

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, July 20, 1977

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

PETITION: UNIONISM

Mr. EVANS presented a petition signed by 20 electors and residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to abandon any legislation which would deprive employees of the right to choose whether or not they wished to join a trade union or to provide for compulsory unionism.

Petition received.

PETITION: WHYALLA WATER

Mr. KENEALLY presented a petition signed by 188 electors and residents of South Australia, praying that the House would investigate the refusal to use waste water for the growing of vegetable produce, and to ensure that existing water resources were not wasted in the city of Whyalla.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: YOUTH COMMITTEE REPORT

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I have received the final report of the Community Welfare Advisory Committee for Youth Assessment and Training Centres in South Australia. I wish to place on record my thanks to all members of the committee, led by its Chairman, Dr. Richard Nies, for the year of work which has gone into the production of the report. Thanks are also due to the large number of interested and expert people who made written and oral submissions to the committee. I have not yet had an opportunity to give the report a thorough reading, but from a preliminary glance it is obvious that the advisory committee has tackled its terms of reference most conscientiously. As soon as I have completed a close examination of the report and recommendations, they will be taken to Cabinet for consideration.

QUESTIONS

CRIME

Mr. TONKIN: In view of the concern on rape and violent crime expressed by the Commissioner of Police in his report tabled in this House yesterday, will the Attorney-General arrange for this year's figures to be released as soon as possible, and will he now outline to the House the steps being taken to reduce the present unacceptable number of these offences? The Police Commissioner's report states, at page 15:

Reports of rapes and attempted rapes have shown an alarming increase from 91 in 1974 to 131 in 1975-76, an increase of 44 per cent.

Although the Police Commissioner's report is not normally available until nearly 12 months, or sometimes more than 12 months, after the completion of that year, it would seem important that this year's figures should be released as soon as possible to see whether that alarming trend has in any way been reversed. The Attorney-General is no doubt aware of the fear and concern being widely expressed particularly by the women of Adelaide about this problem and that most women will not go anywhere unescorted at night. Daily we see newspaper reports of further offences. No Government and no State should tolerate this situation and it is important that the Attorney-General indicate what action he is now taking on this serious and despicable crime and other serious offences.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: First, this Government is, of course, concerned about the number of rapes and other crimes of violence that are occurring in the community. I have previously expressed that concern and I do so again today on behalf of the Government. The Government is concerned about this problem but we are endeavouring to deal with the problem in a constructive and rational way, trying to take steps as appropriate to ensure that the people of South Australia are protected as well as can be.

I will certainly obtain for the Leader at the earliest possible time the statistics for rape in South Australia over the most recent 12 months, and I will make those statistics available publicly. I am pleased to see that at last the Leader and hopefully his colleagues are taking some note of the statistic in relation to these types of offence because for some time they have been taking it upon themselves to pooh-pooh the statistics saying, "They do not represent anything; you can ignore statistics. The campaign that we have been running as an Opposition takes no account of statistics; we do not want to know about statistics, because that ruins the sort of law-and-order campaign we are running."

I think this is an appropriate time to point out to the House, for example, that on Tuesday of last week a Mr. John M. Kelley wrote to the *Advertiser* expressing grave concern about the figures for vandalism and other associated violent crimes, as he saw it, in the community. It might be of interest to members to know that this was simply a continuation of the scare and fear campaign that members opposite have been endeavouring to engender in the community. Mr. Kelley is a Liberal Party organiser in the Seacliff-Brighton area, and this is merely an indication of a continuing campaign the Liberals have been on about for some time.

I warned the people of South Australia some time ago, when there was a debate in this House on such issues (particularly that debate related to the Hon. Mr. Burdett's farcical Bill on child pornography, and I shall deal with that matter in a moment), that this was simply part of the Liberal law-and-order campaign, that the Liberals had no real concern with this issue, and that they were not putting forward constructive and rational proposals. They are simply trying to engender in the community some fear on such issues. I roundly condemned them for doing that, because the effect of it is that many people in the community, after suffering from such an irresponsible campaign, are now quite concerned. The Leader says that women throughout the community are expressing their concern, and well they might express concern after the sort of fear campaign members opposite have been running. Let us look at the comments of some of the more rational people and those in the community who are concerned with these issues.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General must be given an opportunity to reply to the question.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I should like to quote to the House the comments of Heather Orr, who is, I think, the Director of, or is at least associated with, the Rape Crisis Centre. When these matters were brought to her attention she pointed out, quite rightly, that, because South Australia had been the first State in the Commonwealth to introduce new legislation to reduce the trauma suffered by rape victims in reporting this crime to the police and having the matter dealt with through the courts, and because this was the first Government to introduce enlightened legislation to assist such victims and show humanity in that matter, bringing these matters to the attention of women in the community, the trauma of reporting rape in South Australia is very much less than is the case in other States, particularly in Queensland, and women here, according to Ms. Orr (who should know because she is involved with the Rape Crisis Centre), are much more prepared to bring to the attention of the police the fact that they have been raped.

For the first time in Australia we are reaching a situation where women are prepared, *en masse*, to report to the police that they have been raped. I think this is a healthy situation when a community is bringing such matters to the public eye. Whilst this Government is very concerned about the number of rapes occurring, it believes that the number of rapes reported in the community is indicative not of a dramatic increase in the number of rapes occurring but of an increase in the number being reported, because women feel secure in the knowledge that, at least in South Australia, they can report this crime without the fear of a Draconian-type trial, such as occurs in many other States of Australia. I saw only recently that Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, the Premier of Queensland, had now decided to follow our lead, although about two years later. As one might expect of him, however, he does not intend to go to the humane lengths to which the South Australian Government has gone. He intends a little bit of tokenism and window dressing simply to try to pacify the women in Queensland who have expressed concern about the laws there not being appropriate to provide protection to the victims of rape. On AM, I heard a woman in Queensland expressing her concern that the Queensland Government was not going as far as the South Australian Government had gone in providing this humanitarian protection, and she was a member of the Liberal Party. Certainly, the Opposition in this place can take no credit for the fact that the enlightened laws in South Australia now apply because, right to the death knell, it opposed the passage of that legislation.

FERAL GOATS

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister for the Environment say what has been achieved in the control of feral goats in the North of South Australia? As members would appreciate, ever since the explorers and early settlers moved into that part of the State and brought goats to provide them with milk and food, the goats have created enormous problems. As they have unfortunately not practised the birth control methods that seem successful elsewhere, in the Flinders Range and in the North the goats are a tremendous problem to the graziers in the area and to the

national parks. As I understand that action has been taken at Danggali Park I should appreciate any information the Minister can give, knowing full well his close association with and interest in this problem over the years.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Soon after becoming Minister in 1975, I became aware of the magnitude of this problem, particularly in the more rugged part of the Flinders Range where control of the feral goat is almost impossible. Many attempts have been made in various ways to eradicate them by calling in gun clubs, and suggestions have been made that the Army should take over, but it is difficult to control feral goats in country like that. The problem is somewhat easier to deal with in the area around Danggali, a large area that was formerly the stations of Hypurna, Canopus, Postmark and Morganvale, north of Renmark, which the National Parks and Wildlife Division was able to buy with money provided initially by the Whitlam Government a couple of years ago. In that large area, where the terrain is much easier to manage, it has been possible to take action against the goats. Originally, last year, we entered into an agreement with a member of the Angora Mohair Goat Society, which was interested in trapping the animals to obtain the white does for breeding purposes. I also took the initiative in raising the matter with Samcor, which set up a processing line to handle the goats. Samcor's Western Australian equivalent, at Midland Junction, is processing about 10 000 of these animals a week (or about 500 000 a year), so it is possible to handle goats in abattoirs, and there is a market for the meat.

The agreement with this person last year broke down. A condition of the agreement was that the rangers did not take action in Danggali, because we did not want them dispersed by shooting, which would have militated against the effect of harvesting the goats. No action was therefore taken for a while. For one reason or another, he was unable to proceed with the project, so we had to take action with our own resources. What has happened since then has been something of a success story at Danggali, because there has been considerable progress. About 6 000 goats were destroyed by resident rangers up to March this year. That was achieved by rounding them up. I believe that a two-year old kelpie called Patsie was the main agent in bringing about this result. She was expert at her job, and in one day, with her assistance, more than 400 goats were destroyed. Other techniques were used. A landowner, a Mr. Don French, whose property is to the north of Danggali, has been active, with our full endorsement, in rounding up goats and trucking them away for various uses, most of them ending up at Samcor. Mr. French is using a series of mobile yards and moving from dam to dam where the goats congregate. The only really effective way of harvesting them is at the waterholes. I think that more than 3 000 goats have so far been removed from Danggali in this way. Last week about 700 were taken away from the park. The Vertebrate Pests Authority is fully informed and physically involved in some of this work. The management of the adjoining cane grass station has parallel extermination proceeding. By this coming summer the pressure of feral goats on Danggali will be considerably reduced by these measures.

ABORTIONS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say what are the statutory requirements in relation to notification of abortions in South Australia, and what action the Government intends to take to ensure accuracy in

future in reporting abortions? The report of the committee established to notify the situation to the Government was tabled in the House yesterday. The report contains several disturbing features. The increased number of women, aged between 16 and 19 years, who have had abortions is a cause for concern. The reference to the use of hospital beds at page 4 of the report is also a cause for concern. The report states:

The level of reported abortions . . . is still imposing severe restriction on the availability of gynaecological beds. At least at one teaching hospital, where increased interviewing facilities have increased the workload of abortion surgery, there is paucity of bed accommodation for other gynaecological patients and over-utilisation of operating theatres is causing problems. This of course is adverse to teaching responsibilities.

Much doubt is cast by this report on the accuracy of the figures placed before Parliament; it would appear they are quite inaccurate. The report states:

This committee is not convinced that statistics as compiled are accurate, and has no reason to believe that not all abortions are reported, and that the reporting of complications is quite inaccurate. For example, in the report of the social worker attached to Queen Victoria Hospital, Mrs. Squires, it is stated that, out of 247 patients aborted over a six months period, "there were only 32 re-admissions, the majority of them due to retained products . . .", which is a complication rate of approximately 13 per cent which cannot be reconciled with the 3.3 per cent complication rate appearing in these official statistics . . .

Another disturbing factor is that at least 96.74 per cent of those reported abortions are performed for psychiatric reasons (an unbelievable figure to my mind). What are the statutory requirements in relation to the notification of abortions, and what does the Government intend to do in the light of the recommendations made by this committee in the report tabled yesterday in this House?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Deputy Leader will appreciate that the information he requires lies in the province of my colleague in another place. I will bring the matter to his attention.

WHYALLA SHIPYARDS

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Premier make further approaches to Senator Cotton in an endeavour to obtain from that gentleman his current attitude and the actual result of recent discussions held between the Whyalla City Council and the Senator in respect of future employment, or non-employment, of the work force at Whyalla? First, I point out to the Premier that, from the way the article reads in today's *Advertiser* concerning the result, I would have reasonable doubt whether any result has occurred at all. Further, to my knowledge the Premier has received no acknowledgment from the Federal Government of his submission to it in relation to shipbuilding. I remind the Premier that Senator Cotton was reported to have assured the people of Whyalla that money would be made available to that city to make up for the possible loss of shipbuilding to that city. I understand that this was later denied by the Prime Minister. I believe that the Federal Government is not concerned about the employment of people, and that the real result of no further orders being placed to build ships will be dramatically felt in October and November in Whyalla. For this reason details of the result, if possible, of the latest conference is most vital.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Federal Government has not replied to the submissions of the South Australian Government in relation to the shipbuilding industry. The

offers made by the South Australian Government to assist the shipbuilding industry have not been taken up by the Federal Government, which has, however, refused to date to make any provision for additional assistance to the shipbuilding industry. There was a press release, as the honourable member has said, about moneys being made available to Whyalla to provide for some assistance in a social way in respect of people who would become unemployed in Whyalla as a result of the loss of the shipbuilding industry but, as the honourable member has said, that proposal was later denied by the Federal Government; there is no money available from that Government in respect of this matter. As to the present consultation taking place between the Mayor of Whyalla and Senator Cotton, I have not been apprised of its contents. I notice that press reports have stated that Senator Cotton intends to have a job investigation made in Whyalla. As Mrs. Ekblom could have told him, there has been a State Government working party in which the Whyalla council has been involved for many months. The South Australian Government has spent much money on this investigation, which is still continuing the party being headed by a leading South Australian industrialist, Mr. Rainsford, specifically on this question. We have already assembled what information can be made available in respect of the job situation in Whyalla, so it is known. The possibility of alternative bases of employment have been considerably investigated, and discussions have been held with Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited as to alternative means of work for people who are involved in the shipyard. To date there has been no positive response of any kind from the Federal Government for anything it is prepared to do in respect of Whyalla. My own constant applications to the Federal Government for consideration of assistance in this area have simply either been curtly acknowledged without any response from the Government, or simply ignored.

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say what action, if any, the Government intends to take either to have amended or seek a declaration as to the meaning of section 32 of the Constitution Act, or otherwise to make certain that the next State general election can be properly held on the new electoral boundaries pursuant to the order of the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission? Since the last session, as a result of inquiries, I noticed that the apparent effect of section 32 of the Constitution Act passed by Parliament in 1975 was that the new boundaries did not come into effect until the day of the next general election, from which it would follow that until that day none of the preparations for an election on the new boundaries could lawfully be carried out before then. I would remind the Premier, as he is being briefed by his Attorney, of the actual words of section 32 (1), which begins:

Until the first general election of members of the House of Assembly to which subsection (2) of this section applies . . .

The relevant words in subsection (2) are as follows:

. . . the State shall, as from the day on which a general election of members of the House of Assembly is next held . . .

On making my view of this matter public, the Attorney responded immediately by expressing complete satisfaction that there was no problem whatever. I heard the Attorney on television that evening, and was so struck

by the bizarreness of his argument (and I speak charitably) that I had it transcribed. What he actually said on one of the television channels is as follows:

Well the situation is that the Constitution Act provides that the new boundaries shall come into effect on the day of the election. But of course an election is held from the day that the writs are issued until the day that the writs are returned and so it doesn't mean the day upon which voting takes place specifically and so the election can be held . . .

On another channel, he said:

In the provision that Mr. Millhouse has been referring to in the Electoral Act—

I had not been referring to the Electoral Act—

and he's claiming that because the new boundaries or certain provisions for that Act will not come into effect until the day of the election, that in fact returning officers can't be appointed and nominations can't be had until the day of the election. Of course, the day of the election means the day upon which the election starts, and that's the day upon which the writ was issued, and there's no problem at all in that area as far as I'm aware.

Having heard that (and that is a literal transcription of what the Attorney said), I wrote to the Premier on June 20 saying, in part:

The Attorney-General has said that this will not affect the holding of the next State general election but, upon analysis of his remarks, they are meaningless and in any case his reasoning, at least publicly, is so faulty as to be worthless. I therefore doubt whether what he has said is the considered opinion of the Government. What action, if any, does the Government propose to take?

To that letter I have had no reply, not even an acknowledgment. Finally, I would remind the Premier that a simple procedure exists under section 31 of the Supreme Court Act to seek a declaration of the court. For that purpose I refer the Premier to such cases as the Western Australian decision in *Tonkin v. Brand* in 1962, or it could be done by an Act to amend the Constitution Act, which I doubt (although I am not certain) would be caught by section 88, the entrenchment section.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I saw the honourable member's statements in the press and they occasioned me some surprise. I read what was his opinion and can say only, with great respect, that I differed from it and considered it as bizarre as apparently he considers the opinion of the Government. I say that in a most charitable way.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It made the front page of the *Advertiser*, for some unknown reason.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It did get the front page of the *Advertiser*. I point back to the honourable member the Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1969.

Mr. Millhouse: But it has an extra subsection in it if you have a look at it. I made sure it did. You should look at that before you take notice of what Peter Duncan tells you.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have had a look at it. Not only have we considered it, and agree respectfully with my colleague, the leader of the bar, on this opinion but I said, "There is nothing in this point of Millhouse's." However, I shall read to the honourable member what the Crown Solicitor had to say about it, as follows:

Mr. R. Millhouse, M.P., has expressed doubts about the effect of section 32 of the Constitution Act, 1934-1976. As I understand it he refers to section 32 authorising the electoral districts having effect "as from the day on which a general election of members of the House of Assembly is next held".

For that reason, as I understand his argument there is no power to issue writs in respect of the new electoral districts or to prepare rolls for those districts and also

some suggestion that electoral officers cannot be paid. The warrant to issue writs and to prepare rolls is contained in the Electoral Act. I can see no difficulty in issuing the writ for an election for the new electoral districts. In my opinion, section 21 of the Acts Interpretation Act is a clear warrant for such issue. Indeed, if the writ was issued referable to the existing electoral districts I would regard that as clearly a nugatory action.

The preparation of electoral rolls is governed by section 19 of the Electoral Act. In particular, subsections (4), (5) and (6) clearly contemplate the preparation of electoral rolls before electoral districts have come into force. Nor can I follow the argument that the electoral officers cannot be paid as in my opinion there is no difficulty in implementing an election on the new electoral districts. In my opinion, there is no necessity for any amendment to the provisions of the Constitution Act, or the Electoral Act.

The Government agrees with him.

PORT ADELAIDE

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister for Planning provide any information concerning the proposed Port Adelaide redevelopment scheme now that the Monarto Commission report has been completed? The published report is good, much thought and consultation having gone into it. However, my concern now is about the reports appearing in the local press at a time when Port Adelaide needs confidence. The Mayor of Port Adelaide is now knocking the scheme. I thought that knocking was the province of members opposite.

Mr. EVANS: I rise on a point or order, Mr. Speaker. I believe the honourable member is commenting.

The SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order: the honourable member is commenting. I remind all honourable members that if this is to be the standard I will have to pick up many more honourable members.

Mr. WHITTEN: Thank you, Sir; I take your point. I refer the Minister to a report on the front page of the July 6 issue of the *Port Adelaide Messenger*. There is a photograph of St. Vincent Street, Port Adelaide, with a sketch of one of the proposed schemes of redevelopment for Port Adelaide. The heading across the top of the page is "Port scheme 'red herring'". The report states:

The Port Adelaide redevelopment scheme is a "red herring", according to Port Adelaide Mayor, Mr. H. R. C. Marten. Mr. Marten made the statement when asked to report on the scheme's progress to *Messenger*. Mr. Marten said the Monarto Commission engaged to carry out investigations and prepare plans and programmes for the redevelopment, had done "no good". ". . . We don't even know how much the investigation by the commission has cost the ratepayers," Mayor Marten said.

Mr. Marten went on to say that he was concerned about the Port Adelaide Joint Centre Committee, and that its meetings were a waste of time. The following week the President of the Port Adelaide Retail Traders Association said in a letter to the *Messenger*:

I am prompted to comment on your paper's last edition front leader when the Mayor, Mr. Marten, was reported as associating the proposed Port Adelaide redevelopment scheme with a "red herring". . . His "red herring" has turned to a "hornet's nest".

I would appreciate any information the Minister can give me on the situation at Port Adelaide.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not sure whether the herrings are getting into the hornets or the hornets are getting into the herrings. Cabinet is currently considering the whole question of Port Adelaide redevelopment and I hope to be in a position soon to make a formal announcement on the whole matter. One assurance I can give straight

away is that there will be no compulsory acquisition of any residential property, and people in the Port Adelaide area and the central area which might be subject to redevelopment need not concern themselves on that point. I understand the interest of the Port Adelaide business community in getting some effective redevelopment. I am disappointed that the Mayor is not as keen a supporter of the project as he should be.

Dr. Eastick: Whose opinion is that?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is my opinion. I am disappointed that that is the case. Had the member for Light been Mayor of Port Adelaide, I would have thought he would be a keen supporter of the proposal. However, certain formalities must be completed by Cabinet on this, and until they are completed it is not appropriate to make a detailed announcement. As soon as I am in a position to do so, I shall do just that.

ALFALFA APHID

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Agriculture a full report on the present situation in relation to the spotted alfalfa aphid? I would like the Minister to indicate in that report the known outbreaks, the impact that the widespread infestation could have in rural areas of the State, especially those dependent partly or entirely on lucerne pastures, and outlining the present and proposed actions of the Agriculture Department to cope with the situation. The introduction of this pest to South Australia could have serious consequences. There are some 800 000 hectares of lucerne country in this State, 200 000 ha of which is in the Mallee District; there is no alternative pasture to lucerne in that country. Apart from the estimated \$50 000 000 loss in productivity and its effect on the economy of South Australia, the cost to the people concerned, if this infestation should prove as serious as is suspected, could cause bankruptcy in many cases and severe hardship in other instances. I believe that the House should be properly informed of the situation and of the action being taken and proposed by the Government in the matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to take up the matter with my colleague and to get the information sought by the honourable member. He would be aware that the Minister made an announcement recently about a sum of money being made available to try to control this pest. The Government recognises the seriousness of it, and I am certain that the Minister is doing everything possible to control the problem. I shall get the details for the honourable member and bring them down as soon as possible.

SOUTH-EAST EXPENDITURE

Mr. ABBOTT: Will the Premier say whether it is true that the Government is investing too much expenditure in the South-East of our State; whether it is true that the expenditure is short-sighted; and whether the Government would have been better off investing the money in a city-based enterprise and, if so, in what city-based enterprise should the expenditure have been invested? I refer to a report in the *Advertiser* on July 15 under the heading, "South Australian Government goes into hardware business", and the expression of surprise by the member for Mount Gambier at this Government move when he stated that the

Government seemed to be spending millions of dollars in the South-East when the rest of the State was being asked to exercise economic restraint.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was somewhat surprised to read the remarks of the honourable member for Mount Gambier.

Mr. Jennings: "Astonished" is, I think, a better word.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, I was not exaggerating my feelings when I said "surprised". I find it very strange that a member should suggest that the Government is doing too much for his area. I do not believe that Mount Gambier is being improperly dealt with by the provision of the kind of facilities and supports of Government services being provided there.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You're trying to buy the seat.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If that is what the honourable member's case is to the people of Mount Gambier, there is a very clear message from the Liberal Party about Mount Gambier: his interjection means that, if people vote Liberal in Mount Gambier, the message to the Government is that we should stop spending money there.

Mr. Goldsworthy: No.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. That is what the honourable member is saying.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That's what he said.

Mr. Allison: That's what the Premier said at Millicent last week.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is what the honourable member is saying.

Mr. Goldsworthy: No. Keep Allison there and you will do very well.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Mount Gambier has complained that too much money is being spent in that area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: And the Deputy Leader says we're trying to buy the seat.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In relation to this matter, let us deal—

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. Although I have called for order three times, the honourable member for Eyre continues to interject. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The suggestion is that somehow or other the money which was invested by the Woods and Forests Department in a commercial outlet in Mount Gambier that was vital to that commercial concern should not have been spent to maintain that commercial outlet for the department but should somehow or other have been spent in Adelaide. The department, which is the State forestry enterprise in the South-East, is the biggest enterprise in the area and the whole foundation of the economy of Mount Gambier. If it is not a successful commercial enterprise, not only that body but all other major enterprises in that area will suffer, because they depend on it, and part of that commercial operation is the maintenance of an effective and competitive commercial outlet. The advice to us by officers of that department was that we should not allow the major commercial outlet in that area to fall into the hands of the department's competitors which might then deprive it of its major commercial outlet in the South-East, and the Forestry Board recommended

it. That was a perfectly normal commercial operation. If Softwood Holdings had bought Zed's, which member of the Opposition would have said, "That's a terrible thing."?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It would have been a monopoly.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It would have been a monopoly. It would have been a perfectly proper commercial action. How is the department, which is also in the business, to be prevented from a normal commercial operation in the same way? When it took place, the Leader of the Opposition went on air and cried, "Creeping socialism". Has anyone ever heard such nonsense! Obviously, the Opposition has the attitude that, where there is any kind of State investment, it is bad and should never happen. However, the amazing thing is that the Opposition can say that in the South-East where business after business has been funded by Government undertakings. Employment exists in that area only because of it. I was down there the other day.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I opened a new branch—

Mr. Mathwin: You have a permanent booking.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This, again, is something that is said by members opposite. I had not been in Mount Gambier for six months. On a previous occasion when I had not been there for six months, the then Mayor of Mount Gambier got up and said that I had forgotten Mount Gambier. Now, if I go there after six months, members of the Opposition object to my being there. Apparently the Premier should not turn up there, even when I have business there, farmers' meetings to attend, or buildings to open.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On each one of these occasions when I have been there I have been approached by people for State assistance to a number of undertakings, and the Government has been giving them assistance.

Mr. Tonkin: Transport? Are you going to take it over?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The transport people in Mount Gambier are presently laughing at the Leader of the Opposition because he and his party were going around South Australia at the time of the last State election saying that we were going to take over the transport industry. He has just repeated that statement. Some of them got frightened last time, but now they know his statements are completely empty and without basis. The areas in the South-East that the honourable member does not like our being involved in do not extend to businesses in Mount Gambier, because they do not agree with the honourable member. Safcol's undertakings at Millicent were financed through the Government. Those undertakings have provided additional employment in Millicent.

Mr. Vandeppeer: You have a white elephant you didn't know what to do with.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has not been listened to when making statements like that, not only by the electors at Millicent but by the preselection process in his own Party.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Promptly after the honourable member's objections about Government financing of businesses in Mount Gambier I received on my desk a

recommendation by the Industries Development Committee of this Parliament for further assistance by the Government to another major enterprise in Mount Gambier. I signed the guarantee. It would appear that the honourable member wants to close the Mount Schank meatworks, because the Government ought not to provide assistance. The honourable member is saying we are spending too much money down there. If that is the attitude of the Liberal Party, I shall be pleased if it continues to make that clear to the electors in that district.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. ALLISON: At no stage have I been involved in seeking to close down the Mount Schank meatworks. A statement like that, coming from the Premier, is specious, to say the least. With reference to the Zed's takeover in the South-East, I was phoned by the Adelaide press asking for comment. I was totally unaware that the industry had been taken over. The press clipping was read to me. I expressed surprise and said that, had Mr. Chatterton wished to extend the Woods and Forests Department's direct marketing, I was surprised that he had chosen the South-East in preference to Adelaide, where he would have had far greater scope for direct marketing and that the \$200 000 that was spent in purchasing Zed's store might well have achieved greater results for Mount Gambier and for the Woods and Forests Department had it been spent in Adelaide. I believe that someone asked me in which industry in Adelaide the money might be spent, and probably a little facetiously I said, "Jack Wright may have been interested in Kauri Timbers so he could then decide what to do about weekend shopping."

MOTOR CYCLE SCRAMBLE

Mr. ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands to rescind a Government ban placed on the East Lake Bonney site at Barmera as a venue for the annual charitable fund-raising motor cycle scramble? I refer to an article in the *Advertiser* of July 11, which, under the heading "Scramble petition", states:

A petition asking the South Australian Government to lift a ban on motor cycle scramble races near the Barmera aerodrome is being circulated in the town. A number of fund-raising scramble events, organised by the Barmera Rotary Club, were held on the site before being banned by the Minister of Lands (Mr. Casey). The ban was imposed because it was claimed the motor cycles and spectators were damaging the environment and "the use of the cycles in the area around Lake Bonney could not be tolerated." The meetings were held under the control of the Auto Cycle Union. The site is said to be ideal for scramble racing. Since 1971, the Barmera Rotary Club, in conjunction with other sporting bodies in the town, has conducted one annual event on that site during the Christmas holiday period. As a result of this annual event, more than \$3 000 has been donated to the Bonney Lodge Home for the Aged in Barmera. In addition to the \$3 000, other clubs in the district have benefited: the golf club, Girl Guides, Inner Wheel Club, harriers, the basketball and tennis clubs, the Barmera Hotel, business people, and the caravan park. The District Council of Barmera has supported the event as a once-a-year event only, and it has been willing to donate an additional 100 trees to be planted in the area in order to beautify it and keep it intact. I believe that the decision of the Government and the Minister to ban this annual event was a poor decision and should be rescinded.

The Government suggested that the Rotary Club should conduct this annual event at another site. It did so in 1977, and the event was a complete failure. Motor cyclists who came to the area were not happy with it, and there is a likelihood that the scramble will be discontinued if it is forced to go elsewhere. Will the Minister try to have the Government's decision rescinded, so that the scramble can take place once again on the original site?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to ask my colleague to consider the points raised by the honourable member. I assume that the scramble has been completed this year.

Mr. Arnold: Yes, and it was a disaster.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As no scramble is pending, I will ask my colleague for a report for the honourable member.

SCHOOL SECURITY

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Education say whether action is being taken to increase the security of departmental property following recent incidents of arson at schools? This problem has been with us for some time, and damage to school property both from arson and from breaking and entering has cost the Government, and the community, heavily. During the weekend I believe that a school at Colonel Light Gardens and the Strathmont Junior Primary School at Gilles Plains suffered from fires which are believed to have been deliberately lit. These incidents further indicate the need for increased protection and after-hours surveillance of school properties. I therefore ask the Minister what action can be taken or is being considered to alleviate this problem.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As the honourable member has said, this problem has been with us for some time, and I imagine that it is likely to be with us for some time still. Public property of all kinds tends to be, in the large cities in which most members of western industrialised nations live, subject to many depredations. People who live on foreshore areas could give us some idea of the life span of shrubs that are often planted there by councils. Unfortunately, those shrubs are quickly ripped out. We know how public notices and street signs tend to be bent and twisted by people whose sense of humour seems similarly bent and twisted. Of course, schools represent large commitments of public money and are also subject to this form of vandalism. It is not only public property that is subject to vandalism from time to time, but public property tends, by its nature, to be more accessible to those who seek in some way to act out the distorted fantasies that they have.

I would see the long-term solution to this problem emerging out of a change in community attitude. In turn, this is partly the responsibility of the general education process. I would therefore hope that much of the resolution of this problem could come from the schools themselves. I would instance an interesting experiment that was conducted by the Minister of Transport a year or so ago when his department faced vandalism when the Christie Downs railway line was being constructed. Departmental officers had an idea about where some of the young people who were causing the destruction were coming from, particularly the school some of the vandals might be attending or where potential vandals might reside. The young people from that school were actually taken on a tour of inspection of the railway line and were told that it was their property and their parents' property as much as it was anyone else's property. I believe that Coca-Cola came good with a

bottle of drink for each of them. Although other factors may have operated, since then the impact of vandalism on the line has been reduced somewhat.

We will consider various measures in the short term to ascertain what can be done to provide greater security in schools. It is not possible to do anything like putting a caretaker in every school, because that would be extremely expensive. It may be that, in those schools that are subject to much vandalism, we could use floodlights and could perhaps come to an informal arrangement with parents to keep a continuing watch on the school.

Mr. Wardle: Do you know what would be the cost of using caretakers?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I can certainly provide the House with that information if the honourable member wants it. The cost would be quite considerable. We would certainly want to ensure that the programme we have to enable the community to use education facilities is continued. Two arguments exist here, and perhaps both of them have a certain amount of validity. True, where one has much community involvement in a school it is not always possible to distinguish between those who are at the school for a legitimate reason and those who are there without a legitimate reason. It is also true that a school that is abandoned, empty and dark is probably more of a sitting duck than is the school that is subject to much community use. Therefore, the community use programme must continue, but at the same time there must be some means of ensuring that we can detect when people are on school property without a legitimate excuse.

Other information has been made available to the public recently about the appointment of security officers and that sort of thing to advise the department about further measures that might be taken. These people are more in the category of advisory personnel than they are security officers in the normal sense of the term. With more than 800 schools in our State it could not be expected that one, two or three people could perform as security officers in the normal sense of that term, but they may, as a result of visiting schools, see a particular pattern of vandalism and perhaps make appropriate recommendations that we could carry out.

CAVAN BRIDGES

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Transport say when urgent construction work will commence on bridges over the railway tracks at Cavan between Cross Keys Road and the Salisbury Highway on National Route No. 1? The House would be fully aware that a traffic hazard has existed here for a considerable time and that gross inconvenience has been caused at peak traffic periods to those people living in northern areas of the State and in the metropolitan area, and to those at Salisbury. On July 17 the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon) issued a news release in which he stated, among other things:

to ensure a steady flow of Commonwealth funds until the principal legislation could be introduced, the Government recently passed the States Grants (Roads Interim Assistance) Act. This means that \$4 550 000 is now available to South Australia during the three months until the end of September for spending on the national roads projects, which I approved as being eligible for Commonwealth assistance during 1977-1978.

The news release outlines the allocation that has been made to continue 2 kilometres of road construction between Cross Keys Road and Salisbury Highway, including

bridges over the railway at Cavan. The amount available for this work is \$860 000. I therefore ask the Minister when, with this allocation having been appropriated, it can be expected that work will commence on the necessary construction of bridges at Cavan.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I thank the honourable member for raising the question, because it gives me the opportunity to refute an allegation that was made yesterday that work should have started on the duplication of the over-pass and that, in fact, it was another of the alleged broken promises. Had the honourable member cared to check the schedule of works, which I presume the Opposition Whip has received and has made available—
Mr. Venning: It's not made available to everyone.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The schedule is really not of much interest to members except in relation to their own district. I am sure the honourable member would not be interested in knowing what is spent in the South-East, along the river, or on the West Coast, but that is why the Opposition Whip is provided with two copies of the schedule. Until now two copies have always proved adequate. There have been times when a member has sought a duplicate of certain pages as they involve that member's district, and when those pages have been provided immediately. We do not needlessly produce copies of the schedule, because we believe the money should be spent on roads and not on providing unnecessary books. This is a clear example of how it is a waste of time providing material if honourable members do not read it, because, had they read it, they would have seen on the schedule dealing with the proposed expenditure on construction and reconstruction of national highways (appendix 1) that, to the end of June, 1977, \$9 000 has already been spent on the project in the planning stages. In other words, it is proceeding. In fact, an additional \$460 000 is proposed to be expended in 1977-78, with a total expenditure of \$803 000, and work will be done by the department. It is all there in the book. However, there is one other important aspect, and that is why this has not yet been announced. Before we are permitted to go ahead with the expenditure of this money we must first ask Mr. Nixon in Canberra for his approval. We have done that.

Mr. Tonkin: You have done it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We have sent to Canberra, and I am anxiously awaiting the Minister's reply. I do not accept a newspaper report as being a reply from a Federal Minister. That is all I have. When Peter Nixon stops playing politics and replies to correspondence, I will be able to advise the honourable member of the exact position. I hope that the Minister will reply to my letter, and I hope that he will permit us to proceed with what we want to do in South Australia.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Mr. COUMBE

Mr. EVANS (Fisher) moved:

That three months leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Torrens (Mr. J. W. H. Coumbe) on account of absence overseas on Commonwealth Parliamentary Association business.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 19. Page 30.)

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): As is traditional, I support this Bill, which provides for \$190 000 000 to cover the expenditure expected for the support of the Public Service until the Budget is introduced. I cannot help looking back to my comments on April 5 this year, in the previous session of Parliament when we dealt with Supply Bill (No. 1). At that time I said it would be interesting to see the main Appropriation Bill for 1977-78, the Budget. I am looking forward with even greater anticipation to the introduction of that document later this year. It will be taken to pieces, and I give clear warning of that. In April, I said:

It appears from the amount of \$190 000 000 that the introduction of the Budget can be expected in about August of this year. I understand that the increased amount is partly to provide for the high level of costs faced by the Government and partly because of an additional pay period falling due in July.

The Treasurer did not contradict that remark in any way. It is interesting to note that we have priority given to another Supply Bill so early in this session of Parliament. All I can say is that if the Treasurer has any thought of a snap election in this State the passage of this Bill will certainly leave his options wide open, and we are indeed conscious of that fact. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the Bill.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): It was rather surprising to hear no mention of unemployment in the speech prepared for His Excellency yesterday, when the Premier was reported as saying on the same day that the major issue for the coming State election would be unemployment. Apparently the Premier hopes to exploit the present unfortunate unemployment situation, and use it for his own political and electoral advantage. Apparently, he will attempt to lay the total blame for unemployment on the present Federal Government, and that he will point to the present State unemployment relief scheme as being evidence of his own Government's concern to solve the problem.

It is a matter of regret that he has so frequently denigrated the Opposition's suggestions for a more effective long-term approach to the problem. Unemployment is a matter of universal concern; it concerns all Parties, or should, in this State; it concerns everyone. It calls for an approach which I believe is above that of short-term political advantage. For this reason, I intend to take this relatively brief opportunity to examine the problem of unemployment in more detail. This examination will

include the causes and contributing causes, the possible solutions available, and particularly the most effective approach open to the Government of South Australia at present, and in the future, whatever the political complexion of that Government.

Unemployment has replaced inflation as the major concern of the community at present and, while we can take much comfort from the fact that inflation is steadily coming under control, we cannot under-estimate the effect that continuing unemployment is having on our community. Unemployment touches everyone. It threatens the security of individuals. It threatens the security of families, and it therefore threatens their quality of life. It is having a most serious effect on young people particularly.

I hope to take the opportunity, which will arise during the Address in Reply debate, to ventilate some of the particular difficulties that young people are suffering in this regard. It is a world-wide problem that is causing concern in every developed country. It is having a serious effect to the extent that today's unemployment may well influence the attitudes and aspirations of young people for many years to come; that is a tragic state of affairs. Unemployment has been a major subject of political manoeuvring in recent months, and nationally it has brought forth bitter public debate and recrimination between the Parties. On the local scene it has been irresponsibly exploited by a small group of unscrupulous and amoral individuals who, by stifling free speech, have caused extra jobs to be lost at the Chrysler plant. Their aims are undoubtedly political, too, but of a far more radical nature.

Notice has been given today of a motion condemning the Federal Government for unemployment—another example of politicking. Simply blaming someone else does not do anything positive to solve the problem, which needs more than short-term answers. Patching up with band-aids and continually blaming someone else for the situation will not help. Ultimately, long-term solutions must be found, and every member of the community will have a part to play. The sooner we start moving toward the long-term solutions which are absolutely essential to solving the problems, the sooner we will get this State back into some sort of shape. The sooner we realise that that is the approach to adopt, the sooner we will achieve our aim. Inflation and unemployment are closely connected and have been of world-wide concern. Between them, they have probably provided the most serious problem faced by developed and industrialised countries for many years—probably since the great depression.

Although other countries have been subjected to the same economic pressures, their ability to survive these heavy strains has varied considerably, and their rates of recovery, too, have varied accordingly. For example, in Japan, the unemployment rate reached 2 per cent in 1976, and it now seems to have steadied, while in the United States of America, on the other hand, the unemployment rate rose to more than 8 per cent in 1975, and it fell to 7½ per cent in 1976. So, we can see that the rates of unemployment vary considerably. The present situation is changing, but nevertheless in Australia, and South Australia particularly, the rate of unemployment is still increasing. In Australia, we have suffered particularly because of our management problems. It has become very much the accepted thing for South Australian Government Ministers, particularly the Premier, to blame the Federal Government for almost anything that goes wrong in this State, regardless of the facts. Even Bob Hawke has got into the act. The whole exercise by this Government of dodging the blame for its

own shortcomings is becoming more and more of a joke. Unfortunately, it is a very sick joke, and the laughter tends to be hollow.

Certainly we can say (and to this extent agree with the State Government's blaming a Federal Government) that the form of management of the Australian economy at a time when world economic pressures were particularly acute greatly increased the problems now confronting us. Inflation and unemployment increased alarmingly during the Labor Party's term in Federal Government. Unemployment was 136 000 when the Federal Labor Government came to office, and unemployment was 328 000 when it left office. Inflation increased from an average of 3·4 per cent over the 10-year period to 1972, far less than the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development average, while under the Labor Government it rose to a peak of 17·6 per cent in the March quarter of 1975—a tremendous increase. While average award wage rates rose by about 56 per cent in the three years from 1973, the gross domestic product rose by only 6 per cent. Those facts speak for themselves. They show an appalling lack of management of Australia's economy.

No wonder we got into the mess which the Federal Liberal Government inherited in late 1975. The plain facts of the matter are these. Because of the huge increases in labour costs, Australia has successfully priced herself out of many world markets. This means not only a loss of ability to export but also great difficulty for local manufacturing industry in trying to compete against imports on the Australian market. It has been suggested that conditions in our competitor countries have followed the same pattern. I would agree that the trends are there, but we have led the field in increasing labour costs, and as a result we have virtually exported jobs, instead of goods. No wonder the O.E.C.D. forecasts a further increase in unemployment in 1977 in its survey on Australia. It is almost inevitable that it will happen, and that is the tragedy of it.

Fortunately, inflation now shows signs of being controlled, and the Consumer Price Index figures so far this year are very encouraging. It seems likely that the figures for the June quarter, to be issued next week, will be favourable. As a result, inflation will stay in single figures; that was one of the things promised at the last Federal election, and it is one of the achievements of the present Federal Liberal Government. As a result, I have no doubt that economic confidence is bound to improve. However, economic confidence will not improve as long as we have people going around the country, including the shadow Federal Treasurer, Mr. Hurford, and Mr. Hayden (I can never understand which of these two spokesmen is really the shadow Treasurer) and the Premier talking about idiot economic policies and preaching doom and disaster; that is the last thing we need in today's economic conditions. Unfortunately, unemployment, although it will be favourably affected by the control of inflation, will not show the rapid improvement that we would all like, and we must be prepared to face and deal with this fact, because it is a fact.

There is a general acceptance that the form of unemployment now affecting developed countries is more predominantly structural unemployment, rather than cyclical unemployment; in other words, it will not disappear automatically with economic recovery, which is normally the case with cyclical unemployment. Structural unemployment is the result of long-term imbalances in the labour market and the manufacturing sector of the economy, and it is ultimately aggravated in the long term by the artificial support necessary for some industries. Obviously

the industry that concerns South Australia most is the car manufacturing industry, although there is a very real lesson to be learnt (and I believe it has unfortunately been learnt painfully) from the Whyalla shipbuilding industry.

No-one is suggesting that Australian employment should not be protected as far as possible, even if some distortion of the labour market results, but the danger which exists is the one the results of which we are seeing now when favourable differentials have been lost (in other words, when we have lost our cost advantage) and when what began as worker-job protection is becoming worker-job disadvantage.

Mr. Chapman: And the employer's destruction.

Mr. TONKIN: Well, that goes without saying, because it follows automatically. The best job-support scheme in the world cannot save jobs if no-one can afford to buy the finished product, wherever it may be offered for sale, because of prohibitive labour costs. That is a fact of life that we must understand and accept, but I do not believe that the Labor Party has yet accepted it. South Australia is particularly susceptible to any loss of cost differential, because of our heavy dependence on the car and the white goods industries, and because of our distance from interstate and overseas markets.

For this reason, it is particularly unfortunate, if not disastrous, that the present Government has, over a seven-year period, systematically broken down the cost differential South Australia once enjoyed. The Permanent Head of the Department of Economic Development, Mr. R. D. Bakewell, when speaking to the Institute of Personnel Management, on Thursday, May 26, 1977, said:

"Let's face the facts of life" (and I cannot think of a better way to start things, and I think that is what we should be doing) "The last month or so's economic indicators show South Australia's relative advantage compared with the Australian average, while not eliminated, has been whittled away in new motor vehicle sales, new housing approvals, and relative numbers of unemployed. This drift may continue for some time."

Sir Mark Oliphant in "A look at our future", published in the *Advertiser* of December 2, 1976 (immediately on his retirement), said:

South Australia was once attractive to industry because the cost of living was lower than in the Eastern States. This advantage has largely disappeared and, because major markets are in the East, industry is likely to decline rather than grow here. This State is on the way to becoming the poorest.

I agree: we can no longer compete as successfully as once we did on interstate markets, and, as some firms curtail their activities and consider moving away, or actually move out, unemployment increases. No State Government would divorce itself from its accepted role in industrial development and, in accepting that role, it must also take the responsibility for influencing employment. As Mr. Bakewell said later in his speech, "We in a small State, with our own particular economic difficulties, cannot rely on Canberra to look after our destiny." Exactly the same applies to unemployment. The Premier, too (before his present tune was sung), in October, 1971, said:

Many of these developments are providing the kind of diversification needed in the State to ensure that we are not so vulnerable to the winds of change—and indeed economic confusion—that bluster in and out of Canberra.

Mr. Chapman: He was out of tune then.

Mr. TONKIN: Yes, but I wish that he would hold to the same point of view today. Certainly the South Australian Government cannot dodge its responsibility for

the unemployment situation in this State. Its own activities have greatly contributed to what is now becoming an increasing problem. By its support for wage claims, its legislation on workmen's compensation, long service leave, holiday loadings, and its State taxes and charges it has destroyed a great part of our ability to compete on interstate and overseas markets at a most critical time for our economy.

Pay-roll tax concessions are widely publicised, but the conditions to be fulfilled are so impracticable as to make them worthless to almost everyone. Harbor charges are higher than those in other States, when they should be lower if we are to encourage export interstate. What is the sense of the South Australian interstate export wharfage charge of \$1.80 a tonne compared to the 60c a tonne charged in Melbourne for the same interstate export? If we really want to stay in business, how can we possibly allow that situation to continue? But continue it does. I repeat: all this Government has done since it came to office in 1970 has been to break down our cost advantage and, in so doing, it has significantly contributed to our present unemployment problems.

Present working conditions in South Australia have been described as the envy of people in all the other States (we have heard that a few times, have we not?) but, just as job support schemes are of no value if no-one can afford to buy the finished product, so the best working conditions in the world are of no value to a man who cannot get a job, and would gladly do without the conditions which have helped destroy that job. Quality of life means security—security of employment and of income—before it means anything else. Of what value is the much publicised quality of life in South Australia if we cannot afford to enjoy it or get the jobs that will make it possible to enjoy it? It is all a matter of priorities and relative values.

Mr. Abbott: It's all talk.

Mr. TONKIN: No, it is more than talk: it is a matter that desperately concerns everyone in the community—the honourable member's constituents just as much as anyone else. The first priority must be to produce a plan of campaign to overcome the problems of unemployment in the short term and, more importantly, in the long term.

Mr. Chapman: Leave the politics out while the planning goes on.

Mr. TONKIN: Indeed, I could not agree more, and that is the clear message coming back from South Australians. They want answers and plans. It is the long-term solutions which are so urgently needed. They will take time to evolve and time to implement, but the sooner we get on with the job the better. We have not got time to waste—certainly not on petty politicking. South Australia will have to adjust to significant long-term changes if structural unemployment is to be overcome. There will inevitably be a change in our industrial base, and we will have to face up to the manpower problems that will arise. This will require an all-out joint effort by everyone in the community, and it will require detailed long-term planning. I repeat: it is too important an issue for its success to be jeopardised by petty inter-Party politicking.

Whatever Government is in office, it will be confronted with this problem for a long time. The sooner we recognise and accept this basic fact, and stop blaming someone, or anyone else, for political or other reasons, the sooner we will resolve it. What we would like is a new road to "full employment", but this will have to be far wider in its concept than ever before. It must have a balance of traditional economic measures, including the control of inflation and growth incentives, and it must have new structural

policies, involving retraining and relocation schemes. In other words, it is vital that we distinguish between short-term problems facing both the national and State economies and the long-term need to restructure existing operations, and seek other industry opportunities, in the pursuit of long-term job preservation and individual self-fulfilment.

These other industry opportunities are likely to involve development of our mineral resources much more heavily than has been the case until now. To quote Mr. Bakewell once again, South Australia has the lowest proportion of all the States in both the mining and communication industries. It is no accident that Queensland and Western Australia at present show more promise for the future security of their populations than do any other States, and that they are making good use of their mineral resources. I am certain that the Minister of Mines and Energy would agree with me. Short-term band-aid approaches to the problem of unemployment, while well meant, are recognised by the O.E.C.D. countries as providing no real solution. Indeed, if the same funds were spent in providing positive incentives for private sector growth, as well as in providing retraining schemes, there would be a much better chance of finding permanent employment. As the editorial in the *Financial Review* of June 15 states:

State Governments do have economic powers which impinge on the national economic strategy. Their control of pay-roll tax, for example, has a quite considerable impact upon labour policies pursued by employers. Less directly, but nonetheless equally importantly, so do policies covering workers' compensation insurance and even environmental laws. There is also the overall budgetary strategy pursued by State Governments . . . There is, in other words, a capacity within the States to frustrate or hobble national economic strategies.

I would hate to think that any State Government would sink so low in a time of extreme crisis such as this as to frustrate or hobble national economic strategies, because we are all part of those strategies, and we will sink or swim on the basis of them. Those politicians, and our Premier is now one, who would say that State Governments have nothing to do with causing unemployment are in fact simply avoiding their total responsibilities. The creation of jobs by Governments is now widely regarded by O.E.C.D. countries and other authorities as of little value, certainly in the long term, unless it is accompanied by a programme to stimulate the private sector. It has been tried elsewhere in isolation, and the Prime Minister of Britain, Mr. Callaghan, has made the following comment:

We used to think that you could just spend your way out of a recession and increase employment by cutting taxes and boosting Government spending.

I think we have heard that before. I think it is a policy that has been widely promoted by our present Premier. Mr. Callaghan continues:

I tell you in all candor that that option no longer exists and that, in so far as it ever did exist, it worked by injecting inflation into the economy.

This was the economic policy adopted by the Whitlam Government with equally disastrous results, yet our Premier is still promoting it at every opportunity he gets as a solution to Australia's economic problems. It is about time he realised that these proposals have been tried and have failed dismally. It is about time he updated his ideas because, if he is still back in that era, there is little that is good in the future of South Australia as long as this Government remains in office.

Another solution to unemployment has been suggested: to bypass the minimum and award wage structure and to come back to bargaining a mutually acceptable wage determined between employer and employee. This suggestion highlights the fact that high minimum wages, while benefiting the worker in employment, eventually may price him out of employment. It is not an idea which has received much support or which has found favour. As the Economics Editor of the *Advertiser* said, only this morning, supporting the more sensible point of view:

It should be possible for the Federal Government, employers and unions to come to an arrangement under which the \$500 000 000 or so a year being paid in unemployment benefits could be used to bridge the gap—or some of it—between the "economic worth" of the person to be employed and the minimum wage.

That is a very good suggestion, and one that I hope is being worked on. The same thing applies to the State Government, as we have pointed out on numerous occasions. Pay-roll tax remission is only one of the options open in providing incentives to employment in the private sector. Whether or not the Government acts is entirely up to it. More importantly, we must all recognise that unemployment, as a matter of universal concern, should be above Party politicking. I have already referred to the motion put on today condemning the Federal Government for creating the unemployment problem. Such an exercise is totally unproductive and irrational and will do nothing whatever to solve the current problems; indeed, it is likely to obscure the true issue and the need for total co-operation by every member of the community and all Parties to solve this problem.

People who are out of work are not interested in this politicking. They want to know that someone understands the real situation and is prepared to show leadership in helping to solve it. Constant attempts to shift the blame elsewhere simply show up the present Government's lack of understanding of the true situation and its total lack of acceptance of its proper responsibilities. I hope that the member responsible for putting the motion on may now think twice about proceeding with it. It is vital that we get on with the job of solving the short-term and long-term problems associated with unemployment, and we should make it a combined operation, involving everyone in the community. It is time for concerted action, not for politicking.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): In the time available in this debate, I wish to pursue a matter in relation to transport. In debating the no-confidence motion yesterday, I pointed out some matters of considerable concern to the public in this State, probably one of the more pertinent facts being that motor vehicle charges in South Australia are far higher than those in other States. We often hear adverse comment on the Administration in Queensland, but it costs 2½ times more to put a new Holden Kingswood on the road in South Australia than it does in Queensland. The total Government charges, including registration, third party insurance and stamp duty in Queensland are \$131, whilst in South Australia those three account for \$331; the charges are about 250 per cent higher in South Australia.

There is one more facet of the transport scene in this State which I want to air briefly, and that concerns the overloading of vehicles and the relevant legislation and regulations. The matter was mentioned briefly on Monday by the Secretary of the United Farmers and Graziers organisation in his report, because the Government is proposing to reduce the load which can be carried by

primary producers during the harvest period. This will cause great hardship. I know it is of great importance in my district, particularly in relation to the cartage of grain and grapes. If the Government insists on these regulations and if the regulations normally applying to carriers are to obtain in relation to the cartage of primary produce during harvest, inevitably costs will be increased in this hard-pressed sector—in my view, quite unnecessarily.

The safety record relating to the cartage of produce will bear examination and certainly does not indicate that the stringent regulations which have been enacted are necessary in the circumstances. Certainly, in my memory, in all of the accidents I can recall in my district which have involved vehicular traffic none has involved the cartage of goods. I think that a wider view of the statistics would bear out this point.

It seems that the Government is embarking on this bureaucratic exercise of trying to hold people down and promulgating regulations which are of little benefit to the people of this State but which will significantly increase the cost of production, the cost to producers, and the cost to the consumer. I wish to raise one other matter. I shall quote from a letter from a firm of solicitors acting for a client who has been charged with overloading. The letter refers to the penalty he could face. The man is a commercial carrier. The letter states:

He was stopped by a Highways Department official and police officers while taking a load from Melbourne to Perth. His vehicle is a Volvo truck G89 with an allowable gross combination weight (or mass) of 38 tonnes. His vehicle was weighed at Eudunda. The weighbridge is calibrated to 19 tonnes. Therefore, end-to-end weighing has to be carried out. The run on to and run off from the bridge is at an incline. Thus, only part of the vehicle and load can be weighed at a time. Hence a group of axles are weighed independently with the other part of the vehicle on the incline run off. An accurate weight cannot be recorded. In fact, our client's rear axles were weighed and the weighbridge went over the 19 tonnes calibration. The attendants then estimated the amount over the 19 tonnes. He has been charged with exceeding axle weights by 20.02 tonnes. The original complaint was replaced by one alleging that gross combination mass was exceeded. Our client was put on bail. He now faces a maximum penalty of over \$8 000 and a minimum penalty of over \$4 000. He agrees that he was overweight but disputes the fact that he was overweight to the extent alleged. He has explained that as a private operator he is forced to overload; otherwise he cannot compete with the large carting organisations. He has indicated that he may be forced out of the industry through the heavy penalties he will incur. He has instructed that even if he is to remain in the industry he will now no longer drive through South Australia. It has taken him four years to build up a "good run" so as to organise loads for the return trip. It is therefore not only the penalties which will seriously affect him but the effect of having to either give up his livelihood (he has been a truck driver for 12 years) or give up the clients that have taken him several years to establish on the western runs. His expenses and debts are as follows:

- (a) \$16 000 owing on truck; \$1 000 a month or \$500 a trip.
- (b) Tyres—There are 34 tyres at \$200 each which last for eight trips from Melbourne to Perth and return—\$850.
- (c) Living expenses—\$200.
- (d) Road tax—\$400.
- (e) Fuel—\$700.
- (f) Two days service after each trip, labour and materials—\$200.

You will note that, if he averages two trips a month (\$500 on truck payment a trip, and that assumes no major repair work has to be carried out on his vehicle), his expenses are \$2 850. For a legal load, our client has instructed that he could not receive more than \$3 000

(averaging \$2 000 a load to Perth and \$1 000 a load to Melbourne). We are informed by a salesman for Volvo trucks—

I will not name him but he is mentioned here—

that the vehicle described as a Volvo G89 with a gross combination weight allowed at 38 tonnes can in fact safely carry a load at a gross combination weight of about 53 to 55 tonnes. In excess of that weight the rear axles should be strengthened to reduce quick wearing. Frequently clients in this man's situation have raised the disparities between fines pursuant to overloading and those imposed in criminal matters. The arguments usually follow the line that the Government is now more interested ostensibly in the roads (in fact, in revenue collecting) than in the victims of criminal activities. Whether one agrees with the impositions or not, we have noticed an increase in prosecutions and a corresponding increase in discontent among clients affected by the legislation. Another argument put by persons of the Highways Department in an effort to justify the high fines is the potential danger which the vehicle may create. However, logically all vehicles create potential dangers as do electricity poles that line the roads. The existing drivers will continue to offend, as that is their only livelihood and they must undercharge if they are small operators doing subcontractor work. There will thus be continuing strife, according to drivers we have spoken to, which must eventually lead to confrontations of a serious nature. The concern shown indicates that the Government is not trying to relieve a situation. It is not looking at the causes of the problems. There are no restrictions as to who may operate a vehicle. A person may owe tens of thousands of dollars on a truck and work on his own. He will have to take any work he can get which means he will have to charge less than competitors. He will therefore overload to cover losses. Imposing heavy fines does not eliminate the situation. In fact, from the reactions of drivers it has exasperated same.

That word should be "exacerbated", although no doubt the drivers are exasperated at the exacerbation of the problem. The letter continues:

It is not surprising that drivers look cynically at the Government's new penalties.

I read that letter in full because we have all seen on television the problems that the truck drivers are having in New South Wales, where there are confrontations on the main streets of Sydney. That could arise in South Australia when that situation occurs here. The Government is intent on putting small businesses out of business, and it is seeking to put these people out of business. I agree with the sentiments in that letter that the penalties are way out of line with the offences. Serious criminal offenders are not faced with anything like the penalties mentioned in that letter. I draw the attention of the House to this. I hope someone in a Government department somewhere or other scrutinises these debates and that this matter will come to the attention of the appropriate people.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): In the brief period available to me I address myself to certain aspects of education, and it is fortuitous that the Minister of Education is present. It is interesting that the vehicle that gives us the opportunity to have this grievance debate is an "Act to apply, out of the general revenue, a further sum of \$190 000 000 to the Public Service for the financial year ending on June 30, 1978". The question I ask is: what has happened to the payments due to many members of the Public Service before June 30, 1977, and in particular to many persons employed by the Education Department, more specifically as teachers who, since the commencement of the second term, have not yet received payment?

Three persons in my own electoral district have now drawn my attention to the fact that they have not received an increase in the recompense that is their due since the commencement of the second term. They had been

employed by the department before the second term but their circumstances had changed during the second term. The case to which I refer is that of a person moving from two days employment a week as a part-time teacher to full employment. As of Friday last week, July 15, that person was still receiving, and had received, recompense for only two days part-time employment, even though she had an unblemished record of five days service a week for the whole of the second term, holidays excepted.

This money should, one suspects, be available to them in the normal pay packet with alterations made in the pay period following their changed employment, or at the latest in the pay period immediately thereafter. With computerisation, identification numbers, and all the other materials and benefits available to the pay organisation of the Education Department, there should be no reason why persons who have fulfilled their responsibilities do not receive their just remuneration. I shall be pleased to pass on specific details to the Minister for his consideration, but I assure him that what I am saying is correct. I hope that in this debate we shall obtain information about why these people are being denied payment for services rendered.

A serious aspect of the matter is that a person who has failed to receive moneys due for the period from early May to June 30 will, one hopes, eventually receive that money, but it will be in the next financial year. That being so, those people will not have the benefit of apportioning that remuneration against their part-time employment income, as a result of which they would benefit from a smaller taxation commitment. They will obtain that lump sum of money in addition to their full employment income, and it will then be the responsibility of those people, if their earnings take them into another taxation bracket, which is distinctly possible, to meet an excessive taxation burden. This should not happen in 1977, and certainly it should not happen thereafter, the matter having been brought to the Minister's notice.

I should like now to raise another matter regarding education. In this respect, I refer to a letter that I have received from the staff of a school in my district. The contents of this letter typify the statements that are being made by more and more people who are involved in the education system. This is a direct reflection of their genuine concern about the expenditure associated with education today. I trust that the Premier, the Minister of Education and other Cabinet members, when making decisions on the 1977-78 Budget, and indeed on Budgets for subsequent years (if they still occupy the Government benches then), will take serious heed of this. The letter states:

As a result of the staff meeting held on June 23, with regards to Government education spending, we make the following points:

1. Whereas we would not like to see education grants cut, we feel that the present level of spending is adequate provided priorities are established so that there is more equality in education with accommodation being upgraded in many schools; so that more accommodation can be provided to house extra staff and reduce class sizes to nearer 25.

2. In the *Education Gazette*, a list of priority project schools for 1977 under the disadvantaged schools programme has been published. While we feel for the students and staff in some of these areas it is to be hoped that the money allocated to such schools will be used wisely. Some of the materials purchased and projects undertaken in the past would seem to be quite ridiculous and unnecessary.

This statement emanates not from a lay person but from a meeting of teachers held at a primary school. I laud their comments and their willingness to come out in this way. The letter continues:

3. Because in the past money has been earmarked for conferences, some of the topics for discussion have been quite unbelievable. Staff conferences in which whole staffs are accommodated at a hotel/motel for one or two nights seem excessively expensive and could have been just as easily conducted in the school itself.

Mr. Goldsworthy: One staff was told that they had \$500 000 to spend and that they had better get in and get their whack.

Dr. EASTICK: That is the point that I wanted to make. A senior Education Department officer has been imploring schoolteachers in groups in their lunch rooms to enrol for conferences. They have been told, "We have the money and, if we do not spend it this year, we will not get it next year." When asked what the subjects were to be, the officer replied, "What do you want?" There was no forward planning or thinking in the instance to which I have referred. It was merely a matter of, "We have got the money. For goodness sake, let us spend it and have fun."

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Ha! That statement is ridiculous.

Dr. EASTICK: I am grateful that the Minister has interjected by saying "Ha!" However, I am telling him that an increasing number of teachers are upset about this matter. They deplore the attitude that is being expressed to them that they should live it up just because there is money in the kitty. More and more teachers are questioning the unsolicited goods that are being delivered to their schools.

Mr. Evans: That's to their credit.

Dr. EASTICK: True. One evening last week, I was told by a primary school principal that some months ago his school received a microscope, which had not been requisitioned and for which the school had no particular use. Despite that, the microscope arrived. After inquiring, the principal was told that that was the school's allocation and that it was to use the microscope. Some weeks later, a second microscope, of greater magnification, together with some electrical equipment to make it work a little better (I am not suggesting that it was an electronic microscope) arrived at the school. It went into the cupboard where the first microscope went, and it is still there.

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

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The comments made by the member for Light are indeed valid. As the Deputy Leader also said, there is an awareness and an awakening in some of our schools on the part of some staff members, who are greatly concerned about the handling of finances within the department. The first point I raise this afternoon relates to the State's Revenue Account. I am perturbed to think that the Revenue Account statement for the month of May, 1977, was not made available to me until July 13. It would have been fair and reasonable for me to expect that that statement would arrive on about June 8 or June 10, as is the normal practice in any other month: the previous month's financial figures are usually available about 10 days into the following month.

The non-arrival of the May figures concerned me. I therefore kept contacting the Treasury Department to ascertain what had happened and whether my copy of the figures had gone astray or been lost. On June 29, an officer to whom I spoke told me, "No, your figures have not gone astray. No copies have been made available to the public or the Opposition because I am still checking

the figures." One realises that at the end of May, 1977, the Revenue Account statement showed a trading surplus of \$27 180 000. One knows that there would have been a tremendous run-down of finances during June. Certainly, some quarterly debt service payments, particularly interest payments, must be made during that month. However, the Opposition wants to know how the State Government was able to get rid of \$27 000 000 plus the revenue that it received during the month of June. Undoubtedly, the Premier ensured that the Opposition was not given a chance to see the May figures until well into the month of July, and after the end of the financial year.

Only a few days ago, the Premier barely announced that the State had a Revenue Account deficit of \$80 000. That is fair enough, because at long last the Premier has heeded my advice that he should bring down a balanced Budget. That he did, and an \$80 000 deficit, bearing in mind that income and expenditure totalled \$1 171 000 000, is a reasonable result, with which I have no argument. However, the argument that I have with the Premier is that it was totally dishonest for him and the Treasury Department to delay the release of the May figures until after the end of the financial year. It is now July 20, and members have not yet seen a complete statement of the Revenue Account for the month of May, the financial year having ended on June 30.

This proves the contempt that the State Government and the Premier have for the people of South Australia. One should remember that, at the commencement of the 1976-77 financial year, the Government had a surplus in the Consolidated Revenue Account of \$27 500 000. So the State had been cruising along quite nicely. I contend that in the month of June, particularly during the last couple of days, the money was there and that there was a massive spend-up to clear out all the accounts. Money could even have been held until the beginning of this financial year. The Government certainly emptied its coffers in those last few days. There is no other reason why these figures would have been delayed for so long unless the Government was up to some trickery. There was no other reason for an officer of the Treasury Department to inform me on June 29 that he was checking the figures for May. There were reasons all right, reasons the Premier has not been prepared to come clean about, or to tell the Opposition, let alone the public.

The Engineering and Water Supply Department is probably one of the greatest bureaucracies there is when one considers the interest payments of that department are almost 50 per cent of the total income of the department. The Deputy Premier announced on Friday afternoon that the price of water is to increase by 5 per cent and that the allocation of water will be reduced by 21 per cent. Any person who is on excess water, and no matter how careful one is there are many families and householders using excess water, is going to be affected by a 21 per cent increase in real terms, not 5 per cent, because the price of excess water is also increased quite substantially. This, of course, is how the Government rakes in its biggest slice of revenue in the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Again, it penalises the average family unit in the community. Constituents in my area are penalised not only by the 5 per cent increase and the 21 per cent reduction in water allocation (and we will not argue about the quality of the water) but also, at Glenelg North, the water pressure is so bad that it takes twice as long to get an amount of water needed as it takes somebody in the eastern suburbs. Therefore, I do not see why we have to pay, in the south-western

suburbs and particularly in the western suburbs, so much for our water when we cannot enjoy the same pressure as do other people in the metropolitan area.

That does not worry the Government as long as it is ripping us off and benefiting from inflation. When one looks at the result shown in the Revenue Account one sees that that is all the Government has ever done—benefited from inflation; it has slammed the taxpayers in the areas where they have benefited from inflation. I know you, Sir, were one who called for many years for a concession for pensioners, so that they receive concessions for water and sewerage rates. I received a complaint from a constituent and I call on the Engineering and Water Supply Department to smarten its footwear.

Mr. Venning: It is one of the better departments.

Mr. BECKER: It is one of the worst, as far as I am concerned. In the letter mentioned my constituent stated:

On June 22, 1977, my mother received an account from the Engineering & Water Supply Department for \$51.05.

That is the quarterly account. The letter continues:

Balance as at 9.6.77 was \$12.75 and included was an additional amount of \$38.30 with a statement "Pensioner remission January 77-June 77 withdrawn". Enclosed with the account was an application for a remission of property rates and taxes. I understand from Engineering & Water Supply that "Pensioner remission withdrawn" notes are included as a matter of course when one of the joint owners of a property is deceased and all that is required is for the surviving spouse to fill in the new application form and the remission returns. I rang to protest about the policy of not explaining why the remission is withdrawn, but could not discover how or why the "policy" came to be. I am, therefore, writing to you on what you may consider to be an unimportant and trivial matter. My mother, who is 76, did not understand that all she had to do was reapply for a remission. Her immediate reaction was one of distress that her pensioner remission had been withdrawn and concern at the expenditure of and additional \$38.30 from an already stretched pension. Probably many other old people would react in precisely the same way and the Engineering & Water Supply policy causes unnecessary distress by such a blunt statement. Would it not be possible for a brief explanation to be made, either by rubber stamp or printed addition to the form?

It does not even have to be that way. One would have thought—

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

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): A few weeks ago in the *Border Watch* it was reported that a member in the other place stated that the campaign for Mount Gambier was going to be a dirty one. Just how dirty it may be was evidenced today during Question Time in this House when two issues were raised, one of which referred to the Mount Schank abattoir. It was completely out of context and completely false. The Premier implied that I would like to see that premises closed down. The Mount Schank abattoir is one of the more important industrial establishments in the South-East. The proprietors are respectable, hard-working people who through no fault of their own, but because of wrong advice at the administrative level from an employee, had some financial difficulties, which imperilled the jobs of the employees. I was asked to comment, over the telephone, by people closely involved with assessing the position. I strongly recommended that the abattoir be given assistance and said that I had no doubt that that company was capable of working its way out of its difficulties. For the Premier to imply anything else during Question Time was one of the most

specious attacks that could have been made on anyone. It is self-evident that the smear campaign in the South-East is well and truly under way.

The second issue raised, the purchase of Zed & Son, was referred to by the Premier and was reported in, I think, the *Millicent* newspaper of last Saturday when the Premier was reported as saying that the purchase of Zed's was made to improve the situation of industry in the South-East. I had no idea that that firm was in any trouble or that industry in the South-East would have suffered had the Woods and Forests Department not bought into it. I still have tremendous doubts about that. I am not opposed to the Woods and Forests Department venturing into direct sales, but what struck me was that that company might well have been better off by getting out and going interstate or into the metropolitan area where it could really sell the South-Eastern products to a far larger market than it could by fiddling around in its own backyard in the South-East. I do not think there was any threat to industry in the South-East.

Mr. Nankivell: Wouldn't you agree that the Woods and Forests Department is now of some magnitude and that it could be made a statutory authority?

Mr. ALLISON: I would agree. I have mentioned before that the Woods and Forests Department might have operated effectively as a statutory authority. A year ago when depreciation had been allowed to go so far that the machinery was well and truly worn out, because it had not been replaced when it should, and when the Public Accounts Committee pointed that out in no uncertain terms, it would have been impossible for it to operate as a statutory authority. The situation has recovered, new machinery has been ordered and there is a two or three year programme to replace worn out equipment. It is possible that then the Woods and Forests Department could become a statutory authority and make a real fist of things. I agree with my colleague, the member for Mallee. Apart from that, the smear campaign in the South-East, as I have said, seems to be well and truly under way, with an attempt by the Premier to belittle any comment made by me. If he has to resort to such low tactics to win back a political seat, he can have it, because I will not resort to the same tactics against his candidate to hold the seat. It is a ridiculous state of affairs when politics has to get to that stage. The Government told some people to keep out of the South-East in 1975. It even rejected its colleagues in Canberra, telling them, "Keep away, it hurts." However, we are not people of that kind. I think politics is better than that.

I had intended to deal first with another issue, but I became incensed about what happened today and could not let that pass. Last weekend the Premier came to the South-East and stated that the Agriculture Department would now take over administration of all sorts of rural assistance grants. I should also like to place on record in this House that last December I brought to the attention of the Minister of Lands the problems that had been experienced for about six months in the South-East, where more than 60 people had applied for grants and in that time none of them had been paid any money whatsoever.

I told the Minister of Lands that I hoped he would work as the Victorian Government was working, namely, with much more efficiency, and I told the Minister that I hoped that there would be decentralisation of control. I stated that the Rural Finance and Settlement Commission in Victoria had its head office in Melbourne but had decentralised offices throughout the State. If farmers in Victoria who apply for loans have options on land,

their applications are dealt with in sufficient time for them to take up the options if they are viable or to let the options lapse if they are not viable. However, in many cases officers of the Agriculture Department in the South-East have told the Minister of Lands that farmers are viable, but the Minister's officers have then said that the farmers are not viable. In other words, the Minister's officers did not believe the Agriculture Department officers in the South-East for some reason, and after about six or eight months delay many farmers were not viable because their options had expired, their financial situation had become much worse, and the Lands Department considered, therefore, that it was justified in declining applications.

Some ludicrous situations arose. One man applied after the Minister of Lands had told me that he intended to streamline his department and the approach by the Agriculture Department to the granting of money. That happened in January this year, but six months later, at the end of June, one South-East farmer received two advice notes. One was a cheque for \$4 000 in response to an application for money and the other was a rejection, telling him that he was not viable. Both notices arrived in the same mail, and that was a remarkable state of affairs.

Another gentleman, from Mil Lel, had applied for carry-on finance early in the year and by July 8, when he telephoned me, he still had not received a reply, despite the fact that he had sent two reminders to the Lands Department stating that he was still waiting for assistance. Another applicant has had no fewer than seven different reviews of his application, on the yo-yo principle of "Yes, no, yes, no." He is still not sure how his latest review is proceeding. There is remarkable inefficiency in dealing with applications. The Premier stated at Moorak that streamlining had been undertaken, that the Agriculture Department was now in charge of loans, but when the Minister of Lands told me this in a letter of January 21, and in view of the fact that we have people six months later still being dealt with inefficiently, we wonder whether the latest promise will result in efficiency.

Will a much more detailed and specific account be given soon of just how the Agriculture Department will handle the applications? Will there be decentralisation? Will Agriculture Department officers in the South-East be believed in future, when they say farmers are viable, or will they continue to be doubted by their colleagues in Adelaide? It is absolutely critical that cases be dealt with promptly and efficiently so that farmers do not go bankrupt merely because Government advice and delays throw them completely out of gear.

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): I want to make some comments about what happened at Question Time today, in regard to which the member for Mount Gambier has made a reasonable explanation. We have always supported the Mount Schank Meat Company, and the statement by the Premier today that we did not do that was, as the member for Mount Gambier has said, a completely specious statement and one that I did not expect would come from the Premier.

That industry has one of the most fantastic growth stories in small enterprise business in South Australia that we have seen for a long time. We must consider the fact that that small industry has established itself at a time when the beef industry has been at its lowest ebb and passing through one of its most traumatic periods. The industry started in a butcher shop in Mount Gambier and

moved into the boning process to provide a small quantity of boned meat for the Melbourne and other markets. The industry later became too large for the premises and expanded. It then bought a redundant dairy factory and has continued to expand over the past four years, to a point where it wanted about \$250 000 to continue, and we supported that programme completely.

I understand that the Government has come to the party and is also supporting it, but to say that we did not want that industry to continue is ridiculous. As I have said, the growth story is fantastic. The company employs about 30 people and those people have been employed during the present period of unemployment that has been going on for several years. It has several boning-out rooms in the Melbourne area, and it has had a fantastic growth story at a time when growth has been difficult.

I wish now to comment on remarks made by the Deputy Leader about transport, and the effect of Government regulations on transport in South Australia. Recently 8 000 head of fat stock were bought in the South-East for the Western Australian market, mainly because Western Australia was having a difficult season and there was not sufficient meat for the local market. Many were transported to Western Australia by road. We may well ask, as we have a rail connection with Western Australia, why they were not sent by rail. The reason was that the railways could not supply the stock vans for that shipment. The railways have not been able to keep up with the stock van requirements for a long time. Although we have made many approaches to the Minister of Transport, he has not completely solved the problem and we still have a shortage of rail vans in South Australia. This shortage over the past three months has forced the purchasers of the beef stock to use road transport.

Another matter to which I refer is that of weights. It is difficult to estimate how much weight is on a truck when it is being loaded with stock, and many of the transports have been apprehended for overloading. In one instance, many trucks had been travelling for 400 to 500 kilometres to Ceduna, before entering the stretch of the Nullarbor Plain. It is regrettable that, when about 100 km out of Ceduna, they were apprehended and weighed at a Transport Department weighbridge, and told by the inspectors that they would have to unload the stock immediately. I believe that many of the transporters broke the law and, when the inspectors were not looking, drove to Ceduna where they had access to unloading facilities and removed enough stock to be within the load limits. The stock had to remain in yards, and further transport had to be sent from the South-East to take them to Western Australia. The inspectors were so high-handed that they would not allow the transporters to carry on to a reasonable unloading point at which stock could be controlled and kept in yards until further transport arrived.

Mr. Gunn: Big Brother Virgo!

Mr. VANDEPEER: That would be correct. I refer also to the use of static weighbridges, which are installed at various points. Drivers can and do by-pass static weighbridges, and thus use roads other than main roads, which are designed for heavy transport. If the Transport Division wishes to check transports for weight, it should be a fair and even check, and the division should provide some means of weighing transports so that weighing points are not fixed. Weighing machines should be transportable and, with modern technology, the division should be able to produce transportable means of weighing transports. Devices could be provided with the use of hydraulics and an engine and pump, and the division could

provide these means and not force people to use static weighbridges, as that means forcing many transports to use roads other than main roads in order to avoid these static weighbridges. It is time that the Government did something about this ridiculous situation. I now refer to a matter that was raised in Question Time by the member for Mallee, that is, the spotted alfalfa aphid, which could be a devastating insect in our lucerne pastures in the coming months. I urge the Government to investigate the possibility of introducing a heavy spraying programme during the coming spring, in order to restrict the spread of this aphid. It could not be continued for a long time, and such a programme would have to be subsidised. We could approach the Federal Government, if the State Government was willing to co-operate. We would want a statement from this Government that it would co-operate, and then we could ascertain whether the Federal Government would also participate. If we had an extensive spraying programme this spring, it is possible that we could restrict the spread of this aphid and allow most lucerne growers another full season of production.

We do not yet know what effect the aphid will have on lucerne pastures, but some people believe that dry-land lucerne could be eliminated. That is a wide statement, but we are concerned because in some of these areas the spread of such an insect could put much of the deep-sand country in the South-East completely out of production by making the land unviable. I will say something more on this matter, because time does not permit me to cover it completely now. I urge the Government to consider seriously an extensive spraying programme during the summer and subsidise those using sprays, in order to ensure that growers will have another season of full production from Hunter River lucerne before the spotted alfalfa aphid has its effect and properties are made uneconomic. Some farmers rely completely on the growth of Hunter River lucerne.

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The no-confidence motion moved by the Liberals yesterday was, in my opinion, a poor affair. Even though they seemed to have no issue, they considered that they had to go through the ritual of trying to upset the Government by a no-confidence motion or some other means on the first day of the session. They should have learned by now (but I doubt whether they will ever learn) to wait until they had an issue to raise. If they had waited until today, they would have had plenty of information from the various reports laid on yesterday to be able to get stuck into the Government. However, they chose to follow their usual pattern and, in effect, we had a wasted day. That fact is shown by the treatment the debate got in the paper this morning. I now intend to raise one matter that they could well have raised, as they have raised it at other times in this place, because it is one of the great weaknesses and, in my opinion, disgraces of the present Government: that is, its policy of so-called preference to unionists. I am absolutely opposed to that policy, because I believe that it is the complete contrary to my concept of individual freedom.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Is that Chipp's point of view, or haven't you spoken to him about it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have no doubt that my colleague, Mr. Chipp, agrees with me entirely on this matter. I have a specific example I desire to bring before the

House, and it is something that is known to some members of the Liberal Party, who so far this session have been completely silent about it. Last week I received a message in my office, that a Mr. B. D. Stevens of B. D. & G. J. Stevens Proprietary Limited had called at the office. He comes from Modbury, and it is a pity that the member for Tea Tree Gully is not present. Mr. Stevens has his own business in partnership with his wife. He has since told me that he is a ceiling contractor, and he has been laying gypsum slabs at the Good Friday appeal building at the Adelaide Children's Hospital. He showed me, as he had shown my secretary, his builder's licence.

He is a ceiling contractor and works alone, and had been working at the Children's Hospital for the past few weeks. The site manager spoke to him a few days ago and asked whether he was in a union. He is not. Later in the week a chap from the plasterer's union approached him, and said that if he did not join the union he must leave the site. Mr. Stevens has no desire to be in the union, as he does not want to pay a high proportion of his union fees to the Labor Party, nor would it help him much on his own, and he considers that he has paid a large sum for his licence so that he can work freely. He attached notes of the names of those whom he approached, I think last Wednesday. He spoke to Mr. Tonkin on the telephone, but was cut off, and Mr. Tonkin did not ring him back, as his staff had undertaken he would do. Mr. Stevens said that he stayed in for the rest of the day waiting for a telephone call, as that was the message given to him by one of the many staff members of Mr. Tonkin, who suddenly, within twenty seconds of being cut off, had disappeared for lunch.

Mr. Stevens said that he was told that Mr. Tonkin would ring him when he got back, but he did not. Mr. Stevens left a list of those to whom he had spoken or whom he had seen and who did not want to know him. This is the list (in his own writing): Mr. Steel, President of the Housing Industry Association; he spoke to a Mr. Dean Brown on the telephone—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Who would that be?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Deputy Leader does not want to recognise one of his senior colleagues, that is up to him. The list continues: Mr. Ken West, Master Builders Association; representatives of the Trade Practices Tribunal; and Messrs. Hagen and Hegarty of the Federal Arbitration Commission. He said that all those people said that they entirely agreed with him, but that there was nothing they were willing to do to help him.

He came to see me last Saturday morning and confirmed the story I have mentioned here. He told me that he is a subcontractor for Re-slab Gypsum Blocks Proprietary Limited, which is the principal contractor to Fricker Brothers on this building. He was approached a few days ago by the site manager for Fricker Brothers who asked whether he was a unionist. Mr. Stevens was told by the site manager that it was a union site. The site manager accepted his explanation, and said that, as far as he was concerned, Mr. Stevens did not have to be in a union. However, last Tuesday week, Mr. Terry Carroll of the Plasterers Union came to Mr. Stevens while he was on the job and said, "You are not a member of the union. Either you join it or you don't work here, or we will pull everybody off the site." Mr. Stevens did not join the union, but took the next day off to contact the people whose names I have mentioned.

The irony of this situation is that Mr. Stevens tells me that he was a member of this union, but he resigned quite properly about five years ago in these circumstances: he had been given a minute's notice by his then employer (Southern Ceilings, which has now gone out of business), and he went to the union to get his weeks pay in lieu of notice and Carroll—the same man who is now telling him he has to join the union—did absolutely nothing about it, despite the fact that Mr. Stevens got in touch with him several times over a period of months. Therefore, Mr. Stevens does not feel under any obligation to rejoin a union of that nature, which is so inefficient that it does not help its members when they are in trouble but goes off on other pursuits.

Dr. Eastick: It's a bit like the rubber and plastics case.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps that is so, but I will leave the member for Light to support me if he wishes to do so. One other matter on which Mr. Stevens now has an objection (whether he objected five years ago or not I do not know) is that he believes that 65c in every dollar of subscriptions paid to the union goes to the Labor Party.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hear some gusts and guffaws from members opposite, and I hope that at least one of them will get up and tell us how much it really is. Members opposite all deny it, but let us hear how much it really is and see how genuine Government members really are. On Thursday of last week, having seen these people, Mr. Stevens went back to the site manager, told him whom he had seen on the Wednesday and asked whether the site manager would be willing to allow him to go back on the job. The site manager said (and it is the classic attitude of most people, weak though it is in the circumstances), "No way; I agree with you, but you are not coming on this site again." Now they will not let him on the site and he has lost a contract that would have provided him with work for probably 12 or 18 months.

I do not know what will be the results, if any, of raising this matter in the House, but I am damned if I will let a matter of this type go past without making a protest yet again about this scandalous behaviour. Whatever one says to it, the Government simply give the blanket answer that one has to be in a union because unions fight for working conditions. That is no answer, but it is the only answer the Government gives. The real fact is that the Government is dominated by the unions. I have no doubt that the Premier privately would not buy that for a moment, but he has to do so publicly. It is the greatest denial of personal freedom and liberty, for which I thought as a community we stood up for, that one could possibly imagine.

This man is a subcontractor, working for himself, and still the union says that he has to be in it, and still contractors will not stand up and support him, although they must know that he is in the right, because they are afraid of the unions. Until such matters are raised every time they occur, and until, by doing it, we can put some backbone into those who should stand up to the unions, I will not be satisfied. This is a disgraceful situation. I have described this matter chapter and verse, giving every fact I know. I will give these facts to anyone and find out any further facts I can if they will be of any use in fighting what I believe is the most pernicious outlook in our community.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I take this opportunity to examine the reasons behind the Government's general attack

on Riverland co-operatives, grower organisations, and growers. Members have heard the continuing cry from the Government saying that the Riverland co-operatives and growers must become more efficient if they expect their industry to survive. If co-operatives and companies in the Riverland received the same assistance from the South Australian Government as that received by their counterparts in Victoria and New South Wales, there would not be the problem that now exists in the Riverland.

I refer to the support received by co-operatives in Victoria and New South Wales in comparison with the support received in South Australia. For the purpose of such comparison I refer to the Riverland Fruit Products and a similar company in Victoria and New South Wales. The New South Wales Letona cannery at Leeton is a company of similar size to Riverland Fruit Products. The Letona cannery receives much assistance. First, the New South Wales Government provides a freight subsidy on exported canned products and on ancillary raw materials being delivered to the plant. That might not be significant in the case of Letona, because 72 per cent of its production is placed on the Australian market. However, in the case of Riverland Fruit Products that would be a significant figure indeed, because that company exports about 60 per cent of its total production. The freight subsidy on 60 per cent of its total output would be a large sum. From July 1, 1976, the New South Wales Government has provided a total remission of pay-roll tax to that company.

I now refer to the canneries in Victoria which, since the introduction of the Victorian Decentralised Industry Incentive Payments Act, 1972, have received a total remission of pay-roll tax. Had the Riverland cannery received a similar pay-roll tax remission since 1972, as was received by the Victorian canneries, and had it received the freight concession on all its exports and on ancillary raw materials delivered to the plant, the company would have been in no difficulty whatever in meeting Fruit Industry Sugar Concession Committee prices all along the line. That can be borne out by the expected funds that would have been received during that time by the various concessions, as against the shortfall that is indicated. For that purpose I refer to the estimated shortfall on F.I.S.C.C. prices for the 1975 crop, which is about \$320 000, and the 1976 figure of about \$330 000, making a total of \$650 000 for the two years. As I said, the freight and pay-roll tax concessions would have been more than that. Therefore, the growers who are trying to exist on much below the accepted minimum wage structure in South Australia would have received the recognised F.I.S.C.C. prices during that time. The co-operatives and growers are being told continually to become more efficient. No doubt an area for increased efficiency exists, but when one considers the total inefficiency of other ancillary costs that affect an export industry such as the canned fruit industry, one must take into account freight charges and shipping costs.

Let us consider for a moment the shipping costs incurred in South Australia. As an example I will use the citrus industry where stevedoring charges are based on \$7 a person an hour, plus an additional \$7 a person an hour to cover redundancy pay, long service leave, workmen's compensation, etc. Therefore, the total is about \$14 a person an hour for those charges. For a normal ship that comes into the harbor the South Australian Government imposes harbor and wharfage charges of between about \$1 000 and \$1 200 a day and tug charges of about \$1 200. The shipping charge for the packers who have actually delivered fruit to the wharf in Adelaide is about

\$3.86 a case from the time that case leaves the growers' hands. From that sum we can deduce that the estimated total wharf and harbor charges will be somewhere between \$1 and \$1.80 a case from the time that case is loaded onto a ship until the ship leaves the harbor. One can talk about the efficiency and inefficiency of the fruit packing industry or the canning industry, but when one considers the astronomical charges imposed for Government freight, wharf and harbor charges, one realises that the industry is doomed before it starts. The industry cannot compete on the world market with those sorts of charge.

Since the industries involved in the Riverland are very much exporting industries, not only the growers and co-operatives must be efficient but also Government freight and wharf charges must be reasonable. If one considers the situation that existed before the Federal Government handed over pay-roll tax to the States, one sees that the Federal Government remitted pay-roll tax in respect of all exporting industries on the basis of an export incentive. At that time the export incentive from the Federal Government was worth about \$100 000 a year to the Riverland cannery. That \$100 000 export incentive was lost when pay-roll tax was handed over to the State Government. Following the handing over of pay-roll tax, the cannery paid more than \$100 000 to the State Government, whereas before it was receiving from the Federal Government about \$100 000 as export incentives. The situation now is the complete reverse of the situation when the Federal Government handled pay-roll tax, and that is another valid reason why, in that time, particularly 1975 and 1976, the company has been unable to meet F.I.S.C.C. prices. One cannot help wondering what is the Government's objective in driving wedges into the Riverland community by creating conflicts between groups and growers and their grower companies. The only practical answer that I can come up with—

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

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): First, I refer to seasonal conditions. Although I would not suggest that it is the Government's fault that we are experiencing our third dry season in a row, we are having another dry season, which is affecting the State's water supply. Since I have been in this place I have been concerned always about the water resources of South Australia and the best uses of those resources. In the short time available to me I shall refer specifically to the levels of underground water that are necessary for the best welfare of producers in this State, especially that area of the northern Adelaide plains where people rely on the underground water basin. Growers in that area are reporting a drop in the aquifer level of up to 20 metres. Moreover, from the time when that area was first exploited for market gardening much greater drops in aquifer levels have been reported. Consequently, harvesting through market gardening enterprise on the northern Adelaide plains has lowered the aquifer level even in good seasons. However, with the advent of three seriously dry seasons the situation is worsening year by year. Not only is underground water being over-exploited but the present dry spell is continuing to such a late stage in the year that no subsoil moisture is occurring, and growers will need to use more water on their crops and trees than usual; that will only further exacerbate the problem.

I raise the matter now for the purpose of rebuking the Minister of Works for his continued assurance to the

growers in that area that they have no need to worry, and that the aquifer could stand another 30 years use without serious effect. I believe that that is a negation of the facts. Moreover, I believe that it is irresponsible in the extreme for any of us to permit Bolivar effluent water to flow continually out to sea, effluent water that is, I understand, the best quality effluent water in Australia. It goes out to sea—water that is meat to those market gardeners and poison to the marine environment! I would therefore hope that the Government will re-arrange its priorities so that that water can be used to the ultimate benefit of us all. Indeed, the member for Stuart may wish in future to eat lettuce, tomatoes and the like that are grown with that effluent water from the area knowing that that produce is grown with the best use of the resources of the State. I repeat that it is wicked that we should continue to waste this resource, and we waste it at our peril.

It is not only this area that worries me; other areas in the Goyder District still rely on underground water for their supplies. No reticulated scheme was provided for some of these areas because underground water was available and, to their shame, the growers at that time said, "We do not want any reticulated supply, because our wells will do." The sins of the fathers have been visited on the children. Now, with dry seasons and continued use, the water levels are falling; in fact, in the Moorowie district some wells have failed altogether, and farmers have had to go to standpipes some kilometres away to get supplies for their stock. I would not criticise the Government for no action in this matter; there is at present a feasibility study going on to provide water for the Moorowie district, which is one of the most important areas in the Goyder District yet to be served. My only plea at this stage is that the serious plight of the livestock producers be recognised and that the highest priority be given to this matter.

Mr. Arnold: We want more than a feasibility study.

Mr. BOUNDY: Yes. I hope that very soon funds will be made available for projects such as this. I suggest that the Government should transfer some of its resources at present allocated to filtration and use them to provide a basic facility to these people who have not got it at all. I am also greatly concerned about water costs. On July 1, 1977, the Deputy Premier issued a press statement that water costs would rise in this State, but the document is somewhat misleading, and I will point out the Deputy Premier's error. In 1970, the Premier's policy speech deplored the fact that the then Liberal Government was allowing water rates to rise. The clear implication in that policy speech was that water charges were the then Liberal Government's fault and that if the Labor Party was elected to Government this matter would be brought in hand and the citizens would not suffer increased water charges.

What are the facts? In the seven years from 1970 to 1977 (only up to the middle of May this year) water costs have increased by 108 per cent. Prices have gone from 7.7c to 16c a kilolitre, and that does not take into account that water entitlements have gone down, nor does it take into account the latest hike that the Minister has announced, namely, an increase from 16c to 19c a kilolitre. He says that most householders will pay 5 per cent more this year for water and sewerage than they did last year. I am at a loss to understand his arithmetic. An increase from 16c to 19c a kilolitre on the same valuation happens to be 15.8 per cent. Then, if we take into account the fact that the rebate water entitlement per dollar drops from 6.25 k/ down to 5.26 k/, that is a reduction of entitlement

before one pays excess water charges of 15.8 per cent. Effectively, the Government's charges have increased by about 31.6 per cent, not 5 per cent as the Minister suggested; 31.6 per cent is a very great increase in the charges that householders, producers and industry must pay. It is detrimental to the best interests of the State.

The Labor Party blamed the Liberal Party for increasing water charges, but it has a case to answer as well. Certainly some increase was justified but the increase would have to be described as exorbitant. It is a pity that the Minister has seen fit, in a sense, to misrepresent the facts, because for the most part the increase on the same valuation will be 15.8 per cent, not 5 per cent as he suggested.

A constituent has complained to me that the Engineering and Water Supply Department sent him an account for 3c. Surely the computer can be programmed to defer that account until the next time an account is due. It is a pity that frivolous accounts cannot be avoided. I know there are difficulties, but I long for the day when this anomaly can be overcome.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): On December 20, 1976, the Minister of Transport issued a press statement that cyclists could use footpaths. Apparently the Minister believes that cyclists should now be able to use all footpaths, because he believes it would be safer for cyclists, but unfortunately the Minister has not found out how pedestrians can be affected. An article in the *Advertiser* of December 21, 1976, states:

Cyclists may soon be allowed to use footpaths on parts of Adelaide's main roads, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Virgo) said yesterday. They would be asked to leave the footpaths only where there was high pedestrian activity near shops.

Who will police this situation? Who will tell cyclists that there is much activity in front of shops and that they should get on to the road? Members can imagine the fiasco that could occur. The article continues:

Mr. Virgo said the proposal would be put to the Road Traffic Board soon. The main roads would include Unley Road, Glen Osmond Road, Anzac Highway, Main North-East Road, and South Road.

What about the other main roads in the metropolitan area? The Minister attempted to cover himself when he said in the article:

I regard the footpath proposal as only a stop-gap remedy. I should think so. I have in my district probably a greater number of people over the retirement age than in any other district in Australia. This matter is causing concern not only to old people but also to schoolteachers, who do not know whether to tell their students that they may ride on footpaths. The Minister's airy-fairy statement shows that he does not know whether he is coming or going. Cyclists, schoolteachers, the police, and people generally do not know the true situation. If a person commits a first offence involving riding a bike, he receives a caution, and there is a \$20 fine for a second offence. The article also states:

Mr. Virgo said the Department of Transport had done two planning studies, one with the Adelaide City Council, but local government co-operation was needed before the recommendations could be implemented.

The Minister says one thing, and later says something quite different. It is about time he stated what is really happening as regards cyclists. Many people, particularly in my area, have been knocked down by cyclists riding on footpaths. Such a practice is dangerous to everyone using the footpaths.

The final matter I raise deals with the high cost of foreshore protection in this State and the way in which it has affected those councils controlling foreshore areas, particularly the Glenelg and Brighton councils. Recently the Coast Protection Board estimated that it would cost \$684 000 for additional foreshore protection work along parts of Somerton and Brighton, and the area involved is not large. The board said that it would pay two-thirds of the cost of this work, leaving the Brighton City Council to pay \$228 000 as its one-third share. However, I believe that the Government should bear the full cost of this work because one does not have to be clever to realise that our metropolitan beaches could be termed as a national park and playground of the State.

As our foreshore, particularly in the metropolitan area, is used by people throughout the State and by tourists from other States, I believe that it ought to be classified as a national park and placed under the control of the Coast Protection Board, but when it comes to meeting the costs involved it is a different story altogether. Bearing in mind that the council has been saddled with great cost over the past few years in providing rip-rap as coast protection, I think the Government should take full responsibility for this work. In the Playford era, the Government paid the full cost of repairs to damage caused during the great storm.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: That's why it's second-rate now.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister agrees with me but now wants to see the council saddled with one-third of the cost.

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

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I was interested to read in my local paper this morning that the Minister for the Environment had said that charges about land clearance that I had made on behalf of my constituents were irresponsible. This Government seems to have what I consider to be almost a compulsion for setting up various authorities, and I will refer to this matter in more detail in my Address in Reply speech. My statement in the local paper suggested that the new land use authority to administer more controls and reductions in the rights of landowners was unnecessary. I said that landowners had been for many years (and still are) trying desperately to protect areas of native vegetation, but were finding it increasingly difficult to do so because of the high costs and taxes imposed by the Government. I totally agree with the report regarding compensation: it is high time that incentives were introduced to encourage landowners to retain such land. I believe that the report implies that primary producers are incapable of managing their own properties without assistance from what is referred to in the report as a land-use authority. Many of the suggested incentives in the report have been referred to the Government several times over many years, particularly from the area I represent.

The Adelaide Hills Land Use Committee, of which I have the privilege to be Chairman, in a submission to the Monarto Commission Hills Study team supported the concept of people holding areas of bushland, or areas of farming or grazing land, who wished to retain it in its present state, being encouraged to sign some form of mutual or, what we refer to as, a management agreement. However, the committee stipulated that such agreements should have escape clauses for both parties to the agreement, with at least 12 months notice of cancellation. I believe that is necessary. The committee made a strong suggestion that an incentive must be provided to encourage landholders

to enter such agreements, and the submission makes clear that such a scheme should be on a completely voluntary basis, without any compulsion whatever to enter such an agreement. However, I was horrified that the draft Act in appendix 1 of the report refers to the entering of what is called a heritage agreement. I believe the reduction of user rights, with more controls in the administering of such heritage agreements, as suggested in the report, has gone too far. I believe that the controls already exercised by a number of Government departments adequately protect such areas, without having to set up another authority.

It will be necessary to introduce incentives, and much more could be achieved, I believe, under the present system if an improvement was effected in liaison between landholders and certain Government departments. This applies particularly to Government departments dealing with planning. I suggest that Government policies on planning have reached such a confused state in South Australia that I doubt whether those in such departments could hope to understand the policies, let alone explain them to other people. I hope that I have clarified a few of the points about which the Minister has accused me of being irresponsible in statements I have made. It is a matter I treat very seriously. I see the Government as having something of a compulsion to set up even more authorities than exist at the present time.

I turn now to a matter which is the concern of the Minister of Works relating to the costing of water. About a month ago a multi-objective feasibility study of a water supply for the Callington-Strathalbyn area was released. Over many years in this House my predecessor and I have tried to stress the importance of a reticulated water supply for this area. The report's findings indicate that it is not possible to recommend to the Government that this scheme be undertaken at present. The conclusions state that no need can be seen for taking a water main to Strathalbyn to improve the quality of the water there. I could spend much time in attempting to describe the standard of water in Strathalbyn. It is poor. Public meetings have been held and petitions have been brought before this House in relation to the quality of that water.

I believe there is still a desperate need for a reticulated water scheme for Strathalbyn and the surrounding district. The report recommends a complete rehabilitation programme for the cleaning up of the Bremer River. I welcome that report and that move. It will especially help those who will be pumping water directly from the river, but there is still an urgent need for a reticulated water scheme in the Hartley-Woodchester area. This Government promised earlier that it would continue on the scheme now supplying Callington.

Mr. Nankivell: Would the main be large enough?

Mr. WOTTON: That would have to be looked at. It is possible that alterations will have to be made. It is vital that water be brought into the Hartley-Woodchester area, because this area serves much country in the outer Mount Barker districts. A further point on the subject of water deals with unfair charges paid by people on properties simply because a water main happens to pass their place, when they do not use a drop of the water and have never requested such a service. One of the problems facing the areas being overtaken by increased urban activities is this problem of the services being installed. I believe that charges for water should be in line with actual usage; if a person uses water he should be charged for it. If a person wishes

to build a house in a way-out place he should have to pay the full cost of putting on the water. As more people take advantage of the service the cost should be divided between them. I shall quote from a letter received from a constituent, as follows:

I am writing to you requesting to have the Act relating to water rates applied in a reasonable, fair and equitable manner.

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

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I wish to raise two matters in this debate, the first being similar to one raised by the member for Mitcham. Yesterday, I received a letter from the Secretary of a school council dated July 6, stating: Dear Mr. Gunn,

The school council at its meeting of June 20 directed that I write to you in order to convey the council's views regarding the Minister's instructions on preference for unionists, in regard to which the high school council wishes to express its strong objection to that section of the instruction on unionism which reads:

However, before a non-unionist is employed the Principal shall obtain in writing from that person an undertaking that an appropriate union will be joined within a reasonable period of time after commencing employment.

I have not named the school or the Secretary, because we know the manner in which this Government probably would victimise those people if the names were made public. I am happy to show the letter to the Minister or to the Minister of Labour and Industry, but I do not intend to put the names in *Hansard*.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You are happy to show it to me?

Mr. GUNN: I will show it to the Minister. That letter is one of a number which I understand members on this side of the House have been receiving from school councils.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That proves I do not victimise people. Thank you. That is all I wanted.

Mr. GUNN: That is not correct. Members on this side of the House have received such letters, which are in complete contradiction to the platform of the Labor Party regarding the interpretation of democratic socialism.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You haven't got the right book.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GUNN: When they have finished their private discussion, I shall continue.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg is interjecting out of his seat.

Mr. GUNN: The Labor Party's platform claims to protect people from arbitrary invasion by the State. This policy to which I refer is a deliberate invasion by the State of individual freedom. That is the only interpretation anyone can put on this policy of compulsory unionism. Even worse, as the member for Mitcham pointed out, if a person is forced to join a union that is affiliated with the Labor Party he must pay a fee to the Labor Party. The member for Mitcham was not aware of the extent of the fee, but I have looked it up, and I find, in relation to union sustentation fees, that a trade union pays head office a sustentation fee of 70c per annum in respect of every effective member on its books who is not a member of any other political Party. How do they determine whether or not a person is a member of any political Party? I know people who are members of the Liberal Party who have been forced to join a union and have not been given the right to opt out: "You will join." They

have not been given the opportunity of saying, "We are members of the Liberal Party and we do not want to pay a fee to the Labor Party." It is a policy which is an in-built collection for the Australian Labor Party. People are not allowed to express their democratic right in this matter: it is a case of, "You will pay, or else."

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I remember your saying that at least once before.

Mr. GUNN: I have the evidence from a school council in my electoral district and I am perturbed that this Government should take such a course of action. Another matter deals with a report recently released by the Minister for the Environment, the Hon. Mr. Simmons. The report deals with vegetation clearance in South Australia. This report, unfortunately, has not been circulated very widely; there is a shortage of copies. I managed to get a few copies and make them available to some people in my electoral district who are interested in this matter. This report has caused widespread concern throughout agricultural areas in South Australia. It was released without a proper explanation. Many people are of the opinion that a move will be made to stop all land development in the near future.

Some of the recommendations of this report are disturbing. In my opinion, it would be a quite foolish decision if extra controls were placed on land development in this State, particularly if those controls were given to the Minister for the Environment, a person who has shown the people of South Australia that he knows nothing about the practical side of agriculture; and many of his officers are in that category. The recommendation that controls should be in the hands of the Director of Environment is frightening in itself. I do not know whether the member for Stuart has ever read the Soil Conservation Act; there were adequate controls in that Act to make sure people did not clear lands that they should not. I do not believe that every hectare of land currently not developed should be knocked down. I do not hold with that principle. Certain areas should be left and most farmers do not intend to clear all the land; but when people release a report of this nature, all it does is cause concern, and it makes people say, "They are going to put the control in the hands of the conservationists."

Mr. Keneally: Do you think there are areas that have been cleared that, in retrospect, should not have been cleared?

Mr. GUNN: In certain areas, it might have been wiser if some land had been left; much land in South Australia is still suitable to be cleared and should be cleared in the economic interests of the people of this State. No-one would object to having to leave a few more hectares than they do at present; no-one would object to having to leave an area of pine trees or vegetation. No-one would argue about that. If they want more controls, give them to a district council and not to the bureaucrats in Adelaide, because that will cause only more resentment against the department. Unfortunately, the Environment Department has a poor public image in the country areas.

Mr. Keneally: It has a tremendous image up our way.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Frome can completely destroy that argument. I have had drawn to my attention in the last few weeks some of the ridiculous things that have taken place in that member's electoral district. There are large areas in that district that do not share the view that the member for Stuart has just put forward. I think the member for Stuart has clearly revealed that he does

not understand the problem. I could give examples in this House, but I do not want to be faced with the position of having to name particular officers.

Mr. Keneally: You only want to smear.

Mr. GUNN: I do not want to name particular officers of the department, who are obviously carrying out instructions from further afield. I could tell the honourable member privately about a ridiculous thing a few weeks ago that has completely alienated the local landowners; it was unnecessary; the matter could have been handled in a far better way to achieve the same result. The authorities released a few copies of the report; enough were not available so that everyone who wanted to look at it could see it. I got as many as I could; I had to buy them.

Mr. Keneally: I thought you were going to take the opportunity to tell us about your local justices of the peace.

Mr. GUNN: I could tell you a lot about that but it would not achieve anything to highlight that matter. In conclusion, I sincerely hope that this Government, before it acts on this committee, gives this matter its serious consideration; that it discusses the matter with the United Farmers and Graziers, with the Stockowners Association, and with those people who will be affected by any decision because, if the Government does not, all it will do is alienate itself from a large section of the rural population of this State.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I refer to the speech of the member for Light, dealing with education while the Minister of Education was in the Chamber about an hour ago. I am delighted that the teachers and members of the ancillary staff at schools are now coming forward with some honest and constructive suggestions and information about school expenditure in the past. There is no doubt that the Federal Labor Government in 1972, 1973, and 1974 spent a tremendous amount of money on schools and school equipment. In fact, I have searched for some basic reason why such fantastic spending took place, because it does not seem to rest on any particular system or basis. There are schools that say they got equipment they did not necessarily order, and I cannot find any real basis for school equipment except for the fact that it would appear that schools of like numbers of students to a large degree were issued with the basic amount of property—electronic equipment and aids and equipment for various sporting activities.

One of the most amazing statements made to me recently as I have gone around a number of schools in my district was made by one senior man, who said he had at least \$6 000 worth of equipment in the school stores that had not been and was not likely to be used. I wonder just what a search of school libraries, school stores, and school equipment storage areas would reveal in the way of surplus and unused materials.

One of the most unfortunate aspects of this provision of equipment seems to be that there are schools whose principals and senior masters say, "We have a piece or pieces of equipment but we have not really anybody skilled enough to operate that equipment." I am not sure whether other members have had this said to them but it seems to me that much equipment is lying about in schools that is not very appropriate to those schools. No-one seems to be skilled in the use of that equipment. An incredible sum of money (probably totalling many millions of dollars) would have been spent throughout Australia generally on school equipment that is not being used to its full extent.

I wonder whether these things come to the Minister's ears, whether the Minister is aware that a tremendous sum of money has been spent on unnecessary and unused equipment, and whether the Minister has ever asked a departmental officer to summarise or make an inventory of what is being stored in school bookrooms and equipment rooms without being used. I should think that the figure would be staggering. If funds had been used more sensibly during the last four or five years, it would not have been necessary for people to cry out today for more funding for school buildings. Funds that have been used to buy unnecessary equipment would have been available for new buildings.

I now move on to the matter of planning, with which I deal regularly in my speeches in this place. I remember a member of the Legislative Council saying when the Planning and Development Act was first adopted that this State had created a monster. Those were perhaps fairly harsh words that were not readily understood by many people. However, I believe that this State has grown to understand that, certainly in the adoption of the Planning Act and the amendments made thereto since, the State Planning Authority has become a force to be reckoned with in the community. It is a force with which local government cannot compete. This is one of the tragedies regarding the State Planning Office: it seems to take such little notice of what local government has to say. I fully realise that local government, at least until now, has never had the employees nor appointed the people with the planning expertise to cope with this problem. I believe that this will happen to a greater extent in future. This is where the basis of good planning ought to begin: at the local level.

I can see the necessity for the State Planning Authority's being a co-ordinating authority. However, I believe that good planning begins within local government, and, indeed, right at home. I find that, when we impose planning conditions on an area that has had no zoning regulations or, indeed, no plans in any shape or form, it is disastrous for families who try to plan for the future in relation to the provisions of blocks of land and houses for their children. When a planning authority moves into a certain area, a general survey of what development ought to occur in the area is undertaken. That survey ought to be sufficiently futuristic so as not to make it financially difficult or frustrating for the people who have immediate ideas regarding what they intend to do with the property. I have before me a letter from the State Planning Authority declining a certain subdivision in the hundred of Mobilong, which is three or four kilometres north of the main street of Murray Bridge. This involves a pensioner who has battled for many years to freehold a block so that it could be subdivided in order to provide accommodation for two of her children. Now that the woman has the block freehold, and her children are engaged and want to settle down, she has applied for permission to subdivide those two portions from her land. However, she has found that it is absolutely impossible. The State Planning Authority will not permit the subdivision, although the local council is eager that the subdivision occur and the two new dwellings be erected there.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I welcome the opportunity to say a few well-chosen words in this debate. However, even to touch on the area of complaint within the ten minutes which I am allotted would involve my having to speak at the speed of sound. I should like to comment on the debate that ensued in the House yesterday when my colleagues highlighted certain aspects of the

dial-a-bus situation, and when the Minister of Transport, who has the sole responsibility for transport, told the House that, contrary to the advice he had received from experts regarding dial-a-bus, he gave a certain person approval to purchase buses for a dial-a-bus operation. For how long did that service last? It hardly got off the ground when we saw the dial-a-bus buses in secondhand car yards around Adelaide. When one thinks of the number of experts that the Government has appointed to advise it on these matters, it is appalling that the Government has admitted in the House that it acted contrary to the advice of the experts, especially as it was only a matter of days later that we found that the experts were correct in opposing the establishment of the dial-a-bus operation. This was real Alice-in-Wonderland thinking as far as the Government was concerned.

Recently, we were told the sum of money that was to be made available to the States for roads. It involved an increase of about 87 per cent for our rural roads. One sees, on looking into the situation, that this sum of money will not find its way to those specific roads. This is because of the continuing involvement of this Government with freeways in connection with Monarto, on which it has spent millions of dollars, and because of its commitment on the freeways associated with Monarto much money that was to be spent in the North of the State will not now be spent. I think particularly of the Merri-ton to Port Broughton road, 5.6 km of which is still unsealed. Out of the total allocation for this State's roads, the money given to the Red Hill District Council was sufficient for it to seal only 1 km of road, which is appalling.

Mention has been made today about schools and the amount of money that has been wasted on equipment and other things. We have been trying for years to get new schools in my electoral district. Time and again we have heard the story that there is no money. The Government blames the Federal Government for this all the time. Turning to the aspect of schools being burnt down in the metropolitan area, we do not see schools being burnt down in the country. I believe that the Government should take a strong line and build residences at schools, not necessarily for the headmaster but for a member of the staff to occupy. I know it has been the policy of the teachers' union for teachers not to live on the school property but to get as far away as they can from the school.

That is a good philosophy to a degree, but if we are going to look after our schools to any extent I believe a teacher should live on the property. I know that would be a safeguard, to some degree, against vandalism and the burning of schools that is taking place, particularly in the metropolitan area. I know what it would be like on farms throughout the State if farmers lived 10 miles away from their properties and what would happen to those properties with all their valuable stock, plant and equipment. It is a must, I believe, if we are going to arrest some of the heavy losses to the Government from that source; a change of policy will have to be undertaken. We talk of security officers, and the Minister talks about the high cost of security and that it would not work, but I say, "Let us look at something constructive and build some accommodation on school properties."

It may be that the deputy headmaster would be happy to live on the school property and he could be compensated accordingly for whatever disability is imposed by having to live there. We have school teachers in

the country driving school buses, and they are happy to do it. They receive a little extra for doing so, I believe that if we are going to arrest this situation of schools being burnt down at a cost of \$50 000 or \$100 000 at a time when there are areas throughout the State needing this money for new schools, then we must have a person living on the property.

Last week the Premier opened the United Farmers and Graziers conference at the Wayville showgrounds and the question of the lack of teacher accommodation throughout the country was raised. The Premier got back on to the same old story blaming the Federal Government for lack of funds, yet we read a few days later that the Government had spent \$200 000 buying into a hardware business in the South-East. This does not go down with people in my area. If the Government has the money to buy into a situation like that, let it be involved in things that it needs to be involved in.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VENNING: I have been in politics long enough, and lived long enough, to understand the situation. I am wondering whether the Government is going to come into Rocky River and start buying Rocky River. I am a little disappointed that it has not started already. The Premier came into my area on March 1 and met all and sundry. He was very gracious to the people and smiled nicely, but I am waiting now for some result and I would expect that he would have made some announcement by now if he intends buying Rocky River. Perhaps he believes that Rocky River cannot be bought—at least by the people. The Premier amazes me. One sees a photograph of the Premier in the paper when he comes back from the Premier's conferences with his hair all pulled down, where he has been fighting for South Australia, and he puts on a real turn that implies when the Premier fights South Australia wins—it's wonderful! I am wondering when the Premier, having spent so much money in the South-East, will move into Rocky River and spend a bit there.

We are having a dry time there and would appreciate any benefit the Government can give to us. We know that it is hopeless for the primary producer to apply for rural assistance through the rural committee. I have tried for many people in my area and one might as well save one's time and energy because one has no hope at all of getting any help, although the system has now been changed. The Lands Department was handling this relief, but now the Minister of Agriculture is going to handle it. I can tell you now that the effect will be the same; they will make a song and dance about what they are doing for the primary producers in the State. One only needs to look in the *Stock Journal* of a few days ago where the unions loading baled hay were charging \$3 a bale to load it. When you analyse their movements they were moving five bales an hour for \$3 a bale, lifting it 15ft., and the primary producer himself, according to the Department of Agriculture, to grow it, cut it, stack it and bale it he would get 50c.

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

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): Continuing the note that the member for Rocky River finished on, about lifting five bales in an hour, for the past couple of months I have been feeding stock when I have been there, 90 bales in 20 minutes, so I am obviously worth \$2 700 an hour. That

analogy probably underlines the parlous position this Government has got this State into. I cannot employ anybody on my property and I have Mum, Dad and the kids, and that is the position.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You must be working well, you look fairly healthy.

Mr. RODDA: I am. I have lost about 12 kg; it is good for me. It should give the Government hope that healthy farmers mean healthy Government.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Have you had any rain down your way?

Mr. RODDA: We are flooded away; the Lord looks after his own. There is much concern across the broad spectrum of the fishing industry, an industry that probably has the greatest potential of any of our industries. The Minister, Mr. Chatterton, met the delegates for the South Australian Fishing Industry Council at Mount Gambier a short time ago and I think he heard something of what they thought about the Government administration. I remember attending a meeting with the member for Stuart 12 months ago last February in the august environs of the member for Whyalla, who was a good host and looked after us well at the Left Hand Club and the football club. Those fishermen were unhappy then, and I do not think they are any happier now. The fishermen are greatly concerned about the various types of licence in the industry.

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

Mr. RODDA: In the short time for which I spoke before dinner, I was talking about the fishing industry, and I want to tell the Government that that is a valuable industry in this State but that the Government's performance so far this year has been rather dismal. This view has been expressed by the fishermen. It was triggered off by the method of selecting the two people who were brought into the prawn industry. There were new criteria, which the industry did not seem to know much about. I am not casting aspersions on the two new authority holders. Indeed, I think one had spent much time in the industry and perhaps he had earned his preferment. The other person selected did not seem to have that qualification, but he may have met the new criteria.

If we are to have a thriving and a flourishing industry in which there is confidence, there should be a policy whereby people who invest in and work in the industry confidently can expect from the Government certain things. There must be authority and control in regard to those who take fish from a managed fishery, and I subscribe to the managed fishery system, but the balloting system of grading 112 people out of about 220, as I believe was the case in the candidature for the allocation of these new authorities, causes much unrest.

This brings me to the vital question of managed fisheries. If we are to preserve this asset, this common resource, we must see that there is continuity of expertise in not allowing the mob in. At present, there are A class licences and B class licences, and the member for Stuart would be aware of the dissatisfaction arising in his area in this regard. The Government had to take action. It is the custodian with the commission, so it must take full responsibility. However, I would be failing in my duty as an Opposition member if I did not refer to the dissatisfaction being expressed by B class fishermen when the fish are running. The professional fisherman supports the industry in the good times and the bad times and he is entitled to protection.

There should be adequate research so that we know and understand what resource is available, and there should be a catching force of properly authorised people, adequately equipped to harvest that catch. That is not happening under the system of having A class licences and B class licences and the present position is causing much anguish in an industry that has much potential in South Australia.

Mr. Keneally: Is your policy to abolish B class licences?

Mr. RODDA: I am not saying that the present position is causing dissatisfaction. You are the people with a commission to govern. From the way you are acting, you certainly want to keep it.

Mr. Keneally: We are interested in what your policy is.

Mr. RODDA: I know that you are, and you will hear it at the appropriate time.

The SPEAKER: I remind the honourable member that he has used the word "you" many times.

Mr. RODDA: I am speaking of the Government, Mr. Speaker, in the most abstract sense but if I am offending you I withdraw.

The SPEAKER: I thought in your earlier statements you were referring to one of the honourable members.

Mr. RODDA: I am giving him the benefit of being a focal part of the Government. We can term the others in the fishing industry amateur fishermen, the average Australian who wants to catch a fish. Recently, professional fishermen have been concerned about encroachment, and I challenge the Government to do something in this area. We know that it has referred to certain devices, but it should have a provision to enable the average Australian to catch a fish and engage in his pastime or hobby, at the same time ensuring that this amateur fishing is not encroaching on the professional. It ill behoves the member for Stuart to squeeze out of me or anyone else on this side what our policy is, because the Government has the commission to govern. It makes the rules, and it can take the blame at this stage. I point out that there is much dissatisfaction in all stratas in the fishing industry. We have the complexity of the amateur fishermen expressing concern about not getting a go. Tourism is being affected by over-fishing of bays, and the inland waterways should have the benefit of a policy that everyone can enjoy.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): Since this Parliament last met, major new anomalies in the Workmen's Compensation Act have become apparent. These weaknesses relate to claims for loss of hearing. There is obvious need for the Act to be amended urgently. However, I was disappointed and concerned to learn from the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech that the Government has apparently abandoned any intention of correcting the anomalies of the Act, despite promises to do so at the last election.

As a result of these anomalies in the Act, the number of claims for hearing loss is increasing alarmingly. As one lawyer expressed it, until changes are made, industry is sitting on a potential plague of claims. It was claimed at a recent noise seminar that there are potential hearing loss claims valued at about \$300 000 000 just within South Australia. I support the principle that, if a worker suffers a permanent hearing loss through working in a noisy industry, he should be justly compensated for that disability, but the four major anomalies allow the claims to go well beyond that principle.

The lump-sum payment for total loss of hearing is \$15 000, and for partial loss a relative proportion of this amount. The present employers are required to compensate

for the total hearing loss of the worker in a noisy area, irrespective of whether there was already some hearing loss before the person started work with this employer. The only exception to this is if a lump-sum payment has already been made by a previous employer in South Australia. This means that present employers may have to compensate for hearing losses that may have occurred over 30 years ago. Many people who are still working today had partial loss of hearing during the Second World War. I will explain what I mean. If a person had a previous injury and suffered a 50 per cent hearing loss and then three years ago started work in a noisy industry and since lost another 5 per cent and now suffers a 55 per cent hearing loss, he can claim under workmen's compensation a total of 55 per cent against his present employer. In other words, he will get 55 per cent of the \$15 000. That is an injustice, because it puts the entire burden of his previous loss of hearing on to the present employer.

Mr. Wardle: What protection has the employer, if he won't wear hearing protection?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will refer to that point shortly. The second anomaly is that employers are also liable for hearing losses of a worker in a noisy area, even if a major part of that hearing loss occurred outside of the workplace. It is well known that noise levels from motor cycles, band music, motor racing, and even model aeroplanes can readily exceed the noise level at which permanent hearing loss will occur. Despite the fact that the hearing loss may have occurred outside of his present employment, his present employer can be liable for the full loss of hearing.

Another anomaly is that, if a hearing loss occurs in a noisy industry because hearing protection equipment is not worn by the worker, even though such equipment is supplied by the employer, a compensation claim for a lump-sum payment can be made against the employer. Yet another anomaly is that workers in other States who have already received compensation for hearing loss in another State are able to apply successfully for further compensation for the same hearing loss if they work in a noisy industry in South Australia. Therefore, double compensation can be received.

South Australia is one of only two Australian States where simply exposure to high noise at work automatically means that any noise-induced hearing loss will be compensated. Western Australia is the only other State. Factories may be classed as having a high noise level for workmen's compensation purposes even though the rigid standards laid down by the new Noise Control Act are met.

These farcical anomalies are causing more employers to test applicants for work for hearing loss, using an audiogram. Applicants with a partial hearing loss will be unable to get jobs in any noisy industries, because these workers are potential claimants for lump-sum payments. Hence the pool of unemployable persons will increase even further. The responsibility lies with the State Government, and especially the Minister of Labour and Industry, to correct these anomalies as quickly as possible by amending the Act. I request both the Government and the Minister so to do.

The second subject to which I refer is the way in which the Premier is now setting up Yugoslavia as the model that South Australia should use in adopting industrial democracy. I criticise the Premier and the Government for doing that. There are now four specific cases in which the Premier has shown his strong preference for the Yugoslav system of industrial democracy. This is horrifying for South Australians, as Yugoslavia has a communist government and complete State control of industry. We are not interested in sacrificing our freedoms and

benefits for such dictatorial controls. What would Yugoslavia know about democracy, at any rate? It is a country that does not have any.

The first of the four cases was when the Premier visited Yugoslavia when he was overseas last year examining schemes of industrial democracy. He came away praising the system. Secondly, earlier this year three Yugoslavs were brought to Adelaide at the expense of, and as guests of, the Premier. The purpose of the visit was for these people to talk about the Yugoslav system of State control. Thirdly, now this Government has offered to pay the costs for Mr. Ted Gnatenko to visit Yugoslav factories and trade unions for a period of 10 weeks.

Mr. Whitten: Is anyone else going with him?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: According to a report released by the Premier, he is going to Yugoslavia by himself.

Mr. Whitten: And with a representative of employers. Be honest.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If the honourable member is referring to Mr. Michael Lloyd, the employers' representative, he is going to Sweden and not to Yugoslavia. That information is according to a statement released by the Premier. I do not mind an employer representative, or any moderate member of the trade union movement, going overseas, but Mr. Gnatenko is not, I believe, a representative of the trade union movement. Most people would say that he has a strong left-wing point of view.

Mr. Whitten: Fair go! Don't you believe in elections by a democratic vote?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: He was not elected to this, or are you now saying he was?

Mr. Whitten: He was elected into the trade union movement.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: My point is that his trip to Yugoslavia is being paid for by the State Government. I hope the honourable member will keep quiet, and I will explain my fourth example in which the Premier has tried to follow the Yugoslav system. I know these facts hurt Government members, and that they are embarrassed because the State Government is trying to follow an industrial democracy scheme set up by a communist Government. As a final blow the Premier has now invited speakers from Yugoslavia to attend his industrial democracy conference in Adelaide next year.

It is time the Premier stopped trying to impose the controls and restrictions of a communist system on to South Australian industry. Some damage to potential industrial development has already occurred as a result. No free enterprise business will risk investments under such a State Government, and job opportunities will suffer as a consequence. I believe that the Premier has rocks in his head when it comes to his hobby-horse of industrial democracy and worker control.

I have a message for the Minister of Labour and Industry in case he has a defamation writ in his hand. I am speaking in the Chamber, and it is unfortunate that he did not check up on the matter before rushing off to the Supreme Court last time. I am still waiting for an apology for that defamation writ which he filed against me but which he was later forced to withdraw.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I am pleased that the Minister of Works is present, because the problem I wish to raise is a serious one existing in my district. The present Government has been in office for seven years, and today the Premier stated that his Government spent money in areas of need. I do not wish to discuss at this time

the purpose of spending money in the South-East, but I draw to the Government's attention a problem that exists in the Fisher District. The member for Stuart may laugh and joke as much as he likes if he wants to be childish, but in the Fisher District there are more unsewered houses than there are in the rest of metropolitan Adelaide. That situation has been allowed to exist. Let us not be concerned about where money is being cut in other areas. Let us worry about how money is being spent, where there is an area of need that has existed for many years. If members went to Malinge Court in Happy Valley they would find that I am not exaggerating when I say that from 9in. to 1ft. of effluent is lying in the gutters of the street: it is a green slimy mess, it is putrid and unhealthy, and I believe that no society should expect people to live in those conditions. One can go to Aberfoyle Park, Happy Valley, Coromandel Valley, Blackwood, Belair, Hawthornedene, parts of Bellevue Heights, Glenalta, Monalta, and all of the Stirling District Council area that is substantially developed and the problem exists in all those places.

About two years ago it was arranged that I meet officers under the Minister of Works and representatives of the Mitcham council to decide where the highest priority of need existed in the Mitcham Hills area. Subsequently, whenever a person has fronted up honestly and sincerely to determine what are the first priorities the Minister has said, "We can do no more; these are the priorities you put first and we are working as you decided." That is true, but it is happening too slowly. Perhaps the Minister thinks that sounds rough, but progress is too slow when one considers the other areas in which funds are spent. Over \$200 000 (an insignificant sum having regard to the total expenditure required to be spent on sewerage in my district) was spent in buying into a business in the South-East.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You said those funds should be put into housing—you can't have it everywhere.

Mr. EVANS: That is a lie. I have never made such a statement in relation to the \$200 000 spent on buying that business.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That is for the sewerage, and everything else is for housing.

Mr. EVANS: People in that area of the hills are suffering an environmental hazard that affects the quality of life. It affects the roads and costs the council much more to maintain the roads. Certainly, there is no point in the council's surfacing roads that will be dug up when drains are provided in a few years (it should be much sooner) for sewerage facilities. Until that work is done there is no point in kerbing the roads, either. If any members have doubts, I invite them to tell these residents, "You can suffer this disability. We don't give a damn; we will spend the money in other areas." Such a situation cannot be tolerated in today's society.

If we do not now have sufficient funds, the Government could at least agree to the sort of system asked for by people in Monalta. They said they would pay the interest on the funds borrowed if the Government would borrow the sum required, and then pay the loan off according to the normal programme that the Government has set. This request was refused. I point out that costs will escalate, especially this year, when there will be an 8 per cent increase in inflation (perhaps even more, depending on the success of the Fraser Government's initiatives). The Government could borrow the funds and allow the community to pay interest on the money. The council could

borrow against rates and the community could pay the interest and the Government could pay the principal. Thus the facility could be provided, with the work going to private contractors. More people would be employed and the community would solve an employment problem. The Minister said this was rubbish—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I didn't say anything of the sort.

Mr. EVANS: Once the sewerage leeway is caught up with in the Fisher District there is little sewerage development left to be undertaken in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What about your Federal friends? They stopped the national sewerage scheme.

Mr. EVANS: There is no reason to go throwing mud at others when the Minister is not willing to put his own house in order. At Happy Valley the Land Commission, which is under the jurisdiction of this Government, is sewerage nearly 1 000 allotments, even before those allotments are required. They are adjacent to the subdivisions at Chandler Hill and Aberfoyle Park; people can virtually throw waste water into the drains entering Land Commission sewerage facilities, yet the Government will not provide facilities to these residents. The Government did a similar thing in the early part of 1970. People there paid for the temporary water main themselves.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They won't pay for it, and you know it.

Mr. EVANS: The people at Chandler Hill paid \$3 600 for the extension of the water main so they could have a temporary service connected to their subdivision. I helped them to raise the funds.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: If they do the same for their area as the subdividers do, they can have it.

Mr. EVANS: The Land Commission is subdividing and providing a facility.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And paying for it.

Mr. EVANS: Agreed, but with Government money. Who does the Government really believe is paying for the commission's work? The commission or the people?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The people, and the people who are in the other subdivisions can pay for it, too.

Mr. EVANS: The people are paying for a facility that is not yet wanted, while in another area people are going without. The Minister has said that those people should pay for it; I am saying to him that they are willing in Monalta to pay the interest on the principal until the Government's normal programme catches up with that area. Indeed, it will cost the Government less, because it will not have to pay for the inflationary increase. If the Minister cannot see the common sense in that—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I haven't any common sense, so how could I see that?

Mr. EVANS: The Minister has made that statement, not I; I will leave it to the people in my district to judge him. I am sure that others in the area would be willing to do the same, if the Minister were willing to accept the challenge. Why should people and their families have to suffer such an indignity?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You don't know what you're talking about.

Mr. EVANS: It is an indignity. There is a putrid smell there.

Members interjecting:

Mr. EVANS: The commission gets unlimited funds and the Minister knows it can do whatever it likes to acquire

property throughout the metropolitan area. In fact it has acquired about 3 600 ha while other people go without the basic needs of normal community life.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The commission cannot develop an area unless it puts in the services.

Mr. EVANS: Commission funds could be directed in this way if this Government wished. The Minister had the opportunity, and the Premier still has the opportunity, to help the people in this area, but the Premier and the Government do not have any interests in these people and say that they are second-class citizens who can go without.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Rubbish!

Mr. EVANS: It is not rubbish. For seven years a Labor Government has been in office and at that time sewerage has caught up in every other part of the metropolitan area.

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

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Before proceeding with the subject on which I should like to grieve tonight I intend to follow up the comments made by the member for Fisher and seek to reply to some of the remarks made by way of interjection by the Minister of Works. In regard to services, the Minister is well aware of the repeated requests I have made to this Government to provide water services in needy areas. I am disappointed to hear the Minister say in reply to the member for Fisher, "They can have it if they want it; if they are prepared to pay for it they can have it."

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: For a very reasonable amount, too.

Mr. CHAPMAN: That is the very principle my constituents have adopted when approaching the Minister in the past year or so in seeking a water supply. In fact, they have offered to contribute to the capital expenditure as well as the rates that would ordinarily prevail. In fact, in order to determine how much is required I have written to the Minister on behalf of certain constituents and asked how much his department expects to receive from my constituents in order to assist in the capital financing of a scheme, but I have not yet received a reply.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I will obtain a reply. I'll tell you now what it is. We normally expect a 10 per cent return.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I appreciate that. I am not saying that is not a reasonable policy and, indeed, if we were in government I would expect our policy to be similar. However, I am aware of several districts in South Australia where people who are in desperate circumstances have been provided with a supply for less than a 10 per cent contribution.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That shows how generous we are.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I desire not anything special from the Minister but a similar arrangement to what has applied elsewhere. In this situation, which is contrary to that implied earlier this evening by the Minister, a community has offered to pay for the service and offered to contribute not only by way of rates and the cost of the water involved but also directly towards the capital expenditure, yet we cannot get a straight reply on the cost, even though a study of the spur line has been carried out by the department.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Will you specify the area concerned?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Yes.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Where is it?

Mr. CHAPMAN: It is Seddon, a district on Kangaroo Island where several ratepayers came forward and waited on the Minister's officers in his absence and by his arrangement, offered to make a capital contribution, asked how much it would cost, and cannot get a blasted answer. How do you think they feel?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We'll give them the answer and tell them why it cannot be done, too.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I would appreciate that. The offer made was received genuinely, and some sharing of the load would be involved in that scheme. However, enough of that subject. I will now touch briefly on this Government's fishing policy.

Mr. Venning: Has it got a policy?

Mr. CHAPMAN: It has got a policy, all right—it is a closed shop policy like the union arrangement. I refer now to the situation facing the South Australian Agriculture and Fisheries Department, following the court case involving the operations of the Raptis organisation in Investigator Strait. We are told by the courts that Investigator Strait is clearly in Commonwealth waters and that licences to be issued in future for that area will be issued after discussions and agreement between the State and Commonwealth Governments. I have no complaint about that whatever. However, the Commonwealth Government did insert on page 12 of the *Advertiser* of July 2, 1977, an advertisement inviting applications.

In the interim, that is, between now and when those applications are processed by the two Governments, I believe that it would be reasonable for those who have in the immediate past been involved in that industry to have endorsed their authorities to trawl for prawns in the area, so that they can continue in that practice and so that they, along with other persons who depend for their employment on processing the catch, may be gainfully employed and not displaced in the meantime from the industry. I say that in all fairness and on behalf of those people whose incomes are derived from that industry. Despite this request, at the time the applications are processed by the State and Federal authorities, I believe that all applications should be dealt with on their merits and that special preference should not necessarily be granted to those who have been involved in the industry.

The other subject I should like to raise reflects my concern for this Government's inconsistency generally. I refer to page 476 of *Hansard* of July 13, 1966, when the Premier, who was then Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, was explaining the second reading of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Bill. As is his practice, the Premier took advantage of that opportunity to promote loudly and widely his Government. Among other things he said:

They will . . . be . . . given specific rights and titles, which it is clear from their period of informal operation they can and will discharge effectively. It will be possible for the trust board to negotiate with particular reserve councils for the development of these reserves, and to run separate reserve accounts if that seems to them best.

That paragraph embraced the whole theme of his second reading explanation. In other words, he was intending to hand the authority to the Aboriginal Lands Trust, yet some 10 years later, on July 6, 1977, what did the Premier do to that trust? He set up a new working party to perform the very function that the trust had been set up to perform when he appointed the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Working Party (not an Aboriginal group but a totally white group) to inquire into matters connected with Aboriginal land rights and mineral rights in relation to the north-west area of the State. On July 8, 1977,

directly after that advertisement was inserted in the *Advertiser* by the State Government, I received a letter from an Aboriginal who, among other things, said:

In fact, we are disappointed that the above responsibility has not been placed completely and directly in our hands. We have been offered the role of an observer; the interpretation is, "No vote, no voice."

Of course, that is contrary to the policy of this Government. The Government has set up an authority under an Act of Parliament, but when a job comes up the Government superimposes the authority with another group and delivers the backhander described in this letter. It continues:

We have in the past handled similar matters regarding land titles, transfers and leases of land to the trust and then back to the various Aboriginal communities in a most capable manner. The existing Aboriginal Lands Trust is fully aware of the Yalata people's feelings and views on this matter. This trust also enjoys a friendly and trusting relationship with the Pitjantjatjara men folk of the Yalata community.

Finally, he states:

I trust, Ted, that you and your Party may be of some help to me and our trust in what we sincerely believe to be an effort to make us look like damned idiots.

That lengthy letter, from which I have quoted only extracts, is from a reliable citizen in the community. He is an Aboriginal, a gentleman indeed, whom I have employed over many years. He is a person, in fact, who was appointed to that trust by the Premier and who has, 10 years later, after having exercised responsibility and common sense and fulfilled a reliable role in that capacity, been given the backhander I have described. It was at his request that I now seek to have this matter clarified in the House.

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

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I wish to refer to a question that was asked this afternoon by the member for Stuart of the Minister for the Environment. It was obvious to all present that it was a Dorothy Dixier and that the question had probably been prepared by the Minister so that he could get a message over to the South Australian public. No doubt the Minister has realised that he is in the hot seat regarding the area to which the question related, the new national park at Danggali. Much concern exists about the way this national park is being handled and about the way money is being wasted in this area.

My telephone rang considerably yesterday, with people telling me about the amount of money that has been spent on upgrading the homestead on the old Canopus Station. This was a beautiful homestead in which the owner lived for many years with average conveniences. I understand that \$46 000 has been spent on upgrading this homestead and that a 240V power plant has been installed. Although all the surrounding stations can afford only a 32V power plant, most of them being wind lights, in this case a 240V power plant has been installed, and a total of \$46 000 has been spent on upgrading the homestead. Most of the concern is expressed at the manner in which the department has gone about exterminating the goats in this national park. The member for Stuart asked whether the Minister could say what had been achieved in the control of feral goats in the north of South Australia. Once again, the member for Stuart was wrong in his directions. It was not in the north but in the north-east, and there is a difference of some hundreds of kilometres between the two areas. In reply, the Minister stated:

Soon after becoming Minister in 1975, I became aware of the magnitude of this problem, particularly in the more rugged parts of the Flinders Range, where control of the feral goat is almost impossible.

I agree with him; there are parts in the Arkaroola area where it is difficult to exterminate the feral goat. The Minister continued:

Many attempts have been made in various ways to eradicate them by calling in gun clubs—

to my knowledge this was suggested, but I have not known that gun clubs were called in—

and suggestions have been made that the Army should take over.

This was, once again, only a suggestion, and did not proceed. The Minister continued:

But it is difficult to control feral goats in country like this. The problem is somewhat easier to deal with in the area around Danggali, a large area that was formerly the stations of Hypurna, Canopus, Postmark, and Morgantvale, north of Renmark, which the National Parks and Wildlife Division was able to buy with money provided initially by the Whitlam Government a couple of years ago.

The stations were bought from those landowners with money supplied by the Whitlam Government, but the owners had to wait a long time to receive their payments. There was a great deal of worry from their point of view that the properties had been sold and settlement had not been made. The State Government was finding difficulty in obtaining the money, and in the meantime the goats were breeding at a great rate. Eventually, the money was found and the area was taken over as a national park. The Minister's reply to the member for Stuart continued:

In this large area where the terrain is much easier to manage, it has been possible to take action against the goats. Originally, last year, we entered into an agreement with a member of the Angora Mohair Goat Society who was interested in trapping the animals to obtain the white does for breeding purposes. I also took the initiative in raising the matter with Samcor, which set up a processing line to handle the goats.

Why the Minister should go to the trouble of setting up a processing line at Samcor when existing facilities were already available at Peterborough, I do not know. Peterborough had been processing goats for many years. It is some distance closer to the national park than is the metropolitan abattoir, and Peterborough can process goats for less than half the cost of processing at Samcor. Why the Minister should have these goats sent to Samcor for processing, I shall never know. His reply continued:

Samcor's Western Australian equivalent at Midland Junction is processing about 10 000 of these animals a week.

That is nothing out of the ordinary, because in 1975 Peterborough was processing 1 250 goats a week and goats have been processed there ever since then. The Minister continued:

So it is possible to handle goats in abattoirs . . .

The Minister has just discovered that when goats were being processed in Peterborough long before 1975.

Dr. Eastick: Last time Samcor tried it they had goats from Gepps Cross to Tarlee. They got out of the yards and went in all directions.

Mr. ALLEN: I imagine that would be the case. The Minister continued:

The agreement with this person last year broke down. A condition of the agreement was that the rangers did not take action in Danggali, because we did not want them dispersed by shooting, which would have militated against the effect of harvesting the goats.

Is the Minister saying that they were going to shoot the goats at Danggali and have them processed at Samcor,

some 200 km away? What would happen to the goats after they were shot? That is just ridiculous. The Minister's reply continued:

No action was therefore taken for a while. For one reason or another he was unable to proceed with the project, so we had to take action with our own resources. What has happened since then has been something of a success story at Danggali, because there has been considerable progress. About 6 000 goats were destroyed by resident rangers up to March of this year.

Those goats had a value of \$10 a head: the meat, processed at Peterborough, is worth \$4 a head and the skin is worth \$6 a head. The 6 000 goats were shot on the spot and left to rot in the sun, breeding blowflies which are a hazard to the sheep in the district. We could say that \$60 000 of taxpayers' money was left when it could have been saved and spent on upgrading the homestead. The reply continues:

That was achieved by rounding them up. I believe that a two-year-old kelpie called Patsie was the main agent in bringing about this result. She was expert at her job and in one day, with her assistance, more than 400 goats were destroyed.

This is nothing new. People in the north have been rounding up goats with sheep dogs for many years. It is acknowledged that it can be done in open country.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: But this is 400 in two hours. That is not a bad dog.

Mr. ALLEN: That is nothing new. The Minister continued:

Other techniques were used. A landowner, a Mr. Don French, whose property is north of Danggali, has been active, with our full endorsement, in rounding up goats and trucking them away for various uses, most of them winding up at Samcor. Mr. French is using a series of mobile yards and moving from dam to dam where goats congregate.

This is what I suggested to the previous Minister in 1975. I asked a question in this House and he agreed. He concluded his reply at that time by saying:

The problem is a major one but, if the suggestions made by the honourable member are followed, they may go a long way towards relieving the difficulty. The National Parks and Wildlife Service is directing its attention towards overcoming the difficulties as quickly as possible. The previous Minister acknowledged what I suggested, which involved putting up yards at watering points, just as Mr. French is doing, yet the Minister said this afternoon that he had found something new.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And you could have told him years ago.

Mr. ALLEN: I did. The present Minister has just discovered it, something new, rounding up goats with sheep dogs and fencing off watering points.

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

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): Some two or three weeks ago an announcement was made in the press that all trucks manufactured and distributed after July 1, 1977, were to have seat belts fitted to the driver's position and also to the passenger position. The belts fitted were to be at least a lap belt with the option of a lap-sash type of belt. The matter has just come before the House by way of regulation. No doubt members would have seen this and are beginning to appreciate the implications. The regulation in question is quite in order, and it is one I support. It follows the recommendation of the Australian Transport Advisory Council in relation to Australian Design Rule No. 32 that seat belts for heavy vehicles be introduced in all States as from July 1, 1977.

I do not quarrel with this requirement, as I believe that every vehicle that travels on the road in this or in any other State should be obliged to have seat belts fitted, but I draw the line when we compare this regulation with the existing Road Traffic Act as it applies in this State. Section 162ab of that Act provides:

A person shall not be seated in a motor vehicle that is in forward motion in a seat for which a seat belt is provided . . . unless he is wearing the seat belt and it is properly adjusted and securely fastened.

The implication behind this is that it is now compulsory for the driver or passenger in a truck in which a seat belt is fitted to wear that seat belt. Immediately this announcement was made in the press, I received a number of telephone calls, and people have since approached me because they know my own personal situation. I can say without equivocation that, had I been wearing a seat belt in my accident, I certainly would not be here today. I can speak with some conviction about driving trucks, with the knowledge and experience I have had in the past, and say that the compulsory wearing of seat belts leaves much to be desired, particularly in heavy vehicles. I say that because the driver or passenger in a truck is always at a higher level than any oncoming car and, in the event of a head-on smash, legs can be damaged.

Mr. Boundy: The load comes through from behind.

Mr. BLACKER: Yes. I use as a graphic illustration my own case, where much damage was done to me and my vehicle from behind because of the load coming forward; as it was, a big gum tree in front stopped it. I raise this matter because not only is it personal to me but it would be irresponsible of me if, having survived such an accident, I was not to have my say in a place of a public nature to which, since that accident, I have been duly elected. I raise my voice in opposition to the compulsory wearing of seat belts in heavy vehicles, from the point of view of not only safety and the damage that may occur in a collision but also the case of a run-away vehicle, where a truck driver has often been able to bale out. The terrain for most of South Australian transport is such that escape routes are provided and a driver can bale out if he is given the opportunity. Naturally enough, most operators will stay with a vehicle if they can but many an operator has been saved because he has had time to get out of the truck and save his own life. Against that argument, however, there is the aspect of being thrown out of a vehicle on impact. Nevertheless, more transport operators have been saved because they have had the option of vacating the cab at their own discretion; in addition, on impact the likelihood of serious bodily damage is less in a head-on collision.

I was perturbed that in the whole of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech not one word was said about the fishing industry; it was not mentioned. From net fishing to the recreational fisherman, the professional fisherman, the wharves, boat ramps, and matters of that nature, the fishing industry missed out entirely. I am concerned about this because in recent weeks the Premier has visited most of the fishing ports in his tours around the State saying how much the State Government is doing for the industry. We appreciate that; where service is being provided, that is acknowledged but, when the Speech was made, which, after all, provides the guidelines for the work of this session, not one word was said about the fishing industry. I raise this point because, as I recall, on the last or second to last day of the last sittings, the Deputy Premier indicated in this House that the Fisheries Act would be rewritten in this current session of Parliament. I understand that a

considerable amount of interjection flowed across the Chamber, and the Deputy Premier emphasised that the Fisheries Act would be rewritten and debated in this current session of Parliament. It was as a result of the Deputy Premier's undertaking on that occasion that I contacted many of the fishing groups in my electoral district and advised them that the Fisheries Act looked like being rewritten; but at this stage we see a complete ignoring of the plight of that industry.

One of the problems that has arisen in the fishing industry is a result of the activities of the amateur fisherman or, more to the point, the recreational fisherman. In recent weeks and months, just about every organisation associated in any way with the tourist industry, be it the Spencer Gulf Cities Association or the Tourist Promotion Association—any town of a recreational nature or any organisation at all connected with the seafront—has raised objections to the indiscriminate and current unnecessary netting in those areas. I bring to the notice of the House an article that appeared in the *News* of June 23, 1977, in which the latest figures of registrations of fishing items, such as nets and traps that are required by law to be registered, are given. We see that in a two-year period items for registration rose from 24 000 in 1973-74 to 59 000 in 1975-76.

This State has prided itself on the fact that it has a managed fishery. When the registrations of fishing items have increased by 145 per cent in that two-year period, can we say that we have a managed fishery, or do we have just an acknowledged fishery in which the number of traps, craypots, etc., is acknowledged? I cannot accept that we have a managed fishery when we have such an increased registration of fishing items, craypots, nets, and the like. This problem has confronted every tourist association and person interested in winning a dollar from the tourist industry.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Issue and application of \$190 000 000."

Dr. EASTICK: I note that the purpose of this Bill is to obtain funds for the payment of the Public Service. Can the Minister indicate at this stage or will he find out and report back at the earliest possible opportunity what rate of inflation in wages and salaries the Government is contemplating for the year 1977-78? I ask that question against the background of previous comments by the Treasurer that, in the compilation of the overall Budget documents, an element of inflation is built in. It is important for members to recognise or understand the Government's thinking in this critical area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): Offhand I do know the answer to that question. The honourable member will appreciate that a judgment is made but that does not mean to say that that judgment would be correct in the actual event. I do not know the answer but I will find out and let the honourable member know as soon as possible.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): Before the dinner adjournment, when speaking in the grievance debate on the Supply Bill, I indicated my concern about various aspects of the expenditure of funds in the education field. The Minister of Education asked me to provide him with details so that he could undertake an investigation. I assure the Minister that, as soon as the letter to which I referred has been cleared by the school staff, so that their names and the name of their school may be used without fear of victimisation, I will provide him with those details. I will also provide him with the information that has been given to me by many teachers who are gravely concerned about the wastage of money associated with conferences being conducted on subjects that are dreamed up solely for the purpose of holding a conference rather than, in their opinion (which I am expressing), being spent on subjects that will be of benefit, either immediate or lasting, to the children whom they teach.

I also indicated that the staff in a number of schools were gravely concerned about the equipment which was being forwarded, unsolicited, to their schools and which, in most cases, was finding a place in cupboards gathering dust because it was not the type of equipment that the school needed for its students. Despite that, many schools are being denied the opportunity to requisition or obtain funds for equipment which would be advantageous to their students and which would cost much less than the equipment that is being forwarded to them. Before the dinner adjournment, I challenged the Minister to tell the Cabinet, when it was making the final decision on education expenditure in the Budget discussions, that it is recognised that most individual schools know best the type of equipment which they want, which they should be permitted to purchase, and which will have a beneficial effect for the children, rather than their being given material which will be stored and which will not involve a beneficial use of resource money.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You didn't challenge me.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister of Education, who occupied the front bench this afternoon, is the Minister responsible for this matter, and I challenged him to take the matter to Cabinet.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I am sorry: I thought you were challenging me.

Dr. EASTICK: I will do that in due course. However, right now let us agree that it has been stated in this House many times that the course of action which requires a rapid expenditure of money towards June 30 each year is not conducive to the best interests of the department involved, be it the State Transport Authority, the Education Department or any other department. I am of the belief, from statements made by the Premier over a period of time, that the Government recognises the importance of a new accounting system that is going to provide for the people of South Australia much better value for the dollars spent. The sooner we can achieve that goal, without forcing the purchase of unnecessary equipment late in a financial year, the greater will be the benefit to the people of South Australia. Hopefully, the less will be the amount of taxation required to provide for that unnecessary expenditure, which is against best business principles and certainly against the best interests of the community.

Last evening, during the course of the Address in Reply debate, the member for Tea Tree Gully was lauding the fact that the next State election would be the first in South Australia's modern history to be fought on fair and equitable boundaries that put both Parties on an equal footing. She developed that argument along the lines that

it was going to be one vote one value. I have stood in this place previously and said that I believed there were marked changes in a beneficial direction in the redistribution. I question some aspects of it; I did then, and I will continue to do so, but the major point that the member for Tea Tree Gully was making on that occasion was that we were going to have one vote one value. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, there was some difficulty occasioned by way of interjection and other comment as to the introduction of the term "card system" in inquiring of the honourable member for Tea Tree Gully whether she believed that the method of preselection for Labor members was a good example of one vote one value. The matter did not proceed as far as members might have wanted it to, but I want to introduce members to a report published in the *Advertiser* on December 13, 1976, that highlights this particular situation.

I have the greatest regard for the member for Playford and I do not want it to be felt otherwise. I make that comment prior to introducing his name into the debate. In the *Advertiser* of December 13, 1976, in an article headed, "McRae has easy win in seat challenge", presented by Bill Rust, it states:

Mr. McRae defeated the South Australian branch secretary of the Plumbers and Gasfitters Union (Mr. R. W. Fairweather) by about 84 500 votes to 12 500 in a ballot conducted under the Australian Labor Party's card system. Quite obviously, there were not 84 500 votes counted for Mr. McRae and 12 500 for Mr. Fairweather on that night; there were not that many people in the hall. I ask honourable members opposite, and throw it back to them, how do they look upon one vote one value when they espouse a system such as that I have just indicated.

If we go back to 1974, when the same member was in some difficulty and had had a challenge for preselection prior to the 1975 election from Mr. Cavanagh, and this is reported at page 1384 of *Hansard* of October 9, 1974, where there was a bit of by-play between the member for Mitcham, the member for Elizabeth, the member for Torrens and myself relative to events leading up to that occasion. I believe that if one was to chase out the detail in the library one would find that the number of votes involved on that occasion, and the margin, was somewhat different.

The other matter I want to canvass briefly is that notwithstanding that rural land tax has been eliminated in this State we have a situation where many people who are registered only as holders of rural land have been in receipt of a land tax charge. I understand and accept that, where a clerical involvement is present in the system, inevitably not by design but by error mistakes will be made, but because the system has been computerised (it has been computerised for a long time) I express concern that many persons have been receiving land tax assessments for a tax when they have been completely ineligible to pay by virtue of legislation of this Parliament. Regrettably, that position also applies to water rate charges and excess water charges. When we are dealing with those charges, I hope to express concern about the computerisation of them.

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

Mr. HARRISON (Albert Park): Yesterday I was astounded to hear the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in support of his no-confidence motion when he attacked the State Government for its alleged total failure to provide adequately for the transport needs

of metropolitan Adelaide and when he made his attack on the Minister of Transport. I, like other members, have problems relating to transport. These have been taken up with the Minister by correspondence or deputation, and at all times I have been treated sympathetically. Full and factual information has been given to members of deputations, bringing them up to date on what constituents can expect and on when difficulties can be overcome. Although they are disappointed at times at having to face the honest facts, at least they are tolerant.

Many new bus routes have been brought into operation, to the satisfaction of the people of the District of Albert Park. That they are satisfied is borne out by patronage. To blame the Government for the slow fulfilment of orders for the new buses is only a red herring and the usual knock-knock by the Leader of the Opposition. It is true to say that more services are required, and the Minister of Transport knows that more than most other members. This is fully recognised by constituents after they have had deputations to the Minister. The Minister has also assured these people that their complaints will receive just and satisfactory attention when the buses come off the line.

One must not forget that not only are buses required but also that roads must be brought up to a standard sufficient for the buses to run on them. This is an added expense, because when we are outlining to councils the possibility of new bus routes, everyone is up in arms. It seems to me that in this case, as with other problems, people want bus services but do not want them to run past their front door or to stop in front of their house.

Mr. Gunn: Who wrote this?

Mr. HARRISON: I wrote it myself this afternoon. You could have seen me doing it. A point that may be lost by many people is that mileage covered by tramway buses in the metropolitan area is greater now than at any time in the history of South Australian public transport. Faster and more efficient methods are being adopted, such as express buses and trams at peak periods, and that is one of some improvements to public transport that the Leader of the Opposition denied was being done. I appeal to all to be tolerant and support public transport systems as they are introduced to new areas, because the success and continuance of those services depend on the support of people who require them. This support will encourage the Government to continue to introduce new bus routes.

I started by saying that I was astounded by some remarks that I had heard this afternoon. I add that I was also shocked and amazed to hear what the member for Rocky River said this afternoon about mini-buses. The Minister fully explained the position yesterday, but I was amazed and shocked to hear the member for Rocky River try to reverse what the Minister had said. If members want to verify what was said by the Minister and what was said by the member for Rocky River, they can check *Hansard* and compare the two statements. It was a ridiculous statement by the member for Rocky River, and it indicates that the Opposition does not know where it is going and does not know what it is saying.

Mr. Russack: Look at page 30 of the *News* today!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARRISON: Interjections mean nothing to me. I express my appreciation of another service that was introduced by the Government, that is, the Public and Consumer Affairs Department. If Opposition members were honest they would agree that what I am saying is true. This department deals with problems of constituents,

and I have received many complaints in regard to such matters that have been handled by this department. I have referred these problems to it, and although all cases are not solved to the satisfaction of the constituent, they have come away, after they have aired their viewpoint, knowing that their case has been capably and efficiently handled and that they have been given an answer to the problem, if that is possible. Once these people have been to this department, they do not hesitate to telephone me or call at my electoral office and say how much they appreciate the service, and the manner and efficiency with which they were treated by the department.

Not enough has been said about the various Government branches operating, but in the limited time that I have available I have said what I could about the Public and Consumer Affairs Department on behalf of my constituents. I should like to see Opposition members show their appreciation of various Government departments. Another problem that has been much to the fore in the past 10 months is the cutting back of education grants. I illustrate this by referring to one school in my district, the Seaton Park High School. It is now co-educational, but was previously a boys technical high school. For the benefit of honourable members opposite, I say that the term co-educational means to provide for both boys and girls. I do not know whether Opposition members know that, and I am explaining to them what this term means. Much had to be done to that school which previously catered only for boys. Stage 1 of the work catered for development to the second year, when the school could take in boys and girls. If stages 2 and 3 were completed it would allow a child to attend that school and finish his or her entire course of higher school education at that school but, unfortunately, because of the cut-back by the Federal Government in Canberra these children have been denied that opportunity.

Students must now go to this school for their first and second year studies, but then another high school elsewhere to finish their third, fourth and fifth years. This has been brought about as a result of the niggardly attitude of the Federal Government towards education spending. Of course, education spending is only one area in which that Government is niggardly. I could go on for hours, but I have only a minute to go and, unlike the member for Eyre, when the opportunity arises, I will get to my feet and have my say.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I wish to speak briefly on matters affecting the furnishing trade and the problems that I need not remind the House of relating to that industry, especially as it is now calling on the Federal Government, in particular, for greater protection against imported goods. Today, I received a copy of the most recent log of claims of wages and working conditions by the Federated Furnishing Trades Society of Australasia. I should like to bring some of these claims to the attention of the House. This log has been lodged and signed by Ken Carr. The log provides:

... the said log (comes) into operation within 14 days of its service to you.

This is the story of an industry that is in a precarious position at present. Under the heading "Contract of Employment" (page 4), it states:

Employment shall be terminated by 10 weeks notice given by the company or on one weeks notice given by an employee.

That is a fair situation! Under the heading "Redundancy" the following statement is made:

An employee dismissed through redundancy shall, on termination be entitled to payment of four weeks ordinary pay for each year of service with the company. Pro rata payments shall be made for each week of service which is in excess of the number of completed years.

Under the heading "Contract Work" the following claim is made:

An employee working under this award shall not perform contracting or subcontracting work.

However, I now get down to the nitty-gritty of the log of claims dealing with salaries claimed for furniture manufacturing, as set out below:

	Rate per week \$
Furniture Maker Grade A	1 000
Furniture Maker Grade A1	800
Furniture Maker Grade A2	750
Furniture Maker Grade B	650
Furniture Maker Grade C	550

The claim for an assembler is \$650 a week, while the claim for a wood machinist grade A is \$750, grade B \$650 and for the unskilled machinist it is \$500 a week. So this sad, sorry story goes on. Is this a responsible trade union organisation assisting an industry that is now facing severe problems as it cannot compete with imported goods? Such a log of claims at this time is complete suicide.

Mr. Whitten: Union basher!

Mr. MATHWIN: It is not union bashing; it is common sense. Under the heading "Minimum wage" on page 9, it is stated:

No employee over the age of 18 years shall receive less than \$550 per week.

Under "Health insurance", the log of claims states:

Health insurance premiums incurred by an employee shall be paid for by the employer.

Mr. Abbott: It's a very democratic society.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is, indeed. As we proceed further into this fairy story log of claims we see under the subheading "Handling of money", that it is stated that any employee who handles money for his employer shall be entitled to \$50 a week extra. Any employee working on site will be entitled to \$100 a week. If an employee such as a french polisher works on a multi-storey building, he is to be paid an additional amount of \$50 a week. If he works above the first floor he must receive an additional \$20 a week over and above the \$50 a week. The employee must be provided with milk. That is fair enough: if he gets the jitters because he is more than a storey high he could have a milk shake and relieve himself. The ordinary hours of work for all this money under this log of claims shall be 30 hours a week. The employees will receive all this money and all the extra benefits and, in addition, they are to have a rest period, which is defined as follows:

When any spell of duty in ordinary hours is for three hours or more, an interval of 20 minutes at a time to be selected by the employees shall be allowed in the second hour of duty.

If the employees have been working for three hours they must have a small break. If a union meeting is called, a period of four hours each month shall be allowed for employees for the purpose of holding monthly shop meetings. Let us now consider meal money. Under the heading "Meal hours" it is stated:

All work done during meal breaks and thereafter until a meal break is allowed shall be paid for at the rate of time and one half.

Under the heading "Overtime" it is stated:

All time worked outside ordinary hours of a day or a shift shall be overtime and shall be paid for at the rate of quadruple time.

If an employee is required to work overtime he shall be paid an allowance of \$20 for each meal taken during such time. In other words, if an employee is working overtime and wants a meal he is not sent down for a counter meal costing \$3, but gets a meal allowance of \$20. That is great stuff! Under the heading "Incentive or piece work", the log states:

All work performed under the award made from this log shall be on a time work basis. No operator shall operate piece work, incentive system or any system of payment by results . . .

That is good stuff, too. It certainly gives an incentive to work.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You'd like to—

Mr. MATHWIN: Even the Minister of Transport gasps at that; he went white and quivered at the gills when he heard it. Regarding holidays in South Australia the log of claims demands a holiday for Good Friday, Easter Monday and Easter Tuesday. It demands 15 special holidays a year.

Mr. Whitten: What do you have?

Mr. MATHWIN: I never have a holiday. Under the heading "Annual leave" it is stated that an employee after 12 months service with an employer shall be granted 10 weeks annual leave. Employees with five years service are to receive 15 weeks annual leave. This one is a beauty:

An employee, on the death of his wife, husband, father, mother, child, step-child, brother, sister, father-in-law, mother-in-law, sister-in-law, brother-in-law, grandmother, grandfather, grandchild, aunt, uncle, niece, or nephew shall be entitled to leave, including the day of the funeral—that does not leave much—

Such leave shall be for one week without deduction of pay.

So, if your grandmother or your mother-in-law should die (and some people might rejoice at that) you get a week's leave. Now we come to paternity leave, as follows:

Immediately on the birth of his child a male employee shall be entitled to one month's paternity leave on full pay. **Anyone would think it was hard to do and left him in need of a week's leave to get over the fact that his wife had had a child. Then we come to travelling allowances. All fares allowed must be first-class fares.**

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

Motion carried.

At 9.2 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 21, at 2 p.m.