

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 26, 1977

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

PETITION: UNIONISM

Mr. WOTTON presented a petition signed by 91 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.

QUESTIONS

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

GOVERNMENT SALARIES

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (July 20):

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: For the purpose of estimating personal income tax collection in 1977-78 the Commonwealth Government has assumed at this stage that the average level of wages in 1977-78 will be 10.5 per cent above the average level in 1976-77. A similar increase is being contemplated for this State's Budget proposals in the share of personal income tax collections, in pay-roll tax collections and in the estimated costs of salaries and wages.

ART GALLERY BUILDING

Mr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What progress has been made on alterations and renovations to the former IPEC building on Unley Road for use as storage by the Art Gallery of South Australia?

2. What is the estimated cost of completing this work and how does that cost compare to the estimate given at the time the building was acquired by the Government?

3. If there has been any significant increase in the estimated cost, what is the reason?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. A contract for the alteration work has been let and is due for completion at the end of August, 1977.

2. \$296 000. When the building was acquired approval was given for alteration work to upgrade it to an acceptable standard for general storage at a cost of \$60 000.

3. Extensive alterations were required to provide long-term storage for paintings and other works of art in a controlled and secure environment. These included the provision of an air-conditioning system, two staircases, a covered loading dock, new lighting system, fire-detection system and a security alarm system.

PROPERTY VALUATION

Dr. EASTICK (on notice): Have glasshouses or similar structures ever been considered as a permanent structure for the purpose of property valuation by Government valuers and, if so, in what circumstances, where, and when?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The familiar type glass-house usually erected in 4½ metre long sections and constructed of removable glass panes on wooden posts has always been considered a chattel and is not valued by the Valuer-General when making valuations for rating purposes. More recently, however, new types of air-conditioned green-houses requiring council approval for erection have been built in a number of council areas. They are usually constructed of stiff plastic or fibreglass fastened to steel frames concreted into the soil. Currently these types of green-houses are not being valued for rating purposes by the Valuer-General, but a few were valued in 1972 when they first appeared on properties in the Mobilong area because the valuers considered that the nature of their construction was of a permanent rather than a temporary nature.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. For what reason has the Labour and Industry Department arranged a blanket workmen's compensation cover for all participants in the State Unemployment Relief Scheme?

2. When was this action taken?

3. Which company has accepted the insurable risk, at what rate, and what have been the actual amounts paid in premiums, and when?

4. Are there any exceptions to the blanket cover arrangement and, if so, what are the specific details?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows:
1. At the request of local governing authorities (the principal recipients of grants).

2. February 24, 1975.

3. The insurance has been with the State Government Insurance Commission, at premiums of .5 per cent of pay-roll for clerical staff and 15.83 per cent for other workers. These rates are currently being reviewed in the light of claims experience. Payments made have been:

	\$
June 1975	50 000
July 1975	150 000
November 1975	50 000
December 1975	259 070
May 1976	174 454
June 1976	545 190
April 1977	300 000
	\$1 528 714

4. Any sponsor that wishes to do so may arrange their own insurance. The only two who do so are the Salisbury College of Advanced Education and Roseworthy Agricultural College of Advanced Education.

ART GRANTS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What standards for accounting and reporting are required by the Arts Development Division of the Premier's Department in respect of grants made to artistic organisations, associations, and companies?

2. Have these standards altered in the past three years and, if so, in what way and for what specific reasons?

3. Have all grants authorised for 1976-77 been distributed and, if not, why not, in each individual circumstance?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Copies of current standards are provided for tabling before Parliament.

2. Only minor alterations have been made, that is:
- (a) Standards for individuals have been printed separately to those required of groups or associations. This enables each category of grant applicant (that is, individual person or group) to receive only those standards applicable to their needs.
 - (b) Wording has been altered to provide more understanding about need for reports by the division and the Government.
3. All grants authorised for the 1976-77 period have been distributed, with the following exceptions:

- (a) An amount of \$1 000 provided towards advance costs of the annual Organ Music Week, has been withheld for return to Treasury. The organisers of that event have decided now not to hold such an event in 1977.
- (b) The following grants were approved in June, 1976. However, delays in cheque preparation procedures, due to end of financial year pressures, have in turn delayed posting of cheques to recipients. It is anticipated that these payments will be forwarded to recipients this week.
 - (i) A grant of \$1 000 to the Crafers Boys Choir to assist with costs of organisation of a series of concerts.
 - (ii) A grant of \$2 850 to the Community Media Association for various on-going community arts activities.
 - (iii) A grant of \$2 200 to the Australian Ballet School to assist South Australian students at that school.
 - (iv) A grant of \$2 000 to the South Australian Bands Association towards administration costs.

PATHOLOGY LABORATORY

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What action has been taken, if any, to transfer the Port Pirie Pathology Laboratory from Commonwealth to State control, as recommended at page 6 of the report "Task Force on Co-ordination in Welfare and Health"?
2. When is it expected that a change will be effected and will the transfer anyway alter the service now available?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. A joint meeting has been held between Commonwealth and State officers to discuss the possible transfer of the Port Pirie laboratory to State control. No action has yet been taken.
2. If the transfer of the laboratory from Federal to State control is to take place, it can be anticipated that services would continue and would become incorporated in the progressive enhancement and upgrading of laboratory services in rural South Australia.

GAWLER BY-PASS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Has the Highways Department recommended any urgent alterations to the Gawler by-pass, and, if so, what are they?
2. What is the membership of the group investigating the by-pass and how often has it met during 1977, and when?

3. When does it expect to have a final report on the subject, and will it be made public?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. The group investigating the by-pass comprises departmental planning officers. No formal meetings are held, though they regularly consult with other departmental officers.
3. A draft report is expected to be completed in early 1978, and will be forwarded to appropriate councils for comment.

GAS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it intended to answer my letter to the Premier dated June 20, 1977, concerning the price of natural gas and, if so, when?
2. Why has no reply yet been given to this letter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. Letter was answered on July 19.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has there been installed a new system of entry and exit to Parliament House and, if so:
 - (a) what is the new system;
 - (b) when was it installed;
 - (c) why;
 - (d) what was wrong with the old system;
 - (e) how many entries and exits are there now and how many were there before; and
 - (f) at what estimated cost?
2. What breaches of security of the building are known to have taken place in each of the past three years?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.
 - (a) An electronic card system.
 - (b) July, 1977, and operative from July 18.
 - (c) To improve security within Parliament House.
 - (d) Lack of control over keys.
 - (e) There are now six points of entry and exit during working hours and three points of entry and exit after hours. Previously, there were six entry and exit points during working hours and five entry and exit points after hours.
 - (f) \$2 300.
2. Several instances of duplicate keys have occurred and people have been found in the building without authority.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Why is the north-eastern door of Parliament House, facing King William Street, kept so locked that it may not be used, as a rule, for entry to and leaving the building?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The north-eastern door of Parliament House, facing King William Street, is used by the Fire Brigade for access to the building in case of fire. In the evenings there have been problems associated with the people who congregate on the eastern side of Parliament House waiting for buses, etc. In the past other locks on the eastern side of Parliament House have been damaged, broken, or made inoperative by unknown persons. This has been done with the authority of the Joint House Committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the estimated cost of refurbishing members' rooms at Parliament House?
2. How is this cost made up?
3. Why is such refurbishing being undertaken?
4. What is considered wrong with the furniture now in members' rooms?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The estimated cost is \$150 000.
2. The estimate is based on an assumed distribution of furniture in the style recently presented to members. However, the requirements of individual members will be taken into account before final furniture schedules are prepared.

3. The refurbishing of members' rooms is being undertaken as part of a project which involves the upgrading of all furniture within Parliament House. For many years additional and replacement furniture has been provided, as a matter of expediency, by production line and stock items. While this furniture has met an urgent need it is not of a suitable standard for a prestige building such as Parliament House. Surplus furniture as a result of the refurbishing scheme will be used in other Government buildings or sold at auction.

4. See 3.

BAROOTA LAND

Mr. VENNING (on notice):

1. Has the Aboriginal Land Fund Commission purchased land in the hundred of Baroota, known as "Bells" and, if so—

- (a) how many hectares were involved in the purchase;
- (b) what was the price a hectare;
- (c) was the property valued by a licensed valuer prior to purchase; and
- (d) where has or will the money come from for the payment for this property?

2. If the property has been valued—

- (a) who was the valuer and what figure a hectare was his valuation; and
- (b) how did the valuer arrive at his valuation?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Aboriginal Land Fund Commission is an instrumentality of the Commonwealth Government. I suggest the member raises this question with his Federal member.

ROAD TRAFFIC

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Has the Government considered the addition of the words "priority road" around the border of "give way" signs at intersections and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No. It is considered that motorists are aware of the meaning of "give way" signs, and the addition of the words "priority road" where such may be applicable, would be unnecessary.

Mr. BECKER (on notice): When will traffic lights be installed at the junction of Kibby Avenue and Tapley Hill Road, Glenelg North and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department has no plans to install traffic signals at this location at present. A warrant has not been established for these signals.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. When will traffic lights be installed at the junction of Galway Avenue and Marion Road, Netley?
2. Has there been a delay in the installation of these lights and, if so:
 - (a) why; and
 - (b) what is the estimated total cost?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. During 1977.
2. (a) Resources did not permit this work being carried out in 1976-77.
- (b) \$22 000.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the programme for the 1977-78 financial year for the installation of school crossings and pedestrian-activated crossings?
2. What is the estimated cost of the programme?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Thirty-three pedestrian-actuated signals and three school crossings are scheduled for installation in 1977-78.
2. \$350 000 for pedestrian actuated signals and school crossings.

HANDICAPPED PERSONS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the committee inquiring into employment for the handicapped submitted the final report to the Minister and, if so:

- (a) when;
- (b) what were the recommendations contained in the report;
- (c) what action does the Government intend to take and when; and
- (d) if no action is to be taken, why not?

2. What was the total cost and expenditure of the inquiry?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) April, 1977.
- (b) The working party was appointed to provide information on the facilities presently available for the employment of disabled persons and the use made thereof, to list and describe the scope and activities of sheltered workshops, and to ascertain the extent of the present employment of disabled persons. Its terms of reference specifically sought information and not recommendations.

- (c) To make available to interested persons and organisations the factual information the working party has obtained in response to its terms of reference. This will be done as soon as it is printed.

- (d) See (c).

2. Members of the working party did not seek payment, nor were they paid. Secretarial and clerical assistance and the costs involved in the survey of industry were met by the Labour and Industry Department: separate costs were not kept.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What action is the Government currently taking to assist the handicapped to seek employment?
2. How many handicapped persons are registered as unemployed in South Australia?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The replies are as follows:

1. The Commonwealth Employment Service, which has a specialised section to assist handicapped workers obtain

employment, is an agency of the Commonwealth Government.

2. I have sought this information from the Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations and will advise the honourable member as soon as I receive it.

RURAL ROADS

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How much money will South Australia receive this financial year for rural arterial roads?

2. How much will be spent on Eyre Peninsula roads and on which particular roads?

3. How much will be spent in the Far North of South Australia?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is assumed that the question relates only to the Commonwealth grant to South Australia in the category of "rural arterial roads". On this assumption, the answers are as follows:

1. \$7 000 000 (for construction purposes only).

2. \$1 243 000, including grants to councils. Major projects are:

Flinders Highway (Talia-Streaky Bay).

Western approaches to Port Lincoln, Dublin Street Bridge, Port Lincoln.

3. Nil.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What stage have plans reached for building a petro-chemical plant at Redcliff?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A detailed submission has been made to the Commonwealth Government seeking support for additional semi-government loan approvals to finance certain of the infrastructure requirements that are beyond the resources of the State.

LOCK COAL DEPOSIT

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. In which section number and hundred is the brown coal deposit situated near Lock?

2. What is the total area of the deposits and when is it anticipated that mining of these deposits will take place?

3. Will mining be by the open-cut method?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The coal deposit situated near Lock is about 10 to 15 miles west of Lock on the Elliston Road and located in the hundreds of Barwell (B), and McLachlan (M). It covers sections B (4, 11, 14, 26, 28) and M (5B, 27, 28) of the abovementioned hundreds at present, and a current drilling programme should help define the area more fully within two months.

2. The total possible area of interest at present is about 40 square kilometres (4 000 ha) comprising portions of those sections mentioned above. The drilling programme will provide data which will help determine whether the Lock coal deposit is economic for mining or not. If the deposit proved to be economic, it would be about five to seven years before operations could commence and about 10 years before coal would be removed from the area, as a detailed drilling programme would ensue before mining.

3. Coal in the Lock area could only be mined economically by open-cut methods.

FLINDERS HIGHWAY

Mr. GUNN (on notice): When is it expected that sealing of the Flinders Highway will be completed?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In February, 1978.

GOVERNMENT ACCOMMODATION

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Does the Government rent floor space in the building owned by the Wales Property Trust at 50 Pirie Street, Adelaide, and, if so, on what floors is space rented and what is the floor area involved.

2. Did the Education Department rent part or all of this floor space last year, and, if so, what area was involved?

3. On what date did Education Department staff commence to move out of this building into the new building in Flinders Street?

4. On what date did the last staff member of the Education Department move out of this building?

5. Is any of this floor space currently occupied by Government staff and, if so, what floors are occupied, by which departments and when did occupation commence?

6. Is any of the floor space not being used currently by the Government and, if so, which floors of the building are not used and when is it expected that occupation will take place and by which department?

7. What has been the estimated cost of rental for the total period during the last 12 months for floor space that has not been actively occupied by Government staff?

8. When the member for Brighton was Minister of Education, was a toilet or bathroom especially installed in this building for use by the Minister and, if so, what was the cost of installation?

9. During this same period, were two kitchens also installed in the building and, if so, why were these installed, what staff used the kitchens and what was the cost of installation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government leases floors 1 to 8 inclusive, and part of floor 11 in the building owned by the Wales Property Trust at 50 Pirie Street, Adelaide. The total area leased is 4 136 m² or 44 500 sq.ft.

2. The Education Department used floors 1 to 8 inclusive and a small area on the ground floor from 1973 to 1976 involving a total area of 4 062 m² or 43 700 sq.ft.

3. Education Department staff commenced moving from Wales House on October 16, 1976.

4. The transfer of staff to Education Centre was completed on December 23, 1976.

5. All floors leased are now occupied by Government staff. Part of the 11th floor was occupied by the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity on December 16, 1976. Occupation of floors 1 to 8 by the Health Commission and parts of the Hospitals Department, Public Health Department and the Services and Supply Department commenced on May 30, 1977.

6. Half of the first floor is not being used at present. The Teachers Registration Board will occupy this space on July 30, 1977.

7. The estimated cost of rental for the total period during the last 12 months for floor space which has not been actively occupied by Government staff is \$157 000. During

this period extensive recommissioning work was undertaken to house the new occupants. Delays in occupation occurred because of the inability of Telecom (Australia) to provide the required service on time.

8. In 1973, a toilet was installed on the 8th floor for use by the Minister of Education for cost of about \$5 050.

9. At the same time, one kitchen was installed on the 1st floor to enable the provision of a satisfactory tea service to the staff of the Education Department. The kitchens provided by the building owner were too small to enable the tea ladies to work and store essential equipment. The approximate cost to install the kitchen was \$5 150. Recently, another kitchen was installed on the 8th floor for the Health Commission, for the same reasons, at cost of about \$4 750.

FESTIVAL THEATRE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the total cost to date of building the Festival Theatre and what is the breakup of cost for each stage of completion including the car park and outdoor attractions?

2. What is the total cost to date of furniture, fittings, etc. of the—

- (a) main theatre;
- (b) Space;
- (c) Playhouse; and
- (d) offices, etc.?

3. What is the total cost to date of works of art acquired for the theatre complex and plaza?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The total building cost of the Festival Theatre complex is—

	\$
(a) Festival Theatre	7 960 000
(b) Drama complex	7 420 000
(c) Car park and southern plaza . .	5 670 000

2. The cost of furniture, fittings, etc., is included in the figures quoted above because the original contracts provided for the greater bulk of the furniture, equipment and fittings in each of the venues. However, subsequent purchases of capital equipment for the theatres and catering facilities total \$510 000.

Much of the equipment (both that originally installed and that subsequently purchased) is not permanently located in any particular venue, being moved according to the needs of each particular theatre and depending on the show being presented therein.

3. The total cost (including works donated, the cost of which is estimated) is \$125 881. Apart from \$7 777 paid from the 1973-74 grant towards the cost of Max Lyle's sculpture, all other acquisitions have been funded by individual or company gifts, Australia Council grants and the balance remaining in the Adelaide Festival Theatre Appeal Fund over and above \$100 000 applied to the cost of the Festival Theatre. The cost of the Hajek sculptural forms incorporated in the southern plaza was the subject of a previous question by the honourable member.

EDMUND WRIGHT HOUSE

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Are catering facilities provided in the restored Edmund Wright House?

2. Were these facilities included in the original cost of the restoration and, if so, what was the amount involved and, if not, when were they undertaken and what did they cost?

3. How often have these facilities been used and by which organisations?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. No. The upgrading, ventilation and air-conditioning of the toilet and kitchen facilities were carried out in September, 1976, at a cost of about \$106 000.

3. Once, by the Australian Society of Accountants. It is expected that during exhibitions and festivals it will have considerable use.

INSURANCE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Do Government hospitals offer any discount or reduction in the cost of hospital treatment for patients covered by the State Government Insurance Commission and, if so, what is the discount or reduction and why is it offered?

2. Is the same or similar reduction in hospital fees also offered to patients covered by other insurance companies and if not, why not?

3. If the same reduction in fees is not offered to all insurance companies, why does the Government discriminate between companies?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. Government hospitals accept from the State Government Insurance Commission a payment of 80 per cent of the charges raised for treatment and accommodation of vehicular accident third party insurance cases in full settlement, provided such payment is made within one month of receipt of the account from the hospital. This arrangement was introduced to reduce the time for the collection of outstanding moneys where third party claims were involved. Previously, the considerable delays involved in finalising such claims, often extending over many years, meant a real loss to the hospital.

2. This arrangement covers only hospital accounts relating to vehicular accident third party insurance cases and, since such insurance business is at present conducted only by the State Government Insurance Commission, other insurance companies are not involved.

3. Refer above.

INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Is the Government financially supporting the international conference on industrial democracy to be held in Adelaide next year?

2. Who is organising the conference?

3. What is the anticipated total cost to the Government of this conference?

4. Have any persons from Yugoslavia been invited to attend and/or speak at this conference and, if so, how many have been invited and what are their positions?

5. Have any speakers from the U.S.A. been invited and if not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The Tripartite Industrial Democracy Committee in conjunction with the South Australian Government is sponsoring the conference, and the organising work is being done by the staff of the Unit for Industrial Democracy.

3. \$40 000.

4. Two people from Yugoslavia have been invited to attend the conference, and their names and positions are: Dr. Najdan Pasic and Dr. Stanislav Grosdanic, Professors of Political Science, University of Belgrade. In addition, two speakers from the United Kingdom, two speakers from West Germany, and one speaker from each of Norway, Sweden and Belgium have been invited.

5. No. The speakers were chosen by the Tripartite Industrial Democracy Committee in consultation with the Executive Officer of the Unit for Industrial Democracy.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What is the estimated total cost to the Government of the visit by Mr. F. Gnatenko to Yugoslavia?

2. Why was Yugoslavia selected as the country in which Mr. Gnatenko was to study industrial democracy?

3. Is the Premier aware that Yugoslavia has a communist Government and a completely different system of ownership and control?

4. On what basis was Mr. Gnatenko selected and why was he selected in preference to other representatives of the trade union movement?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. About \$6 000.

2. Yugoslavia has a system of self-management and, at least in theory, this system appears to overcome a number of problems that many workplaces experience. Following the visit of the Premier to Yugoslavia last year, an opportunity was made available for a South Australian unionist to work on the shop floor of a Yugoslav car factory, and it was felt that this would provide an ideal opportunity to assess whether the day-to-day Yugoslav self-management system conforms with the theoretical structure as outlined in the Yugoslav Constitution.

3. The Premier is aware that Yugoslavia has a socialist Government which, to a very great extent, relies upon the use of the market mechanism to solve many of its economic problems.

4. Mr. Gnatenko was selected by a panel comprising of Mr. G. J. Inns, Director-General, Premier's Department, Mr. R. D. H. Ling, Chairman and Managing Director, Hills Industries, and Mr. C. Meikle, Secretary, Association of Architects, Engineers, Surveyors and Draughtsmen of Australia. This panel interviewed four trade unionists whose names had been put forward by different people on the Tripartite Industrial Democracy Committee. The selection panel then recommended to the Tripartite Industrial Democracy Committee that Mr. Gnatenko was the most suitably qualified person to undertake the research task. The tripartite committee then recommended to the Premier that Mr. Gnatenko be the union representative, and the Premier accepted this advice. It is worth pointing out that the same selection panel and procedure was used to choose a management representative to go to Sweden to undertake a similar research task later this year. Mr. Michael Lloyd, Managing Director of Cowells Ltd., will be visiting Sweden for a period of approximately eight weeks.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Did the Government contribute to the travel and accommodation expenses of the three Yugoslav experts on industrial democracy who visited South Australia earlier this year and, if so, what was the total of the costs met by the Government?

2. What other organisations contributed to the total costs of the visit and what was the contribution of each organisation?

3. What was the purpose of their visit to Adelaide and to whom did they speak during the visit?

4. Who initiated the visit to Adelaide?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. It is understood that the costs were met by a number of trade unions and tertiary education institutions. The Government does not have a responsibility to reveal how trade unions and tertiary institutions expend their funds.

3. It is believed that the purpose of this visit was to talk about the Yugoslav self-management system. The Yugoslav visitors spoke to many people. The persons known to the Government that the Yugoslav visitors spoke to include: the Premier; the Attorney-General; the Member for Davenport; members of the Tripartite Industrial Democracy Committee; the Chairman of the Public Service Board and a number of permanent heads; persons attending a trade union training authority seminar; and persons attending a seminar at Adelaide College of Advanced Education.

4. The Whitlam Government established a cultural exchange scheme with Yugoslavia, and the continuation of this scheme was endorsed by the Fraser Government. It is understood that the Yugoslavs came to Australia under this scheme.

PUBLIC HOLIDAYS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Is the Premier aware that Monday, December 26, 1977, will be a public holiday in lieu of Christmas Day, which falls on a Sunday, and that December 28 will be a holiday for Proclamation Day?

2. Is the Premier aware that there is strong public support for the public holiday for Proclamation Day being taken on December 27 rather than the 28th, so that there is continuity of public holidays rather than holidays being separated by one day?

3. Will Cabinet reconsider its decision as to the date of the public holiday for Proclamation Day and if not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. No. I do not believe any support approaches the very real and known opposition.

3. No.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION FUND

Mr. ARNOLD (on notice):

1. What is the total revenue paid into the Wildlife Conservation Fund from hunting permits and sale of fauna, since its inception?

2. What projects and other activities have been financed from the fund?

3. What has been the cost of each project and the estimated cost of those projects which have been approved?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. Revenue paid into the Wildlife Conservation Fund since its inception is as follows:

	\$
(1) Hunting permits	350 063·48
(2) Sale of fauna	46 652·30
Total	<u>\$396 715·78</u>

2. Projects and other activities (including costs to date) financed from the fund after consultation with the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council are as follows:

Projects	Approved Costs \$	Expenditure \$	\$
1. Monitoring Japanese snipe and Adelaide rosella populations . . .	21 000	15 069·17	
2. Improvements—Tolderol Game Reserve	65 000	18 887·30	
3. Yellow-footed rock wallaby research	5 500	1 526·60	
4. Bird harvesting	25 000	9 451·15	
5. Grant S.A. Museum—sea lion research	3 250	3 250·00	
6. Pied geese project	12 800	4 149·23	
7. Kangaroo Island wallaby study	3 000	3 000·00	
	<u>135 550</u>	<u>55 333·45</u>	55 333·45
Other Activities			
1. Fees in relation to sale of fauna		4 721·10	
2. Hunting permits—refunds		1 393·94	
3. Stationery and interpretive material in connection with hunting and fauna permits		10 153·70	
4. Administrative costs		16 034·23	
5. Land acquisition purchase Nullabor Station		32 500·00	
		<u>64 802·97</u>	64 802·97
Total Expenditure to date			<u>120 136·42</u>
Balance in fund			<u>\$276 579·36</u>
3. See 1.			\$
Current commitment on projects \$135 550 — \$55 333·45 =			80 216·55
Commitment to purchase and development of game reserves		110 000·00	
Total outstanding commitment		<u>\$190 216·55</u>	
Uncommitted balance		<u>\$86 362·81</u>	

TOURISM DIRECTOR

Mr. EVANS (on notice): When will the new Director of the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau take up duties?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Director of Tourism is expected to commence duty on Monday, August 15, 1977.

UNIONISM

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say what is the reason for the Government's failure to proceed with legislation it proposed last session which

it said would remove the present limitation on the power of the Industrial Commission to provide in its awards for absolute preference to members of trade unions? The Premier recently explained the Government's backing away from this issue by saying it was not urgently necessary, and that it simply brought about a situation similar to that existing in Liberal States. He did not mention that in Western Australia people are now able to choose whether or not to join a union and that the Commonwealth is considering similar legislation.

Compulsory unionism has been the aim of sustained union pressure and standover tactics during the term of this Government. The Kangaroo Island dispute and the Seven Stars affair began the long chapter, and people in the hotel and motor retail industries, school canteens, social club bars, high school ancillary staff, the Public Service (the Lachs affair), Housing Trust contractors and subcontractors, local government and unemployment relief schemes, school cleaners, the textile industry, the timber industry, tanneries, clerks and many others have all been subjected to pressure inspired by trade union officials, threatening the right of individuals to work. Even members of trade unions have commented about this. A letter from Mr. King (the A.W.U. representative at Moomba), written in May, states:

I think I should attempt to clarify the attitude of the members at Moomba, although it may be rather unpalatable. Members are recruited by the companies when they apply for employment, "No union membership, no job." The A.W.U. takes no active part in recruitment but is assured of members' fees. Once they have been coerced to join they remain members willy-nilly, unlike any other organisation where if one feels it is not up to scratch one can just leave and examine the options offered by similar organisations. I am not aware of any other groups in the whole world who are assured of permanent membership and income as unions are.

He goes on to express his deep concern for the effect which compulsory unionism has on the service the A.W.U. provides for its members. It has been suggested that the proposed legislation is not being proceeded with because the union campaign, with Government backing and support, has been most successful in a time when jobs are hard to get. It has been suggested, too, that the Government is afraid of the widespread resentment—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must point out to the Leader that he is now getting into the area of debate.

Mr. TONKIN: I will finish by saying that the Minister therefore should clearly state the Government's intention on compulsory unionism so that the community may pass judgment on that policy.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: For the twenty-fifth time, I shall try to convince the Leader of the Opposition and his Party that the Government has never suggested that it would introduce compulsory unionism.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: We have heard that false laugh so many times that I am sure the people of South Australia are as sick of it as I am. The word "compulsory" has never been mentioned by me, by the Leader of my Party, or by any members of my Party. We said last year that we would remove the restriction that was then in the State arbitration legislation to allow the court to determine whether or not it considered, as it had been possible to do in the Federal court since 1954, that in a particular industry it was an advantage for a preference clause to be inserted in an award. We said last year we would do that; we have not done it, and the only person who seems unhappy about it is the Leader of the Opposition. That is all we said we would remove.

Mr. Tonkin: What is the difference?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The difference is that the onus is on the court as to whether it considers it necessary to insert a preference clause in an award.

Mr. Dean Brown: For industrial peace.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: For industrial peace; that is what I am saying. The simple fact would be for the court to determine, and the court does not have that right at this moment. I believe that the Federal court has the right, and until quite recently that right existed under Western Australian legislation. It is an opt-out situation, as I understand the changes in the law in Western Australia. That also applies in New South Wales and in Tasmania. Let us think about it for just one moment. It has applied since 1954 in the Federal sphere. During the whole of that time, with the exception of three and half years, the Liberal Party has been in office federally and has never seen fit to remove that provision. It cannot have been too obnoxious, otherwise there would have been some attempt by the Federal Liberal Government to remove it.

Mr. Tonkin: Do you think it is fair?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Of course I think it is fair. I think it is a right and proper thing that any tribunal considering employer and employee relationships should have room to manoeuvre. Let us examine what happened in relation to the clerks award. It is not a State award, but a Federal award controlled by people with whom the Leader has a great deal in common. Three or four years ago it was decided to insert the preference clause in the clerks award, and that has not caused any problem in the industry. I think it has promoted peace in the industry. That is what we should be looking at in South Australia, irrespective of what members opposite try to say about South Australian industrial relations. This morning I had a three-hour meeting with my Industrial Relations Advisory Committee, made up of employers and employees, all convinced and hoping that industrial relations in South Australia should continue in the present vein, employers and employees alike saying that these are the best industrial relations. Those sentiments were expressed only this morning, not last month or the month before that.

Let us look at the figures in South Australia. I do not think any member opposite can produce any evidence to show that in the past seven or eight years there have been more than a handful of strikes in connection with people joining unions. Certainly, there has not been one in any Government department. There has been some trouble, but no time has been lost and no production lost to the Government nor to industry. If one goes down to the Chrysler plant or to General Motors-Holden's or to any other recognised industry in South Australia at present, one is expected to become a member of a union. Why does the employer bother to do that? He does not want industrial trouble about people refusing to pay their way. He does not want industrial scabbery on his property before people start there. He wants to ensure that everyone starts in proper and fair conditions. If the policy this Government is following is wrong in that regard, I make no apologies for the fact that we have the lowest amount of lost time and the best industrial record in Australia.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: At this time I should like to draw to the attention of the House the fact that last week the Opposition Whip took the opportunity to grieve about

Question Time. Whilst I have some agreement with him (and I expressed that in my recent appeal to Ministers), I must also point out to Opposition members that they seem to be asking supplementary questions. Anyone paying attention would have realised that several supplementary questions were asked whilst the honourable Minister was on his feet. These supplementary questions take up time that should be available to other honourable members. I appeal to all honourable members to cease this constant interjection by way of supplementary questions, as they restrict the opportunities available to other honourable members to ask questions.

SALMONELLA

Mr. SLATER: Will the Minister of Community Welfare seek an assurance from the Minister of Health that the recent detection of salmonella in powdered milk formulas for babies will be most thoroughly investigated to ensure that there will be no recurrence of this threat to the health of infants? It seems that, although about 80 babies became ill from the salmonella infection during a period of several weeks, powdered milk formulas went unsuspected as the cause until a link was detected by the Australian Salmonella Reference Laboratory and the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science in Adelaide. I am aware that a major investigation is now being undertaken and measures have been taken to remove the contaminated products from sale. However, I am concerned that manufacturers apparently did not detect the presence of the organism before the product was released for sale. It would be fair and proper to say that the last step in any manufacturing process of food should ensure that a reliable test is made to disclose any possible contamination in a product. Therefore, I ask the Minister to ensure that every action is taken to prevent a recurrence of this infection.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Certainly, on behalf of the honourable member, I will seek that assurance from my colleague. However, I add my commendation to the fine work carried out in the laboratory in Adelaide at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, especially in this case. I understand that a lady scientist worked through one weekend in order to carry out some of the testing involved in the resulting detection that occurred. Whilst I fully realise the need for such a laboratory and facilities for this purpose to be provided in various localities throughout Australia, I deplore the fact that it is at the rear end, as it were, of the processing of the product that this kind of link with infection was detected. I have received another submission on this matter from a person who has some qualification in food technology and purity and who has told me that there is some possibility that this contamination occurred during the addition of some of the make-up material that is added to powders that are heat sterilised, vitamin and constitutional losses being corrected by adding certain materials afterwards. I understand that at present it is not clear whether that aspect was involved in this case. I expect that my colleague would have realised the gravity of this incident and would take every necessary action in this matter, and I undertake to stress to him the importance of it to everyone in Australia who has young children who need these products.

CIVIL ACTIONS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether the failure of the Government to introduce legislation to prohibit civil action for damages in industrial disputes indicates that the Government will repeat its earlier action and pay the costs associated with the loss of such a case by a union official? The Government promised in the Governor's Speech at the opening of the last session that legislation would be enacted in this regard. Paragraph 6 of that Speech stated:

A Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act will be placed before you. It will give effect to the undertaking contained in the policy speech of my Government, before it was returned at the last election, that civil action for damages should not be taken in industrial disputes, but that disputes of this nature should be resolved in the tribunals specifically provided for the purpose.

Members will recall the case of *Woolley v. Dunford*, the then Australian Workers Union official who was successfully taken to court for damages in connection with a black ban on Woolley's wool clip, with judgment for costs of \$9 985 being given against Dunford. Members will also no doubt recall the general disgust in the community that the taxpayers of South Australia paid these costs because the Government believed it could spend their money in this way in the course of what it euphemistically termed industrial peace.

Mr. Tonkin: We've heard that before.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We heard it again this afternoon. Does the Government's failure to enact its promised legislation indicate that we can expect the Government to use taxpayers' funds in future to help its friends who refuse to accept the judgment of the courts?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: When the Government drew up its last lot of legislation in the Governor's Speech, to which the honourable member has referred, it saw at that time a particular reason for introducing that type of legislation. Employers generally in South Australia were then trying to use the tort law as often as they could instead of depending on industrial tribunals, which the Government says are set up to determine industrial disputes. The Government and I think that that situation has changed. To the best of my knowledge, there has been no tortious action or threatened tortious action for some time in South Australia (I think that that is a good thing), although this is happening in other States. Whether employers have decided that the consultation policy, which the Government has been putting forward with tremendous success for the past eight or nine years, is better than confrontation (that is, running to the Supreme Court rather than the Industrial Court), I do not know, but if the employers have adopted that attitude I think it is a tremendous thing, and I congratulate them.

As a consequence of the shift in where the action is taking place, the Government does not, at this stage, think it necessary to introduce legislation, as it thought desirable previously. This is not a new thing; when the Government introduced legislation previously, it was defeated in the Legislative Council. In relation to the other question (and I suppose one could say this was a two-fold question, although I thought the Speaker asked members of the Opposition particularly not to ask two questions at the one time), about what the Government intends to do in relation to the costs paid by the Government in relation to the Hon. J. E. Dunford, when he was Secretary of the Australian Workers Union, the Government makes no apology, and it did not do so at the time, for paying those costs, because the State was heading

into one of the strongest confrontations that I have ever experienced in South Australia. In order to keep industrial peace and to ensure the good conduct and safe welfare of the people in Kangaroo Island (because they were the ones being threatened with all sorts of industrial action), the Government took positive action in paying the costs incurred, and this concluded the industrial dispute. The Government does not intend to back off from the stand taken at that time.

SHOP PARKING

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Transport tell traders, shoppers and the House the position in relation to parking in the clearways along Goodwood, Unley and South Roads, the shopping areas on the clearways of Goodwood and Unley Roads being mainly in the Unley District? This question stems from a report that appeared in the *Unley Courier* last week which was headed, "Traders' future in balance", and which contained many "ifs". The Leader of the Opposition then became an expert on the matter, although not one of these roads is in his district, by politely saying that, in effect, this was just another way of killing small traders. The Unley council is noted for its development planning, and it strictly provides that off-street parking be part of the development.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Government has pursued a policy since it has been in office of working with local government and not directing it to do things it does not wish to do. In accordance with that policy, we informed local government that the Road Traffic Board believed that, for the smooth passage of traffic, particularly the public transport sector, it was desirable that the present operation of clearways be further extended. The clearways were originally introduced to operate between 7.30 a.m. and 9 a.m. on the lanes leading to Adelaide, and between 4.30 p.m. and 6 p.m. on the lanes away from Adelaide. The second step was to provide clearway provisions on both sides of the road. The board, in its wisdom, has said (and I agree with it) that the time will come when we will need 12-hour clearways on both sides of the road. That view was conveyed to local government, to obtain its opinion on the matter. Its opinion has been obtained, and the board will respect it. However, it must be pointed out (and the member for Unley has referred to this fact) that nowadays the requirements in respect of shops are vastly different from what they were previously. Today, no council would permit a shop to be built without adequate off-street parking being provided. As time passes, we will find that more and more off-street parking will be provided. I am sure that we will find that the present opposition that has been expressed will disappear, and that the clearways will come in.

Mr. Tonkin: There's not much difference really, from the way you have them now.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is a vast difference. He would cut a swathe right through the metropolitan living area of Adelaide. Although he refused to admit this in the House last Tuesday, he was forced into admitting it by a television interviewer when the Leader said that that was how he would solve Adelaide's transport problems: by building freeways and destroying our way of life. However, that is not this Government's policy.

COMPULSORY UNIONISM

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the Minister of Labour and Industry agree with the proposition put forward last week by the Leader of the Opposition that compulsory unionism, the protection of trade union officials from common law actions, and worker participation or industrial democracy *a la* the Yugoslav pattern add up to the socialist control of the community exercised in that country by the absolute power of trade union leaders over the total community as conscripted members of trade unions and, if he does not agree, in what way does he disagree? We all know that the Government has selected Yugoslavia, a communist country, to which to send Mr. Gnatenko to study industrial democracy, a system which does not exist in Yugoslavia, which has a system of worker co-operatives. We all know that Yugoslavia would not know what democracy was all about.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that he is now debating the matter. He has been given leave to explain his question, but not to debate it.

Mr. MATHWIN: We all know that Yugoslavia knows what worker control is through its worker co-operatives. Does the Minister agree with the Leader?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: No.

REFUGEES

Mr. WELLS: Is the Minister of Labour and Industry aware of the serious situation that has developed because of the unemployment of people who came to this country as refugees and worked for Chrysler Australia Limited? These unfortunate people were retrenched, along with hundreds and hundreds of Australian workers, from Chrysler Australia Limited. The retrenchment caused much concern and, as a result, other trades people and business people in the State offered to assist. I ask the Minister whether he is aware of and whether he has done anything in relation to the statement of the spokesman of the Indo-Chinese refugees who said that they had received a rush of calls after a big advertisement had appeared in the *Advertiser* offering their labour. The spokesman for the refugees, A Nhi Vong, said that the refugees would rather take any work anywhere for just a little money rather than have no job. This is an extremely disturbing situation, and I have no doubt that some people would take advantage of the refugees. If the Minister has not already done so, will he take all steps to protect these people from unscrupulous employers who, in my opinion, will in all probability, want to employ the refugees on the basis that they have suggested, that is, for little money rather than their being out of work. I am extremely concerned about the efforts that have been made to give these people employment, although I admit that they deserve it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that the honourable member is now debating the question.

Mr. WELLS: I conclude by saying that I have hundreds of unemployed men in my district who would be glad of the same opportunity for the work being offered to these people who have unfortunately come to this country in the circumstances I have described.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It seems that it is my day. I did see the report referred to by the honourable member wherein the refugee leader from Indo-China said that they would prefer to have some work at little pay rather than no work at no pay. Personally, I would put that statement down to ignorance and to a lack of understanding of Australian conditions. These people are not

used to having awards, unions and departments such as the Department of Labour and Industry to protect them. I have not contacted these people (I have not known where to do so), nor have they contacted my department. The second point is that it could happen—

Mr. Chapman: It was a two-pointer, was it?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: They are all two-pointers today.

Mr. Dean Brown: You accept two-pointers from your side of the House—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I accepted them from the honourable member's side today.

The SPEAKER: Order! We have had enough interjections.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The second part of the question was that there could be the possibility of employers taking up this offer and employing these people for less than award rates. I would hope that no employer in South Australia would do that. The newspaper report does not state that they will. What the report states is that the refugees have received numerous offers of employment. It does not state that they have received numerous offers at less than award rates of pay. I can assure the House that inspectors from my department will be following up any such considered breach; we are continually inspecting for breaches. However, I will not put myself on record as saying that these people have already been offered or have accepted employment at less than award rates of pay. I do not believe that any employer in South Australia would employ under those conditions. As I say, we have an alert department: it is active in the field, inspecting rates of pay and books all the time. Obviously my department at some stage would find out if there were a breach of the award. In the meantime, I would stress on Mr. Nhi Vong, who I think is the person leading this group, to contact my department so that he can be told the conditions under which he will be expected to work in South Australia, so that he can abide by them and join the appropriate union.

WORKER PARTICIPATION

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what progress has been made in implementing the Government's industrial democracy or worker participation policy in the Housing Trust, the Electricity Trust, the Engineering and Water Supply Department and in other Government departments, and whether it is proposed that the system in Yugoslavia will provide the model for further developments in South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You should know—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry is out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite are apparently unaware that the Unit for Industrial Democracy and the policy on this topic are administered by me and not by the Minister of Labour and Industry. I have every confidence in the Minister of Labour and Industry. He is a very good Minister, as he has made obvious to members this afternoon; I have been pleased to note their discomfort. Yugoslavia is not the model for industrial democracy for South Australia; there is no model for South Australia. Elsewhere in the world there have been many experiments in certain areas of worker participation and industrial democracy programmes. It would be completely foolish

for South Australia, which is embarking on programmes of this kind, and embarking on them, I might add, with the approval of people in the employing sphere (and I note also that Federally and in the State the Liberal Party of Australia has now adopted worker participation policies)—

Mr. Rodda: Answer the question!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest to the honourable member that he let me reply to the question; he will get his answer.

Mr. Mathwin: You're getting warmed up.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest the honourable member cool down and then I will be able to answer the question. The programmes in this State are being developed specifically with relation to this State but, naturally enough, looking to what has been experienced elsewhere both as to what to do and as to what not to do. As a result of our setting up a programme of this kind, we established in South Australia a tripartite committee on industrial democracy representative of employers, trade unions and the public sector. That committee has been sitting for some time preparing a document, which will be released soon, stating the tripartite view of employers, employees and unions on the subject of what the development of an industrial democracy programme should be, and this is independent of the Government's policy. This policy is put forward by a tripartite committee. A tripartite committee was set up in England in this area specifically in order to see to it that this important area of policy was properly developed by an independent organisation. The tripartite committee recommended that certain investigations be undertaken overseas, one by a trade union representative and one by an employers' representative. I find it surprising that honourable members opposite have not mentioned the overseas study to be undertaken by the employers' representative. Mr. Michael Lloyd, who is a prominent industrialist in South Australia and the ex-President of the Housing Industry Association, has been selected for a lengthy tour of inspection of the industrial democracy programmes in Sweden. I find it strange that members opposite should not have questioned that. Although we are looking at Sweden, apparently they are not talking about Sweden as a place from where we are taking information. They are all the time concentrating on Yugoslavia.

Mr. Dean Brown: What do you think people in Yugoslavia would know about democracy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They know something about internal self-management programmes, and the internal self-management—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Chapman: They follow dictatorship.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra is out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is impossible to give an answer to Opposition members if I have to shout them down the whole time. Yugoslavia has had considerable experience (indeed, the most lengthy experience) of experiment in internal self-management programmes. That country's experience has been of considerable importance to all countries that have tried to develop programmes of this kind. It has the longest experience, and in many cases examples of what not to do.

Mr. Mathwin: Worker control.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is a question not of worker control but of what happens inside the factory in the relationship between the workers and their representatives. Representations were made to me in Yugoslavia about how this programme should work, and I

visited the Zastava works in Yugoslavia, where I was told certain things about how it worked in that major motor works, and a major motor works is of interest to us; just as the industrial democracy programmes developed in Sweden in the most advanced form in the Volvo factories, the Zastava works is of interest to us also because it is a very large motor works. Some of the things told to me by the board of that factory I found (it was not in relation to their own factory but in relation to the general operation of the scheme) were wrong.

Mr. Millhouse: Inaccurate, or you didn't agree?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Inaccurate. Indeed, I checked with other industrial concerns in Yugoslavia, some of the statements they had made, and I found that what had been told to me by the board of the Zastava works was wrong. On the other hand, it is a works which has, in its internal self-management programme, quite a number of lessons which could be looked at both by General Motors-Holden's and Chrysler, both of which organisations are seeking to initiate industrial democracy programmes in their own areas. So it was recommended that a unionist be sent to look at the programme on the floor in that works, not to take in propaganda but to see actually how it worked, and that he should be an experienced motor worker who could speak Serbian. We looked at this, and a committee of the tripartite industrial democracy group sat to determine who should be sent as an employer and an employee. Mr. Bob Ling chaired the selection committee. The committee recommended unanimously that Mr. Gnatenko should be sent to Yugoslavia for this purpose and that Mr. Lloyd should be sent to study the programme in Sweden. The honourable member asks about industrial democracy programmes in Government departments. Numbers of developments have taken place in such programmes in Government departments, and I suggest the honourable member should look at the Unit for Industrial Democracy's information papers which have been published and which specify a number of these. At present the programme has not developed in the Housing Trust, simply because there is not agreement among the trust workers as to how it should develop. The Government is not imposing a programme: it is for the workers, in conjunction with the management, to decide how a programme develops. At this stage, it has not developed there. There have been proposals that are now being discussed in relation to the Electricity Trust, initiated by the white-collar unions in the trust, and that is proceeding.

GAUGE STANDARDISATION

Mr. KENEALLY: Has the Minister of Transport any information as to the present position regarding negotiations between the South Australian Government and the Federal Government on the standardisation of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook railway line? It is about 12 months since we had a report from the Minister, and I for one am beginning to believe that we will not get standardisation of that railway line.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Unfortunately, I do not have any news of any description: I suppose the best one could say is that no news is good news. South Australia has every reason to feel badly let down over the project. When the report ordered by the Federal Minister had been completed and then forwarded to South Australia, I went to Canberra especially to discuss this question with him in

order to ensure that South Australia would retain its right to have a standard gauge connection, a right that had been contained in an agreement signed by the Prime Minister and the Premier and ratified by both the South Australian and Federal Parliaments. I was unable to obtain an unequivocal assurance, but I came away with a strong belief that the Federal Minister would, if South Australia co-operated by agreeing to a scaling down of the Maunsell plan to something that resembled the Joy plan, support our request. However, six or seven months has elapsed since that day and, despite repeated letters to the Federal Minister, we have had no response. I was hoping to have had a personal discussion with him at the Australian Transport Advisory Council on Friday last, but regrettably he was not able to attend that function. All I can hope is that some Liberal Federal members from South Australia will use their good offices with the Federal Government to ensure that South Australia gets what it is justly entitled to get.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Minister of Works say what has been the total cost of renovating Parliament House and what is the cost of the proposed refurbishing of the building? All members are aware of the very extensive renovations and refurbishing that have been undertaken—

The SPEAKER: Order! A Question on Notice has been asked on this matter.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Can the Minister of Transport say what are the present proposals of his department in relation to pedestrian and traffic lights at the intersection of Tapley Hill Road and Valetta Road, Fulham Gardens? This intersection adjoins the recently developed Target store on Tapley Hill Road, and in the past two or three years there has been a tremendous increase of traffic as a result of that development and because of housing development at Kidman Park, as people from that area use Valetta Road as a main outlet. I raised this matter with the department about 18 months ago and was told that traffic counting was being considered in order to determine the priorities of the intersection. Because of the many requests I have received from constituents about the future of this intersection, I would appreciate any advice that the Minister can give or obtain for me.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The warrant for traffic lights at that location has been met by the traffic counts that have been undertaken. We have included the work on our programme for the current financial year and, unless the Federal Minister rejects it (and we have not yet got approval), lights will be installed this year.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say what is the potential of mineral resources in the northern part of South Australia, and to what extent will the Australian Labor Party's indefinite moratorium on uranium inhibit the full exploitation of these resources?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not know that anyone can say what is the full potential of the mineral resources in the northern part of South Australia, because

the plain fact of the matter is that the degree of exploration carried out is still so limited that it would not be possible to get any reasonable estimate of that potential. So far as uranium deposits are concerned, there are two small deposits that would probably be viable if the uranium programme were ever to go ahead. Of course, it is not just the Government that must be satisfied: in view of the resolution passed by this House, the House of Assembly as a whole will have to be satisfied that it is safe to export uranium to a customer country before any of those projects could go ahead. We have not yet heard of any statement that the Liberal Party has changed its policy since the vote it gave in this House some time ago.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The honourable member voted that way.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: They all voted that way. Certainly, whilst there is any moratorium of any description in respect of uranium, uranium proposals cannot go ahead. That, of course, does not stop other developments from going ahead.

Mr. Gunn: They are inter-related.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member would be aware that certain arguments have developed with opal miners, for example, because of their fears that other things may go ahead in a way that will adversely affect opal mining. The Government has attempted to make it quite clear that the interests of opal miners will be fully protected. I will certainly emphasise to them, in any discussions that I have with them, that in no circumstances will a company be able to prospect for opal. There is only one instance in this State where a company was given the right to prospect for opal. That right was given by the Hall Government in 1969 to a company called Gemex. Fortunately, that permit lapsed at the end of 1970, and under present legislation it is not possible for any company having an exploration licence for other minerals to prospect for opal. That is specifically excluded. The policy of the Government, which has been stated many times, is that prospecting for and mining of opal is an individual activity to be undertaken by the opal miners. If copper development in the Roxby Downs area is to get off the ground there will have to be some detailed co-operation between opal miners and that company which protects the interests of both. The actions that have been taken by the Government have been designed to do just that. Any opal miner can prospect for opal anywhere in the State and on anyone else's exploration licence; he has that right. If he wishes to peg a claim and the claim is on someone else's exploration licence (someone else's tenement), the holder of that tenement must give approval before that claim can be pegged. The Mines Department knows of no case where a *bona fide* attempt to peg a claim to mine opal on someone else's tenement has been refused. I have every confidence that Western Mining Corporation will co-operate fully with the Government in ensuring that the interests of the opal miners are fully protected. I point out that the Stuart Creek deposit, which was referred to in the press yesterday morning, was originally discovered in 1904, and there has been only sporadic activity at Stuart Creek since. Last April, geologists from the Mines Department undertook a special survey at Stuart Creek with a view to defining a precious stones field; that occurred prior to the recent strike, which has resulted in a rush of claims being pegged for opal in the Stuart Creek area. Certainly the Government proposes that, as we are able to prove up additional opal-bearing areas, additional precious stones fields will be declared.

I also make clear that any company exploring for other minerals has a specific condition on its licence (and this has been a feature only over the past year or so) that any results from its exploration must be forwarded to the Mines Department. So, if opal is discovered as a consequence of its exploration, the Mines Department will know about it. If it is a viable field, that opal will be made available to opal miners on suitable conditions that protect the rights of the mining company in whatever it hopes to do in relation to other minerals. This is entirely proper, and it was agreed to in most respects by the Andamooka Progress Association, which last year was the only representative body of people in Andamooka. At that time, the strata title legislation was agreed to by the executive of the association, together with the adjustment in the size of the declared Andamooka opal field. The Government and I are confident that the arrangements that will be worked out between the mining companies and the opal miners will be carried out in such a way that the interests of the opal miners will be fully protected. It is vital that we carry out this extra exploration for other minerals to know what our resources are, and the people of South Australia have a right to know what our resources are, just as the opal miners have a right to ensure that their way of life is protected to the maximum possible extent.

STRATA TITLES

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister in charge of housing say whether the Act dealing with strata titles in this State provides full legal insurance requirements on property-owners' units? I refer to a recent newspaper report that refers to a statement made by the Insurance Council of Australia's Executive Director (Mr. John Janicke), who complains that the situation is unsatisfactory, and quote from a report in the *Age*, under the heading "Insurance council warns on strata properties", which states:

Many strata property owners risk serious financial loss because they are unaware of the inadequate legal insurance requirements on their units.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not like to stop any honourable member from asking a question, but the question the honourable member is asking seeks a legal opinion, not even from the Attorney-General but from a lay Minister, on whether the strata title legislation gives legal insurance cover. I suggest, with the greatest of respect, that the question is completely out of order on that ground.

The SPEAKER: If the question is asking for a legal opinion, it is certainly out of order. I understood that the honourable member was asking the Minister responsible a question appertaining to the administration of strata titles, rather than a legal opinion.

Mr. Olson: That's correct.

Mr. Millhouse: The form of the question was a straight-out legal opinion.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member for Semaphore to rephrase the question.

Mr. OLSON: Very good, Sir. What I seek, by way of advice, is to know whether, if any one is injured on the property or if the buildings are damaged by explosion

or storm, for example, the owners of strata title units would have to foot the bill for substantial damages or find alternative accommodation. I conclude by—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, Sir, I take the point of order again. The question is asking for a legal opinion.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a further point of order, Sir. All the honourable member is seeking to know is whether the legislation provides in the administration—

Members interjecting:

Mr. Dean Brown: What's your point of order?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Dean Brown: It's not for you to interpret.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The point of order is that I am suggesting that the honourable member is seeking—

Mr. Goldsworthy: It's not your function.

Mr. Chapman: What Standing Order are you—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy will be seated. I have stated clearly to the honourable member for Semaphore that he cannot ask for a legal opinion. I stress that, and I ask him to indicate to me whether he is merely asking a question of the Minister as the Minister responsible and not asking for legal opinion. I trust that the honourable member will convey that to the House without any further explanation.

Mr. OLSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All that I require is to know whether the provisions in this State provide full legal insurance requirements to property owners.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Sir, I must take a point of order again.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not intend to proceed with the question.

WAGE INDEXATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I desire to ask a question of the Premier.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Let's hope it's not a legal one. Mr. Chapman: Is it legally loaded?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I never ask loaded questions. Can the Premier say what attitude, if any, the Government intends to take at the next national wage case hearing? A report in this morning's newspaper, following the announcement of the consumer price index figures for the last quarter, states that the Federal Government will again argue for wage restraint at the next national wage case hearing. Previously, the Government has presented—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —argument at hearings such as this. The Premier is reported on page 12 of the *Advertiser* as saying that he is very pleased with the latest figures. This statement was followed by some huffing and puffing by the Leader of the Opposition, who also said he was pleased with the figures.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Gough.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, it was not Gough; it was the Leader of the Opposition in this State. Neither the Premier nor the Leader has apparently realised what is reported on the first page of the *Advertiser*, that a breakdown of the June quarter figures shows that Adelaide's annual inflation rate is the highest in Australia. The

Adelaide figure has increased from 11.8 per cent in the year to June, 1976, to 14.8 per cent to the end of June this year. How anyone could express satisfaction with those figures I do not know. The Premier has criticised consistently the economic policies of the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that the honourable member is now debating the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was only reminding the Premier of the criticisms that he has made. However, I point out to him that the Prime Minister of Great Britain (who is also a Labour man) has said that his Government continues to regard the mastering of inflation as the pre-condition of success to returning to full employment. I therefore ask this question of the Premier, surprised as I am that no other member has already asked him this afternoon, to give him the earliest opportunity to indicate what his and his Government's attitude may now be to the next wage hearing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has made clear that it considers that wage indexation is, in itself, an effective form of wage restraint and that, in fact, under the indexation guidelines that have been adopted by the Federal Arbitration Commission, a reduction in real wages has already occurred in Australia and that further reductions in real wages would be wrong both morally and economically. Therefore, the Government's position is that it will support the indexation principle in full before the Arbitration Commission. Regarding the honourable member's remarks about inflation, I point out that my remarks expressing some satisfaction in relation to the figures were confined simply to the fact that South Australia in this last quarter had had an inflation rate only at the Australian average. That was the only satisfaction that I expressed. The inflation figure is too high in all circumstances for all parts of Australia. The position in relation to inflation was revealed very clearly by the present Federal Government in the previous submissions to the Arbitration Commission. At the last national wage hearing the Federal Government forecast for this calendar year an inflation rate of 14.2 per cent. On present indications, that forecast will be accurate and we will have an inflation rate for this calendar year of about 14.2 per cent, which is a greater rate of inflation than was experienced last year.

Mr. Nankivell: Knocking again?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certainly I am knocking the Federal Government's policies. I admit the soft impeachment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the figure of 14.2 per cent put before the Arbitration Commission by the Federal Government, if there had been a complete wage freeze for the rest of the year it would have accounted for only 3 per cent of that 14.2 per cent. Those figures were the Federal Government's own figures. The constant demand of the Federal Government to reduce real wages in this country is designed to depress the living standards of the average citizen and will further reduce purchasing power in a situation where our present products are under-demanded. It is economic lunacy.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1976. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Stamp Duties Act on two subjects. The most important of these amendments is designed to close up a loophole that has recently been exploited in the avoidance of duty. Section 66 of the principal Act provides that, where the consideration for a conveyance consists of a sum payable at stated intervals in perpetuity, the duty will be charged on the amount payable during the first 20 years. This provision has been exploited in the following manner: an agreement is made providing for the payment of a very small amount, perhaps \$10 a year, for 21 years, and thereafter a much larger amount is payable in perpetuity. This latter sum is carefully calculated so that the payments as a whole are actuarially equivalent to the present value of the land.

Thus, the Commissioner is prevented from using his power to tax the conveyance on the value of the property, and is forced to use a very small consideration payable during the first 20 years as the basis for assessing the duty. Well over \$100 000 in stamp duty has been avoided over the past few months in this manner. The Government naturally hopes to close the loophole at the earliest possible moment. The Bill therefore provides that, where the consideration for a conveyance on sale consists of money payable periodically in perpetuity or for an indefinite period, the conveyance is to be charged with *ad valorem* duty on the value of the property conveyed.

The second amendment deals with the transfer of a motor vehicle by one spouse into the names of both spouses, or vice versa. At present, the stamp duty is calculated on the basis of the full value of the vehicle. The Government believes that there is some justification for halving the stamp duty otherwise payable in this case and the Bill amends the principal Act accordingly. The Bill also makes a minor amendment for purely formal reasons to the second schedule to the principal Act. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses, which is technical, inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 deals with the transfer of registration by husband and wife to either husband or wife and the transfer of a motor vehicle by one person into the joint names of himself and his spouse. The clause provides for a remission of 50 per cent on the stamp duty that would otherwise be payable. Clause 3 provides that, where the consideration for the conveyance on sale consists of money payable periodically in perpetuity, or for any indefinite period, the conveyance shall be chargeable with *ad valorem* duty on the value of the property conveyed.

Clause 4 slightly expands the provisions of section 66b of the principal Act so that the Commissioner will be empowered to have valuations made where necessary for the purpose of assessing the duty payable on conveyances under the new provisions of section 66. Clause 5 amends the second schedule of the principal Act. The amendment simply enacts an exemption that was previously made by regulation.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support this Bill. It is for obvious reasons necessary to plug loopholes when taxes properly payable are not being paid. I am surprised, particularly in relation to the stamp duty on

conveyancing, that the sum is only about \$100 000. I would have thought it might be considerably more than that. The whole point is that the rate of stamp duties payable in this State is nearly the highest of all States in respect of sums \$30 000 and under, and immediately hits the top spot on conveyances of sums of \$35 000 and above. For some reason or other the Premier has taken lately to quoting figures for State taxation which include mineral royalties in his total estimation. By putting in mineral royalties and because Western Australia and Queensland enjoy a high income from mineral royalties, he puts this forward as a measure of their higher State taxation, and he even brings this into the per capita figures.

There is no way, especially when we have a Bill of this nature dealing specifically with stamp duties, that he can avoid the comparative rates of stamp duties payable. In consideration of sums of \$25 000 in South Australia the stamp duties are \$430. The only State in which the sum is higher is in Victoria where it is \$500. The stamp duties payable on \$30 000 in South Australia are \$580; once again Victoria just beats us with \$600. When we get to \$35 000, South Australia leaps to the front with a sum of \$730; Victoria runs second with \$700. The picture is repeated as we go up the scale.

Mr. Evans: It gets worse, if anything.

Mr. TONKIN: It gets much worse. In consideration of sums of \$40 000, the stamp duties payable in South Australia are \$880, and the next highest is Victoria at \$800. For \$50 000, the sum in South Australia is \$1 180, and for \$100 000 it is \$2 930; the next one down is \$2 250. I repeat that I am amazed that the sum we are talking about that has been avoided in stamp duties should have been such a relatively low figure. The Premier states in his second reading explanation that well over \$100 000 in stamp duty has been avoided, but with these exceptionally high rates of duty I would have thought that that sum could well have been more. I support what is being done and believe that the loophole should be plugged up.

The second amendment deals with the transfer of a motor vehicle by one spouse into the names of both spouses or into the name of the other spouse. I think this is a worthwhile piece of legislation. Quite frequently a car may be in the name of the husband, while the wife drives a second car, which is registered in her name. When the time comes to replace the newer of those two cars it is frequently the case that the first car is transferred into the name of the wife. It is only reasonable that the stamp duty should not be payable. I would suggest that we could well consider doing without it altogether, on a transfer of that nature, where a car itself stays within the same family, where it is used by all members of the family, and where it is ridiculous to consider that stamp duties should be payable simply on a nominal transfer.

Nevertheless, this amendment goes a little part of the way, and once again the sums we are talking about are not inconsiderable. The stamp duties otherwise payable on registering a new Holden Kingswood 202, which costs \$6 000, are \$180. Obviously, that is a significant sum when it is added to all the other charges involved in putting a car on the road. The interesting comparison which could be made is that, although it costs \$180 in stamp duties for that \$6 000 car, it costs only \$45 in Perth, \$60 in Brisbane, \$120 in Sydney, and \$150 in Melbourne. In other words, the stamp duties payable on an average family car in South Australia are higher than in any

other mainland State. That is nothing of which we can be proud.

I believe this is a worthwhile measure that will help relieve the burden of high motoring costs to some extent within families. I repeat that the whole concept of stamp duties on a nominal transfer of a car from one name to another within the same family does smack of the ridiculous, but nevertheless, as the Bill is a step in the right direction, I support it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I am at a great disadvantage in debating this Bill. The first I knew that we were to have a Bill on this subject was when I got that little sheet which is put in our places before the House sits and which said today that the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill would pass all stages today. I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition was oiled up beforehand as to what this Bill was all about and his co-operation obtained, but certainly I was not consulted about it. I knew nothing of it and I guess in that I am in company with most members of the House. This is an important matter. It is technical in its nature and, in the few minutes the Leader of the Opposition has been talking, I have been trying to understand what it is all about. I think I have understood it, but whether or not I agree with it I am not certain. However, I do protest about Bills of this nature, which are technical and may be far-reaching and which may significantly affect some transaction, being pushed through this House without anyone, even with a technical background, having an opportunity to study them before it is too late. That is the position. I have looked at section 66 of the Stamp Duties Act and I have got as far as reading subsection (2), which is one of those to be cut out. I was about to get on to subsection (3) when the Leader of the Opposition stopped, so I cannot quite tell what the purport of that is, and that is one that is being cut out.

One thing which immediately occurs to me on looking at the proposed new subsection as drafted is this: who is to determine what the *ad valorem* duty may be? Presumably that will be the Commissioner of Stamp Duties. It will lead, I suppose, to argument. I do not practise, thank God, as a solicitor, and I do not have much contact with these things now, although I did when I was a much younger practitioner. It will lead, I should think, to great arguments and disputes as to the value. In the section as it stands now, it is an ascertained amount, because subsection (2) in its latter part provides:

With *ad valorem* duty on the total amount which may, according to the terms of sale, be payable during the period of 20 years next after the date of such instrument. Now, one goes to the instrument and ascertains how much will be payable during the next 20 years, and that is the duty. I acknowledge that it is or may be a weakness. I have to take for granted what the Premier has said on this. I have not had a chance to look at it, and I had no knowledge of it. The Leader of the Opposition is prepared to take the Premier's word. I am prepared to accept that there is a loophole in the Act, but the present subsection does not have the weakness that I see in the new subsection because, under the present subsection, it is an ascertainable amount. It may be small, but it does not lead to the argument which I can see developing under subsection (2). I suspect that the Premier has not given this much thought, either. He may scowl at me if he likes. I have not had the advantage of having more than two or three minutes to look at this, but at first glance it looks to me as though this is a weakness in the proposed new subsection. Let me read it in full, as follows:

Where the consideration or any part of the consideration for a conveyance on sale consists of money payable periodically in perpetuity—

and, of course, the wording is the same as that of the present subsection up to there—

or for any indefinite period not terminable with life— and that is the same also—

the conveyance shall be charged with *ad valorem* duty on the value of the property conveyed.

That is where we get the divergence between the proposal and the law as it stands. My point is this: who will determine what the *ad valorem* duty will be under the new subsection? The present subsection speaks of the *ad valorem* duty set down in the instrument. I am not content, unless I get an answer that satisfies me, to let the thing go through in this way. I believe it will cause much dispute between those who are conveying property and the Commissioner, and I do not believe that we should leave the law in a state which leads to dispute.

I cannot say more about it. I protest again at such a technical matter being pushed through the House within probably half an hour from go to whoa. I do not think it is right that this should happen, and I am really amazed (although I suppose it is not hard to get around the Liberal Party if the Premier tries) that Liberal members are prepared to let it go through in this way. Perhaps they would not do any better if they had had a fortnight to look at it, but that is not the point. They themselves would think they were better off. I am surprised that they will do it.

The Leader of the Opposition spent much more time in speaking about the provision relating to the motor car, I suppose because that is easier to understand and of more popular significance. I have no objection to that. It looks to be, again on the face of it, although I have not had a chance even to read the provisions of the Bill, an improvement. On the other matter, I should like the Premier, when replying to the second reading debate, to give me an explanation of the procedure that will be followed in assessing the duty under the proposed new subsection.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I do not know what the member for Mitcham is on about.

Mr. Millhouse: I wouldn't have expected you to understand.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Bill was given to the official Opposition yesterday. The Deputy Premier contacted me and pointed out the facts that appear in the second reading explanation: because there was a loophole in the legislation, about \$100 000, I think had been avoided by way of stamp duty. Without canvassing again the fact that stamp duty is heavy in this State, it seemed to us that it should at least apply in a uniform fashion. This morning, I again read the second reading explanation, and it seemed fairly straightforward to me. It was perused by our shadow Attorney-General, the Hon. John Burdett, who likewise considered that it was reasonably straightforward. We checked in some detail that no retrospectivity was contemplated by the Bill, because, as the House well knows, we are not in favour of trying to catch up with people who have been able to exploit weaknesses in the law.

Having checked that, we were quite satisfied to accommodate the Government in any way we could in closing the loophole. If the member for Mitcham has not had the time he needs to peruse the Bill in detail, that is no fault of ours. I do not think that members on this side

must apologise for seeking to co-operate with the Government when there appears to us to be no sinister motive in this legislation. It seemed to us that the request of the Government was reasonable and that the passage of the Bill should be facilitated. The only questions to be answered were these: is there a loophole and, if so, is it sensible to close it? The answer to both questions was a fairly obvious "Yes", and for that reason we were prepared to support the passage of the Bill.

If there are hidden bugs in this legislation which are obvious to the member for Mitcham and which do not seem obvious to any other member of the House, we would be grateful for the benefit of his erudition, but I should be surprised if those benefits were to be showered upon us. I shall be interested to hear the Premier's response to the queries raised. I support the Bill.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I wish to pose a question to which I hope the Premier will reply when he concludes the second reading debate. The matter has been raised of a transfer between spouses, and I wish to raise a matter relating to partnerships within the family, between two brothers and their wives. Recently I received a letter which states:

Ian and I have dissolved the former partnership. Our wives were also partners. The farm vehicles registered by this old partnership have been transferred to either one or other of the new partnerships. The crunch comes with stamp duty, to transfer these items, when the duty is paid or demanded on the full value of the items, even though it can be argued that we already owned half of the item before.

He goes on about valuations. I should be grateful if the Premier would explain whether the Bill in any way affects the situation to which I have referred. I support the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I do not think it covers the situation to which the honourable member has referred when there is a partnership between two brothers. On a dissolution of that partnership, if property was transferred to one of the parties, unless it was a transfer between husband and wife, it would still be assessable for stamp duty on the full value of the motor vehicle. I take the point made by the honourable member and we will consider it, but I do not think it is covered in this proposal. As I understand the objection raised by the member for Mitcham, he said that, since under section 66 we are now providing that in the circumstances of conveyances that are transferred with the consideration payable periodically in perpetuity or for an indefinite period not terminable with life, the conveyance shall be charged with *ad valorem* duty on the value of the property conveyed.

Mr. Millhouse: I have now seen clause 4.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was going to draw the honourable member's attention to that clause: he should have read it, as it is on the same page.

Mr. Millhouse: I didn't have a chance to read it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, the fact that *ad valorem* duty is coped with by section 66b will now be obvious to the honourable member. The other matter he raised is covered by section 23. The process of having a conveyance assessed and stamped is that the conveyance is submitted to the Commissioner, who makes an assessment. Under section 23 the way in which he goes about doing that is made clear. He gets his valuation if there is not sufficient evidence as to the value of the property. If he is satisfied that sufficient evidence of the value has been

provided, he will make an assessment without an independent valuation. The assessment having been made, it is subject to appeal. If anyone is dissatisfied as to his decision in relation to *ad valorem* duty it is appealable, and I think that the matter is fully covered.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Valuation."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When I spoke before, I had not had the chance to read clause 4, but went straight to clause 3. What I said, if it were not for clause 4, would have been valid, but clause 4 deals with the situation that I canvassed. At first look, it seems to be satisfactory, and I hope it will stand up, although not all legislation that passes through this House does so. My point is reinforced, because it is wrong that a technical Bill like this should be pushed through the House in half an hour.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 21. Page 95.)

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): In supporting the motion, I extend my sympathy to the families of former members who passed away during the recent recess, and also to our former Governor, Sir Douglas Nicholls, on his premature retirement. It was most unfortunate for the people of South Australia that Sir Douglas was unable to complete his full term, because I believe that he would have contributed much to this State. I wish both Sir Douglas and Lady Nicholls well in their retirement.

As the Address in Reply debate gives members the opportunity to refer to many issues and problems covering a wide ambit of the State, I now refer especially to a most distressing situation that developed during the weekend. It was distressing for several fruitgrowers in the Riverland: how many I am not sure, but two canning fruitgrowers in the Riverland contacted me during the weekend and gave me copies of letters they had received from the Government through the Lands Department. The first letter presented to me, after having been sent to the grower, states:

After receiving a deferment of your outstanding water rates to June 30, 1977—

I point out that water rates are due on May 5 in each year—

it is noted that no payment has been received since that date by our department. The outstanding amount is \$540·90, and I regret to advise that unless settlement is made within 14 days of this date I have no option other than to initiate notice of intended forfeiture of the lease. That is a serious matter, because the Government is well aware of the circumstances that exist in the fruitgrowing industry. It is a most unfortunate situation for growers to receive that sort of letter from the Government at this time when not only the grower but also his family are under severe financial stress because of the state of the industry, a situation that has been caused largely through no fault of theirs.

I remind the House that the canning fruit industry in this State was established largely to service the European and United Kingdom markets. When the United Kingdom

entered the European Common Market, that virtually spelt the end of that market. Since the industry in this State was based on that export market, about 60 per cent of all fruit processed in the Riverland canneries is exported. At present it is a most unprofitable market in which to be involved. The reason why growers are not able to meet their commitment to the Government for water rates is simple indeed; they are not receiving any return for their product. We must keep in mind that it is not just the grower who is involved here. Each grower indirectly provides numerous jobs throughout South Australia for many people in the canning industry, the carton manufacturing industry and all the allied industries. We are not just looking after the interests of the grower when we look to defer his water rates to enable him to continue.

The recent Industries Assistance Corporation inquiry into the fruitgrowing industry clearly indicated that many fruitgrowers were receiving much less than the minimum wage in South Australia, so it is not a figment of the imagination that many growers are unable to meet their commitments. The Victorian Government has seen fit to defer water rates, interest free, until October 31. I imagine that that Government will then again consider the situation and, depending on the circumstances of the industry and what payments have been made by the fruit canning industry and other sections of the fruit industry, consider whether it will extend that deferment. I call on the Government, particularly the Minister of Labour and Industry, to look seriously at this matter and take a similar step by deferring the rates of fruitgrowers in the Riverland who are unable to meet their commitments at this time.

The situation varies from grower to grower, depending on whether he is growing wine grapes or drying, citrus, or canned fruit. Payments vary from variety to variety, and the strain varies from grower to grower. It is a very distressing situation that growers should be faced with this sort of demand when they have exhausted their borrowing capacity at the bank. Yet the Government is saying that, unless growers pay their water rates within 14 days, they stand to lose not only their properties but also their homes. This is similar to the situation we have seen in recent times on Kangaroo Island. Now the Government has seen fit to extend this heavy-handed approach into the Riverland.

For the past three years members on this side have been advocating a complete remission of pay-roll tax for decentralised industries in South Australia, similar to the decentralised industries pay-roll tax rebate scheme that operates in Victoria. The South Australian Government has seen fit not to implement similar legislation. Instead, the Premier has gone about the matter in a piecemeal way, selecting industries here and there where some political advantage is to be gained. At no time is there any security in what the Premier is doing, because what he is doing is not based on any statute or legislation. No legislation has been introduced into this Parliament relating to pay-roll tax remissions. When the Federal Government handed pay-roll tax to the States, the Victorian Government introduced its Decentralised Industry Incentive Payments Act, which has operated since that time. If we look back to the period during which the Federal Government collected pay-roll tax we find that exporting industries then received a remission of pay-roll tax in the form of an export incentive. The Victorian Government virtually continued that incentive by the introduction of its legislation. We have no legislation of that type in South Australia.

I have discussed this matter with the New South Wales Parliament and have been informed that the New South Wales Government is introducing legislation next month that will grant a remission on pay-roll tax to the canning fruit industry in that State. It will be retrospective to July 1, 1976. That is a genuine contribution.

The Premier has stated that his form of pay-roll tax is far better because he is establishing a Riverland development fund. The companies and co-operatives that have been nominated by him to participate in the scheme may receive some funds back from the fund if they can submit to the South Australian I.A.C. a plan that will improve their operations. The Minister of Agriculture also claims that this, in the long term, is the best way of handling this matter. What about the short term? In the short term, the Government is sending out notices of intent to resume growers' leases and homes. It is one thing to talk about this in the long term and another thing to talk about it in the short term. Had the same concessions been made to the South Australian industry, which is exporting a far larger percentage of its total production, if the pay-roll tax concession had been provided in South Australia since 1972 and the freight concessions provided to the industry in New South Wales by the Government were also provided in this State, the South Australian Government would now be able to collect its water rates, because the canneries in this State would have been able to meet Fruit Industry Sugar Concession Committee prices and the growers concerned would have been able to meet their commitments. At the moment, however, there is no way that many of the growers in that area can meet their commitments.

Last week I mentioned the Government's continuing attack not only on the co-operatives but also on the growers, saying that the co-operatives and the growers needed to improve their efficiency. I do not say that there is no room to improve efficiency, but, having looked at the fruitgrowing industry in America, particularly in California, which is very similar to the industry in South Australia, I can say that our industry, from a growing, packaging and processing point of view, is as efficient as is the industry in the United States. Many more costs are involved than those of production and packaging of the various primary products that are produced in the fresh fruit market. For example, we have no control over railway freight charges or shipping charges. I gave an example of that last week. I have a report that gives another example involving the handling of baled hay on our wharves. The report I am about to read is taken from the *Stock Journal* of Thursday, June 9, 1977, and is headed "Handling baled hay at our wharves costs \$3 a bale". The report states:

Farmers could comfortably charge \$20 a bale for hay if they adopted the same pricing rationale as Australian wharf labourers. After growing, cutting, baling and stacking, good quality hay is currently bringing between \$1.20 and \$1.50 a bale on the farm. And that price, assuming farmers are not financial masochists, presumably represents a fair return to labour and capital. According to the South Australian Department of Agriculture and Fisheries' economics branch guide to contract rates, a fair average price for mowing, racking, baling, carting and stacking is about 50c a bale, depending on the region. But try having the same bales handled across Australian wharves and you are in for a rude shock. In one recent livestock export exercise a substantial number of bales was loaded aboard a freighter for the incredible cost of nearly \$3 a bale. That's twice as much to lift a bale 15ft. from the wharf and stack it on board as it costs to buy from the producer. Examination of the costing sheets of the stevedoring firm involved shows that each man employed in the balemoving exercise moved the heady total of five bales a working hour.

By contrast an Adelaide firm recently bought 600 bales of hay from a Mount Barker farmer who delivered them from his shed to the Adelaide area and stacked them for 25 cents a bale. The plush working conditions of wharf labourers are already legend, but the livestock export market is valuable to South Australia and it is also an internationally competitive one. With charges like these, Australia can genuinely be said to be bent on pricing itself out of the market.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Have you checked that? I'm having it checked at present.

Mr. ARNOLD: I shall be pleased for the Minister to do that.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Have you checked it?

Mr. ARNOLD: No. If the article is incorrect, I shall be pleased to acknowledge the fact. The report was published in the journal in good faith, and I accept it in that way. However, if it is incorrect, I shall be pleased to know. Last week, I referred to the cost of loading a case of oranges on to a ship. By the time the ship actually left the harbor, the wharfage, tug charges, and so on amounted to about \$1.80 a case to load the case of oranges from the wharf on to the ship.

Mr. Wardle: What's the grower getting a case?

Mr. ARNOLD: Certainly a lot less than that. In many instances, it is not a paying proposition for the grower to export. It is one thing to point to the growers and co-operatives and say, "You must be more efficient." Even if they are 100 per cent efficient, when faced with the kinds of cost to which I have just referred, over which they have no control, they are virtually out of business before they even start, and that is a crime. I refer to another instance of the Government's continually attacking the co-operative movement and the grower organisations. I refer to a report that appeared in the Agriculture Department's official journal, so it would have the blessing of the Minister. The report, reprinted in the *Murray Pioneer* of July 14, under the heading "Collapse of citrus market", states:

According to a report in the June issue of the *State of Agriculture*, arrangements for the orderly interstate marketing of citrus have to all intents and purposes collapsed. The *State of Agriculture* is a Department of Agriculture and Fisheries publication. The article states that reports received during the last two weeks have indicated that 30-litre cartons of navels are selling on the Brisbane and Melbourne markets for as little as \$3 and in Sydney agents are reluctant to buy at the Citrus Marketing Company price.

The \$3 price is \$1 below that recommended by the C.M.C. on behalf of the South Australian Citrus Organisation Committee and the Citrus Marketing Boards of New South Wales and Victoria. The main offenders in the price war, according to the report, appear to be South Australian co-operative packing sheds and grower sellers, together with growers from N.S.W. areas outside the C.M.C. agreement, namely Griffith and Narromine.

Marketing and transport costs were estimated at about \$2.40 to Melbourne and \$2.65 to Sydney. "When these costs are deducted from the \$3 selling price, there is very little left for the grower", states the report.

"This situation will continue, unless growers put pressure on their co-op. packers or distributors to abide by the C.M.C. agreement."

That report brought a quick rebuff from the co-operatives because, the following week, they replied to claims about the citrus market's collapse in the following way:

Two Riverland co-operative packing companies this week hit back at claims made in an article in the June issue of *State of Agriculture*. *State of Agriculture* is published by the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries . . . The assistant general manager of the Berri Co-operative Packing Union Ltd. (Mr. R. L. Curren) said that his company, as a leading South Australian citrus packer, was well aware of the problems currently associated with selling citrus on

Eastern States markets. At the same time, the B.C.P.U. absolutely dissociated itself from any suggestion of involvement in price cutting on those markets or in fact any market.

Similar sentiments were expressed by the General Manager of the Renmark Fruitgrowers Co-operative Limited. It is interesting to note that the following week, namely, on July 21, a further report appeared in the *Murray Pioneer*, under the heading "No basis for attacks on co-ops. C.O.C. says." The Citrus Organisation Committee is the Government statutory body that looks after orderly marketing in South Australia. The report states:

There were no factual reports to back up a statement that co-operative packing houses were largely responsible for the apparent citrus market collapse in the Eastern States, an industry leader said yesterday. This statement was made by the Chairman of the Citrus Organisation Committee (Mr. H. C. Morphett). He was replying to assertions contained in an article in the June issue of the Department of Agriculture's publication the *State of Agriculture*. A report based on this article was published in *The Pioneer*.

Mr. Morphett said C.O.C. had received no factual reports from the citrus boards in these States of the co-operatives breaking their pricing structures. If any such reports had come from the Citrus Management Coy, the operative company from the N.S.W./Vic. Citrus Boards, C.O.C. would have immediately investigated them. Mr. Morphett said he was pleased to see that the co-operatives had published a denial of the allegations. C.O.C. fully endorsed the denial by the co-operatives who all had signed the C.O.C./C.M.C. agreement to uphold the Eastern States marketing scheme

Therefore, the Government's own statutory committee in no way supports the allegations made through the Agriculture Department that the co-ops and the grower organisations are involved in breaking down the price structure of the citrus industry. That is another example of the Government's continuous criticism of the industry and of the ability of the growers to conduct their own affairs properly. Most of the industry's problems are outside the control of the growers or of the grower co-ops and, until the ancillary costs (many of which the Government could alleviate) incurred by the industry are reduced, there is no way in which we can get South Australia's fruit industries back on their own feet. To me that is extremely important, and I trust that the Government will consider seriously the letters that have been sent out to growers threatening the forfeiture of their leases. This action puts undue stress on the growers and their families, and it is absolutely out of their control to do anything about it.

I shall now deal with land tenure and land rentals and the alterations being imposed by the Government. This practice is insidious, because the Government is increasing rentals on Crown leases when those leases are to be transferred or subdivided. Since it is happening on that basis, the Government does not create a situation where enough people are being affected at the same time so that a public outcry would occur. I will now consider some examples where land has been transferred and the owner wishes to sell his property. One example is that before the sale the rental on the property was \$5.81. The Government agreed to the transfer of perpetual lease No. 7824 on the basis that the annual rental would be increased to \$520. That is not a bad increase! It is about a 10 300 per cent increase. Even the Government would agree that that increase is substantial, particularly when one considers the condition of many primary industries today. The Government is certainly not giving anything away in those circumstances. I have numerous examples of such increases. In another example the annual rental was \$16 and was increased to \$501. No real pattern is involved in the increases; the Government just seems to nominate a figure, but the

percentage increase is usually about 8 000 per cent to 10 000 per cent.

The increase on land rentals is as bad as the situation that existed in relation to land tax. The Government was forced into changing its attitude to land tax because it affected everyone. As I said earlier regarding land rentals, the Government only has the opportunity to increase them when an owner tries to sell his property or transfer it. The Government then takes the opportunity to put pressure on the owner to surrender his lease rather than to transfer it and, in so doing, issues another lease with an enormous increase in land rental. This is another area where the Government is stealthily getting at the people in country areas. As the Government is adopting this procedure so slowly and picking growers off one at a time, a public outcry has never occurred as it did with regard to land tax. This procedure is just as bad, however.

I believe that the Government intends to substitute increased Crown rentals for land tax. It will be a long-term project, but, by degrees, eventually the same position will apply, with land rentals rather than land tax applying. The effect will be the same. The landholder will be committed to an astronomical figure. Whether or not he has a crop, he will still have to pay the same land rental as he paid for land tax.

Since I am the Opposition spokesman on water resources, I took the opportunity when overseas on a study tour to study the Colorado River in the United States of America and in Mexico. I undertook this study of the Colorado River because its similarity to the Murray River system in Australia is remarkable. Pollution of the Colorado River is purely the result of salinity caused by irrigation. Industrial pollution is not involved. The problems of the Murray River, too, are not caused by industrial pollution but are caused purely by irrigation. I studied remedial methods that have been adopted in America to ascertain whether there would be any likelihood of relating those methods to the Australian scene. I am quite confident, having seen the work that is being undertaken on the Colorado River, that the problems of the Murray River system in Australia can be solved, but they will never be solved until this and other Governments give sufficient priority to expenditure on capital works to overcome the problem.

South Australia is in the worst position regarding its water of the three States through which the Murray River runs. After all, the best water we receive is the worst water that Victoria and New South Wales have, so it is very much up to us to take the initiative. Until now we have certainly taken no initiative. I do not blame Victoria or New South Wales for not having expressed any real concern for the salinity problem that they are creating in their States. If we consider the situation in South Australia, it is acknowledged by the Minister of Works that South Australia contributes about one-third of the total salinity to the Murray River system in South Australia. Much of that salinity is contributed because of our irrigation undertakings and our diversion works. In the past seven years, since the Gutteridge, Haskins and Davey consultants' report was made available to the Government the South Australian Government has spent the grand total of \$800 000 on this key resource. I say without doubt that the Murray River is the key resource of South Australia, because without the Murray River there would be little of anything in South Australia. Even in today's press the Minister of Works is saying that pumping is proceeding at this moment (in the middle of winter) from the Murray River to supplement Adelaide's water

supply. The Minister states that Adelaide will have no water shortage during next summer. No shortage will occur purely because of this key resource, yet we have spent only \$800 000 in the past seven years on what must surely be the most important resource South Australia has.

The South Australian Government must give a much higher priority to the Murray River and, if that means curtailing some other capital works project for the time being, that must happen. If the Murray River is our main resource, it is high time that we protected it. There is absolutely no way we can bring pressure on Victoria and New South Wales until we try to put our own house in order. Various methods can be used to solve the problem, such as the diversion of obviously known inflows of salinity into the Murray River in South Australia and the contribution made by the irrigation evaporation basins in South Australia which are placed in the valley floor on the banks of the Murray River and which contribute enormously to the salinity problem. The worst of these is, I believe, the Dishers Creek evaporation basin at Renmark which was estimated at one stage to contribute at full capacity about 300 tonnes of salt a day. We have created the problems in South Australia, and it is up to us to show our good faith to Victoria and New South Wales by doing something constructive about it, by diverting those known inflows of salinity away from the river system. There is no doubt that the overall quality of the water in the river is deteriorating year by year.

We have to tackle this problem, whether it be industrial pollution or pollution as a result of irrigation. We should look at other major water systems in the world to see how pollution has been tackled effectively and the problem has been reduced substantially. After many years of negotiation with Mexico, the United States Government has acknowledged that it has a moral obligation to see that Mexico receives its share of the water of the Colorado River in a condition that will enable it to make effective use of it. That has not been the case in recent years. The United States Government reached an agreement with Mexico in 1944 on the quantity of water it would receive. The agreement is for a total quantity of water of 1 500 000 acre feet, exactly the same quantity of water that South Australia will receive once the Dartmouth storage becomes effective. The United States Government has acknowledged that it has a moral obligation to Mexico and has set out in legislation the work it will carry out to solve this problem. This extensive plan will eventually cost the United States Government about \$250 000 000.

It will also make loans available to Mexico to rehabilitate its irrigation areas that have been damaged by salt coming into the country down the Colorado from the United States. I was fortunate enough during my visit to the United States to be able to spend some time with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the United States Senate and also with the Department of State in Washington. I brought back with me copies of the legislation which was put through the United States Congress and the report of which was prepared in 1972 by Mr. Herbert Brownell (the President's special representative) for the Resolution of the Colorado River Salinity Problem with Mexico. It goes into infinite detail about the problem since its inception and sets out how the problem should be solved.

As a result of that report, on February 7, 1974, the State Department presented to the President of the Senate (Mr. Gerald Ford) a letter and statement clearly setting out what was required to solve the problems of salinity in the Colorado River, and the undertakings that the State

Department believed the United States should morally accept. As presented to the United States Senate, this legislation was enacted and is now being put into effect. I believe there is much valuable information in the two documents. The documents are available to the Government, any Government department or any interested people such as engineers who would like to look through them, because I believe they contain some valuable information that could be related to the Australian scene. A basis exists on which a case can be presented to the Victorian, New South Wales and Federal Governments. Until we accept that we have to put our own house in order, there is no way in which we can convince the up-river States that they have a moral obligation to do anything about the problems themselves.

Last week the member for Frome referred to the statement of the Minister for the Environment about the matter of feral goats, particularly in the newly acquired conservation park at Danggali Park. While the Minister for the Environment claimed that the destruction of feral goats in South Australia by his department was a major success story, the member for Frome made the point that the market value of the 6 000 goats was \$50 000 or \$60 000. If the department and the Government are so well off that they can afford to throw away \$60 000, surely there are some charitable organisations or sporting bodies in South Australia that could well do with that money. I was unaware that the Government was so well off that it could afford to throw away a resource of that nature.

Although the feral goats are verminous and must be destroyed, there is also a market value to be considered, and \$50 000 or \$60 000 for the 6 000 goats destroyed was lost. The member for Frome pointed out that for many years the Peterborough meatworks has been processing goats and that there is nothing new in it. The method now being used to round up the goats was suggested to the former Minister for the Environment by the member for Frome two years ago. To me, what the present Minister related is a long way short of being a major success story. It is a disaster that the Government should throw away \$50 000 or \$60 000, which could have been put to far better use. There is absolutely no excuse for that.

It is obvious that the Government was aware of the concern in the community about this matter, otherwise it would not have had one of its members ask the leading question about it on the first day of questions of this session, to give the Minister the opportunity to try to explain his way out of it. As far as the public is concerned, in no way did the Minister explain his way out of it. The waste is still there. The fact that \$50 000 or \$60 000 has been lost not only to the Government but also to any other organisation that could have used it can be justified in no way whatsoever. That was an appalling situation, one that I trust will not be repeated in South Australia.

I turn now to the record of this Government, and I shall quote one or two examples in which I am especially interested. I spent some time referring to the problems of the Murray River system in South Australia and the fact that little has been done in the past seven years to solve those problems. We can go right back to 1970, when the Liberal and Country League Government was defeated over the issue of the building of the Chowilla dam. In his policy speech in 1970, the present Premier said on this issue:

The Labor Party will immediately proceed with this vital measure of planning South Australia's water future. We will renegotiate the agreement concerning the building of the Dartmouth dam to ensure that South Australia's legal rights to the building of the Chowilla dam are not ended. We will seek to negotiate a commencing date for Chowilla to be inserted in an enforceable agreement.

Many of us can remember that statement. If we turn to *Hansard* on April 29, 1970, just before Parliament was dissolved, the present Premier stated:

We say it can be renegotiated—

in referring to the agreement—
and if this Government—

referring to the L.C.L. Government of the day—
is not prepared to do it, a Labor Government will be prepared to do so.

We remember those famous words. On August 20, 1971, following his win at the polls, an *Advertiser* report stated:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) yesterday introduced to Parliament a Bill to rationalise building of the Dartmouth dam on the Mitta Mitta River in north-eastern Victoria. The Bill does not insist on South Australia's rights to the Chowilla dam. Mr. Dunstan said, "My Government never said it would build the Chowilla dam."

Hansard is a bit of a problem when we look back, because it records precisely what we say and it is difficult to get around it. The report states:

"We said we would set about renegotiating the agreement to get the protection Chowilla would afford."

That was what the Premier claimed to have said, but that was not what he had said 12 months earlier. A report in the *Advertiser* on January 12, 1973, stated:

Mr. Dunstan said by phone from Canberra last night that he expected "some announcements in due course" on the overall situation of River Murray waters. The Leader of the Opposition (Dr. Eastick) said last night he did not believe the Dunstan Government's latest moves were genuine. Mr. Dunstan could not fool the South Australian public over Chowilla previously—"nor can he now". Mr. Hall said last night it was "almost incredible" that the Premier was trying again to make an election issue of the Chowilla plan. "Labor has a most disreputable history in relation to our water supplies," he said. "It has held up the construction of the Dartmouth dam by at least two years."

That is correct. In the past two years in South Australia we have been faced with critical salinity problems on the Murray River. Had the construction of the Dartmouth dam not been held up at that time for the purposes of getting the present Government into office (and that is all it was about: certainly it was not about the welfare of South Australia), the waters of Dartmouth probably would be available to South Australia now and we would not be facing the severe salinity problems now existing. It is essential that Dartmouth be completed as soon as possible. Even now we are faced with industrial disputes in trying to get the storage completed. It is essential that a further storage should also be built under control of the River Murray Commission as a dilution storage, which would go a long way to overcoming our salinity problems.

A further storage should be constructed. The River Murray Commission cannot control the Murray River with the limited resources available to it. As well as getting Dartmouth completed, the South Australian Government should be leading the approach and forging ahead with the arguments in support of the construction of a further storage to be available to the River Murray Commission. The waters of that storage should not be committed to any of the three States, but should be available purely as a dilution and salinity control measure throughout the length of the Murray River system.

It is interesting to look at our small storages and to compare them with those available on the Colorado River. We regard the Dartmouth storage, with 3 000 000 acre feet, as a sizable storage. I refer to it in that way because, in the United States of America, the measurement of acre feet is still used.

Mr. Whitten: If the United States uses it, we still have to use it?

Mr. ARNOLD: No, but I shall refer to figures provided to me in the United States and I will thus be able to make an easy comparison. Lake Meade, with a capacity of 32 000 000 acre feet, has 10 times the capacity of Dartmouth. A further storage of similar magnitude on the Colorado system gives a total storage capacity of about 65 000 000 acre feet. When we compare that with the very limited resources available to the River Murray Commission, it is obvious that the commission has an extremely difficult job in controlling the overall salinity level in the Murray River. That job would be made much easier if we could bring pressure to bear on the other States and the Commonwealth for the construction of a further storage on the Murray River as soon as the Dartmouth project is completed.

The Government has achieved precisely nothing in relation to water storage, water resources, and water management. The Minister of Works appears quite proud that \$800 000 has been spent during the past seven years, but he should be ashamed to admit that such a nominal sum has been spent to safeguard South Australia's key asset. On July 14 last, the *Advertiser* printed an article originating in Melbourne, under the heading, "Cash for salinity control urged", as follows:

The Victorian Government has been urged to seek Federal funds to prevent salty drainage entering the Murray River. The drainage comes from the Mildura and Merbein districts.

The project will cost about \$1 000 000 and it is hoped that it will stop about 64 tonnes of salt a day from entering the river. That project could be of benefit only to the people of South Australia. At least the Victorian Government is making an effort to overcome the salinity problem, but we are still humming and ha-ing in this State and doing nothing positive. It is a disgrace, to say the least, that we who have most to lose have done absolutely nothing to overcome this problem. I support fully the effort being made in the Mildura-Merbein area to overcome the salinity problem. It is only one spot in Victoria. All irrigation areas in Victoria and New South Wales contribute to the salinity problem, but at least they are trying to do something about a problem that affects us, and that is more than we are doing. Until we are willing to make a concerted effort in this State and allocate funds by giving the Murray River a high priority of Government expenditure—

Mr. Evans: Some of that \$800 000 000 they got for the railway would have helped us.

Mr. ARNOLD: It could have solved the problem completely. Until we allocate Loan funds and use them for capital works and undertakings that will have to be implemented in order to overcome the problem, we will have the difficult job of convincing Victoria and New South Wales that they have a moral obligation to supply fit and proper water to South Australia. Until we do something constructive about it, we cannot expect those States to adopt that attitude. The Government stands condemned on this matter, as this is a key resource of the State, in that it has done so little in seven years since the problem was highlighted by the presentation to Parliament of the Gutteridge, Haskins and Davey report.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): I, too, support the motion, and congratulate His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor on the way in which the Speech was presented. The Opening Speech is an informative document setting out the pattern that the Government intends to follow. I also congratulate the mover of the motion (the member for Playford) and the seconder (the member for Tea Tree Gully) on their speeches: may they continue to represent their respective districts for many years.

I express my sympathy to those families of the four former members of the House of Assembly at their sad loss. I had the pleasure of meeting only the former Speaker, Mr. Tom Stott. However, the 104 years of combined service to the State given by these gentlemen must stand as a fine record, and I join with His Excellency and all members in recording my appreciation of their services.

I place on record my regret at the premature vacating of the office of Governor of this State by Sir Douglas Nicholls, and I express to both Sir Douglas and Lady Nicholls my best wishes for a long and happy retirement.

It is extremely gratifying that the State Government is trying to ensure, as far as possible, that programmes under the federally funded Australian Assistance Plan, which ended at the conclusion of the last financial year, will be continued, although on a somewhat reduced scale. This decision was made following the withdrawal of Federal funds. The possible closure of many community projects is of great concern to all South Australians, and especially to many of my constituents.

I am most concerned about migrant information centres at Kilkenny and Seaton, and for all other migrant information centres in South Australia. Councils, Government departments, hospitals, and many other organisations have used their services. Statistically, they have proved that they fill an important community need, and it will be a step backward if they are forced to close because of short-sighted Fraser administration. Senator MacKellar, Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, had recently opened centres in Sydney and Melbourne and, since the need had been clearly recognised in other States, I asked the Federal member for Hindmarsh, Mr. C. R. Cameron, M.H.R., and the Federal member for Port Adelaide, Mr. M. J. Young, M.H.R., to approach the Minister and request similar funding for such centres in South Australia, as this abrogation regarding immigration and ethnic affairs showed a marked bias in favour of the other States. Recently, I received a copy of a reply that Mr. Young had received in response to his approach on this matter, and it is as follows:

Dear Mr. Young,

The Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, the Hon. M. J. R. MacKellar, M.P., has asked me to reply to your representations of May 11, 1977, on behalf of Mr. R. K. Abbott, M.P., concerning the threatened closure of migrant information centres at Kilkenny and Seaton which have been funded under the Australian Assistance Plan (A.A.P.). I regret that I have been unable to reply to you earlier on this matter.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan, Q.C., LL.B., M.H.A., Premier for South Australia, recently announced that the State Government would provide financial and other support for the A.A.P. programme in 1977-78, during which time a committee of inquiry would examine community development and assistance in South Australia.

The Premier went on to say that a grant of \$250 000 would be made to the Western Adelaide Regional Council for Social Development to enable the council to recommend the funding of projects. This will ensure that a range of projects, previously funded under the A.A.P. will be able to continue in the next financial year.

How is that for a reply on the matters raised with the Federal Minister? It seems to me that Federal Ministers wait for two or three months, ascertain what the States intend to do about the chopping of funds, and then write and tell us what our State Government has done. I regard that reply as an insult. It is an insult to the migrant community of South Australia, and I will be too ashamed to forward a copy of it to my constituents. The migrant community is entitled to be extremely angry at that kind of treatment.

One could continue criticising the decision to stop Australian Assistance Plan funding and the effect this will have in many areas. Savage cuts have also been made in road grants, legal aid, consumer protection, ethnic radio, growth centres, social security, health, education, and other areas, and will be a disaster for the progress of South Australia. Concerning education, it is not surprising that most teachers are rejecting the guidelines as unwarranted interference in the commission's task of making independent funding recommendations according to need. It is most surprising to learn that the shadow Minister of Education, the member for Mount Gambier, finds it interesting to note that considerably more action is being incited by the South Australian Institute of Teachers than was the case in 1975, when the Federal Government pruned \$105 000 000 from the education Budget.

The shadow Minister believes that, even though the Fraser Administration has been in office for more than 18 months, the present situation has been brought about by the totally irresponsible attitude shown by the previous Federal Administration, and he thinks that perhaps we are lucky that we are not bankrupt let alone able to maintain the spending of 1976. Heaven help the education system if the Opposition gains government in this State. I suggest that the shadow Minister is being cynical.

The latest Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that Australia's unemployment rate is continuing to rise rapidly. They show that the number of Australians unemployed increased by 17.1 per cent, so 62 000 more Australians are out of work now than were unemployed 12 months ago. With unemployment at its highest level since the great depression of the 1930's it is, in my view, a national disaster. The failure of the Fraser Government to rectify the situation and its failure to carry out its election promise to reduce unemployment, its refusal to even consider any special scheme to relieve unemployment (despite fears that it could top 7 per cent by January), and in particular the Prime Minister's attitude to assisting the States in their unemployment relief schemes, is a dereliction of duty and a grave defect in the performance of the Fraser Administration.

The most disturbing aspect of the serious unemployment situation is that the proportion of unemployed aged under 25 years is higher in Australia than in most other countries throughout the world. In Australia, about 55 per cent of the unemployed are aged between 15 and 24 years, and that percentage would be considerably higher had a very large proportion of young people not elected to continue their education. By January, with thousands more school leavers attempting to enter the work force throughout the country, including those who remained at school this year, the situation will be very much worse. Much credit is due to the State Government for making an extra \$14 500 00 available to the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. The \$31 500 000 allocated to the scheme over the past 15 months has, at least, assured many hundreds of South Australian workers of a decent livelihood. The Fraser Government's inept handling of the Australian economy stands condemned. This Federal Government,

which grabbed power at the end of 1975 on specific promises to reduce inflation and unemployment, has, in fact, deliberately increased inflation and produced the highest level of unemployment since before the Second World War.

I refer now to a publication researched and written by the combined research centre of the A.M.W.S.U. titled "Australia Uprooted", which states:

This economic and political analysis had to be published. Discussion of the urgent economic, political and social questions facing Australians has generally remained at a very superficial level. The present Government, the mass circulation newspapers, radio and T.V. have identified the main economic problem as being inflation, supposedly caused by a combination of high wages/salaries and too much Government spending. Most Australians have been rightly concerned at the level of inflation. However, inflation is a symptom of a much deeper crisis. Economic "band-aids" such as the wage/price freeze, even if they could be made effective, are still only treating symptoms. An 18-month long sustained attack on workers, their wages and their unions by the Government and the media has been carried out. The Liberal Country Party Government is currently bringing down the most vicious anti-worker, anti-union legislation in the history of Australia after the careful preparation of the Australian public to accept it. Major issues are being suppressed or ignored. Issues such as:

The fact that, between 1972 and 1974, foreign investors operating in Australia dropped their portion of total net private investment from 40 per cent to 8 per cent. This destabilised the economy and dramatically increased the number of unemployed.

As of 1976, 55.2 per cent of all private company income in Australia is payable overseas, exposing the Australian economy to severe distortions and manipulations.

The build-up of the highly capital intensive mining industry and the rundown and dismemberment of the labour intensive manufacturing industry, with consequent loss of jobs.

In short, the Australian economy is being re-organised and further interlocked with international capital. This benefits the very large Australian and overseas corporations. It means that unemployment will grow and remain for years at levels of 6 per cent to 10 per cent.

The cost of this reorganisation is being imposed on workers in terms of loss of jobs, reduction of wages and living standards, and taming or destruction of their unions. It's time for a wider, deeper discussion of the issues.

It's time to consider some changes in our system in accordance with the needs of the Australian people, not changes required and imposed by big business. This publication is not the final word, in analysis or solutions. It is to be hoped that it makes a useful and dynamic contribution to a wider debate and action. It is imperative that many progressive Australians step forward to extend and amend the contents.

The publication then asks: "Why did it happen?" It states:

In Australia today we have an economic and social situation which is shocking for a country as rich as ours. Fraser, the employers, the T.V., radio and papers are daily flogging the line that inflation would go down, the unemployed would get jobs, and profits would rise and business confidence would be restored and therefore new investment would take place if wages were drastically cut, workers worked harder to raise productivity, workers didn't strike, militant unions were destroyed and Government spending on social services, pensions, education, public transport, roads, Medibank, etc. were cut even further than they have been.

From this theme we can easily see that Fraser's way to resolve the economic problem is to make wage and salary earners pay and to make the workers believe that it is in their own interest to do so. In short, wage and salary earners are being blamed for the present situation. This is merely a smokescreen to cover a very large shift in the nature of the Australian economy. This is now being recognised by many sections of the Australian community. Most people realise that times are bad but not how bad, or really why they are bad. So, first the full extent of the situation.

354 589 registered unemployed; the highest since the depression in the 1930's. That's 5.8 per cent of the workforce or about one person in every 17 out of a job. Even such notables as the Editor of the *Financial Review* have accused the Government of deliberately cooking the books to make the situation look better, and university investigations put the figure at 7.5 per cent of the workforce; or more than one person in every 13 (a total of 450 000 unemployed).

At least 18 per cent of Australians are poor. That's almost one person in five. This is the finding of the Henderson Report on Poverty in Australia.

Australia's manufacturing industries are operating at about three quarters of their full capacity, according to various manufacturing journals.

Inflation is presently running at an annual level of about 15 per cent and will increase further to 17 per cent when the full effects of devaluation flow through the economy. Australia is in the grip of an economic crisis. It is not alone. The world "capitalist" or "free enterprise" system is in crisis and not likely to return to the pre-1972 situation. Some 18 000 000 workers in the advanced capitalist countries are out of work, and the gloomy predictions of the international advisory body to the capitalist world, the O.E.C.D. (Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development), is that the world situation will get worse in late 1977. Perhaps as many as 25 000 000 will be unemployed. The questions that Australians have to come to grips with are: Why is the crisis happening? What direction is the crisis taking? What is the Fraser Government doing about it and why are they attacking wages and unions? What are the best solutions for wage and salary earners?

The publication then deals with each question at a time. The A.M.W.S.U. calls for a new economic programme for Australia. It supports the call for a people's economic programme based on the needs of the people within the terms of maintenance of full employment, protection of the environment, and a progressive reduction of working hours.

Last week, we heard the Leader of the Opposition talk about high unemployment, saying that it was time that everyone got together and did something about it. Why does the Leader not say those things to Mr. Fraser, and tell him that something ought to be done about unemployment? Notably, the Leader's voice was unheard when 700 workers were facing the sack at Chrysler. In fact, all Opposition members' voices were unheard at that time. The aim of organised Labor's campaign for a reduction of the work week is clear, simple and direct: to spread job opportunities and reduce unemployment. It must be emphasised that unemployment is still Australia's leading social problem, because it has been undermining the nation's strength and creating difficulties in labour-management relations. There is no one-shot cure-all for this serious and growing problem. However, the Federal Government's economic policies are clearly not working. It must acknowledge the seriousness of the problems as requiring a national approach involving the State Government's employers, and the trade union movement.

During my maiden speech in the House almost two years ago, I emphasised that employment and the protection of the worker's livelihood were paramount. It is essential that the practice of rendering workers redundant, owing to changes in production, be ended. I feel certain that, if this objective can be achieved and if workers are assured of security of employment, we will not see another fiasco similar to that which occurred at Chrysler, Tonsley Park, a few days ago. Any unemployment is a disgrace to our wealthy nation, our so-called affluent society, and I consider that no issue, foreign or domestic, is more important than ending it. I am an advocate of any and every measure that will put people back to work. We must do everything possible to find employment for our fellow citizens, because we have a national obligation to the unemployed. The

Dunstan Government is doing everything possible in this area, whereas Prime Minister Fraser is doing nothing and should resign. I support the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I give the traditional and customary support to the motion and, as most other members have done, I pay the usual tributes that are traditional in the Address in Reply debate to the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. I believe that we are singularly fortunate in the man who has been chosen as Lieutenant-Governor, on whose shoulders a heavy burden was placed as a result of the premature retirement owing to illness early in the career of Sir Douglas Nicholls. It fell to the lot of Mr. Walter Crocker, the Lieutenant-Governor, to be involved in an official capacity throughout the entire visit of Her Majesty the Queen, and it is now his lot to carry on as Acting Governor until the Government sees fit to appoint a permanent Governor. In paying a particular tribute to Mr. Walter Crocker, I do not know that any other member has yet done that in this debate. I, too, share the sentiments and good wishes that have been expressed to Sir Douglas Nicholls in his retirement.

We have passed through a most interesting time in Australia in regard to our Vice-Regal representation. We were fortunate in having the services of Sir Mark Oliphant during his term as Governor of South Australia. I think I recall saying during the Address in Reply in the previous session that there may have been some in the State who initially doubted the fitness of Sir Mark to assume that office, but I think his record certainly dispelled all such doubts. I thought that the comments he made on the day on which he relinquished the office of Governor were highly significant. He was referring to the Vice-Regal representative in Canberra, Sir John Kerr, who, I think, will go down in history as being one of the significant occupants of the office of Governor-General. Indeed, the judgment of history will be that he showed neither fear nor favour in the discharge of his duties or in his interpretation of the Australian Constitution during a time of severe crisis. I remind honourable members of the words Sir Mark Oliphant used, in paying a tribute to the Governor-General, on the day of his relinquishing office in South Australia. The following report relates to what he said about Sir John Kerr's action in dismissing the Whitlam Ministry:

Kerr's action "democratic". Whitlam had choice—Sir Mark. Sir John Kerr's dismissal of the Whitlam Government last year was an example of democracy in action, the Governor (Sir Mark Oliphant) said on Saturday. At his last press conference as Governor of South Australia, Sir Mark said he thought it would be hard to point to any real fault in the Governor-General's decision in November last year. "I believe democracy can succeed only if one has got somebody who can be an unbiased observer of the scene and who can be a referee when something goes wrong", Sir Mark said. "I am not saying this because I hold any brief for Mr. Whitlam or Mr. Fraser", he said. "But in the end what Sir John Kerr did meant that the people were asked what they wanted".

Mr. Venning: What did they say?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: They gave a record majority to the present Prime Minister.

Mr. Becker: What did the Premier say at the Parliamentary dinner given Sir John Kerr?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know. This is a significant statement by a man whom every member acknowledges was an outstanding Governor. The quote continues:

Asked if he thought the Governor-General's action brought the post and the monarchy into disrepute, Sir Mark said he believed it had added to the repute of both the offices of Governor-General and of the Queen. "We

saw this country, Mr. Whitlam included, abide by the consequences and accept the situation," he said. The advice of Mr. Whitlam's Ministers had been ignored by Parliament and Mr. Whitlam had indicated he would not consult the people, thus choosing instead to be dismissed.

I applaud Sir Mark for those comments, although I have not always considered his emphasis to be strictly accurate. In this case I believe that he was right on the button. Sir Mark summed up the situation admirably, and he gave proper credit to a man who, without fear or favour, was prepared to do his duty in interpreting the Constitution of Australia. In paying tribute at the start of this traditional Speech to the vice-regal representatives in Australia, I pay a tribute to Sir John Kerr.

Mr. Slater: You're joking!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not joking; I am deadly serious.

Mr. Slater: What are you laughing for?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am laughing at the honourable member's reaction, his mirth and the ignorance of the honourable member's thinking that I am not deadly serious. I refer, too, to the former members of this House who have died since we last met. The only member who was really wellknown to me was Sir Glen Pearson, although I did know Mr. Shannon, Mr. Clarke and Mr. Stott, but not particularly well. They were all members who served this State for a long time. I, too, refer to them and their families in expressing appreciation of the efforts that all these men made on behalf not only of their districts but also of the people of this State. The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech this time was pretty thin.

Mr. Wardle: It was a veneer.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It was a thin veneer. That is an apt metaphor: it was indeed a thin veneer. I read through the Speech, which contained little substance, and I will refer to one or two points that are raised in passing in the Speech. The Government acknowledged, as it always does and usually early in the Speech, that South Australia has a primary industry. The Government acknowledges that South Australia has been having a dry year. Probably the rains of the past week have improved the seasonal outlook considerably.

Mr. Evans: The Government blamed Fraser for that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Government blames Fraser for everything, so it would not surprise me if it blamed the Prime Minister for that, too. That several hundred employees were dismissed from the Samcor meatworks recently, highlights the inter-dependence of the city and the country. The reasons for the dismissal of, I think, 300 employees are that South Australia is experiencing a poor season and that livestock is just not coming into the abattoirs to be slaughtered. If the Government needs any reminder of the inter-dependence of the city and the country, that would seem to me to be a salutary instance of it.

I have referred to the Premier's acknowledgment of this inter-dependence when he was opening the United Farmers and Graziers conference down at the Rothman's theatre about a week ago. At that time the Premier saw fit to allude to this inter-dependence between city and country. For many years under the administration of Labor Governments, particularly the Whitlam Government in Canberra and this Government, it has seemed that we do not owe the country anything. Those Governments have been hell-bent on denigrating the country people of this State and doing their best to disfranchise them ever since I have been in this place.

Although it was politic for the Premier, at the opening of the conference, to refer to poor seasonal conditions (and the dismissals at Samcor highlights that point), the blame for that can hardly be laid at the feet of the Fraser Government, at whose feet the Labor Government in this State seems to lay blame for every adverse circumstance that arises here. Employees at Samcor were put off because conditions in the rural industry are far from satisfactory.

I was also interested in the reference on the first page of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech to making financial assistance available to a wider range of disadvantaged people. That reference is delightfully vague, as indeed are other references that occur later in the Speech. The very next reference, in relation to the Premier's Department and the Economic Development Department, which the Government has established to improve the promotion of the sale of local products, is delightfully vague and particularly optimistic in tone. However, it seems to me that the end result has been short on performance. All the evidence we have of industrial development in this State suggests that industries are either folding up or putting people off and, indeed, experiencing a hard time. Nevertheless the Government has seen fit to blow its own bags about setting up a new unit in the Premier's Department that will help remedy our ills.

The next reference in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech deals with the Engineering and Water Supply Department. No doubt we all heard the announcement on a recent Friday of new water charges in South Australia. Again our pace-setting Government has inflicted on the householders of this State a charge that is the highest of all States in Australia.

Mr. Wardle: What will the Government do at Budget time?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Government will say, "We are pleased to announce that we haven't had to increase taxes or charges." That will occur in about three weeks time. The Premier will proclaim to the taxpayers of the State, sticking out his chest on television like a pouting pigeon, "I am proud to announce, that through good management, my Government does not need to increase State taxes and charges." However, about two or three weeks ago the Minister of Works announced that South Australians would be paying 19c a kilolitre for water. From a check of other Government departments in all the other States I have ascertained that South Australia will have the dearest water in this country.

I will quote the figures that have applied from July 1 for the other States for the edification of members opposite. These are current charges and correspond with this State's charges. In Melbourne water costs 12.75c a kilolitre, and 12.75c a kilolitre when used in excess; in Sydney water costs 16.5c a kilolitre, and 16.5c a kilolitre for water used in excess; Brisbane is in the process of setting up a metering system, so it is not possible to get an accurate figure; in Perth the cost is 12.73c a kilolitre for consumption defined by assessed valuation, and 15.81c a kilolitre for excess water used if paid before the end of November, whereas if users cannot pay by the end of November they pay 16.44c a kilolitre for excess water. Adelaide tops the poll. To use this Government's own phrase, "We set the pace," and pay 19c a kilolitre for consumption defined by the assessed valuation, and pay 19c a kilolitre for water used in excess. In Hobart, except in special cases, metres are not read. From the basis of comparison we have it seems that Hobart has the cheapest water in Australia.

When we take into account that we pay more in South Australia to put a Holden Kingswood on the road than is paid in any other State, when we look at the 10 per cent

rise in the cost of electricity announced last week and consider the fact that we pay more in stamp duties for the transfer of a housing property in the average value range, we have to agree with the Premier that we are the pace-setting State. The cost advantages in being a home owner, a car owner and in living in South Australia which obtained about nine or 10 years ago and for many years before that have evaporated during the tenure of office of our pace-setting Premier and his pace-setting Cabinet and colleagues. I do not know whether or not the public is aware of the fact that we now have the dearest water in Australia, and that that has been the case during the past two or three years.

I wish to refer now to the vacillations of the Minister of Works in relation to water filtration. He has released many optimistic statements in the past, although possibly not as way out as the press releases made by the Minister of Transport (his cactus juice as fuel for cars and magnetic vehicles); they have also been inconsistent. We note that the cost of the filtration programme that was originally \$100 000 000 is now estimated to cost \$150 000 000 by completion. I will be surprised if that is the end of the story. The Minister is now talking about delays, spreading his programme over a period of 30 years. I will be surprised if that final cost is not more like \$250 000 000, if that time scale is correct. We do not deny that the water of this State is of poor quality. We were concerned when we read in the *News* of October 28, 1976, under the heading, "S.A. official admits: water fails world tests", the following report:

Adelaide's water does not meet international drinking standards, and that's official. Despite continuous chlorination the bacteriological quality does not satisfy standards regarded as essential throughout the world. The Engineering and Water Supply Department's assistant engineer for water and sewage treatment, Mr. R. D. Stokes, revealed this to a water pollution workshop at the South Australian Institute of Technology in Adelaide today.

Most of the statements made since then have been to reassure the public that the water is in fact safe. From time to time we get little worms and so on in the water, and much cloudiness.

Mr. Jennings: You get them in Parliament, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We do when the honourable member is on his feet, that is for sure. That sort of reference is disturbing and indicates a pressing reason for carrying on with the filtration scheme. It seems unfortunate that hundreds of millions of dollars will be spent on a filtration scheme when the bulk of the water goes down the sewer. If any scheme could have been devised whereby the water used for drinking and washing was filtered and the water used commercially or for watering lawns and washing cars and in sewerage systems was not filtered, no doubt the department would have devised it. It seems an expensive exercise when we know that the bulk of the water supplied at present is of satisfactory quality for its use. The Minister of Works has also made conflicting statements about what is likely to happen to water rates. We know what has happened—the rates are the highest in Australia. On October 5, 1973, he was quoted as saying the following:

It is unlikely water rates will rise to pay for filtration in Adelaide's inner, northern and central suburbs. The Minister of Works said this yesterday after announcing the suburbs would have filtered water within three years.

That was optimistic. Those three years have passed and those suburbs still have not received their filtered water. What the Minister is now saying indicates that we are certainly likely to have increased charges to pay for filtration. Two years later, on November 7, 1975, the Minister was reported as follows:

Water and sewerage rates were likely to rise sharply in the next five years, the Minister of Works said yesterday. Water rates could increase by up to 20 per cent next year. The Engineering and Water Supply Department probably would have to double its revenue to pay for capital works and to allow for rises up to 1980.

Then he talked about capital works, high in the list being the provision of filtered water.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Did he say anything about the Federal Government's backing away from its commitment to provide it?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I well remember the kerfuffle in the days of Whitlam and company when, in the last year of the Whitlam regime, urgent telexes and letters were sent to Mr. Uren about the possibility of there being a cut in Federal funds for the water filtration scheme in South Australia. Do not think the tune you are playing at the moment is a recent one. There were fears in those days that funds would not be available from the Whitlam Administration, and indeed the major cuts in finance for this State came in the last Hayden budget of the Whitlam Government. Government members know that.

We all know that the Minister of Mines and Energy is in a real bind with his Caucus colleagues in relation to mining development in this State. We know that, being a realist, the Minister of Mines and Energy wants to press on with mining exploration and development in South Australia. We know that he is being hamstrung by the left-wingers in the Labor Party, particularly in relation to any development of the uranium resources that occurs in this State. I want to refer briefly to the comments I heard made by Mr. Hawke, the Federal President of the Australian Labor Party and the Australian Council of Trade Unions chief, in a talk he gave to university students in Melbourne recently. It is the most cogent argument I have heard to proceed with uranium mining of any that I can recall. I know the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Anthony) has made some statements about what our attitude should be to uranium mining. This speech is taken directly from a tape of what Mr. Hawke said at that gathering, so the faulty grammar is Mr. Hawke's and not mine. He said:

Now, coming from that point—

Mr. Jennings: This will be good, won't it?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It will be good. He might have had a drink or two, I do not know; but the way it is phrased is rather unusual. This is what Mr. Hawke said:

Now, coming from that point, let me say why at this stage my view is that we should mine and export it. Based on this proposition it is, as I understand the argument, of those who speak and whose integrities many of them I entirely accept. They say that you can identify the dangers that exist in the use of uranium as a source of power generation. Now that I can understand; I think I can understand it as well as any of them; you can lift the dangers and they are very considerable. Where I then find myself unable to follow the argument is that, having lifted those dangers and problems associated with the use of uranium for these purposes, they then say that we leave our uranium in the ground and there seems to be some logical connection, they would say, between lifting the dangers and saying that we do something about those dangers by leaving ours in the ground. Now if, in fact, by leaving Australian uranium in the ground, we could know that we would do something in reduction of those dangers any arguments seem to be complete and the obvious decision would be to leave ours in the ground. But unfortunately no-one, and I repeat no-one, has yet shown that by keeping Australian uranium in the ground we in fact do anything about those dangers and in fact all that has been shown so far is that if we, in fact, with what represents about, according to what dollar equivalent to use, but the general agreement would be you could say our reserves represent about 20 per cent of world reserves.

I am having a little trouble with the grammar, but the idea is clear: Australia has 20 per cent of world reserves; what are we to achieve by leaving it in the ground?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: If that's your view—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: This is Hawke, the Federal President of the Australian Labor Party, of which all members opposite are members. He is one of their senior and leading spokesmen. I should like them to hear what one of their Australian leaders has to say.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I want to know whether you agree.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We are trying to plumb the depths of the people who make the decisions in this State, members of the Labor Party. This is one of their leading spokesmen.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Have you had a look at what your Federal Ministers are saying about it?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Obviously, the honourable member has not been listening. Mr. Anthony, as I have said, made some statements about uranium mining, and Mr. Hawke is making one of the strongest pleas I have yet heard for the mining of uranium. Mr. Hawke continued:

If we keep ours in the ground, all that happens is that alternative suppliers fill the requirements of those countries which not into the future are going to make the decisions but who are already fundamentally committed to this as a source of power. Other suppliers fill the contracts and then what happens, only as a result of keeping ours in the ground, is that the cost of energy is increased in those rich countries, which are now using this as a source of power and to the extent that their energy is costing more by not only making an impact upon them but immediately it also makes an impact upon the underdeveloped world in terms of increasing the cost structure of the rest of the world.

Now, that is the fact which as they say no-one has yet disputed. Now if therefore you believe that all in answer to that that you do is to say, well we can have a lower moral satisfaction in saying all right well we haven't done anything about the problems in the rest of the world, but they are still there, the only thing we have gone and done is to make the world more expensive, but we are not in fact going to have contributed to those dangers if you believe that that is a reason then I'm sorry I can't follow, because if that's the case do we close down our iron ore mines, do we close down our coal mines because some of the things that are going to be done without iron ore which is converted into steel, some of the things which are going to be done without are going to involve the creation of armaments which are going to be used in wars to kill people? Do we close them down because we don't want to have anything to do with that sort of thing? I just can't understand where you draw the line in terms of an issue like this, where there is nothing that you can do about the issue involved.

That is a clear argument, in my mind: are we to stop mining iron ore because it is used to make guns which are used in warfare?

Mr. Venning: He only just got back, didn't he?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think he was wearing his cap as Federal President of the A.L.P., speaking to these university students in Melbourne. Where does the A.L.P. stand? His Excellency's Speech contains references to mining, and we have heard of the possible development of resources at Roxby Downs. We have heard that it could be another Mount Isa, creating great wealth for the State, and yet the South Australian Government is back-peddalling and inhibiting any real development in the area. The hypocrisy of the situation is that Mr. Hawke had just come from the Perth A.L.P. conference, which put an indefinite moratorium on uranium mining. I leave members opposite to sort it out; they are members of the Government in this State.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Twisting and turning again.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I shall make some references to the brash young Attorney-General before I conclude my remarks. I do not know whether members opposite read the literature from the Indian Information Service. As Mr. Hawke acknowledged in his remarks to the university students, we are in the nuclear age whether we like it or not. The material from the Indian Information Service comes in roneoed form.

Mr. Slater: We don't get it. It goes only to the Liberals.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: There is no reason why it should come to the Liberals. It has been coming for some months, and I should think the Labor Party members would be interested in the affairs of the Indian Government. The material is quite unsolicited, and arrives with a good deal of other material. I suspect that Labor members despatch it unopened to their wastepaper baskets. In relation to atomic energy, the Indian literature states:

India has been in the field of nuclear energy for over a quarter of a century. At the end of the Second World War, when most nations still looked upon atomic energy as a force for destruction, India was thinking in terms of harnessing atomic energy solely for economic development. India has never veered from this commitment.

Objectives of India's nuclear programme: To generate electrical energy, utilise radio-isotopes for bringing about improvements in industry, medicine, agriculture and other areas of importance to national health and economy are some of the objectives of India's nuclear programme. This effort has been pursued in the light of the philosophy of self-reliance which has been the cardinal principle of India's planners in all spheres of national endeavour.

This is the most recent publication, put out subsequent to the Indian elections. It continues:

Nuclear power generation: The most important peaceful application of atomic energy is the generation of power. Nuclear power made its debut in the country with the commissioning of the 420-MW Tarapur Atomic Power Station in Maharashtra in 1969.

The paper continues:

Over 350 radio-active products and labelled compounds are produced at the Bhabha Atomic Research Centre. Radio-isotopes are now beginning to be used in India in applications ranging from industrial radiography to the diagnosis and treatment of diseases. Radio-isotopes are being used for diagnosis and therapy of cancer and other diseases, for developing new mutants of food grains, for inducing sterility in some insect pests and for disinfection of food grains. The nuclear scene in the country today represents the hopes of self-reliant activity.

There is little that we can do in Australia to change the scene. We know that the Japanese have nuclear reactors, and they have them in Korea. I leave it to this Government to sort itself out in relation to its Federal President (Mr. Hawke), whose arguments I have recounted. I do not think Government members know what their leaders are saying.

In referring to the question of planning, I understand that regulations were recently sent to councils, which have been invited to comment and make submissions to the Government about them. This seems to be an especially inept time for the Government to invite comments, when all of the planning scene is to be given a facelift under the fairly recently appointed Minister, who is setting up a Housing and Urban Affairs Department and is advertising widely for high-priced officers. We understand that Mr. Hart, the present Director of Planning, is now engaged in a wide-ranging inquiry into all aspects of planning in South Australia, but his report is not due for some time. We know that the Monarto Development Commission, having nothing useful to do because Monarto

has been proved to be a fizzer, is engaged in conducting research into planning in the Adelaide Hills.

In the light of these events, it seems to me an especially inept exercise to be inviting councils to comment on recently promulgated planning regulations when the whole thing is in the melting pot. The Government, when inviting these comments, placed a deadline, I think July 29, although it may have been extended. That is the way this Government operates. It makes out that it is doing the right thing and pushes things in the direction of councils and places a deadline on them. When the Government has not heard anything by the time the deadline arrives, it can say that the councils have not said anything about the regulations and therefore must have accepted them. That is a fruitless exercise.

References to education are fairly thin in the Speech, because the Government does not have much to crow about in this regard. We know why it is bashing the Federal Government: that is a tactic of this Government, and the only peg on which it can hang its hat. We know that the Government has managed to stir up some teachers and parents. By the same token, we know that most people in this State are well aware of the economic conditions prevailing in this country and of the situation in which the present Federal Government found itself as a result of the depredations of the Whitlam Government and his succession of Treasurers for three years.

Mr. Tonkin: There were three or four, weren't there?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: There were several: they were hopping in and out of office like a jack-in-the-box. We know that the State Government, as a result of its seemingly fortuitous railway deal, has had more money at its disposal in the past 12 months. It has funded a \$20 000 000 unemployment programme, bought up almost the whole of the South-East, and even gone into the hardware business. We know that, in the history of this State, no Government has had more money at its disposal than the present Government has had. Despite its expenditures, it is balancing its Budget, while the Federal Government is facing a three billion dollar deficit, but all that this Government can do is bleat that there is not enough money coming from Canberra. I am sure that the Government will be hard pressed to sell this one.

Community centres at Thebarton and Angle Park get a guernsey in the Speech. They were promoted way back in the days of a former Minister, but they are now being trotted forward as one of the progressive new developments of this Government in education. I pay a tribute, though, by saying that I was pleased that the new Nuriootpa Primary School has been opened eventually. That is one parochial note that I inject into my speech. However, there is a huge backlog of provisions necessary for the neglected schools in the Adelaide Hills. A new school complex will be required soon in the town of Birdwood, because the primary and high schools in that town are feeder schools for surrounding districts, the school population is growing spectacularly, and new facilities will be needed. I hope that the rebuilding programme at Lobethal will eventually begin. It is an unusual situation, when \$170 000 was voted in last year's Loan Estimates for such a provision, but nothing has been done.

Mr. Tonkin: It was money the State Government actually had?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It was voted in the Estimates; \$170 000 was to be provided to assist in upgrading the school at Lobethal and to assist the long-suffering public in that area. I think the headmaster's residence has been

turned into an office, but nothing else materialised and people in the area are concerned. I understand that plans have been drawn up, and I hope that they come to fruition.

I was interested in the evidence given to the Public Works Committee in a report that was laid on the table last week about changes in education in relation to open-plan schools. We know that South Australia has been considered a pace-setter in this regard not only in this State and in Australia but also in the world. I was fortunate to undertake a study tour four years ago.

Mr. Keneally: I think you need another one.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do: for once I am on the same wave length as is the honourable member. That would be a red-letter day. Sweden has been cited to us as the education Utopia, but only one open-plan primary school and no such secondary school was operating in Stockholm. The academic tone in Swedish secondary schools was high because their intake age is 16 years, and students usually leave school at the end of primary school if they do not intend to have an academic career. There was no open-plan secondary school in that country. It seemed that open-plan schools was the answer to our education problem. Evidence recently given to the Public Works Committee, and available in the Clerk of Records Office, states:

Changing educational requirements necessitated a new approach to the design of this school. A number of departures from previous planning practice in the "open space" teaching areas were requested by the client department in response to user reaction and current educational philosophy.

The principal changes arise from the reduction in the number of classes in any one "open space" area from between six and nine to four, on the premise that teachers at present work mainly in pairs, threes or fours in co-operative teaching programmes.

The article goes on to discuss in detail how they have accommodated this. I remind the House of an observation I made in a study leave report four years ago. It was thought of as heresy at that time because I cast doubts on the way that every new school in South Australia was of the open-plan type, with about 300 children milling around in an open area with about a dozen teachers. This report can be found in the Parliamentary papers of 1973-74 under the heading, "Study leave report of the member for Kavel, E. R. Goldsworthy". I said in that report, while recounting my overseas visit:

Visit to Wingfield Primary School: I visited an open-plan primary school at Wingfield—

Wingfield is a suburb of London—

which can be described as a middle-class London suburb. The school is divided into seven distinct areas with about 80 to 90 children in each area, and a team of three teachers working with each group. The Headmaster is of the opinion that a team of more than three is undesirable.

The educational thinkers of South Australia have now come to that view.

Mr. Keneally: You should feel very proud.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not feel proud, but I feel concerned when the people who are making decisions that affect our youngsters, mine included, in this State go overboard for some new educational theory that is largely experimental and dive in to an extent not experienced anywhere overseas, and that any criticism was considered to be heresy. That was the sort of reaction I received when I came back and had the temerity to write a paper questioning some of the educational practices in South Australia that were promulgated in the name of progress. Now, four years later, we find the pendulum swinging back. I continued in that reference as follows:

The Headmaster believes more emphasis is now being given to the acquisition of basic skills, that is, in reading, writing and mathematics, after a period of relative neglect.

We know perfectly well there has been a defensive action. I was rubbished publicly by the retiring Director-General of Education for suggesting that all was not well in relation to basic skills in South Australia. One of his big regrets on the eve of his retirement was that he had not been able to sell to the public of South Australia that levels of literacy and numeracy were as good as ever or better than ever. What I have spoken about is the London experience four years ago and the South Australian experience today in 1977.

I was interested in the references to education in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. All that Government members have to hang their hats on this year is that they are proceeding with the community education projects at Thebarton and Angle Park; that song has been sung here for a good many years now.

We have heard much in the press recently about the new consumer protection legislation that the Attorney-General and Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs is going to promulgate in the name of progress during this session. Not much is mentioned in the Speech about it. I came across some interesting background into the activities of the Minister and his private secretary in a publication of *News Weekly* of June 29, 1977. It interested me because I remember that the Minister put on his hat as a private citizen and radioed the Fretilin people in Timor. He said he divorced himself from his association with his public duties and became private citizen P. Duncan. The report in the *News Weekly*, titled "Radical Attorney-General backs Fretilin", stated:

Last week's broadcast to Fretilin guerillas by the South Australian Attorney-General, Peter Duncan, is consistent with his political actions since he was a student leader at Adelaide University ten years ago. In his message to Fretilin, Mr. Duncan said: "I want you to know that you have the support of the Left in Australia, of all progressive working people in Australia, of trade unions and a great number of politically-aware people in our community. I hope your struggle is finally successful."

I will quote more of the article, because it is interesting background.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It is by Santamaria.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not care whether it is Mr. Santamaria or who it is: it is factual. If it is not factual, let the Attorney-General deny it; let him sue the paper for libel. The report continues:

Mr. Duncan has been heavily involved in Citizens for Democracy, was a signatory to the statement of defiance of Government policy on Timor in the *Adelaide Advertiser* on December 22 last year, and has since defended the extreme Left leadership of the Australian Union of Students. While Attorney-General, he said he would not oppose the visit of homosexuals to schools, "to provide balance, one way or the other". Shortly after being elected to Parliament, he spoke at a National Workers Control Conference in Newcastle (*Tribune*, April 24, 1973). In 1968, while still a student leader at Adelaide University, he and other Left-wing student leaders were interviewed by the Communist Party's theoretical journal, the *Australian Left Review*. Among those interviewed was Peter O'Brien, then a co-editor with Duncan of the student newspaper *On Dit*, and now Duncan's private secretary.

During the interview they outlined their political philosophies. Here is a section of that interview, reprinted from the *Australian Left Review*:

Interviewer: What is your attitude to traditional organisations of the radical movement—the trade unions, the Australian Labor Party, the Communist Party of Australia, etc.

Duncan: I give general support to the Labor Party as the most acceptable of two evils within the present system, so I am inclined to favour a policy of "don't rock the boat" near election times. Under the present

system the Communist Party is in a political wilderness and so I think it is following the wrong course. It is likely to find itself in the rear of any radical movements in Australia—even sideshow revolutions over particular issues.

O'Brien: As far as the existing parties are concerned, I think that the Communist Party is the most acceptable.

Organisation changes:

Interviewer: What changes, if any, would you like to see in the traditional radical organisations?

Duncan: The list of changes I would like to see in the A.L.P. would be too long to consider here. Suffice to say that it should follow Cairns rather than Whitlam. The C.P.A. should become more outspoken—its policy of appeasement, followed at present, will, I believe, be shown to be futile.

O'Brien: I will confine my remarks to the changes needed in the Communist Party. It would be more acceptable to the student Left if it got over its paranoia about being persecuted and returned to being a militant revolutionary party.

Interviewer: If a Federal election were held this year, whom would you advise student radicals to work and vote for?

Duncan: I would support and advise radical students to work and vote for A.L.P. candidates in an election.

O'Brien: In the event of an election I would advise students to vote for the Communist Party of Australia.

That is a bit of interesting background to the current activity where our Attorney-General, private citizen P. Duncan, broadcast to Fretilin.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We heard an interesting dissertation this afternoon by the member for Spence on the question of unemployment. It is easy to say that unemployment is the worst problem facing Australia, the worst problem facing capitalist countries around the world, and the problem to which we should address ourselves. Unfortunately, the cure for the problem of inflation is not simply an isolated one. I do not think we can cure unemployment if we have an inflation rate of, say, 20 per cent, the sort of inflation rate that was raging during the years of the Whitlam Administration. We should not over-simplify the unemployment situation. We hear it said that the Commonwealth Government and employers are saying, "You must take a cut in wages." If anyone thinks that the high level of wage increases during the Whitlam years was not one of the causes of Australia's unemployment and inflation, he is ignoring one of the facts of life. As a bit of light reading recently I obtained the book *Kerr's King Hit*, because, like Government members, we are all interested in encouraging Kerr in upholding the Constitution. There is a good run-down of the Whitlam years in the book. I point this out for Government members, whose basic economic policy is to pay higher wages and to reduce tax, so that the people will have more to spend. This policy has been taken up by Hawke, Dunstan, and that financial genius the member for Adelaide in the Federal House (Mr. Hurford), who says, "Let's increase wages and reduce taxes; so that the people will spend more." That is the height of idiot economic policy, to use the Premier's own phrase. If we want a recipe for raging inflation, that is it. Page 111 of the book (dealing with the time when Cameron was Minister for Labour and Industry) states:

Meanwhile, wages had run amok. Fuelled by inflation, increases of up to 40 per cent were won in some industries. The average increase obtained at this time was \$24. This was the result of a classic exercise in leap-frogging. The metal unions covered by the key award won \$15 from their employers, and had the agreement approved by the commission. At much the same time the Transport Workers Union won \$24 for their members working for the Mayne Nickless Company. The union pressed for

a flow on for their other members. After gaining \$18.50 in one judgment they struck until granted the full \$24. This caught the militant pacesetter metal unions with their pants down. They pressed for a further \$15. Knowing that refusal would precipitate an industrial holocaust, Moore awarded another \$9 to make up the \$24. This soon flowed on to all other industries. This meant that wages outstripped inflation during 1974 by around 11 per cent.

If Government members do not believe that that was one of the significant factors which led to the current situation in Australia, I think they have less ability than I give them credit for. There is no short-term quick answer to unemployment. There is no answer with the Labor Party. The \$20 000 000 spent by this State's Labor Government on the unemployment scheme is a short-term palliative to cushion South Australia's present economic difficulties, but it will do nothing to solve long-term unemployment in Australia. If Government members believe that we can hark back to the days referred to in that book and in other publications of the Whitlam Government's administration and that we can increase wages and reduce taxes at the same time to increase spending power, thus reducing unemployment, they are far less able than I give them credit for. The Eckermann economic report, which highlights this fact, states:

The most significant way in which such huge deficits and consequent inflation rates can arise is through an increased reliance on Government spending to alleviate unemployment and stagnant production levels.

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

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Henley Beach): In supporting the motion, I find it somewhat amusing that, although the Deputy Leader spoke for a full hour and had the opportunity to make any constructive criticism against the Government, he spent most of his time reading at great length from newsletters and obscure publications. I have been trying to ascertain where he obtained those publications. It is to the Government's credit that he was forced into that kind of situation.

I congratulate the mover and seconder. I think that other members have already commented on the splendid way in which they moved the adoption of the Address in Reply. I also congratulate the Lieutenant-Governor not only for the way in which he delivered his Speech to the Parliament but generally on the excellent way in which he has represented South Australia for a long time. I also add my best wishes to Sir Douglas Nicholls, who recently regrettably had to leave the State as a result of ill health.

I include in my remarks expressions of sympathy to the families of those members who have died since Parliament was last in session and of whom three of the four were in Parliament when I first became a member. Thinking of ex-members at this time made me cast my mind back to those members who entered Parliament at the same time as I did, those who were already in Parliament, and how many of them remain. It is surprising to me to observe that, although I have not suffered my forty-fifth birthday yet, only five members have longer service than I have. I also make the point that some other distinguished members came in at the same time as I did.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It's seven.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I thought it was only five; there may be a couple I cannot recognise at present. It could be six, but I shall argue about that later. The point I make is that in the next Parliament there will certainly be at least two of those with long service who, regrettably, will no longer be here, namely, the member

for Ross Smith and the member for Torrens, who will not be contesting the next election. There will probably be another, namely, the member for Mitcham, who regrettably is unlikely to get the numbers to be re-elected.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You've researched the position, have you?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I have had a good look at it. There will be other members towards the end of the session to whom I shall have to say goodbye as well. It is a good sign that I have been able to point to the changes that have taken place within the membership of the Parliament. It is a good thing that members who have been in the House for long periods are supported on both sides of the House by enthusiastic new members.

The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech is a good one. It points to several important initiatives that this Government is continuing. I refer particularly to the initiatives in the environment, consumer protection, education, community welfare, and generally in agricultural activities. Normally in a session before an election most Government initiatives commenced from the previous election have tended to slow down, but I do not see that in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. This must be a cause of great concern to the Opposition, considering the achievements we have undertaken in these fields and the fact that we are able to continue, particularly in the new areas to which I have referred. That is a credit to the Government. Because of those initiatives, it has been clear in recent months that the Opposition has been searching desperately for some kind of issue, or for several issues, with which to impress the community. However, nothing seems to be working for the Opposition. Every issue it tries to raise falls to the ground sooner or later.

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

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall list a few of the problems currently experienced by the Opposition. First, the Opposition has to be associated with the ever-increasing unpopularity of the Fraser Government. The community will naturally take every opportunity to show the Opposition that Liberal Party policies throughout Australia are completely unpopular. Secondly, the Opposition is working under difficulties that were so ably referred to by the member for Unley last week; namely, the difficulties it is having within its own Party structure. The arguments concerning preselection have caused great division within the Liberal Party. In this evening's press a report states that the Deputy State Director of the Liberal Party has resigned. I can well understand his resignation, because I hear that the current Director in charge of the Liberal Party's operations in this State is particularly unpopular with wide sections of that Party. So, in view of the Liberal Party's internal difficulties, it is little wonder that it can come up with very little to embarrass the Government.

The splits within the Liberal Party and its inability to act properly as an Opposition were summarised in an Australian Broadcasting Commission television report which dealt with the Opposition's role. The political reporter on that programme made his comments on the second day of this session. He said that the Opposition had had almost three months during the adjournment to dig up any issues that it thought might embarrass the Government, but he had sat in the House during Question Time and he blandly reported to the viewers that he had nothing of interest to report. This is the attitude that is coming across to the community, showing the Opposition as badly disorganised.

The first issue with which the Opposition has tried to embarrass the Government is the question of law and order. The Opposition thought that, following some sensational press reporting on this issue, it ought to criticise the Government concerning problems in relation to the law in this State. As a result, the Leader of the Opposition was seen in company with his family parading on the beach in some television advertisements and indicating that it was quite unsafe to walk the streets in the evening. As a result of the Opposition's campaign, there was much sound criticism of the Opposition's campaign from everyone with any knowledge of the law in this State. The following is the first paragraph of a letter by 26 Adelaide lawyers published in the *News* of July 19:

We wish to convey our support for the stand taken by Mr. Robin Millhouse, M.P., relating to the sensational reporting of crime by the *News* and to express our opposition to the current so-called law and order campaign which certain people are trying to promote.

The letter, which continues in the same vein, clearly criticises the Opposition for trying to make issues of matters of this nature. Further support was given to the claim by the lawyers, who ought to know the exact position better than the Opposition does. During the television programme *This Day Tonight* on July 4, an expert provided figures establishing that the Opposition's campaign was poorly based and simply another gimmick. The next issue on which the Opposition sought to embarrass the Government and on which it sought to hold itself out as a credible alternative was shopping hours.

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

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Clearly, the Opposition does not like hearing about its errors. The Opposition has been isolated, with absolutely no support for its policy from the retailers, the shop assistants, and the community at large. To my surprise, it has no support even from its own head office. An article headed "Clash over Liberal shop hours policy", in the *Advertiser* of July 22 states:

The State Liberal Party had had "no formal contact" with the retailing industry before forming its shopping hours policy.

That was obvious to everyone. The Liberal Party had no formal contact with anyone. The article continues:

This was said yesterday by the Party President (Mr. J. W. Olsen). He was answering questions from the Executive Director of the Retail Traders Association (Mr. M. M. G. McCutcheon) during evidence to the Royal Commission on Shopping Hours. Mr. Olsen said the Liberal Party State Council policy in favour of unrestricted trading hours was not invalidated because it had received no support from the retailing industry.

He told Mr. D. M. Quick, assisting the commission, that there was nothing special in the Parliamentary Liberal Party's qualifying State Council policy by proposing restrictions on week-end trading. Mr. Olsen said he had not discussed with anyone in the Parliamentary Liberal Party its reasons for deciding on some restriction of shopping hours.

This could well be why the Deputy State Director of the Liberal Party resigned. I believe his resignation was due to the unpopularity of the Director. Here we see that the State Liberal Party has a policy on shopping hours. I had never heard about its policy, as a Party policy, in this Chamber, but clearly its policy is for completely unrestricted trading hours. That means Saturday, Sunday and every night of the week.

Mr. Becker: Didn't you know?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I did not know it, and I am sure that the honourable member has never quoted

it in this House, because he knows full well that that would suit the community, retailers and shop assistants even less than the Party's stated policy, which it made public.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They'd have to apply the same rule to banks.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Of course. The Liberal Party is trying by stealth to tell the community that its policy is for unrestricted trading hours only up until noon on Saturday, whereas its policy is actually for completely unrestricted trading hours. Why has no member of the Opposition been honest enough to state the Party's aim? Why have members restricted their arguments in this place to what they think the community would possibly bear?

Mr. Rodda: Are you worried about it?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes, I am worried about how Opposition members will not state their intentions and are trying to mislead the Parliament and the community about what they intend to do. Later in the report is some interesting information that members opposite have not made public. The report continues:

Mr. McCutcheon told Mr. Olsen that every State Liberal Parliamentarian had been addressed by the Retail Traders Association and had been told the Party policy was "on the wrong track".

Anyone could have told them that. It continues:

Mr. McCutcheon: Was that ever communicated to you?

Mr. Olsen: No.

Or that they had addressed any one of them? No.

But there is communication? Surely.

Mr. McCutcheon later asked Mr. Olsen if he had read the *Hansard* accounts of debates on Opposition private members' Bills on shopping hours introduced last year and earlier this year.

Mr. Olsen: No.

Mr. McCutcheon: Isn't that basic homework?

Mr. Olsen said he did not think it his duty to read every word of every debate.

In relation to speeches made by members of the Opposition, and certainly those that have been made so far in this debate, I can understand why Mr. Olsen does not read them. However, when the Liberal Party is tramping around the community and trying to win votes with its shopping hours policy, the President of the Liberal Party does not know anything about that policy, is not talking to his members and does not read what they have to say. Absolutely no communication has occurred. Members opposite would try to have us believe that they are trying genuinely to cater for community needs. What rubbish!

The Opposition then tried to jump on the band wagon regarding uranium. The Party has been making all sorts of statements in both the Federal and State spheres on what should happen about uranium mining in this country. However, the Opposition was strangely silent on any specific policy at State level until the Labor Government moved a motion towards the end of last session in private members' time. We then found that the Opposition readily supported the State Labor Government's policy which is, generally speaking, in identical terms to the present Federal policy. Not one member opposite voted against the motion. However, even then the Federal Liberal Government had the Prime Minister traipsing around overseas for the purpose of disposing of our uranium. Members opposite supported the motion that was before Parliament but, during Question Time and during this debate so far and whenever they get the opportunity, they have attacked the very substance of the motion that they supported.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You think they're dishonest?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I would not say that they are dishonest; I believe that they are in trouble. Since supporting that motion, pressure has obviously been put on members of the Opposition by the Federal Liberal Party, which is saying, "We cannot tolerate State Liberals supporting the State Labor Government's philosophy on uranium mining. How will we look in Parliament when we decide that there will be open slather on our uranium deposits?" How silly would they look? Members opposite know that the community supports Labor Party policy on this matter and, if they had needed any further evidence, they need only to read the survey in last evening's *News* to see what trouble they are in by supporting the Federal Liberal policy. Members opposite cannot continue to have a bob each way any longer. The community expects the Opposition to know where it is going on such an important matter.

Mr. Allison: And the Government.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Of course, and the Government has carried a motion.

Mr. Becker: We supported it.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I know the honourable member supported it.

Mr. Becker: I will stand by it.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: That is one member opposite who is on public record saying that he will stand by it. Are there any other offers? The rest of them are strangely silent.

Mr. Rodda: What's your policy, anyway?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: That is another one. The honourable member is willing to stand by his word. I congratulate him for that, but what else could he say? He voted for the motion less than three months ago; he does not change his mind that quickly. The other major difficulty faced by members opposite in trying to hold themselves out as a credible Opposition is in relation to an industrial policy. The Opposition has been running around the country talking about this Government's compulsory unionism and misleading the community regarding our intentions on preference to unionists. The Opposition decided to get one of its most junior members to speak to people he knew about this issue. The only people he would know, I imagine, would have no idea about industrial policy, but the member for Davenport has come up with an amazing document setting out the Party's new industrial policy. It is absolutely incredible because we—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It's like making the member for Hanson the Treasurer.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes, and we know where we would finish up. The *News* has been particularly sympathetic to all the campaigns that have been promoted by the Liberals to try to give themselves some public support. An editorial appearing in the *News* last evening had to tell the truth about the Liberal Party's industrial policy. It commenced by glossing the picture a little out of support for the Leader of the Opposition. It suggested that he was showing considerable political courage in tackling the turbulent industrial scene.

Mr. Slater: He thought there would be votes in it.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: True. It was a "softener-up". The *News* knew it had to knock the Party down, but the editorial made it seem that the Liberal Party had courage. Frankly, I believe the Party does have courage because anyone who would come forward with such a document would need courage. The concluding two paragraphs of the editorial are as follows:

The reaction of the Labor Minister, Mr. Wright, was to be expected, but in saying that the Liberal approach does not take account of the realities of the industrial and trade union scene, he has a valid point.

He certainly has. It continues:

Coming on top of the weekend outburst by Queensland Premier, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, calling for troops to break severe strikes, the Liberal policy for South Australia is likely to hot up the labour scene at a time when the need is to cool it.

The editorial plastered, and properly so, the new industrial policy of the Opposition. The major factor that the editorial missed is that one of the major planks of this policy is to provide court-controlled ballots for union elections. Surely even the member for Davenport knows that that procedure already operates, because any organisation that does not provide for a court-controlled ballot is not registered. Surely to goodness the member for Davenport, when he was working on this policy, would not have made such a major mistake had he spoken to anyone with any intelligence. Where is his assistance coming from? What sort of machine do the Liberals have when they draw up their policy? I think I made clear earlier that they do not talk to each other on most occasions because they are too busy fighting each other for preselection or fighting for who is going to support whom for the next ballot. They do not talk to their head office and the President of the Party does not even read what is going on. How the devil do they operate? Some shadow Ministers do not even belong to the Party any more; they are in some limbo position. How will they get on if justice prevails as it did in the case of the member for Glenelg and, when the member for Glenelg—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: If justice prevailed as it did in the case of preselection for Glenelg, when the right member was selected—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: From the point of view of the Labor Party.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Of course, but personally I, too, would say that. If the same form of justice prevailed, we would see the present shadow Minister of Transport continuing as a shadow Minister, and good luck to him. The same applies to the member for Murray, because it seems to me there is something drastically wrong with the whole structure of the Party opposite in relation to its preselections.

I read a letter in the *Advertiser* this morning, which I assume was written by a Liberal supporter, about the member for Murray. I am saying this sincerely; I am not trying to embarrass the member in any way; and what I read this morning was dead true.

Mr. Mathwin: You wrote it, didn't you?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Are you telling me that you disagree with the sentiments in that letter? I cannot see how anyone in this Parliament with any sense of decency could disagree with that letter. To conclude my remarks about the real handicaps that the Liberal Party is suffering from, I have mentioned the problems of being associated directly with the Federal Liberal Party but the State Liberal members are causing them equally as much embarrassment.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The only Federal Liberal Minister we have in this State is an absolute disaster.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I was going to refer to him because he seems to be the only Federal Liberal member who gets any press and, when he gets any press,

it is because he makes such wild and inaccurate statements that the newspapers have to report what he says, and I think the greatest joke of all time was for a Federal Minister of this nature to come out and attack the Minister for Housing in the last week or two about some significant developments in the building industry in this State. What did Mr. McLeay say? This is disgusting—the State Labor Government is taking \$1 000 000 away from the private builders! Here is a man in the Federal Ministry who does not have the sense to know what is going on in the State he represents, and the sooner he gets back to laying carpets the better.

One of the real difficulties that the Opposition has found in trying to make any constructive criticisms about the activities of the Government, so well set out in this Speech, is the fact that, despite all the difficulties of a Federal Liberal Government and the fact that it is deliberately starving the States of finance, the Premier and Treasurer of this State can undertake all the activities that we are so proud of and at the same time balance the Budget. In fact, all parts of the State have received considerable help from the Government and the Treasury over past years, and particularly in this last year at a time of Federal Government stringency. What really amazes me is the fact that, while the Government properly holding itself out as a Government that recognises the needs of the country as well as the metropolitan community, where we have put money into all parts of the State trying to develop them as it should be done, with a decentralisation attitude—

Mr. Rodda: Mount Gambier needs a bit of a boost!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I was going to mention the member for Mount Gambier. While I am saying that the Government has been scrupulously fair in developing all sections of our community, I have never seen such an amazing statement as that attributed to the member for Mount Gambier. I was hoping, for his own sake and for the benefit of the intelligence of this Parliament, that he would have taken an opportunity to deny what he said, but he has not done so. As a matter of fact, later the Leader of the Opposition agreed that he was justified in saying that the State Government was spending too much in Mount Gambier. What a dreadful thing for a member of this Parliament to say! I am proud of what this Government has done in my own electoral district. In recent months, we have seen a considerable number of announcements on school-building improvements—\$700 000 alone in relation to the Kidman Park Primary School additions. My district has had substantial sums of money for coast protection work, local government grants for the purchase of reserves, expenditures of funds for Torrens River improvements, and substantial sums of money provided for additions to Western Community Hospital.

The Henley Square development is under way, and \$350 000 is provided for that. Also, my district has enjoyed a substantial proportion of work provided by the Minister of Labour and Industry under the unemployment relief scheme. I do not know whether I am unique in any of the advantages that my constituents have enjoyed; nor do I think I am unique in the amount of money provided to the two councils in my area—Henley and Grange, and Woodville. While in relation to the Woodville council not all the grants are for work undertaken directly in my electoral district, nevertheless those that are in relation to the provision of reserves and other activities in adjoining electoral districts are enjoyed by many living in my area. The sum of \$190 000 has been provided to

the Henley and Grange council, and \$318 000 provided to the Woodville council. This has meant that they have enjoyed about \$500 000 worth of work which, without the activities of this Government, they would not have enjoyed.

I refer to a wide range of facilities, including foreshore improvements, reserves and play areas, and development of the Grange oval and the Henley and Grange oval; considerable change-room facilities have been provided in those areas and we have had such work as the painting of senior citizens' halls and community centres and a wide range of activities that would not have been undertaken by those councils without the support of the Government in this area.

Mr. Harrison: Money well spent.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is not only money well spent in the local community for work that would not normally be done: it is the reason why work is being done and it is to offset the unemployment created by the rotten Fraser Government. In the State over 350 projects are being funded now, and 3 000 people have been given employment under this scheme so far this year. Had the Government not provided this sort of work, those 3 000 people would have been receiving unemployment relief. It is not the fact that people receive unemployment benefits that troubles the community: it is the fact that they lose their sense of identity because they cannot work.

Mr. Jennings: And their dignity, too.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Of course. What was the Federal Government's decision when the State Government asked it to fund this work dollar for dollar? It stated that it did not want the State to create employment, that it wanted that additional 3 000 people unemployed and, in fact, that it wanted more than that number to be unemployed.

Mr. Russack: That Government has never said that.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Of course it has. The Leader of the Opposition in this House has said it is a complete waste of money because we do not want to employ people in this State. He asks how we can get rid of inflation unless we get about 10 per cent of the people unemployed. Opposition members cannot deny that their Leader has said constantly that it is a waste of money. Do Opposition members think that the Federal Government should subsidise this scheme or pay the State Government the unemployment money that it is saving the Federal Government? If any Opposition member thinks that, what has he done about it? Has he written to the Prime Minister or his colleagues asking them to help the South Australian Government to find employment for these people? Of course he has not, because he is tied in with the rest of them in the process of ensuring that unemployment continues.

Mr. Becker: That's not true.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: If the honourable member is such an expert, let him identify this quote:

The Government should pay the minimum wage to the unemployed. If the number of people out of work reaches 250 000, by that time it will be almost impossible for these people to get a job.

Mr. Mathwin: That was Clyde Cameron.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It was not: that was Malcolm Fraser, when shadow Minister for Labor in September, 1974. Let the honourable member identify this quote:

I am hopeful that job opportunities will start to increase early in the life of the new Government, but it will probably take about six months for this to happen.

Mr. Max Brown: That was Tony Street.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member is correct. We have tremendous unemployment figures with the State Government showing the initiative in performing useful community work and having people employed but with no help from the Federal Government: in fact, it is being completely discouraged. I understand that the Federal Government believes that, if we have that sort of money to spend on unemployment relief, we are getting too much from the Federal Government. I was interested to hear one member say that it was not the State Liberal Party's philosophy that we should not be providing this work for unemployment relief.

Mr. Russack: Where did you get the money?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It was provided to this State over a period because of good management by the State Labor Government, especially in relation to the sale of the railway liability to the Federal Government, to enable us to do more in this State than is done in any other State. We have had 3 000 people employed under the scheme so far this year. If the Commonwealth Government doubled that figure and provided the same sort of incentive to each State Government, the unemployment figures would be dramatically reduced. The Liberals do not want them reduced. Why not? Why are they not honest and say whether they support what we have done or whether they support the Federal Liberal Government's philosophy of deliberately creating unemployment?

Mr. Mathwin: What did you do with all the money you got from the railways?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Does the honourable member support us in this matter, or does he oppose us? Opposition members know that they oppose what we have done, but they are not game to say so. A matter of great concern to the community generally and to many people in my district was the recent announcement by the Federal Minister for Health that his Government would do a great thing for the community and save it \$57 000 000 by withdrawing its support for nursing homes throughout Australia. A scheme was to be submitted in future that would ensure that private health funds would have to make up this gap. The Federal Government is saying that taxpayers will be saving \$57 000 000. However, no less taxation will be paid. The Commonwealth Government will have \$57 000 000 more in its coffers, because it will stop the substantial payments being made to people in nursing homes now.

Nothing worse could be contemplated: elderly people require attention that in many cases cannot be supplied by their children or dependants, so that they have to go into nursing homes. In addition to the pension and the present Government subsidy, nursing home costs range from \$20 to \$40 a day for average type accommodation. If a person wants to provide his parent with something more comfortable, it could cost as much as \$90 a day. Most members have heard of the difficulties of the children of these people. Once they have been in nursing homes for some time, the children have to make up the additional amount in order to ensure the comfort of their parents or relations. It is disgusting that the Federal Government should announce such a reduction: it should be providing greater assistance, not backing away from its responsibility in this respect.

Mr. Becker: Why isn't the State doing more?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is doing as much as it can, but this is a social welfare matter and clearly the responsibility of the Federal Government. What the devil

have we got that Government for unless to create unemployment if we are to follow the philosophy of the member for Hanson? That is all it is doing. In addition to the blast we will get in relation to nursing homes, other people in the community who badly need assistance, the sick, will find that hospital charges will rocket and that pharmaceutical assistance now being received will disappear. This is all from a Federal Liberal Government that two years ago was promising all sorts of new deals: that it would get rid of inflation and unemployment, it would look after the needy, it would give us proper education opportunities for all, and it would look after the problems of Aborigines. It has looked after our problems all right! I conclude by quoting from the *National Times* of July 4 an article that I think properly summarises the Federal Government's present position, as follows:

The Federal Liberal Party has for sale a list of special publications, and the Party platform is available for \$1, the Foreign Affairs Minister's policy statement is available for 15c, and the Government's economic platform is available for 2c.

I ask all members to conjecture what, on that basis, would be the value of the industrial policy recently announced by the member for Davenport.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The member for Henley Beach concluded his speech by referring to economics, and he commenced his speech by dealing with economics and referring to the "rotten Fraser Government". That points up the unfortunate thoughts that are going through the mind of the community today. No-one is willing to give the other fellow a go. I could say similar things about the previous Federal Government, which had exactly the same economic theories as the member for Henley Beach has been espousing.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Fraser's economic theories are antediluvian, out of date.

Mr. RODDA: The Minister knows that the former Prime Minister decided to cut tariffs by 25 per cent, and that upset the jobs about which we have heard. We are living beyond our means, with a large deficit. That is what is worrying about the present position. We must be responsible, take each other's washing, and get on with the job.

Mr. Langley: Did you say anything about this when Whitlam was in Government?

Mr. RODDA: I think I said when that Government came to office that we should give it a go. That Government made the bed, and everyone is lying on it. It is all very well for the former Minister, the member for Henley Beach, to talk about the "rotten Fraser Government". However, I did not rise to speak about Federal issues. I join with the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech with which His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to open the last session of the forty-second Parliament. We are in the starter's hands, judging from what the previous speaker has said about members on this side. I am ready; we are ready. I shall be back.

I join with those members who have expressed tributes to the former members of this place who passed away since the last session, namely, the Hon. Sir Glen Pearson, the Hon. T. C. Stott, Howard Huntley Shannon, and Geoffrey Thomas Clarke. Sir Glen Pearson, Mr. Shannon, and the Hon. T. C. Stott were all members of this House for part of the time that I have been here.

I, like the member for Henley Beach, was a Whip when the Hon. T. C. Stott was in his last term as Speaker, and we had some interesting times in the negotiations then.

The Hon. T. C. Stott was here for a long time and saw many changes: indeed, he made a few changes.

Sir Glen Pearson was a respected member of my Party and was a Minister for about 13 years. He has left a big gap on Eyre Peninsula, as the member for Eyre agrees. I think I have said previously that the Pearson era saw a change on Eyre Peninsula. Sir Glen and his brother, Rex, were responsible for many developments in that important part of South Australia.

Mr. Whitten: Do you think the present member for Eyre is responsible?

Mr. RODDA: I think that, in due course, he will be just as illustrious as were the two persons to whom I have referred.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Wasn't there something not about a technical high school but about that other sort of high school?

Mr. RODDA: I think people were asking for a certain sort of high school, but they were not the people about whom I am speaking. They asked for other things. Mr. Shannon was a member for about 35 years, and he was a distinguished and colourful member. He was also a grand colleague. Although I did not have the pleasure of sitting here with Geoffrey Clarke, I was in the House when he made his maiden speech, and I have never heard anyone else make a maiden speech like Mr. Clarke did. He hopped straight into the Opposition, regardless of the "amnesty" that he had, and he was soon in holt with the Hon. R. S. Richards, then Leader of the Opposition. They had a set-to and, notwithstanding that Mr. Clarke was a new member, he was extremely aggressive. I was present as a spectator in the stranger's gallery at that time, and his tenacity left a mark of respect on my mind. I express condolences to the families of deceased members.

His Excellency has forewarned Parliament of a long session. I commend him on the way in which he delivered his Speech and on the distinguished way he is discharging his duties as the viceregal representative in this State.

In paragraph 22 of the Speech, His Excellency expresses his regret at the premature vacation of the office of Governor by Sir Douglas Nicholls due to ill health. I join in the expressions of regret to Sir Douglas, because he was the first of his race to have viceregal honour bestowed on him. I think it is a shame that ill health has made him vacate his office. I wish Sir Douglas and Lady Nicholls a long and happy retirement.

The office of Governor always has been dear to the heart of South Australians. Last week, a member on this side asked the Premier when the people could expect an announcement about the appointment of a new Governor, and the Premier, rightly observing protocol, said that it was for the Government to make a recommendation and for the Palace to make an announcement.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Who is your candidate?

Mr. RODDA: I have not a candidate, for good reason. The Premier was adamant that the announcement would be made through the proper channels in due course. The Premier, holding his cards close to his chest, said "he or she" when referring to the new Governor. He may have been giving a hint, and it stirred speculation along. A few weeks ago when I was in Victoria, the subject of the vacancy for a Governor in South Australia was raised by certain people, some of whom supported the Labor Party. They knew people in the right place, and they were confident that the position had been offered to the present Leader of the Opposition in the Federal Parliament,

Mr. Whitlam. They were confident that he would be our next Governor, and they thought the present Leader was looking at the matter with a jaundiced eye.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He would be a great Governor, wouldn't he?

Mr. RODDA: He probably would be. Most of these Victorian people were strong supporters of the Labor Party, and they thought Gough Whitlam had been offered the position. I do not know whether he has.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They saw a country hick and decided to pull his leg.

Mr. RODDA: If the Minister had been present, he would have been pleased to be with us. I am sure that Bill Hayden would be pleased to hear that comment. Today one of my colleagues raised the issue of expenditure that has taken place in Parliament House.

Mr. Slater: He wasn't allowed to.

Mr. RODDA: He was not allowed to, but I understand that the information will be available on tomorrow's *Hansard* pulls. I do not quarrel with that. We should make facilities available for everybody who works in Parliament House. I have no complaint about what has been done for members; I am talking about the people who come to Parliament House and spend long hours here. We are indebted to them. The question of a non-members' refreshment room (or, if you like, a non-members' bar) has been raised. When I was Minister for Works (for that short 12 weeks) I held the view that we should carry on with the magnificent scheme (not the "depauperate" scheme, because I know the Government has difficulties about that) that catered for everybody. It was my intention, if I received support, to provide a refreshment room for the people working in this place. One does not have to do much arithmetic; there are about 20 journalists who come here and give much service; there is the *Hansard* staff and the messengers, so this place should have a refreshment bar to which these people can go to get a drink, a cup of coffee or a sandwich. It would be far better than their having to go down to the railway station or across the road to the Gateway Inn; it is something we should do for them in the confines of this building. I hope that the Government pays due heed to what I am saying. I raised this matter last year, and I raise it again. I understand that space could be made available in some part of the building. I am sure that this would be appreciated by all of those people, who do so much for us and for the institution of Parliament.

This will be the last session of this Parliament. I think I heard the honourable member for Stuart say, in a joking fashion, that he wonders whether I will come back. I suppose we all wonder that. I suppose no member likes to see his colleagues go, although we appear to try to unseat them. Most of us will be back. Speculation is rife about when we will have the election. We know that the authority for an election lies with the Government. There have been interjections asking when I think we will have an election; I am ready and the Government has a licence from August 24 to call an election. The Opposition is ready, and members will be seeing me back here after the Government gives the green light and an election is held.

Members opposite passed certain remarks about members of my Party who, through no fault of their own but because of the reduction in country representation, have become subjects of certain remarks—salt into the wound. I deprecate those utterances, which are unworthy of some of the people who have made them. I have always been opposed to the one vote one value system, which is the policy of the Labor Party. That policy is now on the

Statute Book. Country members will be facing a long haul to carry out their duties for their constituents. As an example of this (something that happened before the Privy Council decision was given), I refer to an official occasion when I was asked to be in Millicent at 9.30 a.m. for a ceremony that was important to that district, and then the officials intended to fly to Bordertown at 11.45 a.m. I and all other members of Parliament were expected to be in Bordertown. I suppose it did not matter much to the visiting members whether they went to Bordertown or whether they went to Millicent, but as the local member I was expected to be in both places, which was an impossibility.

The member for Stuart may laugh, as may the member for Gilles in his postage-stamp electorate. Metropolitan members will be so thick that they will be falling over each other, but country members will be as scarce as the stuff that rocking horses produce. If one looks at the size of the Eyre and Mallee Districts, one wonders where the Government's heart is on this matter. I recall that the late Frank Walsh, when Premier of this State, said he was concerned about community of interests and sparsity of population, but Frank Walsh's words have fallen very dull upon the ears of present members of the Government. This city-based Government of the Labor Party does not care a cuss about country members or the country people, or about the availability of a country member for any official or formal occasion. We heard the Premier telling farmers at the opening of the United Farmers and Graziers conference at Wayville last week that his Government took the view that no section of the community should be disadvantaged to the advantage of another section. The Premier should examine that statement in terms of what will come out of this electoral distribution that has been foisted on country people. We face the issue, we accept it, and we will get on.

Mr. Keneally: Why do you think a country person's vote should be worth more than a city person's vote?

Mr. RODDA: We have been through that 100 times; there are other issues, but the honourable member seems to be blinded by that, and we could talk about it all night. It must surely suggest to the honourable member for Stuart that the member for Eyre, whoever he may be, cannot serve the people in that vast part of the State using the formula the member for Stuart is falling back on.

Mr. Keneally: The Federal member for Grey will have an electorate the same size of Eyre plus 2 000 square miles; I don't hear you crying about that.

Mr. RODDA: The honourable member should look at the Federal Constitution before he starts talking about that. The State Constitution is much different from the one under which the Federal member for Grey works. I believe (and I have the Premier's words echoing in my ears from the opening of the U.F.G. meeting at Wayville) that three electorate offices will disappear as a result of this redistribution. I refer to the offices at Millicent, Kadina and Mount Barker. People in those areas have become accustomed to using those offices; indeed, another office is located at Port Pirie, and those offices have given valuable service to the community. Whatever Government is on the Treasury benches after the next election, it should look at this matter not from a Party-political viewpoint but ensure that those offices are retained to provide a service for the people who have enjoyed that service in the past.

Regarding the Millicent district, Mayor Smith took her case to court because she was concerned that the people were losing their electorate and their voice as a focal point. This matter should be looked at by the Government. Certainly, it will become extremely difficult to service 16 000 people in the country properly, notwithstanding the point made by the member for Stuart about people's votes being equal, because it goes much deeper than that.

The electorate offices at Millicent, Kadina, Port Pirie and Mount Barker, and there may be others, are to be taken away, and I merely leave that point with the Government. We had a visit last week from the Premier who was on record as saying that certain things had happened in the area, and that leads me to refer to the situation at Mount Gambier. Members opposite have suggested that Opposition members are not happy with the funding received by Mount Gambier.

Mr. Keneally: Socialism, that's what you called it.

Mr. RODDA: We are extremely happy about it.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You might be, but your colleague is not.

Mr. RODDA: My colleague is pleased, and I can assure the honourable member that the Mayor of Mount Gambier and his colleagues will take all that the Government can give them, and still come back for more. It is a wonderful thing to be treated to the largesse that is so good for one's community.

Mr. Keneally: You like a little bit of socialism?

Mr. RODDA: The honourable member can call it what he likes. I understand that the Premier was in a generous mood on his recent Mount Gambier visit. He said it was six months between visits, but that statement could stand a little investigation. Of course, we are always pleased to have him down at the blue triangle. Indeed, I believe the Premier is coming to Naracoorte in the near future, and he will be certainly accorded a royal welcome there. The bill of fare will be fitting for his visit.

We have had to chide the Government for its broken promises. The people of South Australia are extremely concerned about what has gone on across the board. I refer to compulsory unionism, as referred to by the member for Henley Beach. This matter has been raised by people on high school councils expressing their concern and passing resolutions asking that the Minister of Education withdraw the instruction dealing with compulsory unionism. Members opposite can shake their heads, but there are school principals in my district who have received letters from members of Parliament drawing their attention to these instructions concerning appointments made to ancillary staff when the appointees have not been members of the union.

Mr. Keneally: It's just not as simple as that!

Mr. RODDA: If the Government wants such action it should legislate accordingly and not bring about the situation by the backdoor method. It seems that either one joins a union or one does not get a job. The member for Henley Beach can wax eloquent and be proud about people out of work, and refer to the 3 000 people working on the unemployment relief scheme, but would those people get a job if they did not belong to a union?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I think that's reasonable.

Mr. RODDA: When a former Minister says that, then these people have no choice. Certainly, I do not knock unions and, if I were working, I would join a union, but I do not believe we have the right to say, as the member for Henley Beach or the member for Stuart believe they have, that we can tell people what they should do. I

should like to see every farmer join the Stockowners' Association or United Farmers and Graziers, but they do not do so. If the Government introduces this system by the backdoor method, it will stand condemned.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Why don't you have a compulsory Liberal Party union?

Mr. RODDA: If the Liberal Party is good enough people will join it; if a union is good enough people will join it.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What's the use of a union that will not protect its members?

Mr. RODDA: There are many that will not do that, but I am surprised that the honourable member has raised that point. I could tell him a few stories about that, but I will not deal further with that matter. I now refer to child pornography. The Premier waxed eloquent in that regard on Friday, and went on to castigate the shadow Attorney-General (Hon. J. C. Burdett) about his activities.

I refer to a recent conference at Frances in my district conducted by the Country Women's Association. Mrs. Grant, State Vice President, and Mrs. Dunn, State Chairman of Properties in that organisation, raised this matter and showed some of the pornographic, salacious publications that have been scattered around in playgrounds, caravan parks and public places. We have been told that none of this stuff is available in South Australia, yet it is coming into South Australia and it is a responsibility of the Government and the Minister to do something about it.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Did you rummage around in rubbish bins to find it?

Mr. RODDA: The former Minister can express his "couldn't-care-less" attitude, but I am raising this matter in this Chamber because these women are responsible people in a top organisation in this State. They took umbrage that such trash and filth should be available. Further, last Friday on *This Day Tonight* we saw that what they said was true, that these publications are available. The Government is not off the hook on this matter, especially by criticising the Hon. J. C. Burdett, as the Premier has done.

Mr. Keneally: The law prosecutes those who keep it and sell it or put it on show.

Mr. RODDA: The Government should be getting on with prosecutions. The member for Henley Beach made some crack about law and order, but I have been telephoned and approached about the Government's soft attitude. Indeed, most honourable members saw the letter to the Editor by the Minister, who referred to a young man (we will call him that) who was apprehended for lighting fires in a northern suburb and causing thousands of dollars of damage. In his statement the Minister said that the young man had been committed to an organisation under the care of the Minister. This is poor solace for those people who have suffered. There should be some public assurance that such people will be placed in detention and kept out of harm's way, but some of them have been released only to go on causing further trouble. Such incidents worry the community, and that is why I am sure the Government, together with the Opposition, will have cause to worry about this issue. Although living in the country I had strong expressions of disapproval made to me on the matter, and the Minister's letter did nothing to soothe people's fears.

Mr. Keneally: That's only one instance.

Mr. RODDA: I could quote others, but I highlight that instance.

Mr. Keneally: You contend that all law and order has broken down in South Australia.

Mr. RODDA: There are many hooligans in the city. If one catches a bus at night after Parliament has been sitting, one often finds cars with louts in them who roar up to bus stops and make uncouth remarks to women waiting to catch buses. It is often unsavoury to walk around the streets of the city. It is the Government's responsibility to ensure that there are sufficient people with powers of apprehension to bring such offenders to heel. No soft line should be taken in this respect, and the arrest of some of them could well set a good example.

Mr. Keneally: You are reflecting on the police?

Mr. RODDA: Perhaps the force wants some back-up assistance in its work.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You want girls coming home at all hours of night and day after working in shops.

Mr. Keneally: You've got these fellows at Naracoorte, too.

Mr. RODDA: This is a State-wide problem. I know the problem exists at Naracoorte, and I dare say it exists in Port Augusta. South Australia's fishing industry has gone from strength to strength and has reached the stage where it is looking to the Government for aid. There are about 2 000 professional and about 8 000 amateur fishermen holding various licences in South Australia. The total catch in 1967 was about \$7 000 000, whereas I believe that this year it was about \$20 000 000. Some of our fisheries are indeed lucrative. The question of licensing is close to the hearts of professional fishermen. A class A licence is granted to a person intending to carry on the business of fishing as his principal business, and a class B licence is granted to a person intending to carry on the business of fishing regularly as a seasonal or as a part-time business. Those are the two authorities that entitle a person to take and sell fish.

Many regulations apply to amateur fishermen, and fears have been expressed to me about what might happen in the regulations. Such matters should be spelled out and I hope that, for the sake of the industry, in liaison with the South Australian Fishing Industries Council, this area of concern will be spelled out, but not along the lines of the new criteria the Minister announced a few weeks ago when allocating two more prawn authorities for use in the industry. These figures point up the value of the industry and highlight the needs of the industry, of the people engaged in it, and of those who wish to enter it. The class B licence holder may take fish seasonally or as a part-time operation; that matter has caused consternation in some parts of the State.

Another matter of immense interest is the declaration of the 320-kilometre coastline limit. Realising that the State Minister does not make the declaration, I hope that the Australian Government will see its way clear to join with its colleagues in having a declaration of the 320-kilometre limit and that the industry can expand by making use of those extra fisheries that will mean so much to the economy of Australia. To this end, the surveys that have been conducted along the South Australian and Victorian coasts have been most encouraging. This is an aspect of the industry to which the fishermen are looking forward, although it will mean larger vessels to make the longer trips to sea.

I regret that the Minister of Education is absent from the Chamber. The Lucindale Area School has been upgraded somewhat. The school is located in an area of enormous agricultural development, and this is the only area in my district that has not had a new school since I have

been a member. Perhaps there is every reason why it should not have a new school. The school consists of a timber-frame set of buildings and I know that the council there is interested in this matter. We have had several delegations to various Ministers of Education, and I hope that the provision of a new school in this area will be given the highest priority.

The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech also refers to the preservation of this State's water resources. Although the South-East has an enormous underground water supply, as we have seen in other countries (and even in parts of South Australia) such supplies are not inexhaustible; furthermore, the supplies can be contaminated. I commend the Government for what it has done with regard to the preservation of our water resources, especially the requirement that any drilling be done by competent drillers, together with a cost and assessment being made of the effects on the area in question. A close watch is kept on the water resources at Padthaway. Some people were disappointed; they had expected to be able to enter into large-scale irrigation but, because of the demands on the basin, their plans have not been agreed to. I would like to see the water preservation authorities consider the effect of drainage on the ecology and underground basins of the South-East. There seems to be much water running into the sea; this water could perhaps be weired off in connection with the natural aquifer storage.

Some councils in my district have been concerned about the fact that responsibility for class 4 roads is being referred back to them. Whilst the Minister has not said how this will be financed, I point out that the maintenance of these sealed roads cannot be undertaken from the council's own resources. This matter concerns councils not only in my own district but also, I am sure, in other districts.

The Padthaway people have raised several times with the Highways Department the question of speed zones in their township. I point out that there is Padthaway East and Padthaway proper. Requests for speed zones have been refused by the Highways Department. Although there are "school" signs and "children crossing" signs at appropriate places, cars often speed along the road while children are nearby. I have made strong representations about this matter, but it has been thought that speed zones are not required. I hope the department's attitude does not result in any deaths or serious injuries, and I hope that a tragedy is not necessary before speed zones are established. The Minister and the Highways Commissioner have said that the situation will be watched.

The Naracoorte District Council has made overtures to the Government for a ring route, which would cost a large sum. The Naracoorte saleyards are at present selling more stock than is the Adelaide abattoir. The cattle are being brought in on road transports, which are cluttering up the town. The council has a programme of road development which will result in the road transports going around the town. I hope the Minister will favourably consider the council's request in this connection. There has been some criticism of the fact that major stock-selling centres are located at Mount Gambier, Millicent, and Naracoorte.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You got away with only one between Millicent and Mount Gambier. It is facing up to the facts of life.

Mr. RODDA: They are there now, and we must see to it that they work.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It would have been the most economical and sensible thing. They are fine facilities there.

Mr. RODDA: I refer now to the aphid which attacks lucerne plants. If a disease broke out and if there was only one saleyard, there would be problems.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The saleyards are a credit to the people who constructed them.

Mr. RODDA: Yes, and we are grateful to the Government for the assistance it gave at Naracoorte, Mount Gambier and Millicent. I hope the saleyards will be the success that people expected them to be. The South-East is flourishing and enjoying a reasonable season at present. If people have any spare money they ought to invest it in the South-East, because they would get a good return. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. WELLS (Florey): In company with the previous speakers, I would like to congratulate the Lieutenant-Governor on the manner in which he carried out his duties in opening this session of Parliament. I offer Sir Douglas Nicholls my congratulations, and I wish him and his family a happy retirement. He was a very clever and humane person who could be trusted to listen to someone without ire or bias. He would always give the benefit of the doubt to anyone who discussed a matter with him.

I join with other members in expressing regret at the passing of Sir Glen Pearson, Mr. Tom Stott, Mr. Howard Shannon, and Mr. Geoffrey Clarke. I extend my sympathy to the families of those late members. The services they rendered to this State were valuable and creditable, irrespective of the political views of those members.

Much has been said about the content of the Speech of His Excellency. I was particularly pleased to learn that the first stage of the rebuilding of the Northfield wards will be completed in August. This project is extremely important, particularly for me, as this hospital is in my district. Eight new wards are being built, each ward to accommodate 25 patients. The people responsible for the welfare of the patients are very pleased with what the Labor Government has done for them by providing these wards, which were long overdue. This matter had been neglected for many years but, thanks to the Labor Government, the wards will be operating very soon.

We have heard much about trade unions. In fact, I will talk about trade union activities myself this evening. The Labor Party in South Australia is clearly leading the way in providing legislation designed, after long and painstaking study, to produce great benefit not only for Government supporters but also for the welfare of all residents of this State. However, the knockers have come into action. Many of them, particularly members opposite, who are critical of the actions of the Government, should not be critical but should be proud that the job has been done. It is unfortunate that, although the Labor Government in this State has produced so many successful ventures and has done so much for the State and the people, criticism is still levelled at it.

That criticism even extends from the Fraser Government which, having no policy and knowing that its supporters and members in this State are so bereft of ideas and policy that they must do something to justify their existence, it criticises the activities of the Government that has done and will continue to do so much for this State. We have continual criticism even before a policy is put into force and during its implementation. This shows an abject weakness in the Opposition and indicates clearly that it is

absolutely unable to combat the ability of the Party in power in this State, and must call on its cohorts elsewhere, particularly in the Federal Parliament to assist it.

We see similar criticism from Mr. Fraser and his Party in Canberra. There must be a reason for this. We know that here in South Australia the reason is that the Opposition is bereft of policy and ideas and has no alternative but to criticise what the Labor Government is doing for the welfare of the people of this State. It goes beyond that when one considers the Federal situation. One finds Mr. Fraser and his henchmen criticising South Australia, the Premier and the officers of this State. There must be a reason for that, too. They believe that they must rush to support the Party that supports them in this House knowing that the Opposition here needs support to bolster it because it is at such a low ebb with the people of this State. The Federal Government has therefore decided to do a little knocking to help the Opposition in this State. It goes beyond that, because Mr. Fraser himself is in such dire trouble because of his shocking management of this country's affairs that he must find an out for himself. What better out could he find, in his opinion, than to criticise the best Government in Australia—the South Australian Government?

It is a two-edged sword, and Mr. Fraser hopes that he can talk to the people, who will be so gullible that they will accept his decision and statements criticising this Government. If members opposite were willing to admit the truth they would say that Fraser fears the influence of Dunstan and his Government. That is because even Liberal supporters in States other than South Australia are looking towards South Australia and are demanding to know why, if Dunstan and his officers can do so much for the people of South Australia, it cannot be done in their States. They are saying that irrespective of their political views, because it is obvious that when legislation is enacted in South Australia by the Dunstan Government it is for the welfare and benefit of everyone in South Australia irrespective of his political persuasion. Everyone in South Australia benefits from legislation put forward by the Dunstan Government. People in other States are demanding to know from their politicians why they cannot enjoy such benefits provided for the people of South Australia by the Dunstan Government. The Liberal Party must do something to counteract this terrific upsurge of opinion throughout Australia against it, and it feels it must move to the focal point of the criticism—the State where the criticism is engendered because of the superb record of the Dunstan Government. The Liberal Party then vents its vitriolic spleen against the Dunstan Government because it recognises that that Government is the best Government that has operated in Australia for many decades.

I will speak briefly about the controversy of uranium mining. Of course, in concert with the other members of my Party, I fully support the decision that has been made in respect of the mining of uranium, and in the refining of it if we go as far as some of the Liberal Party Opposition members, including the Leader, desire. A survey which was published in a paper here over the weekend indicated, I believe, that 70 per cent of the people interviewed demanded that uranium be left in the ground until such time as it was absolutely certain that it was safe to be moved and utilised. I think the figure was above 70 per cent. I am certain that is a figure that would be duplicated Australia-wide. If Mr. Fraser and his cohorts attempt to mine and refine uranium, they do so at their

own peril because the people of Australia will not tolerate such risks being imposed upon them, their children and their children's children for many generations to come.

For the life of me, I cannot understand why people can support at this stage the mining and refining of uranium when they know the horrible results that follow such activities; nor can I understand why some people, including members in this House on the Opposition benches, support a situation that would result in the mining and refining of uranium, because it is obvious to me, anyway, that the only people outside this House that I know of or have read of who support the mining of uranium are those who have an interest in the mining and selling of uranium, people who stand to make great fortunes out of a substance that belongs to the people of Australia who, to my mind, have clearly said at this point of time anyway, "Leave it in the ground."

But, of course, vested interest takes over and unfortunately that is the reason, I believe, why members opposite are saying that they now favour, despite what they have said previously, the mining and selling of uranium, and they print so many foolish stories to support their contentions, even going so far, not in this House but in other Parliaments in this country, as to say that, if we do not mine and sell uranium to the people who want it, they will come and take it. What stupid and absolute rubbish to utter to sensible people, that other people will come and take our uranium by force. It is absolute tripe.

But, of course, again it is something that the Liberal Party, particularly in the Federal field, has presented to the people of Australia for so many years, the past master being Sir Robert Menzies—that is, the tactic of fear: the red horde will come down, the black horde will come down; God knows who else will come down and take our uranium, wheat, or oil (whatever it was at the time)!

Mr. Keneally: Particularly at election time.

Mr. WELLS: Election time is the time for scare tactics but thank goodness the people of Australia are a little more educated than they were 20 or 30 years ago and do not so easily follow these accusations and threats, because that is all they are—threats; they largely ignore them. Unfortunately, some people are so misguided as to accept the fact that perhaps these terrible things will happen to Australia; but they, too, are changing their minds rapidly.

It is well known and demonstrated by members of the Opposition that they would dearly like to see come true their pipe dream that the trade union movement will be decimated or reduced to a tame cat category. I know that you, Mr. Speaker, know something of this, as I do. It distresses me to hear trade unions attacked, abused, and vilified for no reason whatsoever other than that members of the Opposition may feel there is some kudos to be gained in an attack upon trade unions or they feel that they in this State should follow the example again of the Prime Minister, who clearly indicates his hatred of the worker. I recall that he stated he was fortunate enough to have been born a very wealthy man, and he indicates clearly that the worker and the worker's family should exist for the service of the rich. To my mind, there is no doubt about that.

Much has been said about trade union leadership, and it has happened recently in this House. People have abused the leaders of certain trade unions in this State and they know nothing of what they are talking about; they do not know the true situation. I was amazed and amused when I read that the Leader of the Opposition, in his new Liberal Party policy or his workers policy or whatever he calls it, is to have secret ballots at the election of trade

union officers. I was a President of the Trades and Labor Council and secretary of a trade union for many years; I held a senior position federally in the trade union movement, and I can honestly say that I do not know of one union that does not have a secret ballot to produce its leadership.

Dr. Eastick: I can tell you about one that was so secret that it did not even invite its President to its annual general meeting.

Mr. WELLS: Which one was that?

Dr. Eastick: The plastic and rubber workers.

Mr. WELLS: I am talking about unions; there is no such union. It cannot be denied that many unions in South Australia and throughout Australia have known communists as leaders in their organisation.

Mr. Becker: What difference does that make?

Mr. WELLS: It makes no difference, because a secret ballot determines the leadership of a trade union and if a member of the Communist Party, any other Party, or the Lutheran Church is elected by secret ballot to a high position in a trade union, who are we, the Opposition, or anyone, to deny the membership of that union the right to elect its own leaders? Probably the most powerful organisation (although its members have been depleted), and a union that is not heard much of today because its management and leadership have produced ideal conditions for its members, is the Waterside Workers Federation. In some States the leaders of the branches of that federation are members of the Communist Party, and not only of one Communist Party but of whichever Communist Party you like to name. They are elected democratically by secret ballot to the leadership of that branch. Who outside of that branch has any right to query the right of that man to be elected as an officer of that branch of the federation? No-one at all.

So that in future, or even later this evening, there will be no murmur as to how ballots that elect these people to top leadership, especially in the W.W.F., occur, I should like to place on record the procedure. Nominations are called for branch and Federal offices, and application forms must be filled in. These forms are available for one month and the positions are open for one month. At the end of the month on an Australia-wide basis elections take place all on the same day. A returning officer is elected, by ballot if necessary, and he has assistants, and any member can nominate for any position. When the ballot takes place, a member must produce evidence, and be vouched for, regarding his financial membership (that is superfluous in the federation because a person cannot be an unfinancial member of that union: if he does not pay he does not work). The ballot takes place, and the person receives his ballot form. He goes to a booth, which is obtained from the Commonwealth Government and which is the same booth that is used in State and Federal elections. The person votes as he does in a State or Commonwealth Government election. The paper is folded and put into a sealed box, and at 5 o'clock on that day the door is shut and the ballot is closed. The boxes have been sealed before any voting papers are placed in them, but the returning officer, at the close, then seals the boxes.

Each member is entitled to have a member act on his behalf to witness the ballot. The ballot is then taken by the returning officer and scrutineers to the Commonwealth Bank, at which prior arrangements have been made for the manager to wait until about 5.15 p.m., so that the ballot-boxes can be deposited in the vaults of the Commonwealth Bank at Port Adelaide. Every candidate is entitled to an observer to ensure that ballot-boxes are conveyed to the

bank. The manager of the bank, on receiving the boxes, seals them and everyone goes away after he locks the vault. Next morning the returning officer and his assistants, plus the scrutineers, go to the bank and recover the ballot-boxes. The seals are inspected, and the boxes are taken to the federation office where the seals are broken in the presence of the scrutineers, and the ballot is then counted.

The ballot may take three or four days to finalise, but each evening at 5 o'clock the ballot-boxes are sealed, taken to the bank, and then reclaimed the next morning when the bank opens for business. So much for the gobbledegook about crook ballots about which we hear so much. Most organisations that I know of are very jealous of the integrity of their ballots. If a ballot is conducted in this way and all of the offices being contested are won by Chinese, Japanese, Communists, Liberal members—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Oh no!

Mr. WELLS: We have a few of them, but it does not matter. It has been a democratic election, and that is it. Who in the hell is Fraser (or Opposition members here) to interfere with the conduct of such ballots, and say that the decisions arrived at by the W.W.F. and other organisations throughout Australia in which officers are democratically elected are crook? They say they will interfere and influence the members of these unions. That is just not on, and I should hate to be the person who had to ensure that this interference would take place. This is all a smoke screen, and we have all heard of the fantasy that union ballots are crook, and that people grab 100 forms, vote for Joe Blow, and then throw the votes into the box.

That would be impossible, and it angers me when I hear unwarranted criticism of trade union officers and the trade union movement from people who are not aware of what happens and do not know how the conduct of such ballots is so jealously guarded by all in the trade union movement. It does not matter what Opposition members do, what they threaten, or what they contemplate will happen with trade unions. I say that because the trade unions in South Australia and in Australia generally will dictate how their business is conducted and how their elections are held, and to hell with anyone who wants to interfere, because that person will not get to first base.

Of course, it is becoming generally known that this is merely a subterfuge by the Government in Canberra and the Opposition in this House. They like people to believe that trade unionists and, in particular, trade union leaders are vile people who are there to bring about the downfall of this State and lawful government. That is absolute tripe. It grieves me to know that some people swallow such rubbish, and it grieves me more when I hear people who should and do know better spreading these stupid stories and rumours because they think they may gain political capital if they cast aspersions on the honesty of trade unions.

I have said that there are many members of the Communist Party and all sorts of Parties who are trade union leaders. I think I have established that they have been put there by a democratic vote, but it does not mean that, once elected, they can do as they like. Let us contemplate that a Party other than the Labor Party, the Opposition Party, or the Communist Party has elected to a top office in a union a member of a communist organisation, whichever branch of the communist ideology he follows. On every occasion that I know of, the people whom I have known to be communists and who have been placed in the position of trade union leader have done a good job.

However, they are not free. Members of unions are not fools and, if they find that a trade union leader is trying to foist on them a political ideology which they do not favour and which is abhorrent to them, that leader will not last 10 minutes. However, because these people are elected to such positions, many people say, "He is a com. They must all be coms." I do not think anyone in his right mind would call me a communist, but I have had the experience of talking to someone I know and, before I have walked past, I have heard the comment, "That is Wells, Secretary of the Waterside Workers Federation. He must be a com."

How stupid can one get! No-one has combated communism in trade unions more than I have done, yet people say, "He has to be a com: he is the wharfies' leader." Unfortunately, these false impressions are given by many of our own supporters (at least, those who should be our supporters), some of whom are gullible enough to listen to people who want to deprecate the activities of the Australian Labor Party, and so they will use any measure that may bring success. They think that, if they can convince one person that something is wrong with the trade union movement, that person may influence another, and so it goes on.

This action is fostered time and time again by members opposite. I will not say it is fostered by all of them, but many of them do it, because that is obvious from the questions asked of the Minister of Labour and Industry, and what a hell of a good Minister he has turned out to be! No-one steps around Jack Wright. He is fearless, and he is an honest and a conscientious man who has the welfare of workers at heart. What people say about him does not matter. We know his ability, and the highest credit that can be given to our Ministers is the fact that criticism is levelled at them by the Opposition to such a degree as it is, and outside the House it is levelled on television, radio, and in the press. The attitude is, "Let us give the Labor Party Ministers a kick in the guts. If we cannot beat them inside the House, we will try to beat them outside."

Look at the Premier, the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Education, the Attorney-General—take them all. Where in the hell would anyone find a more conscientious and more capable set of Ministers than these men? Each one of them is a top man in his job, and I pity the Opposition members who have to try to combat their remarks or argue with them. The Ministers are the top of the tree, and no member of the Opposition at present can hold a candle to them. There may be one later who can.

Despite the fact that we have these capable top-class Ministers on the front bench, look behind them. On the back benches we find a group that will do as good a job or nearly as good a job. They would do a better job than Opposition members could do. We have a double barrel, and that gives us much confidence. The strength of our Party is on the front bench. Every man elected to a position—

Mr. Becker: You have a female member. Don't be personal.

Mr. WELLS: We all admire Molly, and she will make her presence felt soon. Every member on the back benches admires the front bench. Those on the front bench in turn return their friendship. We are one crowd, one bloody mob of Labor Party supporters. That is our strength. Members opposite cannot combat it, and they will not be able to combat it for a long time. We are proud of our Party.

Mr. BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): It is always refreshing to speak in this place after the member for Florey, and it was indeed gratifying to find that he was on at least 5½ cylinders this evening and getting back towards the six cylinders with which we know he can fire. During the debate, that man enticed me to interject when he made a comment about secret ballots and activities associated with union affairs. The honourable member is fully aware, as are all members opposite, that I do not idly union-bash. On that occasion, unfortunately, I identified a union that does not exist when I said, "The plastics and rubber workers' union". It was actually the Federated Rubber and Allied Workers Union to which I was referring. Members, if they like, can refer to page 1043 of *Hansard* of September 15, 1976, or pages 1326 and 1327 of *Hansard* of October 6, 1976, where they will find much information about the difficulties that that union has had in this State. They will also find information about the holding of a meeting for the election of officers behind the back of the existing President, who was voted out of office without even knowing from his union Secretary or other office bearers that they were holding an annual general meeting. Much has been said on behalf of that person (Mr. G. H. Edwards), who is still out of work many months later because of the failure of an organisation of which he was a member to stand up and be counted for him. On another occasion, when members opposite give me the opportunity, I will have quite a lot to reveal to them about the difficulties of this gentleman and about the lack of support from the discrimination board, which is currently looking into his problem.

I wish to follow through statements I made here last week in relation to education, which can be found on pages 57, 58, 75 and 76 of *Hansard* of July 20. On that occasion, the Minister of Education asked for supportive evidence relative to comments I had made about the attitude of a number of teachers about educational spending. I assure the Minister that that information will be forthcoming as soon as the teachers involved have given me a clearance. I have a clearance this evening in respect of the comments I made about the failure of the Education Department to pay its staff in proper time. Mrs. Diane Secomb, who lives at Sheoak Log and teaches in the Elizabeth area, yesterday received the payment that was due to her, which has accrued from the beginning of the second term. That was a period from May onwards. Although she received the cheque, there was an almost fifty per cent deduction for taxation. This is the point that I was making to the Minister last week and to members opposite, that it is not in the best interests of any employee of the Government or of any other organisation that pay is withheld, because when it is paid in a lump sum it is taxed heavily. If Mrs. Secomb and the other people I will identify in due course had received their money at the correct time they would have had a smaller taxation deduction. More particularly, they would have had the amount applicable to the

period from early May to June 30 as income for the 1976-77 financial year. The lady to whom I have referred had been employed on a part-time basis for much of the time. Now, as a full-time employee of the Education Department, she will be taxed at a much higher rate for that sum of money received in the one lump sum payment, as it will arrive in the same year in which she will be receiving full payment for full-time employment.

I placed a Question on Notice regarding this matter, but that question was not answered today, although it was on the Notice Paper last Wednesday and Thursday. True, the question did not deal specifically with Mrs. Secomb, but it asked a question in relation to the amount of money outstanding to members of the Education Department at June 30, 1977. In this day of computerisation, and with a proper understanding of its commitments, the Government should have been able to bring forward that answer today, and I shall be having more to say about that matter if the reply to that question is not here by next Tuesday.

During the same debate I referred to a letter I received from a school, and I notice in the most recent *South Australian Teachers Journal* (July 20, 1977) at page 2 a letter to the editor in which the signatories ask for "less money for the frills". They go on to say:

The staff of the Forbes Primary School vigorously oppose the decision of the Federal Government to freeze expenditure on education, calls for the restoration of full costs supplementation for funds allocated through the Schools Commission and calls for a return to needs base funding.

True, this is a journal in which they can express their point of view. The letter continues:

At the same time, the staff considers that there are ways in which moneys allocated to education could be spent more profitably.

Here is yet another group of teachers coming forward and saying that they can see within the system of which they are part an expenditure of funds which is not in the best interests of education or of themselves as taxpayers or other taxpayers of the Commonwealth. The letter continues:

There is a need for a reassessment of the activities taking place in schools so that better use of the funds available is made.

That specifically is the point which I made last week and which other members and other people in the community have made. The letter continues:

Classroom teachers must become more involved in the making of decisions regarding expenditure.

If members examine the comment I made they will see that I said that classroom teachers should be requisitioning equipment that they want, and not receiving unsolicited materials which gather dust in the cupboard. The letter continues:

This staff believes that a larger proportion of funds must be allocated to materials which assist the teaching of basic subjects, rather than to "the frills". There is no justification for the expenditure of funds on seldom-used "hardware".

I refer to the microscopes that are languishing in a cupboard in one of the schools in my district. The letter continues:

The building of schools in newly developed areas should be of a higher priority than the equipping of established schools with luxuries. The proportion of money granted to innovative projects might well be reviewed. At a time when the education system is under increasing pressure to prepare students adequately for adult life, it is appropriate to reassess the objectives and methods of education, but it most certainly is not the time to freeze expenditure.

The letter comes back to the initial point, but the pertinent and important point has been made that, in the determination of the Budget for South Australia, every member of the Cabinet has a responsibility—

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

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): I advert to the question I asked last Thursday about the Receptionist Centre which, according to information I have subsequently received, makes the allegations used in explaining my question pale into insignificance. A man living in the Frome District (and I have written to the member for Frome explaining all this to him—the honourable member knows all about the matter and he knows the gentleman concerned) intended to come down on Tuesday to see me and the member for Frome. However, he came down on Monday and saw me, first, with his wife in my electorate office.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Whom did he bring the second time?

Mr. JENNINGS: He brought his wife and the daughter concerned, to Parliament House after lunch. He said that he thought his daughter had been taken down badly, and he would like to see me on Tuesday afternoon. His daughter had paid \$345. The latest advertisement of yesterday changes the phone number from 51-2699 to 51-2694; otherwise, it is similar, but worse. I did not know what Sweda meant, but apparently it is some kind of accounting machine used in hotels and motels. The advertisement states:

Receptionist career—

with a big exclamation after it. The advertisement continues:

Exciting careers as hotel-motel, travel, fashion, medical, legal or business receptionist. Course includes: Typing to 40 w.p.m. or more (full business typing course), Sweda needed for best jobs, switchboards, grooming, travel receptionist duties and the confidence to do a good job, earn top money. Teaches you quickly, thoroughly, with our exclusive TV programmed learning. Takes hours instead of months. Placement assistance to all students.

Then in block caps it states, "Also touch type in eight hours." A reputable and wellknown college rang my office and said that it was delighted at my disclosures in the House, because it was suffering from the bad name of the Receptionist Centre. The grooming and deportment course, I understand from people who have been to see me, takes two hours. They would be as well groomed as I, if they attended for only two hours.

Mr. Venning: Almost.

Mr. JENNINGS: Well, they could not be as bad as the honourable member. I have received a phone complaint from one man who has three daughters who are about as close in age as three daughters who are not triplets could be. He paid \$900 for the three girls. I asked him to put his complaint in writing, but I had not received it by the time I attended a Public Works Committee meeting this morning. A lady rang me, saying that she had seen the member for Mitcham and had made the same complaint.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: No-one else sees much of him.

Mr. JENNINGS: No. He rang me and said that he would support me but, of course, it depends on whether or not he is here. Some girls, of their own volition, went to the *Advertiser* and had their photographs taken for last Saturday's edition, I believe. The girls agreed with my allegations that this was a complete take-down. I thoroughly support the girls' initiative and also the

Advertiser's action in this matter. I do not think I have agreed with the *Advertiser* too much in all the long years I have been here. That newspaper gets an advertisement for this enterprise almost every week, and the advertisements are now appearing almost every day, yet the *Advertiser* has given full coverage to all aspects of the matter.

A man from Northfield telephoned me to say that he did not agree with what I had said, because his daughter, who did not get on wonderfully well at school, left school and went to a centre of this nature and later got a very good job, which she has kept to the present time. However, the gentleman did not know whether the centre was the one to which I had referred; he thinks it was in Gawler Place, not King William Street. This crooked advertising has to be stopped by some means or other. During the limited time I will be here I will be doing my best, in my humble way, to encourage the Attorney-General to have this crooked advertising stopped, so that people do not have their hard-earned money taken from them by rotten crooks like these. During the dinner adjournment I telephoned my sister in Sydney, and she said, "This goes on in Sydney, too."

Mr. Slater: They advertise throughout Australia.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. My sister said, "I always tell people not to take any notice of the advertisements. What else can I do?" We must remain steadfastly determined to crush every kind of crooked deal we see.

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

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I shall state some of the reactions of people in my district to the proposed vegetation clearance report. Most members will be aware that six weeks ago the vegetation clearance report was published. It originated from an inter-departmental committee set up, I believe, by the then Minister for the Environment (now the member for Henley Beach). That report was completed in September last year and printed and published about six weeks ago. The report has been received with mixed reception. Some people have accepted it as a reasonable and practical step, whereas others especially in newly developed areas, have viewed it with the fear that it may prevent clearing of future land. I shall quote two letters to the Editor on June 13, 1977. One letter favours the report and the other is against it. The first is as follows:

The vegetation clearance report (*Advertiser*, June 3, 1977) in its suggestions for short-term controls over clearance is a first step in balancing the conservation of the natural environment against the need for land for other uses. Unfortunately, I fear it is a tentative step only and that the race may well be lost before the second step is taken.

The controls, in fact, are not controls at all. They are nothing more than a monitoring of vegetation clearance while pointing out to the landowner the possible monetary advantages of foregoing clearance. It is sad that it took "relatively little discussion" for the committee to decide against a ban on vegetation clearance. I agree that a total ban would be too repressive but surely some intermediate proposal could have been suggested giving the Government an option to preclude clearance after careful deliberation. There would then truly exist some form of short-term control until a land use authority could be established.

It is worth while noting that that letter comes from a person in a reasonably well settled area in Coromandel Valley. The second letter is from a constituent of mine on Eyre Peninsula, and is as follows:

Eyre Peninsula is one area where there is still scope for increased clearing for cereal and pasture development. One clause in the report highlights the object of the whole report: "However, it is well aware that if liaison is not

established with rural interests first, this measure could provoke a hostile reaction." The so-called conservation and environment groups, almost unknown before 1972, are noted for their lack of any monetary contribution to the gross national product for Australia. The pioneers of South Australia, on the other hand, are justly proud of their contribution, running into millions of dollars, through their enterprise in clearing and developing land.

Those two letters really indicate the extremes in which the community has received this report. The report has been discussed by members of the Franklin Harbor District Council. I was rather surprised to receive a letter from the council, which evidently has discussed the matter even though its members know that the Chairman of the committee in question (Mr. Colin Harris) will visit the district council on August 9. However, I have received the letter, which I believe summarises the general acceptance of the report by the community. The letter is as follows:

I wish to advise that members of the District Council of Franklin Harbor discussed the recommendations of the committee on vegetation clearance at considerable length at a recent council meeting. Council is opposed to the formation of a special Government authority to establish and administer the proposed controls on management of uncleared areas of natural vegetation on the following grounds:

- (1) The centralisation of authority will lose valuable local knowledge of circumstances both in farm management and rationalisation.
- (2) Advice and assistance on land clearance control is already available from the Agriculture and Fisheries Department. Council would favour closer and better supervision through this agency.
- (3) The rate of land clearance on Eyre Peninsula has not approached the areas of arable land in other parts of the State.
- (4) At present 15 per cent of the State's national park areas are situated on Eyre Peninsula.
- (5) Roadside protection committee is already operative. Control of roadside vegetation is already vested in local government.
- (6) Costs associated with further Government departments, and the placement of further restraints on primary producers by another bureaucracy.

I quote that letter even though I was somewhat surprised to receive it at this stage but I believe it outlines the general acceptance at this stage of the report, and it was because of my awareness of the reaction of local people to that report that I contacted the department and asked whether the committee would see fit to visit the peninsula and outline the situation.

I was pleased to receive a letter from the Minister for the Environment consenting to such a request; the visit will take place in the week August 8 to 12, and the Chairman of the committee will be addressing six public meetings and visiting every district council. I am concerned in one respect, but I think the fear of the councils and of the primary producers can be outlined in the manner in which directions have been given to local government for any roadworks to be undertaken, and it is as a follow on from this reaction that we are getting this almost hostile reaction

to the report. I quote now from a letter to the District Council of Cleve, and I understand a copy has been sent to all district councils. It relates to road grant applications and states:

Councils are reminded that roadworks involving departmental funds shall not be commenced until all appropriate environmental clearances and approvals have been obtained. Councils will be held fully responsible in such matters. However, departmental district engineers will advise and assist on request.

To confirm verbal discussions I have had with officers of your council, action re environmental and other clearances will be required as follows.

Council will receive notification of grants allocations in the normal manner; however, work cannot commence until council has received:

- (1) an environmental clearance from the Highways Department;
- (2) approval of Chief Inspector of Mines in accordance with clause 438 of the regulations under the Mines and Works Inspection Act, 1920-1970, if the grant includes pit operations;
- (3) approval of the State Planning Authority through the Extractive Industries Committee if the grant includes pit operation and if this approval is appropriate; only areas under interim development control require this approval.

The most suitable procedure to arrange the above, following the allocation of grants, appears to be:

- (1) Council overseer/works manager to contact Highways Department/works Engineer re site inspection in regard to obtaining an environmental clearance;
- (2) Joint inspection to be carried out by the council overseer/works manager and Highways Department engineer;
- (3) Highways Department advises council of environmental clearance or otherwise in writing;
- (4) Council to request approval of Chief Inspector of Mines (see attached example); copy to be submitted to Highways Department;
- (5) Council to request approval of the Extractive Industries Committee of the State Planning Authority (if necessary) (see attached example); copy to be submitted to Highways Department;
- (6) Chief Inspector of Mines advises approval or otherwise; copy to be submitted to Highways Department;
- (7) State Planning Authority advises approval or otherwise. Copy to be submitted to Highways Department.
- (8) Work can proceed.

I think it is factors such as this (and clerks or overseers of all district councils can give many examples of how, in their opinion, the councils have been obstructed unreasonably in the carrying out of their duties) in the past that have meant that the vegetation clearance report has met with reasonably hostile reaction without being given a fair opportunity to be discussed in the way in which I believe it was originally intended to be discussed.

Motion carried.

At 10.9 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 27, at 2 p.m.