to our electors and the people of South Australia as well as we do if it were not for our wives and families. It is tremendously important to have a wife and family solidly behind a member of Parliament. Peter Blacker, the member for Flinders, has the very best wishes of Opposition members. What he is doing is putting considerable pressure on the member for Davenport, and it will be interesting to see what happens.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I should like to add my congratulations. I was the last one to be in the position of being elected a bachelor, and taking the plunge, as it were, some time after I came to the House. I can thoroughly recommend the course to him; mine has worked out well, and I hope that his works out just as well.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for the sentiments expressed by you and by members on both sides and of all Parties. I very much appreciate them and will convey them to my fiancée.

QUESTIONS RESUMED

MEAT

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Deputy Premier inform the House just whose responsibility it is to police the Act that controls the marketing of meat for human consumption within town or city limits? I have been contacted by a representative of the butchering trade in Port Lincoln who has expressed concern at the quantity of meat entering Port Lincoln that has not been processed through the appropriate authority. The butchers consider that, because

they are required by law to conform to stringent health standards, they are being disadvantaged and are being undersold by an illegal meat trade. The butchers concerned have contacted the local council, the local health authorities, and the South Australian Meat Corporation, all of whom say that they are unable to do anything. I should be grateful if the Minister could ascertain within whose responsibility this activity lies.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to take up this matter with the Minister of Health, because I believe that the Local Board of Health would be the organisation responsible for controlling the activities the honourable member has raised. I will therefore refer the question to the Minister of Health. If he is not the Minister concerned, I will ascertain where responsibility lies and try to do something about the matter for the honourable member.

RARE BIRD

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister for the Environment outline departmental policy in relation to the taking of rare animals from the wild? I note that two specimens of a rare bird, the Eyrean grass-wren, have recently been taken for scientific purposes in the Simpson Desert Conservation Park and that that action has caused criticism from people who believe that protected, let alone rare, birds should not be taken from the wild.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I am well aware that there has been certain criticism of this action. It has no doubt been heightened recently by a segment on *This Day Tonight*. As a former member of the Australian Broadcasting Commission Advisory Committee, I know that a year or two ago there was in this programme discussion on this matter. It was generally recognised that, although it was in many ways an admirable programme, the constraints of topicality and time sometimes meant that a superficial coverage of an item was given in a segment. I believe that that has occurred in this case. What happened was that an amateur ornithologist, who is a park-keeper in the National Parks and Wildlife Service, was in the Simpson Desert Conservation Park in 1972 when he thought he saw a specimen of the Eyrean grass-wren (*amytornis goyderi*), which was discovered in 1874 near Lake Eyre. It was believed to have been seen subsequently in 1962 in the same area. It is indeed a rare bird.

In 1972, Mr. May (the park-keeper in question) thought that he saw the bird in the Simpson Desert, so he returned to the desert on his holidays to check the occurrence of the bird. As a result, he saw several specimens that were no doubt in the area because of the favourable seasons we have experienced in the past few years, the isolation of the area and the protection afforded to the bird by the conservation park. I am indeed glad that the Simpson Desert, which was once considered to be so barren, has saved this bird from extinction. Mr. May brought back two specimens of the bird, but this action has raised the question whether or not the bird, which was once thought to be rare or even extinct, should be taken.

It is sad but true that museums are often the only places where once abundant, but now extinct, species may be found. For example, in the South Australian Museum's new mammal display are 91 mammals once resident in this State, of which 21 are believed to be extinct, and specimens of which can now be seen only in the museum. The rediscovery of the Eyrean grass-wren in the northern part of the State was a notable achievement of observation

and persistence on the part of an amateur ornithologist working in his own time and at his own expense. It means that this once thought rare or even extinct bird is now known to exist in sufficient numbers to maintain a breeding population. The extensive and intensive field surveys that have been carried out on Australia's fauna in the past couple of decades have revealed numerous species which were similarly presumed to be extinct after man's early rape of the countryside but which have survived in isolated refuges or suitable habitats. In order to outline departmental policy, I must say that it is essential to have a few museum specimens, even of rare species, for positive identification and reference, not the least so that people may recognise these forms in the field and thereby add to our knowledge of their distribution and abundance. Only then can we take steps such as preservation of habitat to ensure the survival of our fauna for future generations. It is a remarkable tribute to Mr. May that, although the number of specimens has dwindled from the six specimens taken more than a hundred years ago to three, and only one of them is in Australia (at Sydney Museum), he was able to recognise the bird. Fortunately, there were sufficient numbers of this bird in the desert to justify his taking two so that they could be displayed for other ornithologists to recognise them and hopefully so that we can take steps to protect them.

BOLIVAR EFFLUENT

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Works outline the effectiveness of the information centre that was opened at Virginia to receive comments about the Bolivar effluent report? In addition can he say whether interpreters were available and whether it is intended that such a centre will be opened soon to receive representations that may be expected to follow industry and community meetings about this subject? After the Minister submitted the report relating to the Northern Adelaide Plains area, an office was opened at Virginia within a matter of hours of the report's becoming available. If there was criticism of the scheme, it was that a person was available at the office to receive comments earlier than it was possible for people of the district to digest the report and make worthwhile comment. A meeting is to be held at Globe Derby Park this evening at which people who are likely to be influenced by action in relation to water policy on the Northern Adelaide Plains have been invited to attend. The atmosphere that could apply at this major meeting this evening might not be conducive to the type of comment that some growers in this area would like to make. I suggest it would be better for an information centre to be opened after the meeting where interpreters could be available to enable meaningful and valuable comment to be made.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I accept the points made by the honourable member. The office was established not to receive comment but to try to avoid confusion that might arise in the minds of people as a result of the report. I insisted that there be a contact point in the area to assist people who might be confused, but not to receive comment. It was planned to hold a series of public meetings at which people could comment. If it is shown that we are not getting comment at public meetings (and I doubt that we will get all the comment we want), provision will be made to allow people who want to make individual comments to do so, because it is important that each person affected by this policy should have an opportunity to do so. They have had an opportunity to do so since about 1968. However, in spite of that contact there is still, in my view, much

confusion and concern about matters that people do not understand. I am willing to be as flexible as I can on this matter, because the objective is to ensure that people have adequate opportunity to tell us what they want to tell us. I will see that that happens.

SWIMMING POOL CONTRACTS

Mr. EVANS: If I tell the Attorney-General the name of the company, will he investigate contracts written by an Adelaide swimming pool construction company situated on North-East Road, Collinswood, to determine whether it affords any protection to consumers? A case involving the company has been brought to my notice, and on the facts presented it shows that the contracts used are far from satisfactory and virtually give the company full protection, even if a house is accidentally demolished by digging equipment working in the course of constructing the pool. In the case brought to my notice, the company was contracted to build a concrete shell for a swimming pool, and the council and Engineering and Water Supply Department permits were to be handled by the company. The company obtained these permits, but the E. & W.S. permit stipulated that any earthenware sewerage pipes within two metres of the pool would have to be replaced with P.V.C. piping.

The company has admitted that it received the E. & W.S. notification, but said that it did not check E. & W.S. records to see whether any earthenware pipes would be near the pool, because it thought these were not now used. The client was assured that all was well, and construction went ahead, but the client was eventually told that some 18 m of sewer at his house had to be pulled up and replaced, at an effective cost of more than \$600. The plumbing account alone was \$220, which did not include manual digging of the entire sewerage line and the cutting of concrete paths. Had the client been told by the company the pool had to be 2 m from the sewers, the pool site chosen would have been shifted on the client's instructions to clear this distance.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I shall be pleased to have the matter investigated. At present there is, to my knowledge, no law in this State which interferes directly and specifically in the matter of contracts for the building of swimming pools. The Government has announced that it proposes to amend the Builders Licensing Act to provide that the builders of swimming pools will come within the jurisdiction of that Act.

Mr. Dean Brown: That was 18 months ago.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: When that legislation has been introduced and, hopefully, passed through the Parliament—

Mr. Millhouse: When will that be?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Government's intention is to introduce that legislation during this session. When that legislation has been passed by the House, the people of this State will have adequate protection from the sort of practice to which the honourable member has referred.

PEDESTRIAN CROSSING LIGHTS

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Transport say why no consideration has been given to the safety of children attending the Morphetville Park Primary School by installing an activated set of pedestrian crossing lights on Morphet Road adjacent to the Morphet Arms Hotel,

thus providing them with the advantage and added protection that will be needed when the new bus depot becomes operational? This question arises from an answer to a written question supplied to me by the Minister. I asked whether pedestrian activated crossings would be installed before the Morphetville bus depot became operational, and in answer to that question the Minister said "No". The Minister knows that, with a further 250 buses to be housed at this depot, many of these buses will be using Morphet Road, thus providing an extra hazard for children. This is causing great concern to parents of children attending the school, to the school council, to teachers at the school and to me as member for the district.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Unfortunately, the member for Glenelg seems always to distort questions and answers and never to come out with the truth. The question he asked was:

Why has no consideration been given to the safety of the children attending the Morphetville Park Primary School?

That question was not put on notice, and the answer to it, of course, is that of course consideration has been given to those children. Had the honourable member been honest enough, he would have put in his explanation the rest of the reply given to him yesterday, which was that a school crossing already exists at the location referred to and that it will be converted to a pedestrian activated signal crossing during 1977-78, subject to the availability of funds. Once that is said, it is a totally different answer and situation from the one that the honourable member attempted to convey to this House. Full consideration has been given to the safety of the children at that school and at every location throughout South Australia. The honourable member knows as well as I do, or should know, that it is not possible to install the number of signals required. If the honourable member cares to look at the *Hansard* report for yesterday and read the reply to the member for Light, he would see details of locations where traffic signals are being installed. He would also see that there was a doubling of effort by the department. If that is still not enough for the honourable member, and if he wants this crossing installed as a matter of urgency, will he please tell me which crossing he would like not to be installed so that we can transfer our efforts to the crossing to which he has referred?

Mr. Mathwin: You provided the problem: now you provide the crossing.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Unfortunately, the honourable member is obsessed with the Morphetville Park depot, because he has always opposed public transport consistently in this House, and he is not deviating on this occasion.

At 3.5 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SPORT AND RECREATION EXPENDITURE

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the Federal Government is to be condemned for reducing expenditure for sport and recreation and calls on the Federal Government to restore financial support for sporting and recreational facilities.

The Federal Government, since it came to office in December, 1975, has relegated sport and recreation to a low

priority, not only in relation to its financial obligations but also by its very attitude to sport and recreation. One instance of this is that the Federal Ministry does not specifically include a Minister for Recreation and Sport. Mr. Newman, the Minister responsible, has a number of portfolios (Environment, Housing and Community Development), and as a consequence it seems that the Federal Government regards sport and recreation as being of little importance to the people of South Australia. This is borne out by a statement made by the member for Griffiths, Mr. Cameron, in July, 1976, which is reported as follows:

In a statement which shocked some Liberal Ministers and is sure to anger the Prime Minister (Mr. Fraser), Mr. Cameron (Lib. Qld.) praised the Labor Government's aid programme. He said it would have been worse for Australian athletes "if, the previous Government had lost office earlier". He also said, "To give them their due, the Labor Party when in Government helped sport like it has never been helped before." Mr. Fraser, who is in the United States, is expected to "carpet" Mr. Cameron for his outburst when he returns home. The only comment from the Government came from the Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development (Mr. Newman), who is responsible for sport.

Mr. Newman said in Launceston: "If one of my colleagues makes a statement like that, he is entitled to do so." After praising Labor's initiatives, Mr. Cameron said a blow to Australian sport this year was the sudden severe illness of Senator Greenwood who was just coming to understand the harmful ramifications of the Government's cuts in financial assistance to sports.

Later in the report he continued:

Mr. Cameron said: "It is hard enough to coach people without being plagued with the constant worry and extra burden of wondering where you are going to raise the fares to send people from one side of the country to the other. It is even worse for international competition."

That is a statement by a Federal Liberal colleague of members opposite, and he is critical of the policies adopted by the Federal Liberal Government in respect to recreation and sport. In the 1975-76 Budget the Federal Labor Government had allocated \$11 600 000 for sport and recreation, but the present Government has rescinded that allocation. Previously, South Australia had been receiving substantial capital grants for sporting and recreational facilities, and I list some of those grants as follows: in 1973-74, \$75 000 was made available for a synthetic athletics track at Kensington, and in 1974-75, \$25 000 was allocated to it. In 1973-74, the sum of \$25 000 was allocated for a recreation complex at Campbelltown High School. The sum of \$50 000 was allocated for an indoor sports complex at Loxton. Also, \$10 000 was provided for a swimming complex and amenities at Marion. The sum of \$21 500 was provided for a multi-purpose recreation centre at O'Sullivan Beach, and \$360 000 for a community recreation centre at Whyalla.

In 1973-74, the total amount provided for such purposes was \$631 500. In 1974-75, the total was \$798 692, and these grants indicate the interest of the Federal Labor Government in facilities for sport and recreation in this State. In April, 1976, the Federal Government advised that projects listed for capital assistance grants in 1976-77 for South Australia were in jeopardy, and, as I understand, grants for these projects have not yet been determined. The grants were to be for several sporting complexes located in the metropolitan and country areas, among them being a community recreation centre at Blackwood; a recreation centre at Kadina; change rooms and club room at the North Adelaide Lacrosse Club; studies for a major stadium, and other projects including one for Port Augusta. These projects are now in jeopardy in relation to capital grants for 1976-77. What does the public think about allocating money for sport and

recreation? A recent Gallup poll indicated that 70 per cent of Australians believed that the Government should give more aid to sport. People were fairly evenly divided about whether aid should be given to improve our chances of winning Olympic gold medals—45 per cent said that it would and 52 per cent said that it would not.

These findings come from a Gallup poll in which 1 979 people aged 16 and over were interviewed in all States and the Australian Capital Territory. The poll was conducted during the first two weekends of August, just after the Olympic Games in which Australia failed to win a gold medal. People were first asked whether the Government should give more or less aid to sport, or whether the present level of aid was about right. They were then asked whether Government aid should be given to improve our chances of winning gold medals in future Olympics.

Finally, they were asked whether they were disappointed about the Australian performances at the Montreal Games. Opinions differed little between the States about the various questions. Men were slightly more concerned than women about Government aid to sport, and Australian performances at Montreal. The Gallup poll indicated that the public of Australia desired that more financial aid should be given to sport and recreation. Australia has been regarded as a sporting nation, and in many international competitions our performances have been reasonably good.

However, the only period in which the Federal Government has been able to greatly assist those involved in sport and recreation was during 1972 to 1975 when assistance was granted by the Federal Labor Government. Despite what the Federal Government has been doing, the State Government is doing what it can, within the limit of its resources, to assist, and recently the Government allocated \$70 000 towards travel assistance for teams and individuals travelling to approved national events. For junior sports coaching a considerable amount has been made available to sporting bodies in this State, and I believe further amounts are to be made available. Another important aspect of sport and recreation that the State Government is developing is the establishment of a sports medicine clinic, which is to be located at the site of the former National Fitness Council premises on South Terrace, and is another indication of the assistance within its limits that the State Government is providing.

Mr. Chapman: Is this what constitutes a fun run: you feature in the *News* today as a fun runner?

Mr. SLATER: The honourable member might consider that procreation is the only aspect of recreation, but I doubt whether he would know anything about that, either. Compared to other nations, Australia is spending little on sport and recreation. Following the performances of our athletes at the Montreal Olympic Games, the Prime Minister announced that an inquiry would be held into the allocation of funds for sport. This was a hypocritical statement, because nothing has been heard since of this inquiry. A former Treasurer (Mr. Hayden) had something to say about the statement of the Prime Minister concerning that inquiry, and a report of that comment states:

The former Treasurer, Mr. Hayden, said yesterday the proposed inquiry into Australian Government assistance for sport was a "crude, vulgar display of hypocrisy" by the Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser. He said: "In past months Mr Fraser has personally been involved in slashing away at financial assistance programmes assisting sporting bodies, community groups and recreational activities."

The \$11 600 000 allocated in the last Labor Government's Budget for capital assistance for the building of sports grounds and sporting complexes had now been revised. Mr Hayden said only those projects which applied for funds before the end of 1975 would be covered by this

allocation. "No new programmes are being funded," he said. "Much of Mr Fraser's austerity cuts are revealed as nothing more than petty meanness exacted against extremely important and valuable sporting, recreational and community bodies."

I believe that recreation and sport is synonymous with fitness and health, and in our society today the importance of physical activity needs to be given a greater priority than that being given by the present Federal Government. Cardio-vascular disease is regarded as being the result of physical inactivity, and Australian men have one of the worst life expectancy rates of any nation in the world. Figures show that Australian men have an average life expectancy of 67·7 years compared to that of New Zealand men, 68·2 years, Japanese men, 68·8 years, English men, 68·6 years, Swiss men, 70 years, and Swedish men, 71·8 years. It is important that Governments concentrate substantial sums to arrest primary stage disabilities through community health and fitness programmes. Time devoted to physical education in our schools does not compare favourably to the time devoted to physical education in schools in overseas countries. Physical fitness plays an integral part in an educational system and, if it is practised in schools, it develops the habit of regular exercise in later life. The success of the East Germans at Montreal was due not to the use of steroids or to the promotion of some elitist race of athletes but to a programme of national fitness devised over a period of years.

Mr. Mathwin: Are you talking about men or women?

Mr. SLATER: In East Germany men and women are encouraged to participate in sporting physical activity. Results achieved by them internationally were due to a programme of national fitness for the whole community. They have the facilities for training and the coaches, and they have promoted the physical well-being of the nation. If Australia is to recapture some of the standing in international competition it held previously, it must also promote sport and recreation not only for the elitist sportsmen but also for all people who wish to participate in sport and recreation. To do this, funds must be allocated to promote physical well-being at all levels. The Government must provide the necessary finance to enable every person to be able to participate in any form of sport and recreation he wishes. This can be done only if money is provided by the Federal Government. Unfortunately, this has not yet been done. The Federal Government has not fulfilled its obligations to the Australian people in this regard, and I believe it must stand condemned for its inaction in not providing financial support for sport and recreation. All members of this House should support this motion if they believe in the welfare of the Australian community.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): In seconding the motion, I congratulate the honourable member on his efforts today. We all know that sport in Australia is a great thing. Conditions in Australia are such that people are able to play two sports successfully if they wish to do so. Times have changed, and during the past few years there has been a tendency towards professionalism in sport. Few sportsmen could now be called amateurs in the true sense of the word. This situation has been overcome by sportsmen being offered employment instead of money, and trophies are often given instead of money. I can remember years ago when members of the South Australian Sheffield Shield team received five shillings a day.

Mr. Becker: The way some of them played, that was all they were worth.

Mr. LANGLEY: The honourable member is entitled to his opinion, but I believe that if I told some of those players they would be upset. They were considered to be some of the best players in South Australia. Australians get more opportunities to play sport than do English sportsmen.

Dr. Tonkin: When are they going to revive the Parliamentary cricket team?

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not know what happened to the Parliamentary cricket team, but I believe it was in the hands of the member for Davenport. I would be only too happy to participate in such a team if it was formed again and if I were selected.

Mr. Allison: Is it true that you had the best team even though you were the worst paid?

Mr. LANGLEY: No, I do not think we had the best team at the time. Anyone playing sport must learn how to win and how to lose. The person has not been born who will not have to learn how to lose. Attitudes towards sport have changed considerably since the days to which I was referring. The situation has been helped considerably by business men. The *Advertiser* has given much thought to helping and coaching young people in many fields of sport. It has made donations to help in other ways. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE REPORT

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council should, as soon as practicable after June 30 in each year, present a report to the Minister on the work of the council during the financial year ending on that date, and that the Minister should as soon as practicable after receipt of a report cause a copy of the report to be laid before each House of Parliament.

On November 27, 1974, when an amendment to the National Parks and Wildlife Act was before this House, I moved an amendment that would have achieved what is set out in this motion. On that occasion the then Minister for the Environment (the member for Henley Beach) said:

The council was established to provide the Minister with an independent view on any issue that may be of concern to him. The system has worked effectively, and I have frequently used the services of this body.

There is no doubt that the council has worked most effectively from that point of view. The National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council is a council of most competent people, a broad cross-section of people with high academic qualifications and practical experience, with much to offer regarding wildlife and wildlife management.

To adopt this motion would add considerable status to the advisory council and would encourage it considerably in its work throughout the year. Many of its members are experts in their various fields, and the work they undertake during the year and the research in which they involve themselves would be of enormous value to the Minister and the Government, as well as to people interested in wildlife management, national parks, and so on, throughout Australia and possibly in other countries. I believe that the work carried out by such bodies could become a reference if put in the form of a Chairman's report on the year's activities of the council, submitted to the Minister, and laid before both Houses of Parliament. It would then become a public document that could be referred to by many organisations throughout the country.

I do not believe that the Minister or the Government has anything to fear from such a move. Any Minister should be willing to answer questions in relation to the

report and to give his reasons for not adopting any recommendation of the advisory council. I see no problem in that. After all, Governments change, and any incoming Government would operate under the same provisions of the National Parks and Wildlife Act. This is merely giving recognition to this important body, this group of people, recognising the work undertaken, so that the results of that work will be recorded and available for the information of others.

I turn briefly to the first and second annual reports on the administration of the National Parks and Wildlife Act, a document prepared by the department. In the first and second reports, presented as a combined report, the composition of the advisory council is set out. In the third annual report on the administration of the Act, just released, only passing reference is made to the advisory council. It is a pity that greater recognition has not been given to it, because, without recognition and if its work is not recorded and made available to the public, the interest and enthusiasm of council members must wane.

Since I moved to amend the National Parks and Wildlife Act when the amending Bill was before the House on November 27, 1974, and since I have placed this motion on the Notice Paper, I have received no representation from any member of the advisory council objecting to the proposal I have placed before Parliament on the two occasions. I take it that the council could see no difficulty in complying with the requirement if the Government were to accept the proposal. I commend this motion to the House and trust that the new Minister for the Environment will consider it seriously and give effect to it.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the motion, which gives the Government an opportunity to make available to the public more detail of what is taking place in Government or semi-government organisations, or, in this case, in the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council. The council has an important role to play, and its full importance cannot be appreciated by the public, by Opposition members, or by back-bench Government members unless a report is made available. A small cost would be involved in printing, but some of that cost would be saved by the lack of necessity for Ministers to have questions answered and queries replied to. Recently, the reply to a question was refused in a case where, if material had been made available during the year or by a report at the end of the year, the question need not have been asked. I will not go further with that at this stage, but shortly I shall point out the stupidity of such a lack of action by the Government.

The member for Chaffey, who is the shadow Minister for the Environment and Planning, is right in asking the House to support the motion. There is a need for Parliament and the public to be informed. The Government in power claims to exercise open government, and this is a simple way of being open over the work of the advisory council, giving members an opportunity to see whether the council's advice is implemented or rejected. If it is rejected, an opportunity is given for members to ask why it has been rejected. I support the motion in the strongest terms.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I am pleased to hear the shadow Minister commend the activities of the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council, a body well deserving of that commendation. The honourable member knows that it is a council advisory only to the Minister and to the Government, as was clearly pointed out in the previous

debate in this House. He knows, too, that there is no precedent for advisory councils to report to Parliament. That is the duty of statutory bodies, not of advisory committees. For the honourable member to draw the conclusion that members of the advisory council support his motion merely because they have not told him they do not support it is not valid if no member has telephoned him and told him personally that he does support it. I would not suggest that I know whether or not any member of the council supports the motion.

Mr. Arnold: Do you know of any objection?

Mr. KENEALLY: I know of no objection to it, because at this stage I have had no discussions with the advisory council. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS BILL

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to regulate the practice of law; to repeal the Legal Practitioners' Act, 1936-1972; to amend the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1975; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Dr. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It establishes a code for the practice of the law. I apologise to the Minister, but even I have only about a fifth copy. The present Act dates back to 1936 and is quite outmoded at the present time. For many years, the Law Society has considered that a new code of practice was necessary to regulate the practice of the law in the interest of the public and of the profession at large. I suggest that we have waited far too long for a code such as this. A Bill was introduced in the last session of Parliament to provide a new Legal Practitioners' Act. This was introduced in another place and it was subsequently announced in the press that the Bill had been dropped because of some opposition by the Law Society and because of amendments proposed in another place.

The Constitution and the Standing Orders of the Houses of Parliament provide a procedure for resolving amendments. The need for a new code regulating the practice of the law remains, and this Bill seeks to provide it. I pay a tribute to those officers of the Law Society who have laboured for so long to see a Bill such as this passed by the Parliament and who are still waiting to see their work brought to fruition. They are still active in the matter and have made several suggestions, even as recently as last week. The Bill proposes, as did the former Government Bill, a commission for legal education, a legal practitioners board and a legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal. It provides investigating procedures and procedures for the audit and control of trust accounts that have many more teeth than does the present Act. This should be to the advantage of the public and of the profession at large.

I turn now to the clauses of the Bill, and I intend to read them, because they are important. Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 repeals the present Legal Practitioners Act and enacts transitional provisions. Clause 5 is the definition clause. Clause 6 enables the Supreme Court to divide the profession. Clause 7 provides for the Law Society of South Australia to continue. Clause 8 relates to the officers of the society. Clause 9 sets up the council of the society. Clause 10 validates acts of the council, notwithstanding a vacancy. Clause 11 vests the management of the society in the council. Clause 12 deals with the keeping and inspection of minutes. Clause

13 enables the society to appear in matters affecting the interests of the society. This clause is obviously desirable and necessary. Clause 14 enables the society to make rules.

Part III deals with the admission and enrolment of practitioners. Clause 15 provides for a commission for legal education. Clause 16 provides for the appointment of members of the commission. Clause 17 provides for a quorum and similar matters. Clause 18 validates acts of the commission, notwithstanding a vacancy. Clause 19 deals with a secretary for the commission. Clause 20 empowers the commission to make admission rules. Clause 21 sets out the qualifications for admission.

Part IV relates to the practice of the law. Clause 22 sets up the Legal Practitioners Board. Clause 23 relates to the term of office of members. Clause 24 sets out the quorum. Clause 25 validates proceedings, notwithstanding defects in appointment of members. Clause 26 provides for delegation of powers. Clause 27 creates the office of Registrar, without which such commission could not function. Clause 28 gives a right of appeal from decisions of the board. Clause 29 provides for practising certificates. Clause 30 deals with the issue of a practising certificate to a person who has allowed his practising certificate to lapse. Clause 31 deals with the time during which a certificate remains in force. Clause 32 provides for a register of practising certificates.

The whole situation, by setting up such a board, will make certain matters absolutely clear which in past practice and organisation of the law have not been entirely clear. Clause 33 prohibits the practice of the law without a certificate and sets out a number of practices that the Act does not prohibit. Clause 34 creates the offence of practising without a certificate. Clause 35 creates offences relating to a person's falsely pretending that he holds a legal qualification.

Division 6 of Part IV provides for the practice of the law by companies. Clause 36 sets out the requirements for companies which are legal practitioners. Clause 37 prohibits practice by a company in partnership with any other person unless authorised by the board. Clause 38 restricts the employment of practitioners by a practitioner company. Clause 39 makes directors of a practitioner company guilty of an offence where an offence is committed by a practitioner company.

Clause 40 makes any civil liability incurred by such a company recoverable against the directors. Clause 41 requires the approval of the board to any alteration to the memorandum or articles of a practitioner company. Clause 42 exempts practitioner companies from some provisions of the Companies Act. Clause 43 requires practitioners to deposit in a trust account trust moneys received by them. Clause 44 relieves a bank in which a trust account is established from the consequences of notice of specific trusts. Clause 45 empowers regulations to be made relating to the audit of trust accounts. Clause 46 gives the court power to order the delivery by practitioners of legal papers. Clause 47 deals with a practitioner's authority to act where his client becomes of unsound mind. Clause 48 imposes limitations on a practitioner's right to bring an action for the recovery of legal costs. Clause 49 gives practitioner and client the right to have all bills of costs taxed by the court. Clause 50 extends this right to non-litigious matters. Clause 51 enables the board to appoint supervisors of trust accounts in certain circumstances, particularly in the case of the death of a practitioner. Clause 52 empowers the board to appoint a manager of a practitioner's practice in certain circumstances. Clause 53 allows a supervisor or manager to apply to the court for direction. Clause 54

provides for the remuneration of supervisors or managers. Clause 55 requires a practitioner who becomes bankrupt to obtain the authority of the board before continuing to practise. Clause 56 enables the personal representatives of a deceased practitioner and certain other representatives of a practitioner to continue to practise subject to conditions. Clause 57 deals with the right of audience before the courts of the State. Clause 58 requires practitioners to deposit a prescribed portion of their trust accounts in a combined legal practitioners' trust account, and makes provisions relating to that account. Clause 59 provides for investment of the moneys so deposited.

Clause 60 protects practitioners from action in respect of any action done in compliance with the requirements relating to the combined account. Clause 61 provides for a statutory interest account into which interest on the combined trust account shall be paid. Clause 62 provides for the legal assistance fund, and clause 63 provides for the legal practitioners' guarantee fund. Clause 64 provides for accounting and audit in regard to these statutory accounts. Clause 65 gives relief from stamp duty in respect of these accounts, and clause 66 gives a borrowing power in respect of them.

Part VI provides for legal assistance. Clause 67 empowers the society to maintain a community legal service. Clause 68 deals with applications for legal assistance. Clause 69 enables the society to maintain a panel of practitioners prepared to give legal assistance. Clause 70 provides for legal assistance to be granted on terms. Clause 71 prevents the courts, in ordering costs, from taking into account the fact that assistance has been given.

Clause 72 prohibits unauthorised disclosure in regard to assistance. Clause 73 creates offences in regard to legal assistance. Clause 74 enables a practitioner to make certain disclosures to the society in regard to assisted persons. Clause 75 enables fees to be remitted in regard to assisted persons. Clause 76 gives relief from stamp duty on declarations in connection with applications for assistance. Clause 77 provides that the provisions of the Part shall not prejudice any other authorised scheme.

The provision of legal assistance and the provisions that have been set out in the Bill will, I believe, help significantly the administration of aid that is now given by the Law Society. I pay a tribute to members of the legal profession who provide such a worthwhile service to the people of South Australia under what have become extremely difficult conditions.

Part VII provides for claims against the guarantee fund. Clause 78 sets out the circumstances in which a person may have a claim against the fund. Clause 79 empowers the society to call for claims. Clause 80 empowers the society to call for any document in connection with a claim. Clause 81 provides for the determination of claims. Clause 82 provides for the satisfaction of claims. Clause 83 subrogates the society to the rights of the claimant. Clause 84 enables a practitioner who has met a claim against a partner or employee to claim against the fund in certain circumstances. Clause 85 provides for an insurance scheme.

Part VIII deals with investigations, inquiries and disciplinary proceedings. Clause 86 provides that the Registrar shall on the direction of the Attorney-General or the board make an investigation into the conduct of a practitioner. The Attorney-General or the board must have reasonable cause to suspect that the practitioner has been guilty of unprofessional conduct. The powers of investigation are very wide. The Registrar may, at his discretion, also act on a complaint made to him. Clause 87 provides for the reporting of the results of an investigation. Clause 88

sets up the Legal Practitioners' Disciplinary Tribunal. Clause 89 sets out the terms and conditions of office of members of the tribunal. Clause 90 provides for a quorum. Clause 91 validates proceedings notwithstanding a vacancy or defect. Clause 92 provides for a secretary of the tribunal. Clause 93 sets out the procedure for hearing charges.

Clause 94 provides for giving notice to the parties. Clause 95 empowers the tribunal to summon witnesses. Clause 96 empowers the tribunal to make orders as to costs. Clause 97 gives a right of appeal to the Supreme Court from decisions of the tribunal. Clause 98 provides for suspension of an order made by the tribunal pending an appeal. Clause 99 provides for disciplinary proceedings before the Supreme Court.

Part IX deals with public notaries. Clause 100 provides for their admission. Clause 101 provides for the keeping of a roll of notaries. Clause 102 enables the court in proper circumstances to strike a notary's name off the roll. Clause 103 creates the offence of falsely claiming to be a notary.

Part X is the miscellaneous Part. Clause 104 provides for one-third of practising fees to be paid to the society for maintenance of its library. Clause 105 makes offences punishable summarily. Clause 106 is the general regulation-making clause. The schedule sets out Acts repealed or affected.

This legislation is long overdue: it should have been introduced and proceeded with in this House, having been introduced first in another place. This measure has resulted from suggested amendments and suggestions made by members of the Law Society. Suggestions that have been made since the Bill was drafted will be taken into account and the necessary action taken during the Committee stages. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

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

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 18. Page 712.)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): This Bill seeks to reverse a decision that was taken by this Parliament almost 40 years ago. I am sure that the member for Glenelg, who introduced the Bill, will be interested in the information I have collected on this matter, mainly because he was not at that time enjoying the hospitality of this wonderful State. On June 24, 1936, a report was tabled in this House of an honorary committee appointed by the Government to report on the Road Traffic Act, 1934, and to make recommendations relating to the traffic laws. The following day the then Premier of South Australia, the Hon. Sir Richard Butler, introduced a Bill to give effect to the committee's recommendations. A copy of the committee's report is in the Parliamentary Library and is available to any member who would be interested in reading it. It is interesting to note that, under the heading "Pillion-riding and donkeying," at page 10, the report states:

Although it was felt that pillion-riding on motor cycles and "donkeying" on push cycles were a serious source of danger, both to the driver and passengers of such vehicles and also to other road users, the committee realises that these two methods of transportation are very difficult, if not impossible, to prevent. Motor cycles are now constructed with a view to the carriage of a passenger on a pillion

seat, and it is doubtful whether this method of transportation at moderate speeds is any more dangerous than that by motor cycle and sidecar.

The committee then dealt with the question of donkeying, but concluded as follows:

It was therefore considered desirable to prevent donkeying on push cycles in proclaimed areas and to restrict the speed of motor cycles carrying pillion passengers.

That was 40 years ago. Today, the wheel has taken a complete turn. I am sure that the Federation of Australian Motorcyclists and Mr. Gray would be interested to know that at that time the Road Traffic Act that was amended as a result of that report inserted the following provision:

Any person who on any road, drives at a greater speed than twenty-five miles per hour a two-wheeled motor cycle carrying any person in addition to the driver, shall be guilty of an offence.

So that 40 years ago this speed limit was 25 m.p.h. anywhere in South Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: You would have needed a cut lunch to go to Burnside.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: At that stage I used to ride a motor cycle, and if I went far I used to take a cut lunch, too. That legislation remained unchanged for 20 years. In 1956, a more enlightened Parliament decided that it was time to increase the maximum speed limit for motor cycles outside municipalities or townships, and increased the limit to 35 m.p.h., but retained the 25 m.p.h. limit in townships. Then, 11 years later, in 1967, a further enlightened Parliament, deciding that 35 m.p.h. outside townships was a bit low, increased the speed limit to 45 m.p.h.

Apart from what happened when the metrication changes were made that limit has remained unchanged. For metrication, the 45 m.p.h. limit was amended to 70 kilometres per hour, the limit that has remained unaltered since. When the metrication change was made there was a lengthy debate and many members (including the honourable member for Glenelg) participated, but this aspect of the speed limit for motor cycles was not mentioned. That is not said as a criticism. What has occurred since then has made it obvious that there was a need to look more closely at this speed limit.

In my handling of matters in the Road Traffic Act I have always attempted to place greater importance on uniformity than on any other matter. Indeed, the Australian Transport Advisory Council unanimously agreed, when we discussed the conversion and the speeds that would be used under metrication, that 70 kilometres per hour would apply throughout Australia. That standard has not been maintained by various States. In his second reading explanation, the honourable member referred to the various speeds that apply in different States at present. What he has said is basically, correct—apart from New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory there are fairly well common maximum speeds for motor cycles and motor cars.

The F.A.M. approached me some months ago and asked me to amend the legislation. I said that I did not believe that an amendment should be made simply on the basis of an approach by an organisation to a member of the Government or to a Minister, because we have always attempted to have some reasonable investigation before decisions are taken. In other words, decisions to apply the 110 km/h absolute speed limit, and the 60 km/h speed limit in built-up areas, decisions relating to stop signs and so on, are seriously considered. I recommended that the federation should make overtures directly to the Road

Traffic Board and state their case, and that I would then ask the Road Traffic Board to consider the representations and report and recommend to the Government.

The board did that earlier this year, and recommended to me, as Minister, that the present limit should be eliminated from the Act and that there should be a common 110 km/h speed limit applicable to motor cyclists with pillion passengers, the same limit applying to solo motor cyclists and the majority of road users. That was agreed to by Cabinet. Immediately afterwards the F.A.M. was advised by letter that we would take this action, so the present move comes as no surprise. In a Question on Notice, the member for Hanson asked a few weeks ago for information about this matter. It is recorded in *Hansard* that this limit is the Government's policy. The honourable member wanted to know the date on which the recommendation of the board was made, and I think it was some time in May. The Government supports this move. We told the motor cyclists that we intended to introduce legislation to deal with this matter, but now the honourable member has done that for us we are delighted to support his approach.

My concluding comment relates to the report in today's newspaper stating that the South Australian Police Force is reorganising its traffic branch by establishing a traffic intelligence centre based at the Thebarton Police Barracks. This matter is very relevant to the subject with which we are dealing in this legislation. Although accident rates for motor cyclists have been increasing at what could be called an alarming rate (as they have been in some other areas as well), we are not sure, in the final analysis, where the fault lies. We are not sure whether the increase in the injuries, even deaths, of motor cyclists and pillion passengers is the result of the actions of the motor cyclists or whether it is the result of motor cyclists being more vulnerable than motorists. The motorist is protected by the steel around him, he is strapped in, and has four wheels. His position is much more stable.

There are many unanswered questions in the road safety area and I hope that, as a result of the relevant action, we will get more meaningful statistics (to use the term used in the report), within a few days rather than in 12 or 18 months, as has been occurring in the past. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I rise briefly to thank the Minister for his co-operation in this matter and the Government for its support, which will enable the Bill to pass speedily. I was interested in the Minister's explanation, and in the research that he has done. As the Minister has said, this legislation was introduced 40 years ago, when, as the Minister said, I was not in this country. I was also interested to hear that the Minister was a motor cyclist at one stage of his career. That makes me wonder why I did not give him more of an opportunity to ride as a pillion passenger behind me on a Norton motor cycle that was offered to me recently in a rally. That offer still stands and, if the Minister sees fit to take a ride as a pillion passenger on a powerful 850 c.c. Norton motor cycle, I can assure him a safe and speedy passage.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 8. Page 897.)

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved:

That debate on the Bill be further adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Noes (21)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown (teller), Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandeppeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Jennings. No—Mr. Boundy.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think under Standing Orders that a date needs to be set when the Bill will again be debated, if the Government is willing to debate it, as it was not willing today.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not think there is any need for—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That the adjourned debate be made an Order of the Day for—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I move:

That Order of the Day No. 5 be made an Order of the Day for Wednesday next.

I hope that on that occasion the Government will allow the debate—

The SPEAKER: Order! There can be no debate.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: You said last week that it was a matter of priorities.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Davenport to be seated. Is the motion seconded?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, Sir.

Motion carried.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 18. Page 714.)

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): We have decided to debate this Bill today, although Opposition members may be sorry that that is so.

Mr. Dean Brown: Couldn't you read more than one Bill in a week?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If the member for Davenport insists on interrupting me, I may adjourn this debate as well.

Mr. Mathwin: Don't be like that, Jack.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: When you are ready to go, I will go on, because I am not in a hurry. If the member for Glenelg wants to hear my reply he may. Is the little boy from Davenport ready?

Mr. Gunn: This is unnecessary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much cross talk between both sides, and I now ask the honourable Minister to continue.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that we all appreciate your comment that there

is too much interjection, but the sort of comment the Minister made a moment ago invites, aggravates, and indeed brings forward the sort of reaction that occurred. I ask him to withdraw the "little boy" remark that he made about the member for Glenelg.

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I did not call the member for Glenelg a little boy.

Mr. Mathwin: He's a big boy, isn't he?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Bigger than some on the other side. Now that we have all that out of the way, I will try to reply to the remarks of the member for Glenelg.

Mr. Dean Brown: Are you going to do the other one next week?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, do I have to put up with incessant interjections by this individual?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much unnecessary interjection.

Mr. Mathwin: You'll be getting angry with me in a minute.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: No. This private member's Bill is a further example of the way in which members opposite want to interfere by law in the internal affairs of industrial organisations. Not content with the numerous safeguards contained in the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act for the democratic control of trade unions, they want to regulate them to the extent that they have no ability to act on behalf of their members and are made the tool of the employers or their front men in the Opposition.

The whole of Part IX of the Act deals with the requirements imposed on registered associations that go far beyond anything imposed on other associations and, particularly concerning democratic procedures, go far beyond controls imposed on business enterprises in the way they can use shareholders' funds. Any rule that imposes unreasonable, oppressive, or unjust conditions on the membership is invalid under section 134 of the Act.

Mr. GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister reading his speech because, if he is, that would be contrary to Standing Orders? If he is, who wrote it?

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order: the Minister is referring to notes.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am referring to the same type of copious notes that the Leader and also the member for Davenport have been referring to for the past five weeks.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Minister has made his point, and may continue.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member, in his speech, made much of the rights and opinions of members of unions in relation to political contributions by their organisation, but he did not refer to the fact that the Act and the rules of unions themselves give members rights in this area. One of the main reasons for this is that he did not want the fact known that this very point has been tested in the highest court in the land, and the High Court of Australia is not known as a group of radicals! The court decided in a Federal case that such rules provide adequate safeguards to members.

In 1959, in the case of *Williams v. Hursey* (a case that the member for Glenelg has probably never heard of), the High Court considered the position in relation to political contributions. It was held that there was nothing "tyrannical or oppressive" involved in construing the rules of the

organisation concerned as authorising the making of the levy for a political purpose. Depending on the rules of the association, the similarity between the wording of the two Acts means that there is no question that associations registered under the South Australian Act may raise moneys for political purposes.

Under the Commonwealth Act, the rules need not contain a specific reference, "direct or indirect", either to the making of contributions to the funds of a political Party or to the making of levies on members for that purpose. In *Williams v. Hursey*, the rules of the organisation gave as its objects "... by all lawful means ... to foster the best interests of its members". Fullagar J. stated in that case that the application of funds to support a political Party were a traditionally accepted means of furthering and protecting the interests of members of an association of employees. My good friend, the member for Florey, would remember that case well.

Those words are important ("a traditionally accepted means"), because they raise the question of what precedent the honourable member might have for his extraordinary proposal. The answer is that there is absolutely none in Australia, either federally or in any of the States. This has been so from the beginning in all States except New South Wales, where until 1959 there had to be a separately administered fund. What about comparable overseas countries? There are absolutely no restrictions in law or practice in Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, West Germany, Iceland, Israel, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland or in France. That is the sort of endorsement that the member's proposal attracts from the most advanced and progressive Western economies.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the U.K.?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If the honourable member will be tolerant, he will hear about Great Britain. I happen to have written the speech myself, so I know what is in it.

Mr. Becker: Yes, but you are reading it.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member ought to listen to the recent questions and speeches of the Leader of the Opposition. That is why I decided I would read the speech.

Mr. Becker: I used to be pulled up on this.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: There is an exception from the list that I have read, and that exception would be dear to the heart of the member for Glenelg. You see, John, I wrote that, because I was considering you at the time. That exception obviously has influenced the honourable member's thinking, and I refer to Britain. But even here the honourable member has got it wrong. In the United Kingdom the Trade Unions Act provides that there must be a separate fund approved by a majority of members and that members may "contract out".

Mr. Mathwin: That's under the present Government: what about the previous Government?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am referring to the present situation, which is as I have stated it.

Mr. Mathwin: Because it's a socialist Government.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member knows that I am stating what is the present situation, because I examined it when I was in England. It is unlike the member for Glenelg's proposal, which hopes positively to exclude contributions unless the member signs on, thus hoping that apathy will ensure there are no such funds. The British Act provides for those who feel strongly to contract out.

There is one variation: contracting in applies, I understand, to Northern Ireland. That is the place that the member apparently sees as the great example of good

Government and good industrial relations! From what I read of Northern Ireland, it would be difficult to share his view. To reply to some further points made by the honourable member, the Government does not and has never advocated compulsory unionism, as the honourable member claims. What we support is preference to unionists, as we believe that those who contribute to the securing of better wages and improved conditions have a greater right to enjoy them than those who refuse to do so, if a choice has to be made between them. That is what preference to unionists is about.

That is our policy and it is one subscribed to by many employers in this State who, unlike members opposite, know something about industrial relations. I do not have to quote them, but several large organisations in this State make it mandatory for people to join the appropriate union.

Mr. Mathwin: A closed shop.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Yes, there is no question about that. It is happening in all types of industry. The Government has a system of preference to trade unionists. If a person wanted to obtain a job with many manufacturers in South Australia, he would find it impossible unless he contracted in under the union's conditions.

Mr. Wells: G.M.H., for instance.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I did not name any organisation; I left that for people to work out themselves, but there are plenty of organisations in which this situation applies. The honourable member made much play of the findings of a sample survey that was published in *The Bulletin* last June. There are a number of things to be said about that. First, the sample involved only 4 000 odd of all people aged over 14 years. Only 1 000 of them were trade union members and thus qualified in any way to speak about what unions should or should not do. Secondly, of those 1 000 people, there is not sufficient evidence as to whether they were in unions that had a tradition of political and industrial activity or whether they were in unions or associations in the white-collar area or the executive area, or even what are known as house unions; further, there is insufficient evidence as to the degree to which this influenced their opinions. So, we must treat with very much care a finding that the majority was against political activity.

Thirdly, the question could be asked: why do they not attend meetings and vote for a change in union policy if they are so dramatically against that situation? Fourthly, the survey found, as the honourable member admitted, that three-quarters were satisfied with how their union was run. If their objections were so serious, this percentage would have been much lower. Just as importantly, the honourable member omitted to mention that, when asked about specific issues, 67 per cent of unionists thought that unions should be trying to improve the education system, and 71 per cent thought that they should be acting to improve pensions. Such aims can be advanced only through political means, and more specifically through the policies of the Australian Labor Party. If the union and its members seek to further such aims, political contributions are necessary.

I have mentioned one of the objects of the honourable member's Bill; that is, to interfere with the internal affairs of unions and thereby stir up as much industrial unrest as possible, on the basis that this would be to the electoral advantage of the honourable member's Party. In this respect, he is in the good company of his Leader and the shadow Minister for industrial trouble-making, the member for Davenport. The other motive is just as

sinister: it is an attempt to deny the Labor Party the financial support of trade unions, to ensure that the Labor Party cannot match the huge sums that the Opposition collects under the counter from big business.

Mr. Mathwin: What do you get?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: We would not get 1 per cent of what members of the Liberal Party are able to obtain from big business in this State and nationally. For the past three years my Party has been attempting to have legislation passed in the Federal Parliament so that people must publicly disclose their political donations, but it is members of the Party of the honourable member for Glenelg who have continually opposed that in both Houses of the Federal Parliament. So, the Labor Party has nothing to hide as regards political contributions. What has the Liberal Party to hide? Bring it out from under the carpet!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The fact that the trade unions are a major source of Labor Party funds is no secret; I do not deny that. Indeed, it is something that we, as part of the industrial labour movement, are proud of. In the Federal Parliament, the Liberal Party and the Country Party would not have a bar of legislation that sought to disclose the source of funds because those Parties have plenty to hide. The hypocrisy of a move to strangle our declared sources of funds while the Liberal and Country Parties accept donations without any scruples from public companies, supposedly controlled by shareholders, is staggering. If the Opposition succeeds (and it will not, of course) in making it impossible for the Labor Party to fight democratic elections, we will not really be the losers; the industrial movement will find other ways to influence change and progress. The loser will be the whole system of Westminster democracy, which will break down if one of the major Parties is eliminated. The honourable member should consider such long-term effects, instead of cashing in on the current fad for union bashing.

I notice that the member for Eyre, who was moving across the Chamber, stopped in his tracks; he must have thought that I was going to talk about him, but he is not that important. I think that every South Australian is at liberty to examine the balance sheets of all trade unions because, under the legislation, the balance sheets are available. Therefore, a person can find out what the political donations will be, because of the union rules.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Mathwin: You can't see them.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Each of the union bashers on the other side has always been able to come in here and produce union rule books, Labor Party rule books, and almost any other evidence. Opposition members can find from the Arbitration Court all the things they are concerned about—

Mr. Mathwin: Not in this State.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: —and they can work out the political donations. I oppose this Bill, because it is a sham and a feeble attempt to break down the source of 99 per cent of the funds of the Labor Party.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I listened with much interest to the honourable member who introduced this Bill and also to the Minister, who has attempted to reply to the member for Glenelg. Frankly, I thought that the Minister did not have his heart in the subject, because, for him, he was speaking very quietly. It seemed that he was trying to play it in low key. He criticised the honourable member who introduced the Bill, and that is his right in

seeking to rebut Opposition arguments. The Minister suggested that the purpose of the Bill was to interfere in the internal affairs of trade unions; actually, that is not intended. This Bill certainly provides for an alteration of rules and, as the member for Glenelg explained, for an improvement in the rights and freedoms of individual union members. Despite what the Minister said, I believe that he may find that, if the Bill were passed, some members of the work force who today are reluctant to join a union might join. The member for Glenelg referred to associations, and I am sure that the Minister knows how wide is the definition of "associations"; it applies to all associations in the South Australian jurisdiction. Of course, the Federal jurisdiction is excluded. Despite the finding in the Hursey case, which is often held as a classic, this Bill seeks to improve the conditions of individual members of associations.

The member for Glenelg seeks to provide a certain amount of freedom for those union members to choose whether or not they will contribute by levy or by sustentation. At present the rules, which have to be approved, provide in 99 per cent of the cases that a certain amount of levy or sustentation fee is paid. The member of a union has no say, in effect, where his contribution to a union is used and how it is used. The member for Glenelg is saying that, if a person joins a union, his normal fees would be payable, but the extra amount (the sustentation fee) is not paid unless that member says so. A certain amount of freedom is being provided for the union member in this regard. It is not a question of union-bashing: far from it. The member for Glenelg is seeking to improve the lot of the ordinary trade unionist.

The Minister has already said that political contributions are necessary for the welfare of the trade unions because of their support for the A.L.P. He said that they were important for the A.L.P., because it would have a vast source of funds tappable at will from which it could get funds for political purposes. The member for Glenelg is saying that the trade union members should have the opportunity to opt in instead of to opt out. He should be allowed to say whether or not he will pay a political levy. I know that difficult situations have occurred in some unions in relation to this, but in many cases unions are prepared to allow some contributions to be made to charities in the case of religious or conscientious beliefs. In 1972 or 1973 a case was put forward whereby those who did not wish to pay sustentation levies could pay money into a separate fund that would be used not necessarily for charitable purposes but possibly for trade union purposes such as education, and it was suggested that two trustees should be elected, Mr. Jim Shannon representing the union and Mr. Colin Branson representing the employers. The bottom suddenly dropped out of that scheme and nothing further was heard of it. Such a scheme, which was to apply only in South Australia, provided for the person who, for religious, conscientious or for other reasons, wanted to be excluded from having to pay a political levy that went against his own conscience.

Obviously, many trade union members have no choice about where their contributions go. If the results of the recent Federal election are any indication, it is obvious that many members of trade unions in this State did not vote for the A.L.P., so in effect they were paying contributions to the unions that effectively went to the A.L.P., a Party they did not support in the ballot-box. The overwhelming vote received by the Fraser Government indicated that a large proportion of that record vote came from members of the trade union movement. I have made

clear over a number of years that I am not a union-basher. I support the principle of trade unions. In speaking in support of the member for Glenelg, I am saying that the individual member of a trade union should have some freedom. At the moment, he is tied, and the Minister should realise (he was trumpeting about it a few moments ago) that he is sticking up for the opting out system. The member for Florey gave the game away only a few weeks ago when he said, "Yes. Down on the waterfront a member has complete liberty to do what he wants. If he wants to opt out, all that happens is that he notifies the secretary and at the next stop-work meeting he will appear down on the wharf and, if he says he wants to opt out, he has to face all the mob." I know where he will finish up—in the drink! How is that for freedom?

The Minister had something to say just now in reply to an interjection regarding balance sheets of trade unions. The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972, has something to say about this. It states:

The Registrar or any officer of the court or the commission shall not—

I wish the Minister would listen to this—

except by direction of the President divulge to any person other than an officer of a registered association the name of any member of that association or the financial position of that association.

Mr. Mathwin: That's right; that's it, Jack.

Mr. CUMBE: The penalty is \$50.

Mr. Mathwin: But you can't get any information on this.

Mr. CUMBE: The Minister raised this point when he was talking about the balance sheets of unions, because he gave the House to understand that the balance sheets of the unions were freely available. He should know that legitimate approaches have been made to the Registrar in the past but, under that clause, he has refused to produce the balance sheet of a trade union, yet the Minister said just now that they were freely available. They are not.

There should not be any huff or puff about the Bill; it is quite simple. It is not union-bashing, but it seeks to improve and give increased freedom of choice to an individual member of a trade union. I repeat what I said just now, that a number of people in the community could, with advantage to themselves, become members of a trade union, but they are reluctant to do so. Some are reluctant because of the political levy or the sustentation fee to which they would be subjected, and it is possible, in my view, that, if a provision such as this was passed, that opposition could dissolve and the trade union movement *in toto* would find it had more members, because I do not think any person joining a trade union would object to the fee payable for membership of a union where that fee was used for the betterment of its own members and the running and proper conduct of that union. The objection arises in regard to that segment of the money paid by contribution which is a political levy or a sustentation fee and it is that segment that this Bill is dealing with, and nothing else. I support the contention of the honourable member that this Bill seeks to enable opting in and opting out. Having said that, I support the comments of the honourable member.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I have been invited to participate in this debate because of the comments made by the Minister about the availability of certain material to any person in the community, subject of course to going through the correct channels. The member for Torrens has pointed out clearly the aspects of that matter as they are enunciated in the Bill; but, as the Minister, from his comments, is obviously in a position to obtain and provide

this information, I invite him, between now and the next time this matter is debated in the House, to obtain for me, and present to me, so that the matter can be duly discussed in this House, the balance sheet of the Storemen and Packers Union going back over the preceding five years. Further, I should like the Minister, for the same period of time (the preceding five years), to obtain and to present to me the balance sheet of the Federated Rubber and Allied Workers Union of Australia (South Australian Branch), listed in the telephone directory as being located at 9 Melbury Street, Elizabeth West.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Would you like balance sheets of the Vehicle Builders Union as well?

Dr. EASTICK: No; I am content. I am not a greedy person. By all means, should the Minister or anybody else opposite be prepared to make available to me any other balance sheet of any other union, I would be completely happy to receive it. I have shown an interest in the matter previously. I have had some documents presented to me over a period of time, but specifically on the invitation of the Minister in this place today, I ask him to use his good offices to obtain for me the documents I have mentioned. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

WATER RESOURCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 18. Page 716.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the Bill, which is a clear-cut measure. I do not know what the Minister's attitude will be but, in essence, the Bill seeks to bring some realism into the situation. In the second reading explanation, the following was pointed out:

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

The Act, as members will no doubt recall, passed this House quite recently. I understand that a similar provision was contained in the previous Act and that the unsatisfactory position of that Act has been recreated in the new Act. It has come to light as a result of an appeal by G. H. Michell and Sons (Australia) Proprietary Limited against a Ministerial decision not to allow access to the underground water supply in the area in which that company's factory has been established. Under the Act, and indeed under the previous Act, under the provisions of which the appeal was lodged, the appeal tribunal found in favour of the company; it determined that, under the terms of the legislation, the Engineering and Water Supply Department had not made out a case to refuse supply to the Michell organisation.

I am not *au fait* with all the detail of the argument, but it revolved generally around the depletion of the underground water supply. The appellant won its case; the department was not able to convince the appeal tribunal that the appeal should be disallowed, and the appeal was upheld. As a result of a Ministerial decision, the decision of the appeal tribunal was overridden. That would seem to me, and indeed to any observer, a completely ludicrous situation. It reminds one of the situation with the department in the case of the Ombudsman. I raise this point simply to draw attention to the similarity of the two situations, realising, of course, that the Ombudsman is not mentioned in the Bill. The situation arose early in his career—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He was wrong.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I should like to refer to that decision.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You can refer to what you like, but he was wrong.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is the Minister's opinion.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It was proved conclusively in this House that he was absolutely wrong.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is not my view, but perhaps I missed some of the Minister's argument during the course of the debate in the House. I have read the relevant Cabinet determination on which the Ombudsman's decision was made and, because of the similarities, I ask for your indulgence, Sir, to enable me to refer to that case. I refer to the report of the Ombudsman for 1973-74, and, in Appendix F, I quote from the portion headed "Cabinet Policy". The matter concerned a complaint from Mr. B. T. Kennedy about a departmental decision not to grant him a water licence which had been applicable to a property he had bought. The report states:

On December 9, 1968, Cabinet approved a policy whereby, on transfer of ownership of a property on which there existed a current water licence, the application for a new water licence by the new owner or occupier should be considered in the light of the type and extent of plantings at the time of the proposed transfer. Where the area is not developed to the full entitlement the licence should be reduced to cover the developed area.

Subsequently, another Cabinet policy was adopted. The report continues:

However, this policy was changed in 1969. The relevant Cabinet decision governing the issue of water licences at the time Mr. Kennedy's application was made was formulated on May 29, 1969, as a result of Cabinet consideration of a minute from the then Minister of Works in the following terms:

The present practice of transferring annual licences is that in the event of the ownership of land changing, the existing licence is automatically cancelled. Normally a new licence is issued, upon application, to the new owner or lessee only for an equivalent amount of plantings in existence at the time of the property transfer, irrespective of the acreage approved in the original licence. This practice has led to a number of cases of considerable hardship occurring, caused by drops in the valuation of properties only partially covered by a licence. I recommend that approval be given to the Minister of Works to transfer licences to the full amount of acreage contained in a current licence upon property transfers where he thinks it proper.

On June 9, 1969, the Cabinet decision and new policy were promulgated in the press. This Cabinet decision was current at the time Mr. Kennedy's complaint arose.

The report goes on to explain what the department did, and I should like to complete this illustration. Under the heading "Departmental instruction", the report states:

On October 20, 1970, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. H. L. Beaney) issued an internal departmental administrative instruction wherein he directed officers that recommendations to the Minister should suggest that the discretion of the Minister be used to refuse transfer of water licences where there was no evidence of development of existing licences.

It seems to me that that is contrary to the Cabinet decision published in the press; indeed, that was the interpretation of the Ombudsman. I do not think I need read further.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Go right through the whole thing. I do not think it has anything to do with it, but go right through it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will. The report continues:

To me such an instruction appeared incompatible with the Cabinet decision of May 29, 1969, but the Director saw no inconsistency. Be that as it may, it was common ground that the governing Cabinet decision, irrespective of differing interpretations, was the decision which was made on May 29, 1969.

I agree entirely, on reading that part of the Ombudsman's report, that, if one is to put any sort of meaning on the Cabinet decision, the instruction was inconsistent with the Cabinet direction. The Cabinet decision (and that was the relevant decision) was perfectly clear. The Minister is getting rather testy about this, so I shall not continue with this reference. The Ombudsman's office was established to adjudicate in disputes, and this was a case where he came down in favour of a complainant. The department was not happy with the decision, the Minister backed up the department, and he carried Cabinet with him.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I didn't do it simply because of the department. I did it because the Ombudsman was wrong.

The SPEAKER: Order! We must not get into discussion about the Ombudsman. I think the honourable member has made his point in relation to the matter under discussion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not believe that the Minister or the department is infallible. On my reading of the evidence, the Ombudsman's statement that the administrative instruction from the department was incompatible with the Cabinet recommendation makes sense. I have mentioned that to illustrate that I believe the inconsistency is far greater and the situation is far worse when we consider the appeal tribunal established under the provisions of the Water Resources Act Amendment Bill. Here is a case where an appeal tribunal can make a decision that can be overruled by the Minister. That makes a complete farce of any appeal tribunal. It would be far better not to have such a tribunal if the public (or a company, as in this case) could go to the expense of appearing before the appeal tribunal, spending money on an appeal and winning it, only to have the tribunal's decision cast aside by Ministerial or Cabinet direction. It makes a complete farce of the idea of an independent appeal tribunal that sits astride the legislation to safeguard the appellant's rights. It creates a situation whereby the Minister or Cabinet can be a complete dictator, so that there is no point in anyone's appealing. That situation has come to light as a result of a successful appeal that was quashed by the Government. The case to which I referred earlier was that of G. H. Michell and Sons, which applied to drill a well at its company site at Salisbury South. Having made application, it was refused in May, 1972, and it successfully won an appeal in January, 1973.

The appeal board found that a case had not been made for undue depletion of the underground water supply—that being the only ground on which the Crown objected. It was then found that, although the appeal board found in the company's favour, the Minister was not required to alter his decision. It was really this case that brought the whole matter to a head. The views of other concerned people in this area were sought. The South Australian Fruit-growers and Market Gardeners Association was contacted, and it completely supported the point of view which the company had adopted. It said, in answer, that the governing council of its associations had discussed the proposed amendment to the Act (the Act which we are now proposing and which was prepared by the Hon. Mr. Burdett) and was in full agreement that the Minister should comply with any direction given by the tribunal. The common sense of the Bill is obvious, and I hope that the Government is willing to accept it.

If the Minister believed that there was a case that there would be a depletion of the underground water resources in the area (and no-one is denying that the department

is charged with the responsibility of looking after underground water resources), all I can say is that the department should have mounted a better case in answer to the Michell appeal. If the department is simply sweating off, knowing that the Minister can quash the recommendation, the whole business is a complete and utter farce. Either the Minister or this Parliament decides whether there will be an appeal tribunal or whether it will be knocked out. It is obvious that, to expect members of the public to appeal, to brief counsel, and to pay legal fees without any assurance that, having won the appeal, they will be able to proceed, makes a complete shambles of the whole appeal procedure. The Minister must surely acknowledge this fact. If he believed that there was a case for refusal on the ground that it would have depleted the underground water supply, it is incumbent on the department to prove that to the satisfaction of the appeal tribunal, but it did not do that in this case. The department cannot just stand up and say that everyone is wrong. The Minister claims (I do not know whether the department did) that the Ombudsman was wrong, but does he now claim that the appeal tribunal was wrong?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There were many times when I never said they were wrong.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister may reply in due course, but it makes a complete farce of an appeal tribunal if he expects members of the public to pay money to appeal, and then have the appeal quashed by the Minister. It would be better not to have an appeal tribunal.

Mr. Arnold: At least the public would know where they stood.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course. It is a complete sham to have a tribunal whose findings are incapable of standing. For this reason, I support the Bill.

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

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Arnold:

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

(Continued from August 18. Page 716.)

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I listened while the member for Chaffey moved his motion and I have examined the various points he made. Unquestionably, in any State such as South Australia, if it is at all economically feasible there should be a pay-roll tax rebate that would help to decentralise industry. There can be no doubt that the various examples which the honourable member gave in respect of the Riverland, the canning industry, the wine industry, and other examples would substantiate that proposition. Furthermore, as the honourable member said quite correctly, such a programme has been operating in Victoria under the Hamer Administration since 1973, and the present New South Wales Government is on record in its pre-election platform as promising a similar measure. The difficulty with the motion is that members will know that the Government has already announced certain pay-roll tax rebates and has foreshadowed incentives of this kind.

Mr. Russack: That's only over 12 months, instead of over six months.

Mr. McRAE: Yes, but as a matter of machinery the Treasurer, with whom I spoke personally a few minutes ago, told me that there is a committee of inquiry into the area to which the member for Chaffey has referred. In those circumstances, the Treasurer has delegated me to say that, in his view, the motion may be a little premature. I would not want members to misunderstand that, because there is no prejudging the results of the inquiry that may be able to assist the Berri area, about which the honourable member is concerned. With that in mind, I seek leave to continue my remarks in the hope that the next time this matter is before the House more concrete facts and figures will be available.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PRE-SCHOOL TEACHERS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mrs. Byrne:

That this House express its satisfaction with the present Commonwealth 75 per cent funding arrangements for pre-school teachers' salaries and approved support expenditure. It notes with concern recent statements attributed to spokesmen for the Commonwealth Government to the effect that this arrangement will be renegotiated, and calls upon the Commonwealth Government to adhere to the existing system, or if it finds this proposition unattractive to at least make funds for childhood services available to the States on a block-grant basis which would be consistent with its much vaunted Federalism policy.

(Continued from September 8. Page 899.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): Last week I commented briefly on this motion and expressed the view that any decision in this area at this stage could be hasty and that it might be wise to wait and see the full implications and effect of whatever moves are made. I still hold that view and express the feeling that it would be desirable not to continue with the motion at this stage. As I see no benefit in debating it at length now, I am pleased to leave further comment to other members.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): I support the motion so ably moved by my colleague the member for Tea Tree Gully. With so many election promises already broken by the Commonwealth Government, it is not difficult to share the honourable member's concern and the concern of all other members on this side about the issue.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Just enumerate all these election promises that have been broken.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ABBOTT: I think they have been enumerated in this House often previously. The fact that the Federal Government has stated its intention to renegotiate the current funding basis for the salaries of pre-school staff throughout the country does not mean that we should sit quietly and await the outcome. That is why the member for Tea Tree Gully has expressed satisfaction with the existing formula.

The member for Fisher has suggested that we should wait to see what may be the result of any discussions. He asks whether the funding arrangements will be any worse or whether they will be improved. Opposition members may have confidence in the Prime Minister, but I can assure them that we on this side have no confidence in him or in his Ministers who are responsible for what has happened. We can agree on one thing, namely, that the Federal Government is being consistent in cutting back Government

expenditure, and this cutting back will have a drastic effect on the great programmes of social reform introduced by the former Labor Government.

If anyone thinks for a moment that the funding arrangements and the approved support expenditure for pre-school staff will mean that the support will be better, they are only kidding themselves. A typical example of the ruthless destruction of numerous programmes and achievements is the Federal Government's recent announcement to withdraw medical cover for hundreds of State wards, including those in schools for the handicapped, under its revised Medibank scheme.

As a result of this announcement, the New South Wales Minister for Youth and Community Services (Mr. R. Jackson) told the New South Wales Parliament, as reported in the *News* of September 9, that deaf, blind and crippled children would suffer. Mr. Jackson stated that the Prime Minister (Mr. Fraser) had said that the Federal Government would no longer accept responsibility for the treatment of these under-privileged and unfortunate children. The Minister also stated that the New South Wales Government had been placed in a position where it would have to insure each child in its care, or see the children go without medical cover. This, he said, was a national disgrace.

It is because of this kind of action that the member for Tea Tree Gully has moved the motion, which I wholeheartedly support. I support it also because my district possibly will be affected more than others if the salaries of pre-school staff are reduced from the present 75 per cent to 50 per cent. About 30 per cent of the children who attend the Mansfield Park pre-school come from single-parent homes. Good work is being done at that pre-school, and the chopping off or reduction of these funds will be a bitter blow to the families in those areas. Members will be aware that our Minister of Education found it necessary, only yesterday, to make a public statement to clarify certain aspects of funding support for childhood services facilities.

The State Government directly meets the short-fall between actual staff salaries and the 75 per cent contribution made by the Commonwealth Government. It also provides finance to meet basic branch operating expenses. This is in accordance with this State Government's pre-election promise, and the Government recognises the need to cater for the educational, social and caring needs of the whole age range of young children and their parents. Thankfully, my Government does not break election promises.

An excellent report was forwarded to me by the Principal of the Kilkenny Experimental Non-Graded Primary School on June 15 last on priority project progress. The report was sent to me so that I could better appreciate what the staff of that school was doing to try to give the community value for money. It deals with various stages of the priority project progress at that school, and the stages deal with the following matters:

- (1) The transition of a traditional school to a modified non-graded school.
- (2) The appointment of teachers of English as a second language.
- (3) The reduction of class sizes.
- (4) The appointment of teacher aides.
- (5) The appointment of bilingual teachers.
- (6) The development of music, dance, drama, art and craft programmes.
- (7) Continuity of interests of staff.
- (8) Continuous intake on fifth birthday.
- (9) Pre-school programme and pre-school teachers.
- (10) Fund raising.
- (11) School visitors.

- (12) Visits out.
- (13) Publicity.
- (14) Celebrations of national days or matters of importance.
- (15) Greek, Italian and Yugoslav councils.

Regarding the pre-school programme and pre-school teachers, stage (9), the Principal of the school states:

This school first sought pre-school facilities in 1970. After a long struggle with the Minister over Government policy, the pre-school was ultimately established in a converted house in 1974. Mrs. Elix and Mrs. Braunsthal have been the first teachers and both have performed capably. The pre-school programme based on continuous entry at age four has afforded long-needed opportunities for younger children to have experiences in socialisation, language development, manipulative development, music, dance and so on. This complements entry to the school on fifth birthday. Mrs. Braunsthal, in particular, has done much in involving herself with parents, in organising parent evenings, in organising working bees, in visiting homes. She has visited homes with the following aides: Mrs. Riggall, Mrs. Krashos, Mrs. Krantis, Mrs. Castello, and Mrs. Franz (the pre-school aide). Others will be involved as the visits continue. The establishment of the pre-school has seen the fulfilment of one of the schools prized goals and we are glad we were one of the first seven schools to have a pre-school in South Australia.

The Principal's interest in pre-schools is shown by his membership on the State Pre-school Committee from 1973 to 1976. The Principal's final summary headed "Pre-school" states:

Given the 75/25 per cent funding arrangements established by the previous Commonwealth Government and being continued by the present Federal Government, it appears that the school will have to be engaged in an expansion of its services and activities within the pre-school to cover such matters as play groups, occasional half-day and full-day child-care facilities, toy library, book library and a host of other activities associated with the pre-school. It is obvious that not only more staff, but more building development will be required. This is so notwithstanding the exhortations of the Prime Minister and Senator Guilfoyle that all these additional services should be carried out at minimum cost, that is, without staff or building development. It will be virtually impossible to introduce and carry out the programmes without more finance, more staff and more building development unless the intention is to cause the pre-school programme virtually to come to a halt.

I congratulate the member for Tea Tree Gully on moving the motion and have much pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): The Opposition supports in principle this motion. Members on this side are concerned, as the honourable member is concerned, to know precisely what the present on-going policy will be regarding kindergarten and pre-school funding as we now know it. The Child Care Act under which this money is made available was introduced in 1972, by the then Liberal-Country Party Coalition Government. During the interval since 1972, increasing sums have been spent in this area. In 1972-73 the sum spent was \$500 000, in 1973-74 the sum was \$8 600 000, in 1974-75 it was \$44 860 000, and it was \$64 000 000 last financial year. Despite what has been said about funds being cut off, the sum allocated in this year's Commonwealth Budget is \$73 300 000.

The controversy is really over whose responsibility it is for pre-school education. The Commonwealth Government says that it will not take over the total responsibility for pre-school education because it is a State responsibility. The Commonwealth Government now intends contributing to other services that it believes are essential in the total child-care context, services such as full day care, occasional emergency care, holiday and outside school hours care, as well as pre-school support from group services for children. As far as the Commonwealth is concerned, the

concept (and it was indeed the principle that was behind funding by the Whitlam Labor Government towards pre-school children) is for child-care services in the broadest sense.

I well recall that two years ago Pinnaroo was fortunate to receive a grant to enable it to build a child-care centre. The town was waiting for a subsidy under the existing State subsidy scheme at that time and was fortunate that a child-care centre was built. The terms and conditions of the grant were that the building was to be used as a kindergarten and that it would be available for other purposes. Those conditions were laid down in policy by the Whitlam Government. Nothing new is being proposed now. I do not believe there has been a confidence trick in anything that has been said.

The member for Tea Tree Gully suggested that the Fraser Government did not carry on the existing programme that was outlined by the Whitlam Government. On January 1 this year the present Commonwealth Government agreed to continue to fund pre-school education on the same basis as that which existed before to provide 75 per cent of the wages and salaries paid to pre-school teachers and to provide other additional funds on an agreed basis. On June 2, 1976, the following question by Mr. Sainsbury was asked in the House of Representatives:

Has the Government yet made a decision on the future of the Children's Commission?

Earlier funding was done under the aegis of an interim committee for the Children's Commission, which has never been confirmed. The Prime Minister replied to Mr. Sainsbury as follows:

Yes. A decision has been made not to proclaim the Act. The Prime Minister was referring to an Act relating to the Children's Commission. He continued:

We believe that it is more appropriate for an Office of Child care to be established under the Minister for Social Security, as part of the Department of Social Security. It will be a separate office with its own Director. The philosophy of the Government in relation to child care will be to see that the funds which the Commonwealth makes available provide facilities for child care for those who need it, especially for single parent families.

Opposition members are concerned about the welfare of people in necessitous circumstances; single-parent families where the parent works. That is the sort of example that has been causing concern, and has also been of concern in other States, because the Federal Government has been lobbied as far as funds are concerned. The Prime Minister's concern was that 75 per cent to 80 per cent of the funds provided by the Commonwealth were not being spent in the general area of child care to help these people but, instead, were being spent to pay salaries to pre-school teachers and that that was not really, as he contended, an area of total responsibility of the Commonwealth Government, which believed it had a much wider responsibility to fund than salaries. This is what the member for Tea Tree Gully has referred to.

I understand that the South Australian Minister of Education is in a better position to confirm that matter than I am. I hope he will do that when he replies, by saying that it is true that funds being provided for pre-school education are being renegotiated. It has been suggested that instead of supporting the salary ratio of 75 per cent to 25 per cent the ratio may be reduced to 50 per cent for each Government; however, a hard policy has not been stated in that regard. I have been led to believe, in discussions I have had with the authorities, that there is every reason for each State to be treated separately in relation to funding in this area.

There is a great need for child-minding centres in other States where problems are experienced with families living in high-rise buildings, and where the children of Australian and migrant families need care and attention while their parents are working. These sorts of pressure are greater in industrial areas in other States than they are in places like South Australia, where most kindergartens are in Adelaide or our major country towns. We have made a few mistakes, and I hope the member for Whyalla will excuse me if I say that a mistake has been made at this stage, anyway, in the construction of the child-care centre at Whyalla. That was built, at great expense, to provide child-minding facilities. There is another centre at Port Augusta, of which the member for Stuart would be aware. However, these centres may not be used fully for the purpose for which they were constructed. Although another use may perhaps be found for them, the pattern of occupation has changed. The demand at that time was for child-minding centres.

Mr. Max Brown: That could be debatable.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am informed reliably that the demand for these centres has fallen to a point where, had the need for them been assessed at present, approval would not have been given to proceed with them.

Mr. Max Brown: But if the amenity is provided, perhaps—

Mr. NANKIVELL: The amenity is provided, but capital is tied up to provide something which, at this stage, is not in the sort of demand that once existed. This is what happens when something specific like this is constructed. I understand that such a centre was also constructed at Nangwarry, because many of the wives of the forest workers in that district worked in a certain factory there and some provision had to be made to mind children while their mothers were working. However, the industry for which those mothers were working has now closed and the mothers are back at home looking after their children. The problem is that we have provided a specialist facility that may not have a purpose. Unless we have high-density industrial areas in which we can be sure of this sort of need, the situation that obtains in South Australia in this respect is probably the best situation that we can have in relation to this State's needs. If we do not need that sort of child-care facility, our kindergarten and pre-school systems meet adequately the needs of this section of the community.

I believe that, when the Minister puts this sort of case to the Commonwealth authorities when negotiating next year's financial arrangements, this point will be recognised. The Minister's statement, which was a good one, stressed the situation in South Australia. Although we have these kindergartens, they will not be funded purely and simply as teaching units, as they have been in the past. However, if the people who operate them are willing to organise a wider spread of service for child care in all areas, there is no reason why they should not attract the same sort of funding in the future as they have attracted in the past. They will not, I understand, attract this sort of funding if they stay in their present situation as teaching organisations or institutions only. If they are teaching children, it is strictly an educational area. However, if they are providing other facilities, it is a child-care, child-minding area. It is in that area that the Commonwealth is willing to find funds.

I therefore believe that a compromise is possible in South Australia, and that this will be put forward by the Minister in his negotiations. I hope that, in representations made in support of this contention, this State's funding arrangements will not be jeopardised as a result of any statement that

has been made to date. I hope that the money will be made available to us either by a direct block grant, as the honourable member has suggested might be possible under our federal system of funding, or by continuing to fund the present system on an approved basis: that, where kindergartens or pre-school centres are providing a wide breadth of child-care facilities and are not involved in a specific area of child teaching only, they will continue to attract in future funds that they have attracted in the past.

I believe that this will happen, and I will support the Minister in any representations he makes along those lines in relation to pre-school child care in South Australia. Although I felt a little hurt by the way in which the motion was worded in a couple of places, I will not be thin-skinned about that. The Opposition believes the federalism policy is something to be proud of: it is accepted that it is our much vaunted policy. We hope to prove that it will work effectively in this area, as it will in others. I support the motion and seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Second reading.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes two important changes to voting for the Legislative Council: first, in the method of voting and, secondly, in the manner in which the votes so cast are counted. One may well ask the question, in a voting system that elects members from a State-wide electorate, with every person over the age of 18 years voting, why it could be anything else but one vote one value. The present system of voting, which allows a group polling 48.5 per cent of the vote to gain 54.5 per cent of the elected members, cannot be said to be a system providing for one vote one value, while the groups polling 51.5 per cent of the vote elect 45.5 per cent of members.

In the existing Legislative Council, this is what the voting system has brought about, because certain of the electors did not have their preferences taken into account. The method of voting in the present Act provides for a vote for a group, preselected by a political Party, which the voter cannot change. Any system that denies the voter the right to vote for a person if he so desires is not totally democratic.

The amendment allows a voter to vote for persons of his choice. The amending Bill provides that a voter shall vote for one more person than the number required to be elected. For example, if 11 are to be elected, a voter would be required to express his choice from one to 12, but may continue his preference further if he so desires. The second change that this Bill makes is that every vote cast will be counted, as the voter expresses that vote.

Under the existing Act, an elector may express a preference but, having expressed that preference, in most cases is denied the right to have that preference counted. There can be no support for such a voting system, where an elector is permitted to express a preference or preferences but, having expressed it, is denied the right to have that preference counted. The existing system of voting and of counting votes introduces what has been described as a mathematical gerrymander. The amendments remove these mathematical gerrymander factors from the existing Act and produce, as near as practicable in a voting system, one vote one value, by allowing all preferences to be taken into account.

Clause 1 is formal. Clauses 2 and 3 dispose with the group voting system and allow a voter to vote for an individual candidate. Clause 4 defines an informal vote under the new system as a vote that does not express a first preference vote and consecutive preferences of other candidates equal to one more than the candidates required. Clause 5 spells out how the votes will be counted, following precisely the method in a Senate election and in the Hare-Clark system in Tasmanian elections. Clause 6 amends the fourth schedule.

In commending this Bill to all members, I sincerely hope that the Government will support it, because a system that allows a minority to elect a majority is undemocratic. As that can happen under the present system, that system is not fair. The Labor Party for many years in this State has always favoured the principle of majority rule, and this Bill will bring about that situation. If the Government does not support the Bill, it will completely express to the people of this State that it does not believe in the majority of people electing the majority of members to the Upper House. I seek the support of all members for this Bill.

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

INFLATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Goldsworthy:

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

(Continued from August 18. Page 901.)

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): Last Wednesday I was discussing this excellent motion so ably moved by the Deputy Leader, but I had not detailed the number of promises that the present Commonwealth Government has kept. It is only nine months since that Government was elected by an overwhelming majority of the people of this country, after they had been given the opportunity by the Governor-General's decision. The people have elected a competent Government, which has considered the welfare of all the people of this nation. Let us consider some of the things that the present Federal Government has done. I have received from the Prime Minister's office a screed outlining the many beneficial actions it has taken.

Mr. Max Brown: Why not look at the Aboriginal problem?

Mr. GUNN: Yesterday, I communicated with Mr. Viner's office concerning a project in my district. A deputa-tion from Coober Pedy visited Canberra and met Mr. Viner. This group organised itself, and I do not know whether it spoke to Mr. Wallis, but it was concerned that the Commonwealth Government would not provide funds to establish an area that the South Australian Museum may use at Coober Pedy. Today I received a telegram from Mr. Viner stating that funds would be available: that is an example of the responsible attitude that the present Commonwealth Government is adopting. Any worthwhile project will be funded if it is in the interests of the total community, and the Coober Pedy project will benefit local people as well as the South Australian Museum. I point out that the South Australian Government handed over responsibility for Aboriginal affairs to the Commonwealth, and I opposed that move.

The present Commonwealth Government promised before last year's election that it would get the economy moving again: it has treated inflation as a first priority in order to get people back to work, and the Budget was designed accordingly, so that both consumer demand and national production began to grow again in the first half of 1976. Major new development projects have been undertaken: for example, the \$76 000 000 Ford expansion in Victoria. Also, in order to help the economy, it has halted any increase in the Government share of the gross domestic product, and clear foreign investment guidelines, equitable to all parties, have been adopted. The Federal Government has given specific help to business to provide jobs; it introduced an investment allowance, initially at 40 per cent, which has been criticised by Mr. Hurford, the Labor spokesman; it relaxed conditions under which interest on convertible notes is deductible; and it has suspended quarterly tax payments for the duration of the crisis. It promised to introduce stock valuation adjustments in line with the recommendations of the Mathews report, and 50 per cent has been introduced with a full implementation before the term is finished. Its promise to increase the retention allowance for private companies has been completed; depreciation allowances are under study. The Federal Government has followed a consistent economic policy with common sense and in the interests of the whole nation.

The Federal Government intervened in the wage case to ensure that national economic objectives were considered, and supported wage indexation agreements. It has promised to abolish the Prices Justification Tribunal, and this matter is being considered. Also, that Government promised to examine the mass of Labor imposed rules and regulations and abandon those that damaged prosperity and jobs. That will be a long and difficult task because there are so many. The Government promised to end the secret tax rip-off caused by Labor's inflation, and it has already introduced full personal tax indexation. The Government promised to pay special attention to the disadvantaged and those in need, and the family allowance scheme helps most of the 300 000 low-income families with 800 000 children who were not able to benefit fully from previous arrangements. I wonder whether the Labor Party opposes such a scheme. The Government has increased the handicapped child allowance, and has increased the tax exemption where an estate passes between husband and wife. The Government promised to maintain and improve Medibank, and to help single-income families.

Mr. Harrison: We have been doing that for a long time.

Mr. GUNN: That would be the third speech of the honourable member, by way of interjection. Let us consider industrial relations. The Government promised secret ballots for office bearers under the supervision of the Electoral Office, and legislation was introduced with effect from August 9, so that ballots will be conducted by the Commonwealth Electoral Office and paid for by the Commonwealth. Unions that chose to conduct their own secret postal ballots may do so at their own expense. This move is long overdue, and has been requested by most Australians, so that they will not be held to ransom by union gangsters and communist union officials who have no desire to look after the welfare of the workers of this State; all they want is to promote trouble and chaos, and destroy the economic system and society of this country as we know it today. This action is long overdue. The Labor Party did not have the courage to act but, as usual, the Liberal Party has introduced legislation which is in the interests of the nation.

Mr. Max Brown: Do you believe what you are reading?

Mr. GUNN: I certainly do. The document, under the heading "Effective Government", states that the Liberal Party promised to economise in Government spending and improve administrative efficiency; the result has been that administrative machinery has been established to review spending. There was no review of spending or economic planning under the Labor Government. Another result of the Liberal Party's promises is that immediate cuts in Government spending of \$60 000 000 were announced in January, and further cuts of \$300 000 000 were announced in February. Of course, the aim of those cuts was simple. About 75 per cent of the people employed in this country are employed by the private sector. Therefore, if we are to reduce unemployment and control inflation we have to get the private sector moving.

The private sector bore the brunt of the Whitlam Government's socialist policies, because that Government set out to destroy the private sector, and it just about succeeded in doing so. The Liberal Party, on behalf of the Australian people, will again revitalise the private sector, so that everyone, from the workers up, will benefit. The rural industries have laid the foundations of the tremendous growth achieved in this country, and I refer particularly to the growth achieved under the Menzies Government, Rural industries and country people were singled out for special attack by the Labor Party.

Mr. Abbott: That is not correct.

Mr. GUNN: It is correct. The Labor Party deliberately set out to punish country people because they have a tradition of never supporting the Labor Party. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 5.59 to 7.30 p.m.]

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prices Act, 1948-1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This short Bill has two objects: first, it provides for a change of name of the Commissioner responsible for the administration of the principal Act, the Prices Act, 1948, as amended, from the South Australian Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs. It is felt that this new description more accurately expresses the functions of the Commissioner; and secondly, it effects the annual renewal of the price-fixing powers of the Commissioner. Clause 1 is formal. Clauses 2 and 3 effect the change in name adverted to. Clause 4 amends section 53 of the principal Act by extending for 12 months from December 31, 1976, the price-fixing powers of the Commissioner.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 14. Page 1013.)

Mr WOTTON (Heysen): Last evening, I spoke of some of the effects of the State Budget and referred to some of the criticism being thrown at the Fraser Government and the Fraser Budget.

Mr. Gunn: Most unjustified.

Mr. WOTTON: Most unjustified. I should like now to go through the Treasurer's Financial Statement, and to make a few observations. Under the heading "Summary of Major Financial Factors", the document states:

In looking at the major financial factors which influenced this 1976-77 Revenue Budget, the most important is the financial policy of the Commonwealth Government and the ill effects flowing from that policy.

I should like to look at some of the so-called ill effects flowing from the Commonwealth Government's financial policy, or the Lynch Budget. One of the first things we read is that the Commonwealth policy papers ignore the present plight of the building and construction industry. I should like to look more closely at the situation of that industry. The Federal Government is supposed to have completely neglected the industry, but the Fraser Government has introduced home savings grants to assist buyers of first homes in bridging the deposit gap. The scheme was the subject of an election promise. It has been introduced since the election, and it is more generous than had been originally promised. The Commonwealth Government, which is alleged to have ignored the building and construction industry, has introduced a home loan interest deduction scheme, which is working now on a more effective basis than was previously the case.

On the State scene, it is well known that Liberal Party policy is to encourage people, particularly young people, to own their own houses. We appreciate the importance of families being able to live in their own dwellings and own their own piece of Australia. It is much better for a family existence. We appreciate the importance of people being able to live as individuals, rather than *en masse*, and being able to use their imagination in setting up their homes and their blocks, rather than living in stereotyped accommodation or flats. As a Party, we have advocated the importance of research into cheaper forms of building materials. Those who visited the Royal Show recently would have been impressed by the many new forms of building materials introduced this year, some in the form of transportable houses.

Mr. Evans: Relocatable houses.

Mr. WOTTON: Relocatable houses. Where previously some of these buildings were rather shabby, they are now impressive structures. The material from which they are built is much cheaper, and it is easier for people, especially young people, to obtain one and create for themselves a house of their own.

The Commonwealth Government is blamed for the waiting list of more than three years for Housing Trust rental accommodation. I do not believe that that situation is worse now than it was under the Whitlam Government. Housing Trust houses have been subject to a waiting list for many years. I have said in this House many times, and the member for Fisher, as shadow Minister for Housing, has also said, that we need an investigation into this aspect of Housing Trust accommodation. Housing Trust rental accommodation was provided especially for under-privileged people, those who needed cheaper accommodation, and we must look seriously into the matter to find out what is going wrong, because many people who can well afford to build their own accommodation or take alternative accommodation are now living in Housing Trust houses.

We must look into this to ensure that accommodation is provided for the disadvantaged, for those in need, as was originally intended.

The disadvantaged are the subject of comment in the Financial Statement. The Federal Government has expanded child endowment payments into family allowance schemes to help low-income families. We have seen an increase in an allowance for handicapped children and an increased handicapped children's benefit, and the Federal Government has introduced a three-year programme, to cost \$121 000 000, for handicapped people. The work of the Fraser Government in this matter is to be commended.

Mr. Keneally: Do you realise that this is Adelaide and not Canberra? This is the South Australian House of Assembly.

Mr. WOTTON: I am about to refer to the State scene.

Dr. Eastick: The honourable member is an international traveller.

Mr. WOTTON: He has not been back in South Australia long enough to find out about the Budget. On the State scene, the disadvantaged and those in need are fairly well catered for, but a certain group is still in great need. I am aware, for example, of the situation of totally dependent people. Many members may be aware that an association was formed recently to look into the matter of care for totally dependent people. I was fortunate enough to be at the inaugural meeting, and I was most interested to learn of the plight in which many totally dependent people find themselves. We heard examples of elderly parents looking after totally dependent adult children, who at a mature age were still totally dependent. There is a great need for more nursing care and beds to be made available to look after these people, in particular.

Reference is also made in the document to what the State Government is doing regarding succession duties. As I commented on this matter last evening, I will not comment further, except to say that the State Government has presented this matter as a glossy package deal which has solved the emotional problems, particularly between spouses. However, we need to go even further and extend it to business enterprises and properties handed down from generation to generation. The Federal Government has increased tax exemptions on estates passing from husband to wife, and it has introduced a special \$50 000 deduction on estates passing between spouses. No duty is payable on estates of up to \$90 000 where the estate passes wholly to the surviving spouse, and in the case of a primary producing estate the sum is fixed at \$98 000.

Reference is made in the statement to the fact that the grant from the Commonwealth Government under the community health scheme is expected to increase from \$2 400 000 to \$4 300 000, and that a total of \$5 100 000 has been made available to the State for 1976-77 in the form of a block grant to cover capital and recurrent costs. The point is made that most of the costs will be taken out of the operating expenses of Government and non-Government hospitals and the opening of the new Flinders Medical Centre. I am sure that all members and, indeed, all people in the community are aware of the exceptionally good services provided in South Australian public hospitals, such as the Royal Adelaide, the Adelaide Children's, and the Flinders Medical Centre. Although Flinders has not yet been completed, signs are that it will be of great benefit to this State. The expertise of the staff and the research now being carried out both in the Royal Adelaide and in the Adelaide Children's are the envy of many other Australian public hospitals.

The Fraser Government has increased age pensions automatically in line with price increases; the necessary legislation will be introduced soon, and I believe that it is extremely fair. Although it has been rubbished about housing the elderly, the Federal Government has introduced a three-year programme for aged persons' homes and hostels, at a cost of about \$225 000 000. The Whitlam Government was willing to throw finance left, right and centre. Much of that finance went, for example, into the setting up of a few elderly citizens' buildings, so that we now find that many elderly citizens' clubs, in particular, want to be given the same treatment. The situation under the Whitlam Government was very much like the case of the parent who hands out toys to his children on Tuesday, and on Wednesday he finds that he cannot afford them and needs to take them back again. We are in exactly the same situation now, because money handed out under the Whitlam Government was given out irresponsibly. It was handed out willy nilly, and now we find that we do not have the money.

Dr. Eastick: Most of the present cut-backs were made by the Whitlam Government.

Mr. WOTTON: Well, the Whitlam Government made them necessary. Page 13 of the statement refers to education, and again we see that there has been only a small increase in Commonwealth funds overall. The Federal Government promised in its election campaign that it would ensure that all Australians would have access to primary and secondary schools to provide equal opportunity for personal achievement. This has been done, and the Fraser Government has restored triennial funding with real increases. Expenditure on child migrant education during 1966-67 will be increased significantly. Mention is made particularly of further education and of the need for increased finance for independent schools and for pre-school education. I am sure that all members realise the greater need for further education in this State. The need for more skilled tradesmen is becoming obvious, because we have almost reached the stage of having too many chiefs and not enough Indians: we need to have people who will get down to studying the basic trade skills. Regarding independent schools, I was pleased to receive a report this morning, on which I should like to comment, but I do not have time to do so. I will comment on it on another occasion.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Thank me for sending it to you.

Mr. WOTTON: I thank the Minister. I am pleased to see that at last independent schools are receiving a reasonably good deal, because for too long they were getting the raw end of the deal. I believe that parents should have the opportunity of choosing whether their children attend a private or public school. Many parents for religious reasons find it desirable to send their children to private schools. We all realise the importance, particularly today, of pre-school education. With so many mothers working, there is a need for early childhood care. This facet of education needs to be studied much more thoroughly and to have more money spent on it.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): The impression I have gained from the financial and other statements released to Parliament recently is quite favourable, and I do not hesitate, as you, Mr. Speaker, and other members well know, that, where credit is due, I am always ready to deliver it. Indeed, I do not join with other members in criticising just for the sake of criticising. Despite

the criticisms by Government speakers during the debate, and despite some of the criticisms by Opposition members of this Budget and of the Government's general fiscal management, I accept that, within the framework of this Government's policies, there has been a fair attempt to prepare a financial plan for the forthcoming period, and it can be noted from the Budget preparation that every effort has been made to prepare a balance.

Mr. Keneally: Did you pick up my speech?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I did not. I had a job picking up the honourable member's company in recent months: he has not been around. This Budget period that we are in now is a time when we can enjoy a well-managed and well-conducted Federal climate. I make no apology for mentioning the hard-working team of our colleagues in the Commonwealth Parliament who are superimposed over the management of all States, including this one, despite the political colour of the Government here. The confidence of Australians was expressed during the election campaign, and that team of our colleagues at the Federal level has shown since taking office just how well it can manage our affairs.

Before referring to the details of our State Budget, I should like to draw a parallel regarding some matters. For the purposes of giving an example, I take the metric system, on which we have been working for several years. The implementation of that system and the policies at present being implemented at the federal level are parallel. They are both desirable and in the interests of every Australian. On one hand, we have the statement, "You will never metricate me: I will die with my Imperial-size boots on." On the other hand, other people have said, "You will never Liberalise me: I am Labor to the core."

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That's a strange analogy.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Recently we have learnt the benefits of both changes. If they are not the statements, they at least are the sentiments of most Australians. Like the Imperial diehards, the Labor supporters are part and parcel of a minority group. I will expand further on this rather unusual analogy, as the Minister of Education has described it, and if he listens he may be able to pick up the similarity which exists and on which we have been working for a long time. Admittedly, members opposite have not been working on getting our colleagues into government, but they will suffer it for a long time.

Of 140 sector-conversion programmes formulated, more than 100 have been completed. Likewise, in the Federal Liberal and National Country Party coalition, a similar percentage of its pre-election promises already has been enacted. I have a list of the key commitments made by our colleagues before the recent Federal election, and I also have a list of what they have achieved in their first nine months in office. It is worth noting that, of the 51 promises listed, about 39 already have been implemented fully. I mention these matters because these items, almost without exception, link up directly with the items listed in our State Budget.

Mr. Olson: Reduction of unemployment isn't one of them.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Regarding the economy, it was a paramount feature of Mr. Fraser's policy speech that he would get the economy moving again. He has already shown that he is doing this by tackling inflation as a first priority in getting people back to work. I do not need to expand on that. Members on both sides know my feelings and my support for any Government that encourages the work force to do a fair day's work for a

fair day's pay. Both consumer demand and national production began to grow again in the first half of 1976. Major new development projects are under way. For example, there is the \$76 000 000 Ford expansion. Further, the Nissan company is establishing an engine plant, and we have expansion of the chemical industry.

I will not go through all these items, because, whilst I should be pleased to mention them at any time, I know how embarrassing it would be to do that now, in the company of members opposite. Promise No. 2 was to give specific help to business to provide jobs. One way that that would be done would be by introducing an investment allowance, and that has been done, initially at 40 per cent. Another form of help was to relax conditions under which interest on convertible notes was deductible, and that has been done. A further method of giving specific help was by suspending quarterly tax payments for the duration of the crisis, and that has been done.

Item No. 3 of this significant list of achievements shows that the Federal Government promised to follow the consistent economic policies of that coalition Party, and the strategy outlined at the time of the election has been followed consistently. Unswerving priority has been given to reducing inflation and eliminating the unemployment problem.

Promise No. 4 was to intervene in wage cases to ensure that national economic objectives were considered. The result of that promise, even at this early stage, is that the Federal Government has argued before the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Commission for wage restraint, with some measure of success in the past two national wage cases. The Government has stressed the link between wage increases, inflation and unemployment.

The fifth promise was to support the wage indexation agreement, and those guidelines have been observed. Promise No. 6 was to abolish the Prices Justification Tribunal, and an inquiry has been established into the future of the tribunal. Abolition has been deferred, after consultation with unions and business. That is a case where clearly the Government has been open-minded, flexible, and acting in the interests of the people. It has taken into account the interests of all, regardless of their political colour, with the one aim of getting a fair day's work for a fair day's pay, taking into account the feelings of every Australian.

Promise No. 7 was to examine the mass of Labor imposed rules and regulations, and abandon those that damaged prosperity and jobs. The Government is well on the way with that. Having due consideration for families the Government promised, as promise No. 8, to end the secret tax rip-off caused by Labor's inflation. Again, the Government is well on the way towards fixing that one, too.

Promise No. 9 was to pay special attention to the disadvantaged and those in need. There, clearly, quite apart from politics, we have only to consider the child endowment funding that has been extended to every family in Australia. That scheme has directly assisted 300 000 low-income families with 800 000 children who were not able to benefit fully from the previous arrangement. There is no question but that the Federal Government has set out to do its best for every person, whether in industry or in the street and whether the person is aged. In this case, it comes right down to the children.

Promise No. 10 was to introduce home savings grants to assist first home buyers to bridge the deposit gap. Immediately the Government came into office, that promise was implemented. Promise No. 11 was to increase tax

exemption where an estate passed between husband and wife. That matter has been discussed in this place several times, so I need not expand on it, other than to say that it is another pre-election promise that the Federal Government implemented immediately on coming to office. Promise No. 12 was to maintain and improve Medibank. What a hell of a mess that was, and what an incredible job the Commonwealth Government has had to do in order to try to maintain a scheme that was thrust upon it by the Labor Government so that it could be applied and the people could afford to meet the costs involved. Promise No. 13 was to help single income families, which embraces most of us. The increase in the level of tax rebate for spouse and sole parent rebate increase has gone far towards fulfilling promise No. 13.

Promise No. 14 was to institute tax rebates for child-care expenses. As complex as that matter may seem, the Federal Government has already undertaken a study in that area. The same applies to promise No. 15 whereby the Commonwealth Government has undertaken to study the benefits accruing from the promise wherein the Government stated that it would remove injustices that existed in Labor's tax scales generally. In the field of industrial relations, a subject that I have some pleasure discussing because it usually arouses interest in this place, the Federal Government announced blatantly before the recent Commonwealth election that it would improve industrial relations in Australia. No-one has demonstrated more effort in that direction in a more skilful and meaningful way than the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Mr. Tony Street.

Promise No. 18 was to maintain the real value of pensions and other benefits, which has been done. We have all read about that matter in the press several times. Promise No. 19 was to replace the means test with an income test with a view not to penalise people who have saved.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The matter for debate before the House is commonly known as the State Budget. Although much of that material is an interesting insight to the honourable member's psychology, he seems to be taking much time to link up his remarks.

Mr. Venning: That's a matter of opinion.

The SPEAKER: It is, as the Minister states, a wide-ranging debate. I am merely following past practice since the Federal Budget does have a relationship to the State Budget. All honourable members' remarks must bear some relationship to the State Budget.

Mr. CHAPMAN: This debate relates not only to the Federal Government but also to the State Government, which depends on the Federal Government because it gets its money from that source, and its assistance, guidance and planning to run the State. Without Commonwealth Government allocations the State would not have a hope in hell of—

Mr. Keneally: You didn't say that last year.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I would have said it last year had the Federal Government been doing its job. When this Federal Government does not do its job I will be the first to admit it. Promise No. 20 was that the Commonwealth Government would stand by its commitment to abolish the means test on pensioners. What did the Government do? The means test was abolished immediately when it came into office. The Commonwealth promised to ensure that all Australians have access to primary and secondary schools, which provide equal opportunity for personal achievement.

Throughout the promises to which I have referred is an incentive element; a direct relationship to getting on with the job. Fraser has demonstrated time and time again that he is keen to get on with the job. He works like a slave and expects everyone else to do the same. When they do so he arranges for a fair and reasonable return for that effort. It is about time that this State Government and all people in industry demonstrated exactly the same attitude and policy towards their job. Promise No. 22 was to retain the tertiary education assistance scheme. That policy has been supported at both State and Federal levels. The Commonwealth Government has entered this field and has retained the scheme, conditions and benefits, which are being reviewed now to improve the scheme.

Promise No. 23 was to maintain free tertiary education. That scheme has also been retained. Promise No. 24 was to place particular stress on meeting the needs of the disadvantaged, including handicapped, isolated, migrant and Aboriginal children. The conditions and benefits for isolated children and Aboriginal children are under review. Expenditure on child migrant education in 1976-77 will be higher than that spent in 1975-76. Embodied in that matter is another sensitive subject relating to Aborigines; however, I will not expand on that matter. Whatever a people's colour or politics may be, if they do a day's work they are entitled to a day's pay. As members opposite would know, in no circumstances should anyone, irrespective of their colour, especially where there is any suggestion at all of black bludgers getting any more than white workers or whatever the situation, get away with that sort of thing, and I would jump up and down with the rest on that matter. As long as those people work and apply themselves they are entitled to a fair day's pay and a fair standard of living along with the rest of us.

Promise No. 25 was to introduce basic grants to children at all schools. From the beginning we understood that the Commonwealth Government would study each dollar spent before implementing the scheme. That programme is also being studied. Promise No. 26, which demonstrates the effectiveness of the Federal Government, ties up entirely with several items in the State Budget. That was a promise to economise Government spending and improve administrative efficiency. The result has been that the Commonwealth Cabinet has established administrative machinery to review spending at all levels. The Commonwealth Government implemented immediate cuts in Government spending of \$60 000 000, which was announced in January this year, and further cuts of \$300 000 000, which were announced in February. Government spending will rise by 11 per cent in 1976-77, compared with 23 per cent in 1975-76. Further reviews leading up to the recent Commonwealth Budget led to savings of \$2 600 000 000. An expenditure committee was established to improve Parliament's scrutiny of departments. Reductions were made in Public Service staff levels for the first time in 24 years, which is not before time.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You are in favour of a reduction in the Public Service?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Yes, wherever possible.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Are you in favour, or not?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CHAPMAN: Promise No. 27 relating to decentralised Government was to provide increased financial independence and responsibility for the States and local government. As wide and embracing as the promise was, financial independence and responsibility is well under way. Promise No. 28 was to establish an independent council for inter-governmental relations. I agree that there is a

need for better relations between some Government departments in this State. Further promises related to the rural community. Promise No. 29 was to continue the reserve price scheme for wool at not less than 250c a kilogramme in the 1976-77 season. There is not much point in my expanding on that matter, because members opposite would not understand what I meant. The main thing, however, is that that scheme will be continued.

Promise No. 30 was to re-establish the superphosphate bounty and give assistance to the depressed beef industry. I know of no-one who is willing to object to that. Even the member for Whyalla during his recent visit to Kangaroo Island had demonstrated clearly to him the need to re-introduce the superphosphate bounty and for this State, if possible, to subsidise the Federal bounty on superphosphate. Clearly, the member for Whyalla, in his capacity as Chairman of the Land Settlement Committee, and his colleagues have appreciated that point. The 31st commitment was to introduce a farm income reserve fund.

Members interjecting:

Mr. CHAPMAN: Members should not talk to me about that. What about the fellows in the shipbuilding industry? How much has it cost them?

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable member for Alexandra that he must relate whatever he says regarding the Federal Budget or anything else to the State Appropriation Bill. At times, the honourable member gets a little far from the Bill and talks too much about the Federal Bill rather than the State Bill.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Not too far, Sir, just sort of drifting a bit.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's comments must relate to the State Appropriation Bill.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I do not want to use too much of my time, although I assure you, Sir, that every statement I make can be related to the Bill. You, Sir, and members know that I have only a limited time available to me, so I do not want to be held up too much. Members can be assured that I have read the document, I know what I have in front of me, and what I want to say. I turn now to item No. 32, which related to the establishment of a rural bank for long-term finance. I do not know of anyone who would deny that a need exists for adequate finance at a reasonable rate of interest to be made available to those people throughout the land who have their backs to the wall and need finance. The Government has undertaken to examine that proposal and, although I am not sure of this, I understand that it intends to introduce it before the next Budget is presented. Promise No. 33 was that to ease eligibility provisions for unemployment assistance to farmers. That has been done in a sort of way. Promise No. 34 was to strike a responsible balance between conservation and growth. That comes under the "Environment" heading, and is another subject into which I will not venture in depth, as I would have difficulty in linking that subject to the State Budget, although there is a line of expenditure for the Minister of Environment and Conservation.

Promise No. 35 was to continue urban programmes. Promise No. 36 was to maintain present levels of assistance to Aborigines. I will get off that one quickly. Promise No. 37 was to introduce land rights for the Northern Territory based on justice for all. That is another one that has a bit of colour about it. Promise No. 38 was to establish a separate Immigration and Ethnic Affairs Department. That sounds fair enough and, indeed, it has been done.

There are 51 of these promises, so I will belt through them from here on. Promise No. 39 was to make available adequate bilingual staff at Government departments and public hospitals. It would not be a bad idea if we had some of them here. These additional positions, in which people can interpret and translate, have already been advertised, so they are well under way with that one. Promise No. 40 was to encourage the teaching of ethnic languages and culture in schools. That, linked with promise No. 41, that is, to assist migrants to overcome the language barrier, is part of the programme that the Federal Government has developed. Promise No. 42 was to eliminate discrimination. That is clear, because we in this State know that throughout the Budget there are equal opportunities at every level for both males and females. So, there is no problem about expanding on that.

Promise No. 43, which comes under the heading "Arts and Culture", was to maintain an active interest in and support for the creative and performing arts. Again, I am not sure whether I am misinterpreting the hush that has come over the Chamber, but this is clearly linked with the Budget by the line that is applied in this State to the arts and culture area, supplemented by income and support from the Federal Government.

Promises Nos. 44, 45 and 46, which fall under the heading "Civil Liberties", are all under way, and are a real part of the Federal Government's programme. Promises 47 to 51, which fall under the heading "Foreign Affairs and Defence", refer to the general Federal policy on defence, which is well on the way to being implemented. It involves a promise to build up Australia's defences, to rebuild our alliance with the United States and New Zealand, and to maintain close ties with countries in the region, as well as a couple of other promises that round off a tremendous document, which was well presented by the Federal Leader. I am proud to relate it to our Budget at any time of the day or night. I can only sum up my remarks about our Commonwealth colleagues by saying—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I thought you were talking about the South Australian Budget.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The Minister was not paying attention. I continually linked my remarks this evening with the matters listed in the Budget. Indeed, at one stage I reminded the House that this State's finances and expenditure depend largely on money that is made available to us by our generous Commonwealth colleagues. I did that for a specific reason. I am a little sore at Ministers and other Government members who duck for cover when they are required to do a job. They stand up in this House and, through the press, blame the Commonwealth Government for every ill among their own ranks. That is most unfair. If they cannot be complimentary, or appreciate what is being done, and done well, they ought to hop in and do something about it themselves, and not be ever-ready to fly in and blame the other bloke.

I have a moment or two left in which to refer to a couple of other matters. I suppose I had better return to the State scene. I have packets of stuff here at which I would like to have a crack, but there is just a chance that I may be able to continue my remarks in the grievance debate later this evening. Of course, I cannot even get an opportunity to ask a question in this place.

Mr. Nankivell: And you're an easy-going sort of chap.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Of course I am, as honourable members realise. However, one thing does disturb me. I think this is constructive criticism that is well founded. From time to time, we hear our Treasurer promoting South Australia as a great tourist State or at least a

State with a potential for tourism at high levels. I compliment him for the way he stands on the platform and, wherever possible, promotes this State in whatever way he can to our tourists and visitors. However, it is all a little synthetic. I mention this matter briefly, as I will not be able to go into it in detail. I should like the Treasurer, out of the Budget lines, to put some of his money where his mouth is. Fair dinkum, I have heard him in this place and out in the field making statements about what he will and will not do, about what is desirable, and how the need to do certain things has been established. However, when it comes to asking him and his Ministers for money to implement those schemes, it is a different matter. I leave it at that. The subject of reticulated water supplies to districts with a great tourist potential, particularly American River, and places on the South Coast, as well as other towns on the plains—

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

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): I support the Budget. I echo the words of the member who has just resumed his seat, and compliment the Treasurer, who should be complimented on the good housekeeping that has allowed us this year to present a balanced Budget.

Mr. Gunn: He's a real performer.

Mr. WHITTEN: Certainly he always performs well for this State, and he will always do so. This year, there have been no new taxation increases. However, I am afraid that there may be tax increases next year because, having heard the member for Alexandra who has just resumed his seat, and the absolute garbage that he has trundled out, as well as his falsification of figures, there is no way in which we could have a balanced Budget with the Commonwealth Government that we have at present in Canberra.

Recently, the petrol franchise tax was removed: and if that had continued it would have meant a revenue of \$12 000 000 in a year. At least this Government honoured its promise, but Big Mal in Canberra has not yet honoured his promises. Of the 50 points referred to by the member for Alexandra, few had any substance. There has been an increase in wharfage charges in this State, but as the previous increase occurred three years ago, it became necessary to increase these charges. However, there has been no curtailment of spending this year, as has occurred in the Federal sphere.

Contrary to what Opposition members have been saying, the Federal Government has introduced several cut-backs. Funds for capital works such as schools, roads, hospitals, housing and sewerage have been reduced by a total of \$127 000 000, and funds for health have been reduced by \$126 000 000. We are not getting value for our money from the Federal Government, which broke its promise about the Medibank agreement. Unemployment figures have now been manipulated to try to show that they are not increasing as rapidly as they are in fact. The member for Alexandra praised the Federal Government, when it should have been denigrated. I agree with his statement that much of our money comes from the Federal Government, but the Treasurer said that the State's single most important source of revenue, financial assistance grants, has fallen this year by \$13 200 000.

Don Chipp, who was shadow Minister of Social Security when in Opposition, stated, when speaking recently at Wesley Church in Victoria, that the Federal Government was dismantling a superb programme set up by its predecessor, and he singled out the disbandment of the

Children's Commission and the withdrawal of the Australian Assistance Plan. Mr. O'Halloran Giles, member for Angas in the House of Representatives in Canberra, was given the task of examining the reaction to the Government's policy concerning primary producers, and he reported to Fraser that farmers were against his Government and that, if an election were held today, they would vote against him. With all the hand-outs that farmers have received, they still seem to be getting it in the neck.

In Victoria, Mr. Viner (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs in the Fraser Government) has said, "We have broken our promise to the Aboriginal people," yet the member for Alexandra has said what a wonderful job the Federal Government is doing. However, our State Treasurer has done a remarkable job and, because of good housekeeping, has brought down a balanced Budget. There must be a revolt in the Liberal Party in Canberra, because Senator Bonner has said:

The reduction of \$33 000 000 in the appropriation for the Department of Aboriginal Affairs is a tragedy and will put Aboriginal affairs back about 50 years.

I am sure that Opposition members must realise that there has been a split in their perhaps once great Party. Even Senator Jessop, a South Australian member, has condemned the Government for its shipbuilding policies. There has been no increase in funds to build hospitals, and funds for tuberculosis control will cease at the end of this year. Also, unemployment grants of \$30 000 000 have ceased. The Liberal Party does not care how many people it puts out of work, as it considers that the only cure for inflation is to sack people. The member for Alexandra said that he would sack public servants, and he meant it.

Mr. Venning: You'll be sacked after the next election.

Mr. WHITTEN: You would not bet on that, would you: perhaps the member for Alexandra would not lay the odds, but I would lay you odds on that proposition. Funds for Aboriginal affairs (mainly housing) have been reduced in the Federal Budget by \$10 000 000, and there has been no increase in welfare housing funds. What can we do when money is needed for Housing Trust houses in this State? We should be able to obtain it from the Federal Government and, if we cannot do that, we must get more from the people of this State, although the Treasurer has not increased State taxation. Funds for land development have been reduced by \$29 000 000, and it seems that the Federal Government is afraid that ordinary people who buy a block of land on which to build may defeat the efforts of land sharks and obtain blocks at a reasonable price. By setting up the Land Commission the State Government has been able to assist young people, and I know from personal experience how people can be shot at by land sharks.

Funds for dairy adjustment have been reduced, and those available for local government have been reduced by \$80 000 000 in the Federal Budget. There has been no increase in the allocation for roads, and no new programme for the development of urban public transport has been approved. Much of the money has to be made available by the Commonwealth Government, but unfortunately this year less money has been made available than was expected. In particular, we have not got nearly as much out of the transfer of the non-metropolitan railways as we had hoped to get. In this connection, I think we have been sold a pup; we should have received much more than we actually received. I have tried to review some of the Opposition's arguments regarding the State Budget, which is certainly a good Budget in comparison with the rotten Budget of the Fraser Government,

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I think we ought to return from the fantasy land into which the member for Price led us. We are getting used to the Government's catchcry that its Budget will have no tax increases; this catchcry was uttered last year and it has been uttered again this year. The basis of socialism is high taxation; the State Government has to have high taxation to pay for its grand schemes and, of course, the money must come from the people's pockets.

The Treasurer, the showman of the Labor Party, has his picture on everything that moves and everything that does not move. When I went to the opera recently, I had to pay 80c for a programme, on the first page of which was not a picture of a participant in the opera but a picture of the Treasurer; this did not help me to enjoy my evening at the opera. Actually, I was in the same kind of situation as a lady who sat in front of me and who said, "That picture has put me right off the show." The member for Price said that we will have no new taxes now but that we may have some extra taxes next year. In his explanation, the Treasurer states:

By the end of 1975, it had become apparent that the Revenue Budget was progressing towards a more favourable result than had been forecast originally. There was evidence that wage indexation was starting to have a moderating influence on wage increases, some revenues were improving, and departments were generally exercising a tight control over their expenditures.

Receipts this year are expected to amount to \$1 171 000 000. If we work on the same principle as the Government worked on last year, when the Government's estimates were incorrect, we will find that the Government is taxing South Australians nearly out of existence. Yesterday, a Government member said that we are the highest taxed people in the world.

Mr. Venning: We are almost in orbit.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes. In his Financial Statement, the Treasurer also states:

With the proposed measures, which will operate for all of 1976-77, tax of course, receipts from land tax are expected to be only about \$18 600 000.

The Treasurer, until recently, used to say, "I am here to trim the tall poppies." However, in imposing land tax he is not trimming the tall poppies at all, because it is the little people who are coping this shocking tax: they are paying for the privilege of owning property. The Treasurer states:

The franchise tax on the sale of petroleum products operated for the first quarter of 1975-76 and produced revenue of \$4 700 000.

Here again, a tax was imposed by the Treasurer to gain revenue, but this tax does not operate in every other State. The Treasurer took the opportunity to impose a tax not only on motorists but also on petrol resellers, by way of licensing fees. The member for Price should read what the Treasurer says, as follows:

The Government has already announced that water and sewer rates will rise by an average of about 15 per cent in 1976-77. Together with the natural growth in the number of consumers, this will increase the revenue of the Engineering and Water Supply Department by about \$7 100 000 to about \$68 800 000.

Further, the Treasurer admits that these taxes are already operating. No wonder he could not increase any taxes in the Budget, because the people are already paying dearly. The Treasurer states later:

As from August 1, fees for the registration of private motor vehicles were raised by 25 per cent—

they have already been raised, so they cannot be put in the Budget—

and those for the registration of commercial vehicles were raised by 30 per cent. From July 7, the fee for a driver's licence was increased from \$5 to \$6 a year . . . These higher rates, together with the normal annual growth in the number of vehicles and the number of drivers, are expected to increase receipts from \$32 100 000 to \$45 000 000.

That tax is already operating. So, the Treasurer (and Government members are gullible enough to believe him) states that there will be no increases in this Budget at this stage. The reality is, of course, that these high taxes are already being paid.

In 1971, 3 per cent of the revenue of the Electricity Trust was paid to the Treasury. In 1973, under this Government, the levy was increased from 3 per cent to 5 per cent. Revenue, too, has increased. In 1971, the revenue was \$468 007; in 1971-72 it had increased to \$2 080 629; in 1972-73 to \$2 241 906; and in 1974-75 it had increased to \$4 862 854. The increase imposed by this Government, which says it has not raised taxation in the Budget, will bring in revenue in 1975-76 of about \$5 800 000. So, in the past six years the rip-off from the Electricity Trust has increased from \$468 007 to about \$5 800 000, and we have been warned that gas charges will also increase.

Excess water charges will be greater this year. The Minister of Works gave this warning yesterday. In 1970-71, the charge for excess water was 7.7c a kilolitre; this year it will be 16c a kl. An extra \$10 000 000 in revenue will thus be received by the Government in this year, yet the member for Price told us there were to be no increases until next year.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. MATHWIN: I turn now to taxation on vehicles other than commercial vehicles and primary producers' tractors. The charge for stamp duty is \$10 for every \$1 000. In 1971, the charge was \$55 on \$3 000 and \$105 on \$5 000. In 1975, the figure had increased to \$60 on \$3 000 and to \$140 on \$5 000. In 1970, of course, certain cars would have cost \$3 000, but similar models now would cost \$5 000, because of inflation. In those terms the increase is from \$30 to \$140 over that period, and represents an increase of about 400 per cent.

I turn now to the housekeeping of this Government and the way in which it adds up its sums. In 1975-76, the estimated receipts from stamp duties, including duty on various instruments and licences, were \$55 000 000. Estimated receipts for the current year total \$73 700 000, an increase of \$18 700 000 this year, yet the member for Price has the audacity to say that no tax increases are contained in the Budget. Estimated receipts for pay-roll tax have risen from \$126 000 000 in the last financial year to \$136 000 000 this year, an increase of \$10 000 000. And this great socialist Government is not supposed to be increasing taxation!

Mr. Slater: Where did you get your red tie?

Mr. MATHWIN: That has nothing to do with the running of this State and the bad housekeeping of the Government. The basis of socialism is the people's dollar in its pocket. The Government must get this revenue, and it comes from the ordinary people, not from the tall poppies. It is all very well for the member for Stuart to look at me like that, after his trip to Russia. I should like to know, if he is allowed to say a few words in this place, how the trade union movement operates, how efficient are the strikes in the Soviet Union, and how the shop stewards perform.

The SPEAKER: Order! I fail to see how the honourable member for Glenelg can relate his present remarks to the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: I apologise, Sir. I was a little naughty, but it happens to all of us. The Labour and Industry line relates to licence, registration, permit, notification and certificate fees under various Acts. Last year, "guesstimated" receipts totalled \$6 000, and actual receipts totalled \$1 074 495. This year, the Government expects to receive for that line \$1 114 000. That is an increase of about \$40 000 on last year's actual receipts, and about 200 times more than was estimated last year; it was \$1 068 495 over the estimate. That is how good the figures are. The Treasurer needs to know how to do his sums. It is useless to say that the Government is not going to charge extra taxation in the Budget.

Mr. Gunn: A private individual would have the consumer affairs people on him.

Mr. MATHWIN: My word! The Attorney-General would be called in, and they would close the place immediately. The unions themselves would put a black ban on the department. Turning to the Public and Consumer Affairs line, builders' licence and permit fees last year were expected to total \$155 000. The figures were pretty well on the ball, because some good people are involved in the building trade.

The estimated receipts were \$155 000, actual receipts amounting to \$155 355. This year (and this is the opportunity of ripping off a bit more from the situation) builders' licence and permit fees are estimated to be \$236 000—an increase of \$80 645 on that one item alone. Regarding the Licensing Court, anticipated receipts for publicans' and other licence fees were \$7 500 000, whereas this year the Government expects to gain \$8 600 000. That is not bad for a Government which says, "We are not increasing taxes in the Budget."

Government members get up and say how great they are and the Treasurer struts around the countryside and says, "As far as I'm concerned, there will be no extra taxation in this State. We will not tax the people any further. We don't want any more money. We're a good Government. We're not going to tax people any more under the Budget." However, the evidence is before the eyes of the public of how much the Government wants to collect from this State's ordinary people. Regarding tourism and recreation, the Treasurer plastered his record and poetry books all over the Tourist Bureau office in Sydney, and said that this was to attract tourists to South Australia. Heaven help us! Seeing his face on the programme has stopped me from going to the opera again, so one would never know what it did to the people in New South Wales.

Mr. Coumbe: He's on a soap box now.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, and I hope that he makes a clean sweep of it. Although the estimated receipts under the Tourism, Recreation and Sport line were \$375 000, the actual receipts were \$475 000; that is not too bad. The Treasurer will even get at the pawnbrokers. Although the Government expected to receive \$400 from pawnbrokers' fees it actually received \$1 000, so even the pawnshops have got it in the neck. The member for Price said that there would be no increases in wharf charges. From the Marine and Harbors Department's wharfage tonnage rates and handling charges, last year the Government expected to receive \$10 300 000, whereas this year the estimated receipts are \$13 300 000, or a \$3 000 000 increase. If there is to be no increase in costs, where will the Government get the extra \$3 000 000?

In addition, we all know the situation regarding the new container depot. It is debatable whether the wharfies want to use it, although it is supposed to be one of Australia's best, with plenty of room. They do not want to use it, and they have said that for so long now that no-one wants to use it; all the ships are bypassing us. For water and sewerage charges, the estimated receipts last year were \$60 500 000, whereas this year the Government expects to receive \$68 800 000, or a cool \$8 300 000 increase. It is all right for the wizzkids in the Premier's Department to talk about millions of dollars as though it did not mean anything and for some of the Government fat cats, such as the Treasurer and others, to talk about millions of dollars as being nothing, but we are talking about increases on that one page of the statement alone of \$3 000 000 and \$7 000 000, and there is another increase in relation to the Electricity Trust of \$8 000 000; that is an awful lot of money to the average man in the street, yet the Government passes it on as though it is nothing at all. The Treasurer has the audacity to come into the House, backed by his colleagues, and say, "There will be no tax increases in the Budget." The member for Price, the Government's mouthpiece on this matter today, said that there would be no extra taxes this year but there might be some next year. However, if people take the trouble to read the Budget they will see that there are increases amounting to millions of dollars. I suppose that Government members who are conversant with union rules would call it an ambit situation. We are always hearing about that. The member for Spence is trying to interject. He would know a lot about ambit, because he gets an honourable mention in the Rank and File sheet, which is given to me each week. I was disappointed that he did not speak about the Rank and File matter yesterday.

Mr. Dean Brown: How was he referred to?

Mr. MATHWIN: I cannot say, because it was rude, although it was in the sheet I read. I did not agree with it. I thought it was shocking that he should have been referred to in that way. At page 353, the Auditor-General's Report, dealing with Housing Trust house renovations, states:

During the year 2 177 houses and 98 flats were upgraded bringing the total number of dwellings upgraded to 15 184. The total amount expended on the upgrading programme since its inception to June 1976, was \$12 619 000.

That, I suppose, includes the number of houses the trust has bought. These are older-type houses which the trust buys at auction for reasonable prices. The trust upgrades these houses at a high cost, thus placing them in the high-price bracket. I would like a detailed figure of the sum the trust has spent on some of the houses it has upgraded, because we may find that the cost involved is far more than the houses are actually worth. The member for Price stated that there would be no additional tax in the Budget this year. The Treasurer, the main showman for the Government, takes every opportunity to get his photograph on whatever pamphlet, programme or leaflet is put out. Regardless of whether it is a publication for the Worker Participation Unit, or a programme at the opera or at the Festival of Arts, he has his photograph on the first page. There was also a photograph of him riding an elephant, and he is not very apt at doing that.

The SPEAKER: Order! I fail to see how the honourable member for Glenelg can relate this to the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN: I suppose it is hard to get an elephant and the Treasurer into discussion of the Budget at the same time.

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

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I want to deal first with the opening remarks of the member for Glenelg, when I think he said that the Government was a socialist Government. I do not know what the honourable member means by "socialist", but if, for example, he means that this Government provides more money for housing, education facilities, urban development, cultural development, social benefits, improved school dentistry, and additional pensions for unmarried mothers, I agree that it is a socialist Government. However, my interpretation of "socialism" is a little different from the honourable member's interpretation. My interpretation is that the State takes over industries and runs them as State industries.

I point out to the member for Glenelg that, young as I am, I remember that the Liberal and Country League Government under that famous, or infamous, leader called Sir Thomas Playford, set up the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the South Australian Housing Trust. It also fostered and fed the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia. I believe that that is socialism, and perhaps the present Government could be condemned for that! Whilst we have been in office, we have also fostered those State ventures. I believe that that is right and proper, and that is my interpretation of socialism.

Mr. Keneally: It was a scare word as far as he was concerned.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Am I to understand from the remarks made by the member for Glenelg about increased charges for electricity, water rates, and transport, that Liberal Governments in Victoria and Western Australia, the Liberal Government that was in office in New South Wales, and our friend the banana king from Queensland, have decreased these charges? They have all gone up. Of course, that suggestion by him is a ridiculous situation, absolutely stark raving mad.

Mr. Keneally: So is the member for Glenelg.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I did not say that, because I might have had to withdraw it, but it is getting dangerously close to the truth. I want to deal briefly with the speech made by the member for Alexandra. What a speech that was! He must have been either raving mad or quoting from some feudal system or Magna Carta. Whatever document it was, it could not be allied to the word "democracy". I will try to deal with the State Budget, which is what this argument is all about. Over the years that this Government has been in office under Don Dunstan, we have, in the Budget, spent money on people. We have spent money on education, and I mentioned the three high schools in Whyalla, of which we are proud, because, regardless of whether the Opposition likes this, in the term of office of the L.C.L. Government (and, although we have long memories, we must go back a few years for that) that Government built high schools spasmodically on a programme that had regard to the fewest number of children in the area, never considering possible development and growth of population of the area.

Mr. Venning: The children were well educated, too.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is more than I can say for the member for Rocky River. The L.C.L. Government did not consider the projection of population growth, and the schools that that Government built were, before long, not providing sufficient accommodation, so portable buildings were provided, at big expense. Those buildings reminded me of an Indian reserve. The education building programme led to the provision of undesirable portable buildings.

However, under the Dunstan Government the Stuart High School (I think it would be in the District of Eyre now), which is one of the best high schools in the North, was built. It has every facility for the children, and it was built on a projected growth basis. We also can be proud of the Institute of Technology and the library in Whyalla. They would come up to the standard of any others outside the metropolitan area. We also have the trade school, for which sufficient Federal Government money was not available for it to develop as a further education centre. The number of people wanting to go to the trade school was increasing at such a rate that the provision of buildings could not keep pace. Despite approaches to the infamous Federal Fraser Government for money for the institute, the Fraser Government did not provide a cent, whereas the Dunstan Labor Government recently accepted a tender from Fricker Brothers of \$6 000 000 for this project. The institute must be built as a matter of urgency for Whyalla, and it is being built at this State's expense. I do not hear members opposite suggesting that we should dash off to Canberra to tell the Federal Minister for Education that the institute is absolutely necessary. The Federal Government is not interested in this project.

An editorial appeared in the *News* of September 8, to which the Opposition has chosen not to refer, whether because of convenience or because it was overlooked, I do not know. I do not believe that the *News* could be said to be pro-Labor.

Mr. Keneally: But the *Advertiser* is a good socialist paper!

Mr. MAX BROWN: It is a good working-class paper—it will not work and it has no class. The editorial of September 8, headed "S.A. gets a prudent Budget", states:

It's a lucky State that gets tax cuts and not more slugs on Budget day.

The Opposition has been saying that we have had tax slugs, yet the Murdoch press says that we do not have them. The editorial continues:

That is why Mr. Dunstan's State Budget is a generally cheerful document. It is true that some increases in taxes and charges have already been announced and that the growth element built into taxes such as the pay-roll levy ensures increased revenue.

No-one denies that. I have said it before. The editorial continues:

But this should not detract from the pluses. In achieving a balance while confirming concessions in land and pay-roll taxes and giving a little more relief in stamp duties, the Premier and his Treasury officers are shown as prudent housekeepers. The overall approach adopted by Mr. Dunstan appears to be one of "steady as she goes".

I do not know whether the Treasurer is a sailor, but I agree with that term. The Leader raved on about the Treasurer appearing on television in documentaries made by the South Australian Film Corporation. I do not know what the view of people in other Government members' districts is, but in Whyalla, among the working class, these documentaries are well accepted.

Mr. Keneally: People look forward to them.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes. Whether or not the Opposition likes it, it is generally accepted that information about where money is being spent and why it is being spent is appreciated. All taxpayers should have the right to know what is happening in that regard, yet the Leader of the Opposition condemns that type of practice for reasons that I do not understand. I thought the member for Torrens was a quiet man, but he raved on about the so-called indecision of the State Government on the question of health. A report in the *News* of September 14 headed

"Government backs down on hospital aid" (and I am referring not to the State Government but to Canberra) states:

The Federal Government has backed down from its threat to limit its financial support to State hospitals. It has agreed to continue to meet 50 per cent of all hospital costs—

which I thought was mighty good of the Federal Government!—

despite saying only last week it would in future pay only half of the hospital allocation listed in each State's Budget. How can the member for Torrens say that this Government is backing down when the Federal Government has changed course many times in the past fortnight? Regarding Medibank, we would not have to look too far to see how many times the Federal Government has altered course. The report continues:

The back-down followed strong protests, in at least four States—

It has been said many times that Dunstan, for an unknown reason is always the ringleader of protests against the Liberal and National Country Party Federal Government. The report continues:

South Australia—

which is fair enough—

New South Wales—

which is fair enough, too—

Victoria and Western Australia. The Federal Health Minister, Mr. Hunt, is believed to have made urgent contact with all of his State counterparts late yesterday to explain Canberra's position. He assured them there was no truth in the suggestion that only 50 per cent of the Budget allocations would be met.

It is not true for the Opposition to say that we are backing down on health proposals when we must put up with that sort of thing. I have been associated with local government in my district for some time. Despite what members opposite say, during the three-year term of office of the Whitlam Labor Government, local government was never better off. In a speech made at Murray Bridge, the Minister of Local Government, Mr. Virgo, stated:

Local government has once again become the "Cinderella" of the three arms of Government in Australia following cut-backs in Federal Government funding announced in the Federal Budget . . . Federal funding to local councils had been reduced almost to a trickle despite the Prime Minister's earlier assurances that his administration would work closely with local government.

The member for Eyre raved on about what the Federal Government has done, but this is another broken promise on its part. Last year the Minister of Local Government said that local government throughout Australia had received \$229 000 000 through direct grants and assistance plans. He also added that this financial year allocations had been cut to not much more than \$140 000 000—almost halved. The State Budget is as good a Budget as this State has ever had: it is balanced. It is no good the Opposition referring to increases in water rates and electricity charges. The Opposition spokesman on housing said on television about a week ago that the Opposition would have increased housing rentals even more than the increases announced recently by the Government. Yet they get up in this House and say that we do this and that, contrary to what they would do. Let the next Opposition member who contributes to the debate get up and tell me how they would reduce these things.

Mr. Rodda: Why didn't you put up the housing rents in Mount Gambier?

Mr. MAX BROWN: Because we lost the seat; that may be a good answer. If the member for Victoria can get

up and tell me what is his Party's policy in relation to lowering rentals, electricity and water charges, let him do so. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): I rise to speak in the debate and, before making my comments on the Bill, I should like to answer one or two statements made by the previous speaker. I refer, first, to his reference to the school buildings that were constructed during the term of office of the Playford Government. Since coming into this House, I have received many complaints about these buildings. However, when one looks at them carefully at the time of their construction, one sees that they are well-constructed wooden buildings. I remind members opposite that in Victoria and New South Wales a large percentage of the houses are constructed of wood.

Mr. Whitten: But they are Liberal States, you know.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I cannot help whether or not they are Liberal States. However, materials for solid construction houses have been in short supply and, in some instances, almost unprocurable there. They have therefore constructed wooden houses, as has been done in many parts of the world. These original buildings would have been all right as school buildings had they been repaired and maintained to their original standard. Even today in some schools in my area in which this has been done—

Mr. Whitten: What about the corrugated iron ones?

Mr. VANDEPEER: I should like the honourable member to name them, because I do not know of any.

Mr. Whitten: What about the Liberty Grove and Woodville schools? They were all put up in the Playford era. They have become a fire trap.

Mr. VANDEPEER: If the old wooden buildings were maintained and repaired to the correct standard, they would be all right. Some schools in my area which have brand new buildings still have some of these old buildings, which have been repaired and sound-proofed. Sound was a problem in them.

Mr. Whitten: Have they been air-conditioned?

Mr. VANDEPEER: Yes, and all concerned say that they are all right and that they are pleased with that type of construction, if the buildings are maintained to modern standards. The problem is that this Government has not been willing to back up these buildings with maintenance and repairs, and keep them up to standard. They are fortunate, because these are modern construction buildings. I refer, for instance, to the Samcon building at Millicent North, where additions have been made. That is very nice. This is an advancement, and we are pleased to see it. Indeed, we would be extremely critical if we did not see advancements being made in school building and construction technologies. I think it is wrong that the Playford Government should be condemned for constructing wooden buildings at a time when building materials were in extremely short supply, much shorter than they ever are today. These buildings were constructed in a programme that was designed to boost school accommodation, and that has been achieved. In their day, these were good buildings and, if they are maintained to their proper standard, they can still be good and useful buildings today. This is a red herring that I should like to lay to rest, to a certain extent. I hope that it will not be raised in this place again.

Reference has also been made to taxation cuts and hospital aid cuts made by the Commonwealth Parliament. One thing that Government members do not seem to understand is that we do not really get anything for nothing. Everything must be paid for. What Government

or organisation would maintain an agreement which was open-ended and in which there were absolutely no restrictions on the size of the bill? That was the problem with the hospitals agreement and, when the Federal Government refused to acknowledge that agreement and to pay an open-ended bill, I think it acted correctly. Everyone must realise that things must be paid for. It is nice to have as much money to spend on education as one would like to spend. However, no-one could spend as much as he liked on education, because the community could not pay for it. Members opposite all have a budget of their own, and they know how much they can do and what they can spend on their motor cars.

Mr. Whitten: Too much.

Mr. VANDEPEER: That is so. They may have to ask how much they can spend on something else. This is all governed by one's total income. This is what we must remember when we talk about our Budget and the way in which we finance the community. Everything must be paid for. Government members have for some time been saying that there has been no increase in costs. I am afraid I do not understand how they can stand up and say that. Although the member for Torrens should have laid that one to rest when he spoke, the statement still continues to be made. This State's total Revenue Budget is \$1 171 000 000, which is the largest Revenue Budget that the State has ever seen. It has risen by \$134 000 000 (which, on my estimate, is a 12.9 per cent increase) from \$1 037 000 000 last year.

Mr. Whitten: Yet inflation has increased by 15 per cent, so we are doing a good job.

Mr. VANDEPEER: The Federal Government is aiming to reduce that inflation rate to single figures.

Mr. Whitten: How will they do it?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: We can't trust them.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I will come to that statement, that we cannot trust them, in a moment. I must admit that the 13 per cent increase is not a colossal one, such as we have seen in the past two or three years, when there were 20 per cent and 30 per cent rises under the former Federal Labor Government. However, it is a larger rise than that to which we are aiming to restrict our inflation rate, that is, about 9 per cent or 10 per cent. So, the dog is still chasing its tail, to a certain extent.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What have been the rises in Liberal Government States this year?

Mr. VANDEPEER: I am afraid that I cannot answer that. One member said by interjecting that we could not trust them, and I presume he meant the Federal Liberal Government. In this respect, I should like to refer to the Treasurer's second reading explanation, in which he referred to the lack of consultation on the part of the Commonwealth Government. He said that the Government intended to introduce full indexation on personal income tax in the first years, to introduce a Medibank levy, and to change child endowment arrangements and income tax rebates for dependent children, and that this was an example of the Federal Government's departure from what he believed was a responsibility to consult with the States in matters which might affect the sharing of personal income tax.

I do not know how much this Government expects the Commonwealth Government to consult with it on this matter, although I do not think this Government's criticism spells out much co-operation, especially when all it has been doing in this House to answer criticism has been to blame the Federal Government. It says that it has not got the money, that the Commonwealth Government

will not give it the money, or that the Federal Government has done this thing or that thing. What about having a spirit of co-operation with the Federal Government? It has been elected with a large majority, so let us get on with the job and stop complaining about it.

Dr. Eastick: Mr. Wran is going to co-operate.

Mr. Keneally: What about Bjelke-Petersen? He co-operated all right. What about Askin?

Mr. VANDEPEER: What about setting an example, and we will all be in it. The State Government should remember that this is an extremely lucky country. Government members should realise that everything must be paid for: nothing grows on apple trees, although they may think it would. We must be lucky if the Federal Government can introduce a Budget with such a large deficit.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Tell us what a good Budget ours is.

Mr. VANDEPEER: I am relating the Federal Budget to the State Budget. If it were not for the discovery of petroleum in Bass Strait, in Roma in Queensland, the Cooper Basin in South Australia, and the small field at Alice Springs, in addition to our iron ore and coal deposits that we are exporting, we would not be able to withstand a deficit Budget.

Mr. Keneally: What about the workers in those industries?

Mr. VANDEPEER: I am not forgetting them, but these industries provide them with work, and we are selling these natural assets to provide them with an income. Without these natural resources, we could not stand the huge Federal deficit. Government members, when considering finance, would do well to read Walt Disney's *Pinnocchio*, which has a moral that Government members do not understand. It is nice to have cream puffs and toffee apples, but someone has to pay for them. Government members have referred to the lack of increase in charges, but I point out that motor vehicle registration receipts have risen sharply from about \$32 000 000 last year to \$45 000 000. Recently one of my constituents complained bitterly to me about his paying \$48 a year to register his motor cycle, which he uses on his farm, to collect the newspaper, and sometimes to go fishing. It has a 100 c.c. engine, but it costs him \$48 a year to register. No wonder that income from motor vehicle registrations has increased by \$13 000 000. My constituent has asked me to find out from Government members what it would cost to register a push bike in future. Receipts from harbor fees have risen from \$10 000 000 to \$13 000 000, but I commend the Government for reducing stamp duty charges. Last year \$19 800 000 was received, and \$18 600 000 is expected to be received this year: that is a reduction, and with the strong inflationary trend is of some consequence, but the Government is not giving away a large sum.

However, pay-roll tax will increase from \$119 000 000 to \$136 000 000: that is a destructive tax, especially for small industries that cannot afford to pay it. If most of this money could be returned to small industries, it would make a tremendous difference to the unemployment figures. Small industries employ a large percentage of our work force, but the Government is taking \$136 000 000 from them by this tax. Government members have said that there have been no increases in State charges. I refer them to the Auditor-General's Report concerning the Planning Appeal Board. Fees received during the year amounted to \$4 660, but payments amount to \$269 000. It seems that part of the planning and development pro-

gramme and the philosophy of the Government has cost another \$250 000. Obviously, costs are rising at a considerable rate.

The Government has been somewhat liberal in its succession duties plan, and I commend it. It has not gone far enough, but its actions have helped the family unit, and we hope that there will be more reductions in future. When the Liberal Party is returned to power, there will be a great reduction in succession duties, an iniquitous tax that is destroying many small farmers and businesses. One hears many stories from country areas about the horrifying situation that people find themselves in after having to pay succession duties. There has been a reduction in rural land tax, another commendable effort by the Government. This action has been necessary in a time of drought, but it will be interesting to find out what happens in the next couple of years and how far this Government will be willing to go in relieving the burden of this tax.

The Government's programme in this regard, especially in these hard times for primary producers, does not offer enough assistance or encouragement to these industries. We seem to be passing through one of our most severe droughts, but the Budget has not specifically detailed what the Government intends to do to assist agriculture in the next couple of years. I understand that \$10 000 000 has been made available from Loan Account for unemployment relief, but, from my perusal of the Auditor-General's Report, there seems to be a \$10 000 000 balance in the unemployment relief account and, eventually, I will ask the Government whether a total amount of \$20 000 000 is available for that purpose. This sum will be of great assistance during the year.

Assistance is particularly required for young unemployed people. Although the Minister of Community Welfare and his staff are doing a considerable amount in this direction, nevertheless I do not think the State Government has gone far enough. The Federal Government is assisting in this direction, and it is also considering what is wrong with our education system; there appears to be a blank period between the time some students leave school and the time they find work. This problem does not apply to those who go on to tertiary education. I believe that there is not enough training in technical skills, and technical schools are not being assisted sufficiently, as the member for Whyalla said. The young people to whom I have referred have not made up their minds as to whether they are willing to learn a skill or enter an apprenticeship; indeed, some of those young people are too old to enter an apprenticeship. The Government should seek to fill the vacuum, which has been brought about by the education system's concentrating a little too much on the arts and on how to live and not enough on practical skills. Students should be taught how to move from the sheltered life of the education system into the work force. This whole matter should be investigated and remedied.

In connection with job hunters clubs, the Community Welfare Department has rented two buildings in my town over the past 18 months, but it has not used either of them; we cannot afford such waste. I should like to see the Government step in by buying a block in Millicent, establish Government offices on it, and provide proper accommodation, including accommodation for a job hunters club. The problem of latch-key children also occurs; there is nowhere for them to go. We are establishing community schools, but I doubt whether we will get these young people to go back to the schools for training and recreation, because they are difficult to motivate. It is hoped that finance will be provided for an "outward

bound" type of recreation centre. This will take children away from the atmosphere they are accustomed to, and it will motivate them in a different direction, thereby encouraging them to pull their weight in the community. I turn now to the question of exploration for natural gas in the Cooper Basin. Tonight, we heard the member for Whyalla admit that his Party is a socialist Party.

Mr. Max Brown: What do you mean by "admit"?

Mr. VANDEPEER: I think the honourable member used that word. I apologise if he did not use it.

Mr. Max Brown: But what do you mean?

Mr. VANDEPEER: I am willing to withdraw the word "admit". The present State Government admits that it is a socialist Government.

Mr. Allison: The word "socialist" was a rude word last year.

Mr. Keneally: It is a rude word on your side.

Mr. VANDEPEER: It was a rude word last year after the anti-socialist march. As a result, we have the present member for Mount Gambier on the Opposition benches. It is a very embarrassing word for the Labor Government. The sum of \$12 000 000 has been allocated to the Cooper Basin gas fields, of which \$2 500 000 is to provide funds for exploration and \$9 500 000 is to buy into the scheme. The previous Federal Labor Government bought equity in this field, and the present Federal Liberal Government is willing to divest itself of that equity. I see no reason for the State Government to spend \$9 500 000 of South Australia's hard earned money in buying out equity from the Federal Government.

The State Government is inflicting pay-roll tax, land tax and higher registration fees so that it can buy into the Cooper Basin. I deplore that situation, and I hope that the people will deplore it, too, and take action at the next State election. The Cooper Basin, which was discovered by private enterprise, has been a colossal asset. It is now supplying natural gas to Sydney, too. If the Federal Labor Government had followed a respectable policy of encouraging exploration, more oil reserves would possibly have been discovered and we would be feeling much more comfortable in the face of the energy crisis with which the world has been confronted in recent years. It was not willing to continue with a respectable exploration programme or to encourage exploration. Now we see the South Australian Government waking up to the fact and being willing to contribute \$2 500 000. If that is its policy, I commend it, but I must condemn it for spending \$9 500 000 on the purchase of an equity in that field.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): As I understand the procedures normally applying in this Chamber (and I have no reason to believe that they have changed in the past few months), it is the Government's responsibility to introduce legislation, and there is no more important legislation than the Budget documents, and it is the role of the Opposition to criticise the legislation the Government brings in, if it is opposed to it, and to highlight its deficiencies. In this debate, to date at least, the Government is at a severe disadvantage, because the only effective opposition in the House (the member for Mitcham) has not spoken yet in the debate.

The Opposition contribution has been a mish-mash of confused philosophy, theology, fantasy, and whatever else it can be called. One after the other, members opposite have concentrated almost entirely on the Federal Budget, completely ignoring the State Budget. We do not really have to think hard to know why this is so: the Treasurer, as he always does, has introduced a good Budget for South

Australia. The almost paranoid obsession of members opposite in trying to defend their Federal colleagues from an attack I am unable to ascertain by reading the Treasurer's documents is indicative, first, of their belief that the Budget is a good one and, secondly, that the Federal Budget is as bad as this one is good.

We have heard much confused political philosophy. In other years, members opposite have been anxious that this Government should produce a balanced Budget. This is an argument politicians always have, because of their different philosophies. Last year, I recall that it was bad for this State to bring in a deficit Budget, and it was appalling for the Federal Government to bring in a deficit Budget. This year, it is appalling for the State Government to bring in a balanced Budget and it is wonderful for the Federal Government to bring in a deficit Budget. I just cannot keep up with the confused thinking of members opposite. This confusion is led most ably by their Leader, who is never so bad as when he is talking on economic matters. I have said this continually. I said it before he rose to his present exalted position. As a back-bencher, as a member of the executive, and as Leader he has shown an appalling grasp of economic matters. If anyone disputes that, I challenge them to read the Leader's contribution to this debate.

In his paucity of ideas, he has been exceeded by some of his colleagues, and that indeed was a great effort on their part. I should mention the member for Alexandra as one of those members opposite who was able to exceed his Leader in producing absolutely nothing. One of the great habits of members opposite is to criticise the Government, no matter what it may introduce, and to say it should spend more money and tax the community less, never at any stage offering any suggestions as to what they would do. It is interesting to read an extract from the Leader's remarks to see how definite his Party is in offering an alternative. I have some masochistic tendencies; one is to read the Leader's contributions in the House. I sometimes worry about myself. The Leader said:

The Liberal Party will undertake at the appropriate time to announce a land tax policy which, as in the case of succession duty rates, will bring positive relief to all sections of the community who pay land tax.

Fine words! Of course he can say this, because he can be completely irresponsible, knowing he will never be in a position to live up to his words.

Dr. Tonkin: So say you.

Mr. KENEALLY: We will see. Members opposite have been extremely patient, but I think their patience will run out. The Leader said:

The Liberal Party will do everything possible to encourage house ownership and to help people remain in their houses.

Dr. Tonkin: Even your Whip wants you to be quiet now.

Mr. KENEALLY: For the benefit of members opposite, I much appreciate the words of commendation my Whip has just expressed, and I am pleased that he believes I am doing so well. The Leader also stated:

The Liberal Party would make significant concessions to encourage industrial development, because it is important for the prosperity of us all.

Of course it is. Why do people opposite not say what they would do, what is wrong with the Budget, and exactly what their alternatives would be? They have been challenged continually to do this, but their contributions in the Budget debate have become progressively worse. That is a major achievement! I want to leave the best part of my speech until tomorrow, when everyone will be fresh and eager to hear my words of wisdom, so I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): It is bad luck that the member for Stuart has only recently returned to the State. We understand that he has been abroad and it is a pity that, while he was there, he did not brush up on his debating. If he is trying to criticise members on this side, he is off to a poor start.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the redistribution?

Mr. BECKER: I do not think he knows anything about the redistribution, but he will find out in the next few months. It will be interesting to see what happens and how he is prepared to move.

Mr. Langley: But—

Mr. BECKER: I hear the member for Unley making his usual noises. His colleague, the member for Spence, had some remarks to make in this House following an article in the *News* on Thursday, September 9. It is a pity the member for Unley could not advise his new colleague that, before he makes ridiculous statements and goes on with his Federal Government bashing, as we have come to expect, he should do his homework.

Mr. Slater: You don't do anything at all.

Mr. BECKER: If the honourable member listens to what I have to say, he might learn something. The article is headed, "Children lose health cover", and I was surprised that the member for Spence read it, because I thought the Murdoch press was banned to Government members. The article originates in Sydney, and it states:

The Federal Government has withdrawn medical cover for hundreds of State wards, including those in schools for the handicapped, in its revised Medibank scheme. New South Wales Minister for Youth and Community Services, Mr. R. Jackson, told State Parliament yesterday that deaf, blind and crippled children would suffer . . . He said today the State Government had been placed in a position where it would have to insure each child in its care or see them go without medical cover. "This is a national disgrace," Mr. Jackson said.

This is Mr. Jackson, who is supposed to be a responsible Minister in the new New South Wales Government, but it is typical of the sort of Federal Government bashing we have come to witness in this Chamber. Mr. Jackson would not have a clue what he was talking about because, like the member for Spence, he should have consulted his Minister for Health. Actually, what has happened in this area is that children under the care of the State Minister of Community Welfare (that is, State wards, those who are in correctional institutions, whether children or adult, and those who are handicapped or who are in some other institution) have their medical services provided by salaried doctors who are therefore on the State pay-roll. The whole argument is whether the State Government wants to be reimbursed by Medibank for the cost of these services. In New South Wales, the Minister said that this cost about \$30 000 a year. We know that the Labor Parties in South Australia and in New South Wales have yet to grasp the fundamental benefits of the Federal Liberal Government's federalism policy, because wrapped up in the deal is one large cake, and all these services are provided there.

Let us see how well the member for Spence and Mr. Jackson did their homework. What happened is that the Federal Minister for Health (Mr. Hunt) wrote to State Health Ministers on July 31 requesting from them the categories of people involved and what the States would do in this respect. However, until two days ago not one

State Health Minister had replied to the Federal Minister. That is how much our Minister of Health, the New South Wales Minister for Health and the New South Wales Minister for Youth and Community Services care. The last named Minister has not consulted his colleague the Minister for Health, who has not bothered to reply to the Federal Minister.

Here we find that a supposedly responsible Minister in the New South Wales Government is using under-privileged and unfortunate people as a means of bashing the Federal Government. What would have happened in this State if an Opposition member had done this when the Federal Labor Party was in power? Imagine the abuse he would have received for using under-privileged people to bolster up an argument. The New South Wales Minister for Health had not done his homework; he had not bothered to reply to the Federal Minister for Health, who wrote to him on July 31. So much for the credibility of the Labor Party in this State and in New South Wales. That Party has little credibility there as a result of the antics of its Premier, who is trying to outdo our Premier. No doubt the New South Wales Premier will want to come over here and try to ride an elephant in our zoo, but he might be in for a shock. We have a vacancy in the zoo for an orang-outang.

The report in the *News*, which was used by the member for Spence, was incorrect in another way. Foster children and those in non-State religious or charitable homes are covered by Medibank. The people involved should check their facts. The unfortunate people in these institutions are covered by good medical services provided by the State, and no-one will be disadvantaged under the scheme as it exists now. It is no good trying to scare these people and whip up public sympathy by making ridiculous statements such as this, which are irresponsible and without foundation, when these people will not be deprived of medical services. These members know that no Government would deprive them of those services. Here the State has the responsibility, when it has the salaried doctors giving the service already.

The whole argument is whether the State Government wants to be reimbursed for the salaried doctors who are on their pay-roll now and who always have been there. There is no case for the Commonwealth Minister for Health to answer, but he has told me that he will consider the representations from the various State Health Ministers. He will be pleased to receive representations and examine the whole issue.

Mr. Langley: What would be the answer?

Mr. BECKER: If the member for Unley reads the Medibank legislation, he will find that the Federal Minister now has the discretion to make the payments if he wants to do that. It is time the Labor Party realised that it will not score points and that for the first time the Liberal Government in Canberra is an efficient machine. We will not allow lies and deceitful untruths to be peddled in this State, when we have a Federal Government that in a few months has done more to rectify the economic situation in this country than any Labor Government will ever do. No-one should deny that. What Federal Government has ever had to deal with economic chaos similar to that which the Federal Fraser Government has had to take over? No-one else has had to deal with what is the greatest responsibility and challenge given to one man. No responsible citizen would allow the situation in which we were placed in September, October and November last year to continue. The final decision (and it was overwhelming) was made on December 13 last.

I want to correct another statement that was made this afternoon. It was another typical case of Federal Government bashing. That statement was that the Federal Government is not giving financial support to sport. The member for Fisher will deal with that matter later, but I want to refer to a letter from the Federal Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development. It states that in November this year the full 1976-77 Budget funds will be available and are now expected to total more than \$11 000 000 for certain funding for sport. The member for Unley is a member of a sports committee in this State that is sponsored by the Government, and he ought to know what he is talking about. We do not want to hear about what cricketers were paid 25 years ago. He knows that the Federal Government will honour its obligation.

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

Mr. HARRISON (Albert Park): I must express amazement at many statements that have been made in this House recently. I wish to comment on some of them, but I cannot comment on others, because I would not be in order in doing so. I refer to the statements made in the House last week about the vehicle industry. It is true (and this is not disputed for a moment) that there are problems in this industry but, whatever industry is functioning in this State, there are problems in it of a minor nature, but causing disruption, we know. There have been problems in this industry and other industries for many years.

We have overcome those problems in the past and, no doubt, the present problems in the vehicle industry will be overcome soon. We always have had officers who are capable of handling the problems as they should be handled, to the satisfaction of most members. Regardless of what a union official did, there will still be some minority grudge against the official and the organisation to which he belonged. I stress that certain statements were made wreaking wrath on this Government for not moving in certain directions to solve minor problems. Before the shadow Minister of Labour and Industry (the member for Davenport) rises to his feet on any issue he should study a little more closely the way in which unions conduct their affairs in various industries, especially in the Federal sphere. The rules of federal organisations are registered in the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, so that the State can do nothing in that area.

Many times this Government is called on to use its good offices to try to resolve or assist to resolve disputes in certain industries. We have been asked to do the same when in Opposition, too, but the State Government is powerless to act in the Federal sphere. Nevertheless, all Government members, whether on the front bench or back bench, with their trade union knowledge and background, would try in the interests of this State to give any advice needed. We cannot interfere with the internal structure of any organisation. Whether in Opposition or in Government we have always made ourselves available to assist with advice.

The previous Minister of Labour and Industry, the Hon. Dave McKee, worked untiringly to settle disputes when the House was in session, or in recess. I have been in his company when he has tried to resolve problems as late as 1 a.m. The present Minister of Labour and Industry also works untiringly whenever a dispute of any kind arises, whether under the jurisdiction of State or Federal courts. He always tries to bring his influence to bear whenever possible to solve disputes to the satisfaction of all concerned—employers and employees.

Mr. Dean Brown: Why do you think that he opposed the motion on prices yesterday?

Mr. HARRISON: I am not dealing with prices; I am dealing with the question of conciliation and arbitration in this State and of keeping peace and harmony within organisations without interfering with their internal structures and also ensuring that we do not transgress union policy in relation to Federal courts.

Mr. Dean Brown: Aren't you worried about the dispute at Chrysler's?

Mr. HARRISON: We are always worried about disputes, and the honourable member would know that if he had been here and heard what I said. We take every dispute to heart, whether it involves Chrysler Australia Limited, General Motors-Holden's, or the waterfront. We have proved that point in the past, and we will continue to do so in future. The point is that the vehicle industry, to which I first referred, is a characteristic industry, so much so that a minor dispute therein, involving only two or three men, can tie up thousands of people.

Mr. Mathwin: Like a demarcation issue?

Mr. HARRISON: I am referring not just to a demarcation dispute but to whatever the problem may be. There have been many of them, in some of which I have been involved. I have taken a few tin cans, tomatoes and Coca-Cola bottles at my end. That was my duty, and I performed it. Trade union officials have tried in the past, and I am sure will try in the future, to do their utmost to ensure that their members are satisfactorily served by them and that disputes are kept to a minimum, wherever possible. The shadow Minister should have a little more sympathy for these people instead of making personal attacks on various organisations for their lack of obligation to union officials. They are as dedicated as Opposition members and Government members are to their jobs, although they do not get anywhere near the money that members are paid. Indeed, they receive only slightly more than their normal wage. So, members opposite should not kick union officials to pieces. They do their jobs sincerely, and I am sure that it hurts each member of this House to see—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARRISON: —an industrial dispute occur anywhere. It does not matter which industry is involved. All Government members who have been associated with the industry try to give advice to ensure that something is done to resolve the issue. Opposition members should take cognisance of that.

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

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Having heard the member for Price earlier this evening once again decrying the Commonwealth Government for its attitude toward Aborigines, I could not help thinking that perhaps someone should set him to rights. Perhaps there are people on this side who are more knowledgeable and sympathetic towards Aborigines than anyone on the Government benches gives us credit for.

Coincidentally, money is not necessarily the solution to the problem. It goes a long way but, ironically enough, on *This Day Tonight* this evening there was a wonderful programme that gave the lie to almost everything he said. That programme caught my attention. It was a marvellous thing, because there was one of the most reasonable and articulate Aborigines who has ever appeared on

television speaking from Alice Springs about his attitude towards the Aboriginal Affairs Department over the past three years.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Was he satisfied with the Federal Government?

Mr. ALLISON: He was not satisfied with the Federal Whitlam Government. He said that that Government's Aboriginal Affairs Department, in his words, should have been scrapped long ago, because men in that department were racist in the extreme and referred to Aborigines as coons, etc. He said they were racist in approach. They were not sympathetic towards Aborigines, but were well paid themselves. He said there should have been far more involvement by Aborigines in Aboriginal affairs.

The money allocated towards Aboriginal welfare was far from adequately accounted for, he said. White man's administration costs absorbed far too much, and \$100 000 000 was spent by the Whitlam Government on Northern Territory Aborigines, who numbered 28 000. The sum of \$100 000 000 was spent on 28 000 people. This is quite edifying, one must admit, and that happened in three years! The most significant factor is that there was little sign of improvement. The money had largely been wasted. The sum of \$27 000 000 was spent on a hospital and allied facilities, with white doctors and white nurses. He said, "Why cannot they even train a few Aborigines to wash and bathe and look after the patients?" They did not do that, so what did the Aborigines do? They opened an Aboriginal medical centre and employed three doctors whom even white people visited because they were warm, kindly, and sympathetic. There was a rapport that people did not get in the cold, clean, clinical atmosphere in the Federal Government hospital. What about the housing project there? It alarmed me to see \$500 000 worth of houses, no progress to report following the cessation of building, because walls were partly erected, demolished, erected again, and then demolished. Aborigines were employed, not formally trained, and materials were lying there decaying—the steel shell of a supermarket and static buildings for nomadic Aborigines, with little hope of ever being used. That is an example of Government waste. It was alarming to realise that the Governments' policy was that money was the answer to all problems. Education comes first, not a hand-out of cash.

The man to whom I have referred said that money was paid to an advisory and technical consultant (white, of course), and quoted \$4 000 as an advisory fee for the construction of toilet blocks. "The fellows down the road got that", he said. More than that, the Southern Region Director (the white Director of the department) defended his staff and said that they had had only three years and that they were sympathetic, but they did not have the sympathy of the Aborigines. Somewhere there is a tremendous racial gap and, whatever he says, a solution is not close at hand. The Federal Government's policy of waving a cheque book around is obviously not a solution to the Aboriginal problem. Aborigines complained that money had gone into the wrong pockets, and that their own lot in life was unimproved. That, I say to critical Government members, especially the member for Price, is precisely what Fraser said when he said that he would reduce the amount available but that he would make sure that every cent used was accounted for, and that Aborigines would get value for money and saw that they got it. That is part of the answer to the problem.

In case any member thinks I have never met an Aboriginal, I point out that it has been my privilege to be associated with a fine young Aboriginal woman for the past

20 years who knows my wife and me. She is a double-certificated midwife, was an Australian test cricketer and fast bowler, and is a fine example of what an educated Aboriginal can become. There is no need for any of us on either side to be patronising.

Dr. Charles Duguid (an old Scotch name), who wrote a book about 20 years ago *No Dying Race*, was right on the ball: they are not a dying race, but a fine group of people. One thing that struck me when doing research on Aborigines 20 years ago as a newcomer to this country was that it was a race of people who did not need patronising. They are superior to the white people in Australia.

About 30 000 years ago they came from the north across the land bridge that existed, and what did they find in Australia? A climate that was not suitable for settlement; no grain crops they could use; no fruit they could use; and no animals they could domesticate unless you count the dingo, which has been the Aborigines' friend since way back into antiquity. When the land bridge disappeared, this group of people, who had a language with the most complicated verbal syntax of any language anywhere in the world (the Eskimo is good, because he has about 2 000 declensions of verbs), mastered not only their own language but also that of the tribes around them. Also, the Aboriginal had the most complicated musical structure of any group of people in the world. Charles Darwin (the noted scientist) indicted this group of people forever when he came to Australia and said that this group were little better than the Tierra del Fuegians, who were among the cesspit of the earth, according to Darwin. He rated Aborigines with them, and set the standards for the rest of the people who settled Australia and judged the Aboriginal by that standard. Darwin did that despite the fact that he took an Aboriginal back to Britain and found, to his surprise, that the Aboriginal learned one or two languages quite easily, a remarkable thing for a dull native! That is the type of person whom the Labor Party is patronising, because the Whitlam Government decided that it would give white oversight and white funding, and it has done very little to lift the Aboriginal and make him responsible for his own affairs.

What has the white man done in the past 150 years for the Aboriginal, without blaming Fraser, who has been in office for less than a year? We have given the Aboriginal disease, money, drink, drugs, and our own life-style, which we think is marvellous. We have given the Aboriginal a fraudulent, rapacious, decadent sort of culture. We have destroyed the Aboriginal's natural life-style. We have bastardised his culture and replaced it with something inferior—our own culture. What sort of a culture have we superimposed, when our own courts have not decreased our own crime rate, yet we decry the way the Aboriginal administers justice? What an example we have set!

The problems are massive. The Aboriginal probably needs us like he needs a hole in the head. Money alone will not solve the problem. There are now two problems: the problem of the city Aboriginal (the fringe dweller) and the country Aboriginal, who needs completely different treatment. I am sorry that the State usurped its own authority so willingly when it agreed to let the Federal Government take supreme responsibility for Aborigines in South Australia. The Whitlam Government said, "We can take over the Aboriginal problems," and this State was happy to let that Government do so.

The problems of education, health, nourishment, accommodation, gainful employment, but not necessarily along our life-style—these are the sorts of things about which the Opposition agrees with the Labor Party. The Aboriginal needs that sort of treatment. But the mere cutting down of a sum of money will not replace the education, the sympathy, the rapport and, above all, something we must put back into the Aboriginal—the idea that we respect him and his heritage. Unless people have that—and I doubt whether any Government member had an inkling of what this debate was going to be about—you may as well shut shop completely and go home. They are no dying race! A South Australian wrote that book, and we, as South Australians, owe it to him and the Aborigines to see that something is done.

Motion carried.

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 16, at 2 p.m.