

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 16, 1977

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

## ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Motor Fuel Rationing (Temporary Provisions),  
Statutes Amendment (Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs and Justices).

## QUESTIONS

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

## SALMONELLA

In reply to Mr. SLATER (July 26):

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The recent detection of salmonella organisms in powdered milk formulas has been thoroughly investigated both here and interstate, and effective action has been taken. Ten babies in South Australia are known to have been infected in this way in the recent episode. There are many opportunities for accidental contamination of prepared food of all kinds, and this is specially true of baby foods. This incident points up the great advantage of breast feeding. Attention has rightly focused on the importance of standards in the manufacturing process. Present legal standards apply only to the finished product by which it is an offence to sell contaminated material. There is also a legal obligation on manufacturers and vendors of all foods to protect their products from contamination at all times. There has not been up to now any legal obligation on manufacturers to report evidence which they may find of contamination. My officers are at present examining the best means of providing for this. Constant attention is given by the Mothers and Babies Health Association and my own department to educating parents in the safe handling of food materials prepared in the home including especially baby food and feeding bottles. In the past, contamination at this point has been all too prevalent, but there is evidence of considerable improvement in recent times resulting from education and better equipment for food handling in the home.

## STAMP DUTIES

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (July 26):

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the debate on the second reading of the Bill to amend the Stamp Duties Act, the honourable member inquired as to whether the concession from duty on an application to transfer the registration of a motor vehicle would extend to a dissolution of partnership. I informed him that I did not believe the concession would extend to a dissolution of partnership unless the registration of the motor vehicle (being a partnership asset) was being transferred between husband and wife. I now confirm that this is so. Unlike stamp duties on conveyances of land, duty on an application to transfer

the registration of a motor vehicle is not related to the value of the interest of the owner in the motor vehicle. Indeed, many motor vehicles are registered in the names of persons other than the legal owners (for example, vehicles under hiring arrangements). Therefore, when any application to transfer registration is lodged, it is not possible or appropriate to calculate the value of the interest being transferred or to base the duty payable on that value. The duty is based on the value of the vehicle and is paid by the person in whose name the vehicle is being registered or to whom the registration is being transferred. Stamp duties legislation in the other States treats these kinds of transfer in a similar manner. Whilst the Government has been prepared to grant a concession where a vehicle registration is transferred between spouses, it does not propose to extend it.

## GRAND JUNCTION ROAD

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (August 3):

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Based on present priorities and the anticipated availability of funds, work on the section of Grand Junction Road between North-East Road at Holden Hill and Anstey Hill is not expected to commence before 1981.

## HILLS BUS SERVICE

In reply to Mr. RUSSACK (August 3):

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: An officer of the State Transport Authority attended a meeting in April, 1977, called by the District Council of Meadows. The meeting was exploratory in nature and at a further meeting in May several options open to the councils represented were outlined by the State Transport Authority. It was decided that, on receipt of formal advice from the authority (and this was forwarded on May 13, 1977), the councils would report their attitudes to the Secretary, Local Government Association for collation and return to the authority. To date, in spite of several inquiries, no information has been forthcoming, although it is known that councils are still actively considering the matter.

## JUVENILE OFFENDERS

In reply to Mr. VANDEPEER (August 3):

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

1. Number of absconders during the period 1/1/77 to 5/8/77—

McNally Training Centre . . . . .	9
Brookway Park . . . . .	12
Vaughan House . . . . .	5

2. Number of above absconders who had absconded prior to 1/1/77—

McNally Training Centre . . . . .	7
Brookway Park . . . . .	4
Vaughan House . . . . .	3

Some of the abscondings occurred during periods of leave or at times when the young person was out from the centre seeking employment, etc.

## TURF RESEARCH

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What action, if any, has the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries taken to implement a Turf Research and Advisory Institute of South Australia?

2. Has the Government apprised itself of similar schemes operating in New South Wales, Victoria, and New Zealand or elsewhere and, if so, what has been the result of such investigation and, if not, is it intended to undertake such an investigation

3. What service, if any, is now provided by the State to sporting organisations that rely on turf surfaces?

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

1. The Chairman of the Steering Committee, South Australia Turf Research Advisory Institute, has contacted the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport seeking support for the establishment of such an institute in South Australia. It was felt that an advisory service of this type would be of value to a wide range of sporting organisations which use turf for their activities, and he was advised to approach the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries in the first instance in order to receive advice about the viability of such a service in this State. Subsequently, the Minister of Agriculture arranged for officers of his department to consider the proposal, but no action has yet been taken by him following his very recent receipt of the departmental report.

2. There has been some contact between South Australian departmental officers and the Victorian and New South Wales institutes. It is intended to follow up this contact.

3. The State has provided turf services through weed control officers, the Home Gardens Advisory Service, plant pathologists, and entomologists of the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries and through officers of the Botanic Garden. Information has also been provided by the C.S.I.R.O. Division of Soils and the Waite Agricultural Research Institute.

#### REHABILITATION CENTRE

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What action has been taken, if any, to arrange the transfer of the Commonwealth Rehabilitation Centre to State control, as recommended at page 6 of the report "Task Force on Co-ordination in Welfare and Health"?

2. What is the nature of such proposal and when is it expected that a transfer will be effected?

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 implications of the Health and Welfare Task Force, including the possible transfer of the Commonwealth Rehabilitation Centre. No action has yet been taken.

2. Professional and administrative collaboration between State hospital services and Commonwealth Government instrumentalities concerned with medical and vocational rehabilitation has been continuing for a considerable period. It is anticipated that, if the recommendation of the Bailey committee is accepted by both Governments, there should be no major difficulty in effecting the proposed transfer. It is not at present contemplated that this would be undertaken during the present financial year.

#### FOOTBALL POOLS

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Has the Government given further consideration to the establishment of football pools in South Australia and, if so—

(a) what were the findings;

(b) what action does the Government intend to take; and

(c) if the Government does not intend to take action, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. Soccer pools commenced in Queensland in June, 1976, and during the novelty period of approximately seven weeks, the turnover for one week reached a peak of approximately \$315 500, and the 30 per cent tax to Government amounted to about \$94 600. Since then, there has been a steady decline; the return to the Government reached its lowest figure of \$24 217.75 in January this year. Efforts were, apparently, made to bolster the pools, as the turnover increased slightly over the next two months when the Government's take rose to \$37 590.51. However, this increase has been shortlived, as the decline, with the exception of two slight variations, was again evident during the months of April and May this year. The decline in New South Wales is not quite so drastic. After the novelty period in 1975, the popularity of soccer pools declined from a peak turnover for one week of approximately \$630 000 and a Government tax (30 per cent) of about \$190 000 to fairly static weekly figures of \$350 000 and \$105 000 respectively.

Soccer pools commenced in Victoria towards the end of 1974 and never really got off the ground. As a consequence, the decline in Victoria is not so great but, nevertheless, there has been a decline which is continuing slightly each year. From the information received, it would appear that soccer pools are still on the decline in Queensland and Victoria and, after a steady decline following the novelty period, are at best static for the present in New South Wales. Because of the much smaller population, the progress of Lotto in South Australia is slower. However, it is steadily progressing as turnover has increased from \$972 719 in 1973-74 to \$8 389 821 in 1976/77, and whilst the first draw for July, 1977, did have the benefit of a substantial Jackpot, income is \$1 051 926 compared with \$718 603 for July, 1976. Strangely enough, X Lotto was won on four consecutive occasions during both months. The Manager, State Lotteries, is of the opinion that soccer pools will fade even further if Queensland, New South Wales and Western Australia introduce Lotto, and that there is no worthwhile advantage introducing them to South Australia and impeding the steady growth of X Lotto.

#### EAST TORRENS KINDERGARTEN

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Is a transportable building to be provided at Ashton for the East Torrens District Kindergarten Incorporated and, if so, is this building ready for transportation and when was the building completed?

2. Was the due date for the transporting of the building to site June 29 and, if so, what are the reasons for the delay and, if not, what was the due date for transportation and what are the reasons for the delay?

3. Will the Minister take the necessary action to expedite the delivery and opening date of the new kindergarten?

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

1. Yes.

2. Yes. The State Planning Authority had not received all the information required by the Hills Face Zone regulations prior to its July meeting.

3. The State Planning Authority will consider the application on August 9.

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Have application papers been lodged with the State Planning Authority for the siting of a transportable building at Ashton for the East Torrens District Kindergarten Incorporated and, if so, when was this application lodged and what are the reasons for the delay in processing this application and, if they have not been lodged, are they in the hands of the State Planning Authority?

2. Will the Minister take the necessary action to expedite the processing and finalising of this application?

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

1. Yes; an application on behalf of the Kindergarten Union was lodged on April 7, 1977. The District Council of East Torrens on April 20, 1977, indicated that it had approved the application, pursuant to the provisions of the Building Act. The site was inspected and the applicants advised on May 12, 1977, of the requirements of the Hills Face Zone regulations, including public advertising of the proposal. As there were comments from Government departments/instrumentalities outstanding as at July 12, 1977, it was not possible to consider the application at the July State Planning Authority meeting.

2. The Authority will consider the application at its next meeting (August 9). The State Planning Authority has not delayed consideration of this application.

#### SUPREME COURT

Mr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. When will work commence on the western wing of the Supreme Court complex?

2. What was the original estimated cost of the project?

3. What is the present estimated cost and what is the reason for the increase?

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

1. The commencement date has not been determined at this stage.

2. \$7 562 576.

3. \$22 500 000. Variations in client requirements, and escalation in building costs.

#### PROPERTY SETTLEMENTS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. Is South Australian stamp duty applicable to property settlements ordered by the Family Court of Australia in divorce cases?

2. If the position is not clear when will it be clarified?

3. Is it a fact that property settlements are being made and exemption from stamp duty granted by the court?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It is my policy not to answer questions involving purely legal matters or to give legal advice when replying to questions. My policy in this regard was clearly stated in the House on October 14, 1975.

#### ITALIAN VILLAGE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What was the date of the option signed by the Italian Village Committee Incorporated for the land situated at the corner of Ayton Avenue and Henley Beach Road, Fulham?

2. Will the terms of the option be strictly enforced and, if not why not?

3. What action is currently being taken by the Government to assist the committee to obtain an alternative site?

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

1. Negotiations for an option have been in hand for some time but have not yet been finalised.

2. Not applicable.

3. The Government is awaiting the outcome of negotiations between the Italian Village Committee Incorporated and the newly elected council of West Torrens.

#### VOLVO BUSES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many new Volvo buses have been received from Leyland?

2. Is the programme of delivery on schedule and, if not, why not?

3. What is the estimated total cost of the contract for the new buses, and:

(a) how does this compare with the original estimate; and

(b) what is the reason for the variation?

4. Will the buses ordered be sufficient to meet requirements and:

(a) if so, for how long;

(b) if not, what further proposals are in hand for bus replacement and, if there are no proposals, why not?

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

1. 24, as at August 15, 1977.

2. No, because of manufacturing difficulties.

3. The original estimate, including allowances for escalation was \$21 400 000. There is no reason to change the estimate at this date although the final result will depend upon future escalation.

4. Yes.

(a) Until about 1981-82 (for existing and planned requirements).

(b) Not applicable.

#### ROCK LOBSTER

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What are the findings to date on the studies on the western population of the southern rock lobster?

2. What was the total amount of receipts and payments of the trust fund for the past financial year?

3. What is the total amount spent to date on the studies?

4. How long will such studies continue?

5. How many persons are employed on the studies?

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

1. Research has concentrated on the stock of rock lobsters in the South-East of South Australia which appears to be one of two distinct stocks or sub-populations of the western population of the southern rock lobster. The other sub-population occurs between Kangaroo Island and the Western Australian border.

The general findings are that:

(a) The post-larval (puerulus) stages settle inshore around August, the time of lowest water temperature and salinity. While this represents a marked peak, some post larvae settle throughout the year.

- (b) There have been marked yearly fluctuations in the numbers of post larvae settling, and the availability of shelter is an important factor in survival after settling.
- (c) Growth parameters have been calculated. The calculated ages at the legal minimum (carapace) length of 98.5 mm are—males 5.3 years; females 5.9 years.
- (d) Movements have been studied through tagging. Marked animals have moved distances up to 75 km, but most movements have been much less.

A detailed progress report appeared in *SAFIC* No. 4, May, 1975.

2. For the 1976-77 financial year, receipts to the State Fisheries Research and Development Fund were \$103 996; expenditure \$108 328. The excess was made up from other credit in the fund.

3. The actual source of funds was the National Fishing Industry Research Trust Account. The final grant has now terminated, and field personnel are being paid from State funds. Total expenditure was in the order of \$138 000 (grants) plus \$53 000 from State funds.

4. The programme will be reviewed in June, 1979. In the next 12 months research will be extended to the other sub-population, which appears to have quite different recruitment and growth characteristics.

5. The staff directly working on the rock lobster are a research officer (Mr. R. Lewis) and a technical assistant. Both are stationed at Millicent. The work also draws on other personnel in the Fisheries Branch including the librarian and mathematician.

**CHILD CARE**

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What was the average number in residence and total all costs a child a week in departmental training centres and residential care centres for the financial year ending June 30, 1977?
2. How do these figures compare to the previous financial year?
3. What is the reason for any variation?
4. What was the average daily number of children accommodated and the average annual cost a child for children in centres?
5. How do these figures compare to the last financial year?

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

1. As per schedule—section A.
2. As per schedule—section A.
3. Reasons for variations:
  - (a) Inflationary trends.
  - (b) Reduction in number of children (generally) while fixed costs (staff, etc.) remained steady after allowing for inflationary factor.
  - (c) Large overall increase in expenditure on building alterations and maintenance by Public Buildings Department.
4. As per schedule—section B.
5. As per schedule—section B.

**SCHEDULE**

	Total daily average No. of children in residence	Total all costs per child per week \$
Section A—		
1975-76 . . . . .	297	286
1976-77 . . . . .	255	388

	Total daily average No. of children in residence	Average annual cost per child in centres \$
Section B—		
1975-76 . . . . .	297	14 846
1976-77 . . . . .	255	20 164

**PARLIAMENT HOUSE**

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Why is all furniture within Parliament House to be upgraded?
2. What is the total estimated cost of the project to do so?
3. What is the estimated value of the furniture surplus as a result of this refurbishing scheme?

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

1. Stock items of furniture have been provided over the years as a matter of expediency in view of the known plan for upgrading Parliament House. The suitability of this type of furniture is now being reviewed in the light of the overall upgrading programme.
2. The cost of the project will not be available until the review is completed.
3. See 1.

**NORTH-WEST NATIONAL PARK**

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Has the Government any plans to reduce the size of the North-West National Park?
2. Has the Government any plans to alter the ownership of the North-West National Park?
3. Have any groups or organisations made application to obtain any of the land currently held by the National Parks and Wildlife Department in the North-West of South Australia?

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

1. The area of land now known as the North-West National Park was promised by both the Playford Government and the Labor Government as an addition to the North-West Aboriginal Reserve. Despite this undertaking by Governments of both political persuasions, the Hall Government declared it a national park just prior to leaving office in 1970, and without any consultation with the Aboriginal people to whom it had been promised. Since then the Government has been investigating this matter with the aim of ensuring the retention of adequate national reserves and parks, while ensuring the rights of the Aboriginal people.
2. See 1.
3. There is currently a working party for the setting up of a Pitjantjatjara Lands Trust, which is discussing with the Aboriginal people of this State their tribal lands. The Aboriginal groups concerned have been advised that if they wish to pursue this matter, a proper case for their tribal association with the land must be made. No submission has yet been received.

**MINNIPA RESEARCH FARM**

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Will the Minister give an assurance that the Agriculture Department Research Farm at Minnipa will not be closed or phased out or its operations reduced?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, it is not possible to give such an assurance. Research must be tailored to meet the needs of rural communities and, in the case of Eyre Peninsula, these are more complex than can be carried out at Minnipa. Regionalisation, which will bring research closer to the community, could also result in changes to the function of Minnipa.

#### MOTOR VEHICLES BUILDING

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): What was the total cost of all plants and greenery for the new building of the Motor Vehicles Department?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The total cost is \$6 200.

#### VALUATION DEPARTMENT

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Have any instructions been given to the Valuation Department not to provide information to the public?

2. Will the Minister table any such instructions?

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

1. No.

2. See answer to No. 1.

#### DAIRYING INDUSTRY

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. When is it anticipated that the report from the committee of inquiry into the dairy industry will be released?

2. What are the reasons for the delay in the release of this report?

3. Is this report to be made public?

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

1. Advance copies of the committee's report are expected during the week commencing August 8.

2. The complexity of the subject under investigation.

3. Yes, in due course.

#### METEORITES

Mr. ARNOLD (on notice): Will the Government be introducing a Bill this session for the protection of meteorites?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: No.

#### PAY-ROLL TAX

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. How many companies or business enterprises in South Australia are currently receiving a rebate of pay-roll tax as decentralised industry, what companies are involved, and in which towns are these located?

2. What is the anticipated cost to the Government for the year 1977-78 of rebates on pay-roll tax to decentralised industry?

3. What was the total cost to the Government for the year 1976-77 of rebates on pay-roll tax to decentralised industry?

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

1. To date three companies have been approved to receive rebates of pay-roll tax as decentralised industries

in South Australia. The companies involved are Fletcher Jones & Staff Pty. Ltd., Mount Gambier; G. N. Yoannidis & Sons, Mount Gambier; Reyrolle Parsons of Australia Ltd., Whyalla.

2. The anticipated cost for the year 1977-78 for pay-roll tax rebates to decentralised industries is \$366 000. In addition, an amount of \$350 000 is estimated for grants equivalent to pay-roll tax rebates to assist the Riverland fruit packing and processing industries in 1977-78.

3. The total cost for the year 1976-77 for pay-roll tax rebates to decentralised industries was \$22 493·65.

#### PROPERTY VALUATIONS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Which Minister issued the instruction that officers of the Valuer-General's office were to be available at the Norwood Town Hall on July 27, 28 and 29, 1977, to discuss property valuations and appeals for the city of Kensington and Norwood, and why was this instruction issued?

2. Have officers set up temporary offices in other council areas to offer similar services and, if so, what other areas have been involved?

3. Why was not a similar service offered to the residents of the city of Burnside in 1974 when that area was revalued?

4. What other council areas were revalued during 1976-77, with the new values taking effect for the year 1977-78?

5. Has the Premier appealed against the valuation given for any property in the area of the city of Kensington and Norwood for which he is owner or part owner and, if so, why has he appealed against the valuation?

6. Were many properties in the city of Kensington and Norwood valued below the value already estimated using value equalisation factors and, if so, why is this so?

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

1. No instruction was issued to the Valuer-General by any Minister.

2. Yes—for the past 2½ years similar temporary offices have been set up in the following areas:

Tatiara	Streaky Bay
Munno Para	Ridley
Murray Bridge	Yankalilla
Loxton	Kadina
Port Augusta	Millicent
Kanyaka/Quorn	Mount Barker
East Torrens	Mannum
Hawker	Minlaton
Berri	Paringa
Renmark	Central Yorke Peninsula
Warooka	Barmera
Murat Bay	Orroroo
Yorketown	Mount Pleasant
Le Hunte	Port Lincoln
Peterborough	

Officers will be in attendance at Salisbury on August 17, 1977.

3. Prior to January, 1975, the Valuer-General did not provide this present service, but speakers were made available at public meetings, upon the request of members of Parliament or interested organisations. No request was made to the Valuer-General for the services of his officers to the public in connection with the general valuation of the Burnside area in 1974.

- 4.
- |              |                 |
|--------------|-----------------|
| Adelaide     | Barossa         |
| Carrieton    | Cleve           |
| Elliston     | Franklin Harbor |
| Hawker       | Kanyaka/Quorn   |
| Kimba        | Le Hunte        |
| Lincoln      | Loxton          |
| Marion       | Munno Para      |
| Murat Bay    | Murray Bridge   |
| Orroroo      | Peterborough    |
| Port Augusta | Port Lincoln    |
| Ridley       | Salisbury       |
| St. Peters   | Streaky Bay     |
| Thebarton    | Tumby Bay       |

5. Yes, the Premier exercised his right of objecting to what he considered to be an excessive unimproved valuation assessment by the Valuer-General of his private residence.

6. The answer to this question is not presently available in the Valuer-General's Office. In order to establish whether there are any properties in which the previous unimproved values equalised exceed the current unimproved values, it is necessary to examine some 4 000 land tax equalised value calculations and compare them with the new valuations. This comparison could take some time and is not warranted in view of the extra expense involved.

#### LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it proposed, during the present session, to introduce:

- (a) a Bill providing for environmental impact statements; and
- (b) a measure dealing with the cultural heritage of the State and, if so, when, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The reply is as follows:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) The instructions for such a Bill are being prepared, but it is expected in the next session.

#### ADVERTISING SIGN

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it proposed not to have an advertising sign in future above the main entrance to the Adelaide railway station and, if so, when will the supporting structure for such a sign be removed?

2. If it be proposed to erect another sign there, why has it been decided to erect it, what will it advertise, when will it be erected, and what is to be the annual charge for it?

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

1. The sign was removed on July 24, 1977, and the structure removed from the roof on Sunday, July 31, 1977.
2. There is no current proposal to erect another sign.

#### WEST COAST WATER

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What plans has the Government to supply the Port Kenny, Venus Bay, and Mount Cooper areas with a reticulated water scheme?

2. How much water is there available in the Talia Basin?

3. What tests have been carried out on the Talia Basin?

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

1. Investigations are being undertaken to see if an economical scheme for supply can be developed.

2. Initial investigation indicates that safe yield should be limited to 909 megalitres per year.

3. Preliminary testing and investigation work, including the drilling of basin delineation, production and observation bores, pump testing of the production bore and some salinity evaluation.

#### REGIONAL BOUNDARIES

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Has the report based on the findings of the Committee on Uniform Regional Boundaries for Government departments been completed and, if so, when was it completed?

2. Has this report been adopted by the Government, if not, why not and, if so, does this mean that the schools of Strathalbyn and districts will transfer to Central Southern Region, based on Marion and referred to in the report as Region 4?

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

1. Yes; September, 1975.
2. Yes, except for the report's recommendations on Whyalla and Crystal Brook, and some minor variations. The schools of Strathalbyn and districts will be included in the Central Southern Region. The Director-General of Education will ensure that, when the Central Southern Region Education Office is established, there will be continuity of service provided to schools in that district. The same standard of assistance and response to problems as the schools at present receive from the Regional Education Office located at Murray Bridge will also be provided.

#### COMPENSATION

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Are any amendments currently proposed to the Workmen's Compensation Act and, if so, what are they?

2. Are amendments proposed for holiday leave to be included in compensation payments rather than as an employer's liability and, if not, why not?

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

1. No.
2. Vide No. 1.

#### MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the Government considered reducing or waiving stamp duty on the purchase of new motor vehicles to assist local manufacturers and, if not, why not?

2. What current action is the Government taking to assist and protect motor vehicle manufacturers in South Australia?

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

1. The possible removal of stamp duty on new motor vehicle registrations has been considered as a means of stimulating the sales of motor vehicles but has been rejected on the grounds that it would almost certainly be ineffective and would have a significant impact on State revenue collections. Permanent removal of the duty would cost in the vicinity of \$9 000 000 to \$10 000 000 per annum at current cost levels and current levels of new motor vehicle registrations. Removal of the duty for, say, six months would cost between \$4 500 000 and \$5 000 000 on this basis and would probably only bring forward in time sales which would in any case have been made. The proposal would be ineffective as a means of assisting local manufacturers because sales of motor vehicles in South Australia represent

only a small proportion of the market for vehicles produced in this State. Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that stamp duty represents, on average, about 3 per cent of the purchase price of a vehicle. A far more effective means of assisting local manufacturers, therefore, would be a reduction in the very high levels of sales tax presently imposed by the Commonwealth Government. This would have a much greater effect on the cost to the consumer and would, moreover, be effective in all States. Inquiries of other State Governments as to such a scheme brought an unfavourable response.

2. The scope for unilateral State Government actions to "assist and protect motor vehicle manufacturers in South Australia" is extremely limited. Nevertheless, the South Australian Government supports local manufacturers in its purchasing activities and has consistently and forcefully represented the interests not only of the vehicle manufacturers but of material and component suppliers before the Commonwealth Government and its agencies. The most recent representation was a submission to the Industries Assistance Commission in its current examination of the industry. That submission recommended tariff quotas as a short-term measure and a comprehensive programme of structural adjustment assistance to assist the industry in the longer term.

#### MINDA HOME

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What was the outcome of the inquiry into the administration of Minda Home in October last year?
2. Were any of the allegations contained in a petition sent to the Premier proved correct?
3. Is the Government satisfied with the management of Minda Home?
4. Is it the Government's intention to encourage worker participation at Minda Home?
5. Is the Government satisfied with the constitution of the Minda Association?

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

1. Recommendations were made to the board of management of Minda Home.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. Yes, by means of staff representation on board.
5. The constitution is currently under review.

#### SCHOOL SECURITY

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What financial assistance does the Government propose to give to schools that have installed security alarm systems and, if none is proposed, why not?
2. Why do school councils have to bear the cost of such security systems?
3. Has there been any increase in vandalism and burglaries in schools during the financial year ended June 30, 1977, and, if so—
  - (a) what was the total cost of damage and theft to property, equipment, etc;
  - (b) to what extent; and
  - (c) how do these figures compare to the previous three years?

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

1. The Education Department is considering various methods of deterring theft and vandalism at schools,

including security alarm systems. When the various alternatives have been evaluated, action will be taken to introduce appropriate measures. Should any school councils decide to install alarm systems independently, they will be expected to meet the costs incurred from school council funds.

2. See 1.
3. (a) 1976-77, \$110 000;  
(b) See (c);  
(c) 1973-74, \$36 000;  
1974-75, \$66 000;  
1975-76, \$91 000.

#### DISABLED PERSONS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the Government considered a rebate of 90 per cent of motor vehicle registration for disabled persons similar to that of New South Wales and, if not, why not?
2. What action, if any, does the Government propose to take?

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

1. No. Provision for reduced registration fees for incapacitated persons is made in the following sections of the Motor Vehicles Act:

Section 38, Incapacitated ex-servicemen—reduction of 66½ per cent in motor vehicle registration fee.

Section 38 (a), Pensioners (including invalid pensioners)—reduction of 50 per cent in motor vehicle registration fee.

Section 38 (ab), Pensioners (including invalid pensioners)—reduction of 50 per cent in trailer registration fee.

Section 38 (b), Other incapacitated persons—reduction of 50 per cent in motor vehicle registration fee.

2. No moves are being made to extend these provisions or to increase the rebates.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the Government considered a rebate of 90 per cent of stamp duty on the purchase of a new automatic motor vehicle for disabled persons similar to New South Wales and, if not, why not?

2. What action, if any, does the Government now propose to take?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The second schedule of the Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1977, provides for an exemption from stamp duty payable in respect of an application to register a motor vehicle or to transfer the registration of a motor vehicle or in respect of a policy of insurance under Part IV of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959, when the person concerned satisfies the Registrar—

- (a) that he is the owner of the motor vehicle;
- (b) that, in consequence of the loss by him of the use of one or both of his legs, he is permanently unable to use public transport;
- (c) that the motor vehicle will be wholly or mainly used for transporting himself; and
- (d) that he is not enjoying the benefit of this exemption in respect of any other motor vehicle currently owned by him.

Inquiries made with the New South Wales Treasury reveal that the rebate of duty as stated by the member does not apply in that State.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the Government considered a disabled persons parking authority similar to New South Wales and, if not, why not?
2. What action, if any, does the Government propose to take?

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

1. In recognition of the various difficulties encountered by disabled persons, the Government recently set up a Committee on the Rights of Persons with Handicaps which is chaired by Mr. Justice Bright. Other members of the committee are Ms. Barbara Garrett, Chief Social Worker at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and Mr. Donald Simpson, Neurosurgeon. One of the committee's first tasks is to have a look at the mobility and access problems as they relate to persons with handicaps.

2. See 1 above.

#### RAINWATER TANKS

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Has the Government given further consideration to encouraging the installation of rainwater tanks on residential properties and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No. The decision to install rainwater tanks is one for the individual householder.

#### MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What action has been taken to protect workers in the motor vehicle manufacturing industry in South Australia from losing continuity of employment?

2. Does the Government propose to establish a scheme whereby motor vehicle manufacture employees and employers contribute to a common fund to compensate for unforeseen retrenchments and, if not, why not?

3. Are any discussions being held to assist employees in this industry obtain alternative employment and, if not, why not?

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

1. and 2. The Government is in constant contact with the employers and unions in the motor industry and, as for example, in the submission to the Industries Assistance Commission, is ready to assist where appropriate. In any case the industrial conditions of workers in the motor vehicle manufacturing industry are contained in awards made pursuant to the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

3. The Commonwealth Employment Service is the appropriate organisation to assist in finding alternative employment where this is necessary.

#### ROAD MAINTENANCE TAX

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the total amount of road maintenance tax outstanding, and by how many individuals, companies, etc?

2. How much is owed by bankrupt estates and what is the estimated amount that may be received?

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

1. As at June 30, 1977—\$490 238 owed by 1 818 debtors.  
2. As at June 30, 1977—\$70 666 of which it is estimated that \$5 000 may be received.

#### SHORE PROTECTION

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What is the programme, estimated cost, and location of beach and foreshore protection in the metropolitan area this financial year?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: It is proposed to construct rip-rap protective walling between Harrow Road and Whyte Street, Brighton, and to move 20 000-40 000 cubic metres of sand to the dunes at West Beach Trust, at a total cost in the order of \$200 000.

#### EDUCATION COST

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What was the total cost of providing education for each pupil in primary schools and secondary schools for the financial year ended June 30, 1977?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The reply is as follows:

(a) Actual June 30, 1977, figures not available.

(b) Estimated cost after deducting School Commission grants:—

Primary—\$733.

Secondary—\$1 313.

#### NOISE CONTROL

Mr. BECKER (on notice): When will noise control regulations be introduced and gazetted, and what is the reason for any delay?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The proclamations committing the administration of the Noise Control Act to the Minister for the Environment, and those required to bring Parts 1, 2, 5 and 6 of the Act into operation, are being prepared by the Legal Services Department and should be presented to Executive Council on Thursday, August 18. Part 5 of the Act will enable some immediate control of noise emitted from domestic premises without regulations being prescribed at this time. Parts 3 and 4 of the Act will not be brought into operation until such time as the drafting of regulations to control industrial and other non-domestic noise, and noise emitted by machines has been completed. An Advisory Committee on Noise (Regulations) is being established to assist officers in the noise control section with the drafting of the necessary regulations under the Act. It is anticipated that the regulations to control employee exposure to noise, and noise emitted by machines, will be completed and gazetted by the end of October, 1977. The regulations to enable the control of noise emitted from industrial and other non-domestic premises, under Part 3 of the Act, should be completed and gazetted by the end of November, 1977.

#### LAND COMMISSION

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What is the total area of land now held by the South Australian Land Commission?

2. What is the total purchase price of this land?

3. What was the total cost to develop those subdivisions that are now fully developed and what moneys have been committed to each incomplete subdivision?



4. How many allotments are held in each subdivision that—

- (a) are fully serviced and available to be marketed; and
- (b) are partly serviced but will be available for the market by June, 1978?

5. How many allotments were sold to the Australian Housing Commission for Defence Service Homes, what was the price paid, and in what suburbs are these allotments located?

6. What have been the individual sources and amounts of moneys that have been used by the South Australian Land Commission for its acquisitions and developments?

7. What is the South Australian Land Commission's reserve of funds presently held, or available to it?

8. Have some builders not taken up their allocation of allotments from the South Australian Land Commission and if so—

- (a) how many allotments were involved; and
- (b) in what subdivisions were they situated?

9. How many private buyers sought longer than a two-year period for housing construction on South Australian Land Commission subdivisions?

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

1. The total area of land purchased by the South Australian Land Commission for urban purposes as at June 30, 1977, is 4 763·20 ha. Of that total approximately 910 ha have been transferred to development, leaving 3 853 ha not yet under development.

2. The total purchase price for 4 763·20 ha as at June 30 was \$39 500 000.

	\$
(as at June 30, 1976 . . . . .)	32 600 000
1976-77 . . . . .	6 900 000
	\$39 500 000)

3. (i) The total cost to develop fully completed subdivisions as at June 30, 1977, was \$10 441 000.

(ii) The moneys committed to each incomplete subdivision are as follows:

Area	Balance of committed moneys to complete projects \$
Hillbank . . . . .	66 000
Craigmore . . . . .	1 491 000
St. Agnes (Stages 2 and 3) . . . . .	212 000
Modbury Heights . . . . .	576 000
Hallett Cove (Stages B and C) . . . . .	623 000
Happy Valley . . . . .	182 000
Aberfoyle Park (B) . . . . .	182 000
Aberfoyle Park (C) . . . . .	1 366 000
Morphett Vale (B) . . . . .	124 000
Reynella West . . . . .	147 000
	\$4 969 000

Area	(a)	(b)
	No. of lots fully serviced and available for marketing from June 30, 1977	No. of lots currently partly completed but available for sale between July 1, 1977- June 30, 1978
Hillbank . . . . .	—	179
Craigmore . . . . .	—	1 100
Salisbury North (II) . . . . .	1	—
Modbury North . . . . .	41	—
Modbury Heights . . . . .	—	283
St. Agnes (I) . . . . .	—	232
St. Agnes (II) . . . . .	—	122
St. Agnes (III) . . . . .	—	114
Hallett Cove (A) . . . . .	40	—
Hallett Cove (B and C) . . . . .	—	686
Aberfoyle Park (B) . . . . .	—	98
Aberfoyle Park (C) . . . . .	—	274
Happy Valley (II) . . . . .	—	163
Chandlers Hill . . . . .	110	136
Reynella East . . . . .	54	—
Reynella West (1 and 2) . . . . .	—	153
Morphett Vale (B) . . . . .	—	194
Mount Gambier . . . . .	—	120
	246	3 854

5. No allotments have been sold to the Australian Housing Commission for defence service homes. However, in the interest of integrated development at Morphett Vale and providing an opportunity for the defence service homes to offer their clients a wider area selection an exchange of land was negotiated whereby the Land Commission took up broadacres at Morphett Vale and the defence service homes took up land at St. Agnes. Due to the equivalent value of the exchanged parcels of land no monetary consideration was involved. The commission is acting as the development agent for the defence service homes and is currently project managing the production of 122 allotments at St. Agnes and 119 allotments at Morphett Vale. The allotments resulting from this arrangement will be marketed by Defence Service Homes.

6. Loans from—	\$
The Commonwealth . . . . .	46 800 000
The State . . . . .	6 000 000
Sundry institutions . . . . .	6 700 000
	\$59 500 000

The above excludes grants received from the Commonwealth and the State for the purchase of open space land on behalf of the State Planning Authority.

7. Working capital of \$9 600 000 was held by the Land Commission as at June 30, 1977, consisting of short-term investments and cash in hand.

8. The number of builders which have not taken up their allocations from the South Australian Land Commission is as follows:

Area	No. of builders	No. of allotments
Happy Valley . . . . .	3	14
Bolivar . . . . .	4	74
Salisbury North (4004) . . . . .	3	30
Hallett Cove . . . . .	2	4
Reynella . . . . .	1	3
Modbury North . . . . .	2	12
	15	137

9.

Area	No. of buyers
Happy Valley . . . . .	3
Hallett Cove . . . . .	1
Reynella . . . . .	2
	6

The total number of individual purchasers who asked for an extension of time of the two-year building period is six. This number is low as applications were only received from applicants intending to build within the two-year period.

**SHEOAK ROAD**

Mr. EVANS (on notice): Have any homes recently been constructed on Sheoak Road, Upper Sturt Estate, which could be affected if that road is developed as a main connecting link with Belair and, if so, what will be the effect on those properties?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: To the knowledge of the Highways Department, no such homes have recently been constructed. The consent of the Commissioner of Highways is required pursuant to the provisions of the Metropolitan Adelaide Road Widening Plan Act, for any building work within 6 m of the possible future boundary of Sheoak Road. No applications have been received for such consent since the Act came into force in 1974.

**KANGAROO ISLAND SETTLER**

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What are the contents of the letter written by the Minister during the last week of July to the Regional Director of the Australian Housing Corporation relating to Mr. C. J. Berryman's dealings under the War Service Land Settlement Scheme?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The letter posted on July 28, 1977, to the Regional Director (Housing), Department of Housing, concerning Mr. Berryman was of a confidential nature and therefore, the contents will not be divulged.

**MEMBERS' SECRETARIES**

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Has the Government yet made a decision as to whom is to be, in law, the employer of members' electorate secretaries and, if so, what is that decision and, if not, when is it proposed to make such decision?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:  
 1. No.  
 2. A decision on the matter will be made shortly.

**SEAT BELTS**

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many complaints have been laid since July 1, 1976, for the offence of not wearing a seat belt?
2. How many of such complaints have been dealt with by a court?
3. In the case of how many of such complaints has there been a conviction?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies as as follows:  
 1. 7 067.  
 2. 5 670.  
 3. 5 664.

**MONARTO**

Mr. WARDLE (on notice): Will the Government make available for sale to the public all land within the designated site of Monarto, on the eastern side of White Hill below the scrub line between Princes Highway in the south and the railway line in the north, excluding the area occupied by the Woods and Forests Department and, if not, why not?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows: No. (See reply to Mr. Wotton, M.P., *Hansard* August 2). When any land becomes available for sale at Monarto it will be released in accordance with the development of the site as a growth centre.

Mr. WARDLE (on notice): Will the Minister agree to the transferring of the designated site of Monarto to the care, control and management of the District Council of Murray Bridge until such time as there is a need for self local government within the site?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. It is essential that the site continue to be administered by the Monarto Development Commission for the purposes of environmental control and development, the maintenance of existing properties, tenant and lessee control, agricultural production, supervision of community groups, and the development of other facilities as opportunities occur consistent with long-term planning proposals. The local government function, which is the legal responsibility of the commission, is only a minor part of these activities.

**WARNING DEVICES**

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What is the 1977-78 programme for new or upgraded warning devices on railway crossings in this State?
2. What is the site of each such device, the expected cost, and the probable date of commencement and completion?
3. Have there been any significant changes in the form of signalling available or expected to be introduced in the near future and, if so, what are the details?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:  
 1. and 2. The 1977-78 programme provides for:

<i>Metropolitan lines</i>	Location	Estimated cost \$	Estimated completion
	1. Mitcham-Wattlebury Road, Automatic gates . . . .	25 000	} October-November, 1977
	2. Hawthorn-Sussex Terrace, Automatic gates . . . .	25 000	
	3. Elizabeth-Womma Road, Automatic gates . . . .	25 000	
	4. Nurlutta-Commercial Road, Automatic gates . . . .	25 000	
	1. Glenalta-Belair Road, Automatic gates	} Crossing designs not yet finalised	
	2. Oaklands-Diagonal Road, Alterations		
	3. Hove-Brighton Road, Alterations and Road Traffic Signals		
<i>Non-metropolitan lines</i>			
	1. Penrice-Plush's Corner, Flashing Lights (to complete 1975-76 programme) . . . . .	35 000	} December, 1977-June, 1978
	2. Jibilla-Yatina Road, Flashing Lights . . . . .	17 000	
	3. Mile End-Railway Terrace, Flashing Lights . . . .	20 000	
	4. Reedy Creek-Princess Highway, Flashing Lights . .	20 000	
	5. Bagot Well-Main Road No. 22, Flashing Lights . .	25 000	
	6. Virginia-Penfield Road, Flashing Lights . . . . .	42 000	
	7. Virginia-Angle Vale Road, Flashing Lights . . . .	40 000	} July-November, 1978
	8. Hamley Bridge-Stockport Road, Flashing Lights . .	19 000	
	9. Hamley Bridge-Station Road, Flashing Lights . .	20 000	
	10. Cannawigara-Pinnaroo Road, Flashing Lights . .	34 000	
	11. Wasleys-Main Road, Flashing Lights . . . . .	6 000	
	1. Farrell Flat-Main Road No. 46 . . . . .	25 000	} Crossing designs not yet finalised
	2. Gumbowie-Main Road No. 45 . . . . .	25 000	

3. There have been no significant changes in the form of signalling available, and equipment will continue to be installed in accordance with the Standards Association of Australia *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*.

School site, but owing to the need for new schools in developing areas and the need to upgrade many substandard schools it is not possible to commit funds for stage II in the foreseeable future. This is in agreement with the priorities established by the Regional Director of Education, Western Region.

**PORT LINCOLN HOSPITAL**

Mr. BLACKER (on notice):

1. When is it expected that work will commence on the extensions to the Port Lincoln Hospital?
2. Will such extensions increase the bed capacity of the hospital and, if so, to what extent?

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

1. The exact time of construction of the extensions cannot presently be given. However, development generally has now proceeded to the point of seeking an imminent hearing with the Public Works Standing Committee.
2. Yes, by 13 beds.

**PORT LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL**

Mr. BLACKER (on notice): When is it expected that work will commence on the building of Stage II of the Port Lincoln High School?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: A proposal for the staged redevelopment of Port Lincoln High School was submitted to the Public Works Standing Committee in 1971 and in August of that year the committee recommended approval for the construction of Stage I. This was the major part of the redevelopment and comprised Assembly Hall, Administration Block, Science/Class Block, Library/Class Block, Year 12 Centre and Music Suite. These buildings were completed and occupied in 1976. Stage II, which has not been programmed, was intended to replace the large number of wooden buildings which remain on the High

**FISHING COMMITTEES**

Mr. BLACKER (on notice): Does the Government intend to introduce advisory committees for each of the following fishing industries—prawn, lobster, abalone, tuna, shark, scale fish, oyster, and scallops—and, if so, when will these committees commence duties?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The South Australian Government has improved communications with the South Australian fishing industry through its support for a full-time Executive Officer for A.F.I.C. (Australian Fishing Industry Council, S.A. Division). At the annual general meeting of A.F.I.C. last year, the Minister of Fisheries suggested to A.F.I.C. that advisory committees be established for various fishing industries. The matter is one for A.F.I.C. to decide. They have taken the view that the new arrangements should be given time to settle down before an elaborate structure of advisory committees within the A.F.I.C. umbrella is established.

**RECOMPRESSION CHAMBER**

Mr. BLACKER (on notice): What plans does the Government have to develop a recompression chamber and hyperbaric facilities in this State, where will such facilities be located, and when will they be available for use?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is planned to locate a main hyperbaric unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and portable units at Port Lincoln and Mount Gambier. The anticipated availability of these units in service is early 1979.

#### UNION SECRETARY

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Was a union secretary by the name of Mr. G. Apap arrested in March last year for being unlawfully on the premises of Elder Smith Goldsborough Mort, Currie Street, Adelaide?

2. Did the Crown fail to tender any evidence to prosecute and, if so, why and was the decision not to tender evidence for the prosecution a Government or Ministerial decision?

3. Was the case dismissed because of want of prosecution?

4. Who paid the costs of the case and what was the amount involved?

5. Will this case set a precedent?

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

1. Yes.

2. Yes. The decision not to tender evidence resulted from discussion between the private counsel instructed by the Crown Solicitor, counsel for the defendant, and representatives of Elder Smith Goldsborough Mort Ltd.

3. Yes.

4. The fee for counsel on behalf of the Crown was \$300 and was paid by the Crown Law Department.

5. No.

#### MEDIAN STRIP

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Have investigations been made for closing the median strip opening south-east of Pine Avenue, Glenelg North and, if so, what is the recommendation, and, if not, why not?

2. Have any reports and/or complaints been received concerning motor vehicles travelling west on Anzac Highway cutting across this median strip to Pine Avenue?

3. What was the nature of the complaints?

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

1. No. No complaints have been received.

2. No.

3. See 2.

#### ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Is the condition of the facade of the Adelaide railway station sound?

2. Has consideration been given to cleaning the facade and—

(a) if so, what is the estimated total cost; and

(b) if consideration has not been given, why not and will consideration be given to such a project?

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

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

(a) \$75 000.

(b) See (a) above.

#### GLENELG ROAD JUNCTION

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many motor vehicle accidents have occurred at the junction of Pine Avenue and Anzac Highway, Glenelg North, each year during the past five years?

2. What was the total cost of damage to vehicles and the—

(a) number of vehicles involved;

(b) injuries sustained;

(c) number of fatalities; and

(d) number of prosecutions?

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

1. 1972—2 reported accidents. 1973—2 reported accidents. 1974—4 reported accidents. 1975—1 reported accident. 1976—2 reported accidents.

2. As estimated on the police reports—\$2 150.

(a) 22.

(b) 0.

(c) 0.

(d) This information is not available.

#### GLENELG INTERSECTIONS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. For each year during the past three years how many motor vehicle accidents have occurred at the intersections of Augusta Street, Glenelg and—

(a) Durham Street;

(b) Sussex Street;

(c) Nile Street;

(d) Waterloo Street;

(e) Byron Street; and

(f) Gordon Street?

2. What were the causes of the accidents and—

(a) what was the total number of persons injured; and

(b) what was the total amount of vehicle and property damage?

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

1. Reported Accidents	1974	1975	1976
(a)	5	9	14
(b)	1	2	1
(c)	0	0	0
(d)	3	5	3
(e)	4	1	7
(f)	1	6	12

2. 52 failed to give way;

14 disobeyed "stop" signs;

6 rear-end collisions;

1 failed to stand;

1 reversed without due care.

(a) 17;

(b) as estimated on the police reports—\$54 370.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What criteria are used in assessing applications for unemployment relief funds?

2. Would an application to employ a person to research and establish walking tours in Glenelg be considered and, if not, why not?

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

1. The general criteria for assessing applications for projects to be sponsored from unemployment relief funds are as follows:

I. Specific allocations—Specific allocations to project sponsors and participants take into account:

- (a) the capacity of the sponsor or participant to efficiently expend the funds;
- (b) the value of the project to the community in general;
- (c) whether the project will have continued community benefit;
- (d) whether the project contains a reasonable labour content to ensure the maximisation of job opportunities.

II. Eligibility for grants—Grants may be made to State Government departments, local governing authorities, statutory authorities or other organisations which are charitable in nature and are non-profit-making in the general sense of that word. In selecting projects, regard is given to:

- (a) the need to give preference to socially deprived areas;
- (b) the suitability for the employment of specific occupational categories of unemployed persons;
- (c) a reasonable mix of sex and age groups;
- (d) the need to give preference in employment to single-income families and self-supporting individuals;
- (e) the facility within the project to incorporate training programmes to increase work skills;
- (f) the desirability of giving preference where a sponsor or participating body is prepared to financially contribute towards the projects;
- (g) the need to give preference to those projects which will result in permanent employment.

2. No such application has been received, so to that extent the question is hypothetical. If an application along the lines suggested is made it will be considered in conjunction with the criteria set out in 1 above.

#### VALUER-GENERAL'S OFFICE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): For how long is it proposed that the temporary office of the Valuer-General's Department at Norwood be open?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The temporary office was open for three days on July 27, 28, and 29, 1977.

#### AUDITORIUM

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has consideration been given to the construction of a permanent auditorium large enough to seat 4 000 persons and suitable for international circuses?

2. If consideration has not been given, will the suggestion be investigated and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: An announcement has been made that a contract has been let for a feasibility study into a facility which will include an auditorium with large audience capacity.

#### ICE-SKATING

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has consideration been given to the construction of a large outdoor ice-skating rink similar to the one near Central railway station in Sydney and, if not, why not?

2. Will consideration be given to encouraging such a venture?

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

1. Consideration has been given to the construction of a large ice-skating rink, and meetings have been held with interested groups in such a venture.

2. See 1 above.

#### SWIMMING POOL

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the Government given consideration to covering the olympic swimming pool at North Adelaide and providing seating for several thousand spectators?

2. Has such a request been made to the Government by the Amateur Swimming Association?

3. What is the estimated cost of such a proposal?

4. If no proposal has been received or considered, what encouragement would be given to such a scheme?

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

1. Consideration is being given to the covering of the Adelaide Swimming Centre, North Adelaide, including the seating for several thousand spectators.

2. No request for the covering of the centre has been made by the South Australian Amateur Swimming Association to the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department.

3. An estimated cost of this proposal would be about \$750 000.

4. See 1. and 3. above.

#### ILLEGAL BETTING

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many cases of illegal betting were brought to the courts in the financial year ended June 30, 1977?

2. How do these figures compare to each of the last three years?

3. What is the reason for the variation in these figures?

4. What continuing and new action is being taken to eradicate illegal betting?

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

1. Thirty-one. A further 14 charges were laid and are awaiting disposition in the courts.

2. Comparable figures for the two preceding years were:

1975	1976
10	51

3. Changes in police operational tactics are considered to be the main reason for the variation.

4. Police will continue to pay attention to places where illegal betting is suspected or reported to be taking place. There are no immediate proposals to change the methods or extent of operations in this area.

#### QUEEN'S COUNSEL

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Who were the last two Queen's Counsel appointments made in South Australia and when were they appointed?

2. Are further appointments contemplated and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) Messrs. D. W. Bollen and H. C. Williams were appointed on November 21, 1974.

(b) Mr. T. R. Morling, a Queen's Counsel in New South Wales was appointed as a Queen's Counsel on April 14, 1977.

2. Not known.

#### SUCCESS MOTIVATION INSTITUTE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Have investigations been made into the operation, contracts, and methods of payment to Success Motivation Institute of Mile End and, if so, what were the findings?

2. What control does the Government propose to place on such organisations and, if none, why not?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: This answer is based on the assumption that the question relates to Success Motivation Australia Proprietary Limited, which is listed in the Adelaide telephone directory at 96 Henley Beach Road, Mile End, and which has recently changed its name to Personal Dynamics Proprietary Limited:

1. No complaint has been received about the activities of this company, and there has therefore been no cause for an investigation of its affairs either by the Government Investigations Section of the Legal Services Department or the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs.
2. The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs has no power to investigate the selling practices of organisations such as this, unless he has received a complaint from a consumer. A Bill to give him additional powers in this regard is currently before the House.

#### COTTAGES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the South Australian Housing Trust taken over Bower Cottages, Bower Road, Semaphore and, if so, how did the trust acquire these cottages and—

- (a) how many cottages are involved;
- (b) what is their condition; and
- (c) what is the estimated total cost of repairing them?

2. Was a trust established to administer the cottages originally, and—

- (a) if so, when;
- (b) who are the trustees;
- (c) who is the secretary;
- (d) what funds are there in the trust; and
- (e) what were the chief aims and objects of the trust?

3. What does the South Australian Housing Trust propose to do with these cottages?

4. Has consideration been given to establishing a liquor licence with barbecues and entertaining areas?

5. Who originally owned the cottages?

6. Are there any other similar cottages owned by the same person or trust in the metropolitan area and, if so—

- (a) where;
- (b) what is their condition; and
- (c) do they need repairing and, if so, to what extent and what is the estimated total cost?

7. Have these cottages been taken over by the South Australian Housing Trust?

8. What is proposed to be done with these cottages?

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

1. After negotiating with the surviving trustees and following the granting of Supreme Court approval, the Housing Trust has completed purchase of the David Bower Jubilee Cottage Homes.

(a) Six.

(b) At the time of purchase, very dilapidated.

(c) The budget is \$40 000.

2. Yes.

(a) March 18, 1898.

(b) G. B. Clarke, A. H. Tonkin, and P. R. Tonkin.

(c) D. H. Roeger.

(d) Not known.

(e) The provision of housing "for the worthy poor, preferentially for mariners and their wives or widows resident within the electoral district of Port Adelaide".

3. The Housing Trust is committed to restoring the cottages to their original external conditions (the building has a National Trust rating), and to convert them internally for community use before vesting them in a suitable public based body for controlling and maintaining them. A co-ordinating committee involving participants from many sections of the community has been meeting regularly to plan the operation of this and other facilities in the Semaphore Park and West Lakes area, and several organisations, including a local youth group, have contributed to the planning. The emphasis has been on flexibility to cater for a diversity of groups.

4. Not at this stage.

5. D. Bower, C. R. Morris, T. N. Stephens as trustees of the David Bower Jubilee Cottage Homes.

6. (a) Not known.

(b) Not known.

(c) Not known.

7. and 8. Vide 6.

#### LEASEHOLD LAND

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. What is the current Government policy relating to the freeholding of leasehold land in—

- (a) rural areas; and
- (b) urban areas?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to change this policy and, if so, when can it be anticipated that such a change will be made?

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

1. (a) In relation to rural broadacres, each application is dealt with on its merits, having regard to existing land tenures, land use, soils, climatic conditions, etc., prevailing in the particular locality. No freeholding of Crown leasehold land within 1 kilometre of the sea coast or  $\frac{1}{2}$  kilometre of inland water is being permitted. There is no statutory provision for the freeholding of leases issued under the Marginal Lands Act, 1940, or within Government irrigation areas. Freeholding is granted where the right to do so is contained in the lease. (Apart from war service perpetual leases, there is only a minimal number of leases which contain this right.)

(b) Freeholding of normal residential sites and business sites in or adjacent to towns is permitted subject to any developmental requirements which may be imposed.

2. This policy is subject to constant review.

#### LAND USE

Mr. WOTTON (on notice):

1. Is it current Government policy to participate in capital gain on either a change of land use or a change of title in rural areas?

2. How does the Government define a change of land use when the land remains in rural use?

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

1. The Crown as lessor has an interest in leasehold land, and accordingly is entitled to receive a fair return for that interest, including where a change in purpose of the lease has occurred. In cases where there is a change of tenure, the Crown's interest for fixing the purchase money or rental is based on the unimproved value as derived from sales of comparable land in the locality, having full regard to the lessee's interests in that land.

2. The terms and conditions, including the rental of all Crown leases, relate to the specified or implied purpose which applied as at the date of issue of the lease. Where the market value of the land for its existing or proposed use is substantially higher than the assessed productive worth of that land for the purpose stated or implied in the lease as at the date of issue, it is deemed that a change of purpose has occurred. However, where the land is to continue in non-intensive broadacre rural use consistent with the specified or implied purpose, and the land provides an adequate and viable area for such use, or it is to be held inseparably with adjoining or nearby land and the combined area is adequate and viable for such use, no change of purpose is deemed to have occurred irrespective of the market value. This policy is applied where applications for consent to transfer indicate that a change of purpose is proposed, or where it becomes evident that a lessee is engaging in some pursuit which is not in accordance with the specified or implied purpose of his lease.

#### DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Will the Minister explain the process by which changes are made to a draft development or supplementary plan after it has been exhibited, and is the Minister aware that significant changes have been made to draft development plans and supplementary development plans after they have been publicly exhibited without making public the intention to make such an alteration?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Under the Planning and Development Act the State Planning Authority, and then the Minister, must fully consider all representations made to a draft plan which has been publicly exhibited. These are all itemised, including recommended action, in a report which accompanies the final draft plan recommended for authorisation, and which is finally forwarded to the Governor. It is possible that the weight of submissions may bring about significant changes to the draft plan. Under statutory legislation the Government is then entitled to proceed to authorisation without further reference to the public. In practice, however, this is not the method which has generally been adopted. Where significant changes have been recommended, the draft plan has been either:

- (a) Re-exhibited to the public: the Supplementary Development Plan for Clare, which is currently on public exhibition for a second period, is such an example. This was brought about by significant changes following representations from the local council.
- (b) Returned to the appropriate local government authorities for final comment, in which case, although not formally on public exhibition, the councils have made the amended plan available

for public inspection and for comments. These have always been considered at this late stage. Examples of this procedure were the Outer Metropolitan Planning Area Development Plan and the recently authorised Riverland Planning Area Development Plan.

#### SCHOOL DENTAL PROGRAMME

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many schools are now included in the dental health programme?
2. When will Plympton, West Beach, Henley Beach, Fulham, and Lockleys North Primary Schools be included in the programme?
3. What was the total expenditure for the financial year ended June 30, 1977, on the school dental programme?
4. Which schools will be included in the programme this financial year?

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

1. 301.
2. Plympton Primary School, 1979 or 1980;  
West Beach Primary School, 1980;  
Henley Beach Primary School, 1980;  
Fulham Primary School, 1980;  
Lockleys North Primary School, 1980.
3. Schools of Dental Therapy—
 

	\$
Capital expenditure . . . . .	35 796
Recurrent costs . . . . .	1 390 017
School dental clinics—	
Capital expenditure (14 new school dental clinics) . . . . .	1 096 974
Recurrent costs . . . . .	3 100 857
	5 623 644

4. Banksia Park  
Campbelltown  
Clare  
Hackham East  
Ingle Farm  
Klemzig  
Madison Park  
Morphett Vale East  
Nuriootpa  
Parafield Gardens  
Salisbury North  
Salisbury North-West  
Smithfield  
Stirling East  
Stradbroke

#### BROOKWAY PARK

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many boys may be accommodated at Brookway Park?
2. What has been the weekly average occupancy of Brookway Park during each of the past two years?
3. What has been the average number of staff at Brookway Park during the past two years?
4. Are there any plans for the use of Brookway Park other than its present use and, if so, what are they?

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

1. 45.
2. Year ending June 30, 1976: 28.  
Year ending June 30, 1977: 25.

3. 46, plus 10 Education Department teaching staff.
4. The future use of Brookway Park will be considered in relation to the reports of the Royal Commission and the Community Welfare Advisory Committee on Youth Assessment and Training Centres.

LAND VALUATION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): On what date was the Premier notified of the rejection of his appeal against the valuation of his property at Norwood?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no record of the date of reception by the Premier of the notification. It would have been a date late in July.

VALUATION APPEALS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. How many appeals were lodged from the Kensington and Norwood council area against the new Government valuations?
2. How many appeals were successful?
3. How many were unsuccessful?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:  
 1. 106.  
 2. 23 applications have been processed to date; 3 have been successful; and 20 valuations have remained unaltered.  
 3. See No. 2 above.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Is the computer in the Public Buildings Department fully operational?
2. When was the computer brought into operation?
3. Which sections of the department are included in the computer programme?
4. What information is provided to the various sections?
5. Are some sections reverting to manual operations and, if so, which ones and why?
6. What is the total cost to the Public Buildings Department since the installation and commencement of the computer?
7. How many persons are employed in the computer section?

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

1. Yes.
2. February, 1976.
3. All sections.
4. Information pertaining to income, expenditure and resource utilisation related to budgetary control.
5. The computer application was not intended to supplant all manual operations. The spectrum of activities intended to be serviced by the computer application have been implemented.

	\$
6. Up-date of tape drive facilities . . . . .	900
Purchase of disk pack . . . . .	700
Maintenance by contract . . . . .	21 000
7. Two computer systems officers—Grade II; two computer systems officer—Grade I.	

BANK SECURITY

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Will the State Bank of South Australia install bullet-proof tellers' boxes for their staff and, if not, why not?
2. What is the estimated cost of such a teller's box?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In common with other banks, the State Bank of South Australia is aware that there has been an increasing element of violence associated with robberies in the community and of the need to take counter measures. Consequently, it is giving consideration to the provision of further protective devices in those of its branches where such may be considered appropriate. The value of bullet-proof tellers' boxes is being examined in relation not only to the protection they are said to provide to tellers but also to the possibility that other persons may be used as hostages in an attempted robbery. The estimated cost of such boxes ranges from \$6 000 to \$17 000, depending on design.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. When did the Attorney-General have a meeting with representatives of the South Australian and Northern Territory division of the Australian Bank Officials Association and Australian Bankers Association to discuss bank hold-ups and security?
2. What was the outcome of the meeting?
3. If no meetings have been held, why not?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Meetings were held with representatives of the Australian Bank Officials Association on June 27 and with members of the Australian Bankers Association on August 8.
2. Matters discussed at these meetings will be further considered in connection with a study of bank security and related problems which the Criminologist of this department is undertaking.
3. Not applicable.

MONARTO COMMISSION

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What was the total amount paid in long service leave and severance pay to persons no longer employed with the Monarto Commission?
2. How many persons were involved and how many were transferred to other departments?

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

1. Two persons were paid \$6 715.74 for long service leave entitlements. No severance payments were made.
2. Of 20 persons notified of pending retrenchment on December 22, 1976, two resigned to take up employment interstate, while the remainder were placed or found employment elsewhere in the Government service.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Have contracts now been let for the purchase of 2 200 new motor vehicles for the Government fleet and, if so—
  - (a) to whom;
  - (b) what is the quantity from each supplier; and
  - (c) at what price a unit?
2. What is the estimated proceeds of sale of vehicles being replaced?



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

1. Yes.
  - (a) Chrysler Limited and General Motors-Holden's Proprietary Limited.
  - (b) Approximately half.
  - (c) Prices vary according to types of vehicles and options required.
2. Approximately \$4 800 000.

BUS AND TRAM ACCIDENTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many accidents have State Transport Authority buses and trams been involved in during the year ended June 30, 1977, and—
  - (a) how many other vehicles were involved;
  - (b) how many persons were injured;
  - (c) what is the estimated total cost of damage to authority vehicles and other vehicles; and
  - (d) what is the estimated cost of claims for injuries?
2. How many buses were removed from service as totally no longer usable?

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

1. 646.
  - (a) 670.
  - (b) 170.
  - (c) \$104 058.
  - (d) \$64 557.
2. Nil.

MOORINGE AVENUE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many accidents during the past five years have occurred at the intersections of Mooringe Avenue, Plympton and—
  - (a) Errington Street;
  - (b) Neston Street; and
  - (c) Bransby Street?
2. What was the total number of persons injured and the—
  - (a) cause of the accidents;
  - (b) number of vehicles involved; and
  - (c) estimated amount of damage?
3. Has the Road Traffic Board received from West Torrens council a request for a school crossing at the intersection of Mooringe Avenue and Errington Street, Plympton, and, if so—
  - (a) has the application been approved;
  - (b) when will the lights be installed; and
  - (c) what is the estimated cost of installing the lights?

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

1.
 

	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
(a) Reported accidents	1	1	0	0	3
(b) Reported accidents	0	0	3	1	3
(c) Reported accidents	2	0	1	0	1
2. 1 killed, 17 injured.
  - (a) Fail to give way . . . . . 11
  - Rear end . . . . . 2
  - Incorrect turn . . . . . 2
  - Driver inattention . . . . . 1
- (b) 31.
- (c) As estimated on the police reports—\$12 000.
3. Yes.
  - (a) Yes.
  - (b) Estimated in September, 1977.
  - (c) \$7 200.

BOAT RAMP

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What investigations and findings have been made into the success or otherwise of the boat ramp adjacent to the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron and, if none has been carried out, why not?
2. Is the ramp being undermined by erosion and, if so, what action is contemplated to preserve it?
3. What is the estimated total cost of any repairs or protective action?

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

1. No specific investigation has been made into the success or otherwise of the ramp adjacent to the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron. However, use of the ramp is known to be restricted by two major factors: the site has no shelter from the weather; when the sand level is low, gutters form at the ramp toe making beach access difficult. The Sea Rescue Squadron does not use the ramp at all and use by the Holdfast Bay Yacht Club is restricted to beach access when tides are favourable. Use by the general public is slight.
2. Some undermining of the ramp has occurred, though the structure does not appear to be in danger of collapse at present. The extent of undermining will be fully assessed when weather and tide conditions are more favourable at the end of the winter. The Coast Protection Board, in deciding upon repair measures, will take into account the small amount of use which the ramp attracts.
3. No estimates of repair cost have yet been made.

MARINELAND

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What happened to the carcass and teeth of the shark loaned to Marineland by the Underwater Divers Club?
2. What was the estimated value of the carcass and teeth?

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

1. The shark carcass which had been suspended above the eastern end of the dolphin pool for some years had deteriorated to such an extent that it constituted a danger and as a result the Manager, after advising both the Underwater Diver's Club and the museum, removed it in August, 1975. The teeth of the shark were taken by persons unknown.
2. In its deteriorated state the carcass had no value.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Are special seasonal shows held at Marineland each Easter and Christmas and, if not, why not?
2. How many charity performances are held each year and for which charities and, if none are held, why not?
3. What new behaviours have been achieved and lost by the dolphins?
4. How do attendance records last financial year compare to similar periods for the previous five years?
5. How many times has Marineland been closed during the past 12 months and, if so, why?
6. What is the estimated loss in revenue during these periods?
7. What new programmes and innovations to attract patrons are being prepared for the reopening of Marineland?

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

1. Seasonal shows are held when it is felt that there is a promotional advantage. These shows usually comprise the normal Marineland show plus some additional features.

2. Charity performances have not been held in the past, but arrangements are currently being made for a major charity performance on August 28 in conjunction with the Adelaide Lionesses Club with proceeds going to the Channel 10 Christmas Appeal.

3. No behaviours have been lost by the dolphins. Indeed, the behaviour pattern has been extended in the past 18 months.

4. Attendance records during the last financial year were slightly lower than that in the preceding five years. However, the loss has not been significant.

5. Marineland has closed for one period only of 14 days to permit major renovations and repairs.

6. Approximately \$2 000.

7. Constant reprogramming is being arranged at Marineland to ensure an appeal to the public. A display gallery of six bays containing static exhibits under the title "The world beneath the sea" will shortly open and a new outdoor dolphin pool, incorporating 14 metres of underwater viewing windows, is currently under construction and will be open to the public in time for the Christmas holidays.

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What are the estimated weekly feeding costs at Marineland?

2. What type of fish are purchased for feeding purposes?

3. Are reject fish purchased for this purpose?

4. Where are the fish for feeding purposes purchased?

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

1. \$461.

2. Tommy ruffs and mullet.

3. No.

4. The fish are purchased primarily from a private fisherman who fishes these species almost exclusively for the benefit of Marineland.

CHRISTIES BEACH HOSPITAL

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. When were approaches first made to the Government to seek assistance for a private hospital for Christies Beach and by whom?

2. Who suggested the inclusion of a maternity section, and why?

3. What casualty facilities will be available at the hospital?

4. What is the estimated cost of the hospital?

5. What is the total paid-up capital of the consortium proposing the hospital?

6. Have all financial arrangements been made and, if not, why not?

7. How many patients will be catered for?

8. Will admission be by referral only?

9. What assistance other than the maternity section has the Government given the consortium, and since when?

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

1. On January 13, 1977 (and reaffirmed on March 7, 1977) by Mr. A. Gilligan of Gilligan & O'Connor, architects and engineers, of Melbourne.

2. The South Australian Government, following requests for such facilities from local residents.

3. Operating room and support facilities including anaesthetic equipment, suction and oxygen supplies of the nature traditionally provided in community type hospitals.

4. \$3 000 000.

5. See 6. below.

6. Arrangements have been made for the financial viability of the proposal to be independently checked by South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation and the Industries Development Committee.

7. Provision is being made for 60 beds.

8. Normally by referral but in emergencies the hospital will be able to provide immediate aid pending arrival of a doctor.

9. Assistance in specific negotiations with the South Australian Housing Trust regarding a suitable site since March 7, 1977, and in securing a mortgage loan by way of Government supported guarantee.

BUSES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What has happened to the \$20 000 000 appropriated from Revenue Account during the financial year ended June 30, 1976, to purchase new buses?

2. How much has been paid out, to whom, and for what purpose?

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

1. The \$20 000 000 was invested with other funds held by the State Transport Authority and no longer has a specific identity.

2. Payments made by the State Transport Authority for capital works during the last financial year included:

Bus and Tram Division—

	\$	\$
Buses . . . . .	6 039 000	
Land and buildings, plant, equipment, etc. . . . .	4 991 000	
	—————	11 030 000

Rail Division—

Christie Downs project . .	1 214 000	
Civil works, plant and sundry items, etc. . . . .	1 054 000	
	—————	2 268 000
		—————
		13 298 000

The State Transport Authority is committed to pay a further \$14 170 000 under existing bus contracts during the years 1977-78 to 1979-80.

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What does the Government propose to do with its property at 579 Tapley Hill Road, Fulham?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government intends to sell such property either to the Italian Village Incorporated or at auction.

X-LOTTO

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Why is there not a certificate by the Auditor-General certifying to the correctness of each X-Lotto result when published in the press?

2. Will this be done in future and, if not, why not?

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

1. The Auditor-General's representative certifies as to the correctness of each lottery and X-Lotto draw. The press publish lottery and X-Lotto results as a "news" item at no

cost to the commission. In doing so, they publish only the actual list of numbers drawn, plus any details relating to major prizewinners available for publication. Because of this, the Lotteries Commission stipulates that the press cannot publish the results as being official.

2. I have requested the commission to include on the bottom of future X-Lotto results published by the commission a statement to the effect that the prizewinning numbers were drawn under the supervision of the Auditor-General's representative.

#### PATAWALONGA BASIN

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has an approach been made by the Glenelg council to the Government for financial assistance to maintain the Patawalonga Lake and Basin?

2. When was such application received?

3. What policy will the Government adopt in assisting Glenelg council?

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

1. Yes.

2. August 3, 1977.

3. The matter is still under consideration.

#### NOTICE OF MOTION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I give notice that tomorrow I will move:

That this House—

- (1) disapproves of the policy of the Government in spending lavishly on school facilities in newly developing and politically marginal areas to the detriment of inner metropolitan districts which do not normally support the Labor Party and where many schools are in drastic need of renovation;
- (2) calls for an equitable and responsible allocation of available funds for all schools irrespective of location; and
- (3) in particular calls for the relocation of Mitcham Junior Primary School, which in its present location is inadequate, antiquated, noisy and unsafe, so that it may be integrated with Mitcham Primary School in Ashbourne Avenue, Kingswood, and directs the Government to give this relocation priority over the relocation of any other school in the State.

In view of the report in the local paper of the comments of the Liberal Party candidate for Mitcham, which I have put into the motion word for word, after he had visited the school with the member for Mount Gambier, I call on the member for Mount Gambier or any other member of the Liberal Party to second this motion.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. Millhouse: What! Isn't it going to be seconded?

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand that the member for Mitcham has simply given notice.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I have asked for a seconder because my notice is not yet signed. I need a seconder before I can put it in.

The SPEAKER: In this case it is essential that I ask for a seconder. Is there a seconder to the motion?

Mr. Millhouse: Come on, you hypocrites, you go to a school and stir up trouble and then you will not stand by your words.

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order.

Mr. Millhouse: I thought you were going to second it, for a moment.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before we go any further, is there a seconder? If there is no seconder, the motion must lapse.

Mr. Millhouse: Come on, Allison!

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! It is normal for anyone giving notice to have a seconder and for that seconder to have signed it. This was an exceptional circumstance where the notice was not signed, and I have had to ask for a seconder.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GOLDEN BREED

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Recently I told this House that I would give a full statement in respect to O'Neill Wetsuits (Australia) Proprietary Limited and the formation of a new company called Golden Breed Proprietary Limited. I regret that this statement is somewhat lengthy but I undertook to give to the House a full statement, and I will do so. However, before I give that statement, I would like to take up the four specific examples which the member for Davenport cited last week as evidence that incorrect and incomplete information had been given in respect to these companies. I do so as it will once again clearly demonstrate the honourable member's ability deliberately to mislead the public for his own political purposes rather than to take a responsible attitude and make some constructive contribution to matters before the House.

First, the member claims that I have refused to give information about the extension of Government loans and guarantees to O'Neill Wetsuits (Australia) Proprietary Limited. If he had cared to read the *Advertiser* on June 10, 1977, he would have seen that the Deputy Premier (in my absence) had stated that \$1 000 000 had been put into the company some time beforehand. That assistance was provided by way of a loan of \$300 000 from the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation and \$700 000 by way of a Government guarantee to a bank loan to the company. Both forms of assistance were approved by the Industries Development Committee, on which two members of his Party sit.

Secondly, he claims that the South Australian Government stated that it had stepped in to save 500 to 800 jobs at O'Neill's. Again this is quite incorrect. What the Government did say was that the closing of O'Neill's would place 500 to 800 jobs in jeopardy, as reference to that same newspaper will clearly testify.

Thirdly, he seems to find it "disgusting" (that was the word he used) that the Government worked closely with an oversea company without due regard to safeguarding the interests of local business. It was for the very purpose of safeguarding those interests and the interests of employment which led the corporation to devote an enormous amount of time to preserving this industry in South Australia. The corporation made every effort to obtain support from Australian organisations but, because of the state of the garment industry in this country, only one materialised—Courtauld Hilton Limited. However, that company wished to move the operation interstate, and that was not acceptable to the Government.

If the honourable member's idea of industrial development is to move industries interstate rather than negotiate for their continued operation in South Australia, then all I can say is "God help South Australia" if the member's Party should ever get into Government.

Finally, he claims that the Government has not revealed its capital investment, loans and guarantees in the new operating company Golden Breed Proprietary Limited. Whilst a newspaper report of June 26 clearly sets out that involvement, I will nevertheless confirm it for the member and return to it in detail in a moment. As to making public all records and agreements entered into between the Government and/or the corporation and its clients, I can only say that in common with other responsible leading institutions I regard those matters as confidential between the parties involved.

Mr. Dean Brown: Ha, ha, you—

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let me now turn to the facts in this matter as advised to me by the Chairman of the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation. First, the problems which led to the placing of O'Neill Wetsuits (Australia) Proprietary Limited in receivership in April of this year began to manifest themselves as long as three years ago when the company first approached the Government for financial assistance. At that time the company, and in particular its Managing Director, Mr. John Arnold, were told that the company was too highly geared and lacked the financial management to realise the potential of its product. However, because of the product's undoubted potential, the Government on the recommendation of the Industries Development Committee guaranteed a loan of \$200 000 from the Bank of New South Wales to the company on the condition that it took immediate steps to correct those deficiencies. The Government was eventually released from its guarantee in April, 1976. A few weeks later the company approached the South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation for a loan to expand its operations. The company's attention was once again directed to its high gearing and lack of financial management. The corporation saw the correction of these deficiencies as fundamental to any expansion proposals.

In about June, 1976, the company began to experience serious liquidity problems. High turnover coupled with a very highly geared financial structure presented serious difficulties to the company in financing raw materials from overseas and in increasing stock and debtor holding. The company approached the corporation for financial assistance, and the corporation engaged a major Adelaide accounting firm to advise the corporation on the company's situation as a matter of urgency. The accounting firm, one of the most reputable in the State—

Mr. Millhouse: Which one?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Touche Ross & Company, which reported that the company was chronically undercapitalised and in danger of total financial collapse and that top-level management was inadequate. However, its product was in strong demand. The accounting firm recommended that, in view of the strong public interest and the product demand, \$1 000 000 be injected into the company and the management be completely restructured.

On the basis of that information the corporation recommended to the Government that a loan of \$300 000 be provided by the corporation to the company and that the corporation appoint three directors to the board of O'Neill Wetsuits. At the same time the company arranged for its debtors to be factored by Heller Factors Limited, who also

took over the letter of credit financing arrangements for the company's oversea raw material purchases. The question of the remaining \$700 000 was deferred, pending further investigation by the accounting firm. The two-Party Industries Development Committee unanimously endorsed the corporation's recommendations.

Mr. Arnold and Mr. Bennett (the other shareholder in O'Neills) agreed to the directorship appointments, and these gentlemen, together with the corporation representatives, made up the five-man board. The board took immediate action to appoint a financial controller to the company. In the meantime, the accounting firm had undertaken further investigations and in January, 1977, reported to the corporation that, although existing financial records were inadequate, it was satisfied that, despite the company's liquidity problems, it was operating profitably and would show a small profit (or at least break even) during the six-month period to December 31, 1976.

In view of the firm's earlier report, the corporation questioned this advice in some depth. Finally, in view of the high public interest (employment, dependent industries, creditors), the corporation recommended to the Government that a bank loan of \$700 000 be guaranteed by the Government. Again, the two-Party Industries Development Committee unanimously supported the corporation's recommendation, and I point out that I can give no such guarantee unless I have a recommendation from that two-Party committee. Shortly after injecting those funds into the company, the corporation was advised that the company had shown a loss of \$1 200 000 during the six-month period to December 31, 1976. The directors immediately advised those members of the corporation who were available, and they met and interviewed all interested parties.

The accounting firm and Mr. Arnold were asked whether the figures were correct. They agreed they were substantially so. All the advice and information which could be obtained indicated that the company was insolvent and would be unable to continue. The secured creditors were advised of the situation. It was evident that a receiver would have to be appointed and the business taken over by someone with the resources to operate it. A number of organisations showed early interest but, because of the problems facing the garment industry, only one materialised—Courtaulds Hilton Limited. However, this company's offer was not acceptable to the Government, as that company wished to move the business to Victoria.

In the meantime, "wind-up" notices had been issued by two major creditors, and, on April 20, 1977, it was the unanimous decision of the O'Neill board to appoint a receiver. On April 22, 1977, Richton International advised that, because of their interest in the Golden Breed name in Australia, they were prepared to discuss the possibility of a joint venture with the South Australian Government to continue the manufacture of Golden Breed products in South Australia.

As there were no other suitable offers, the Government decided that it would be proper and in the public interest to negotiate a joint venture operation with Richton. The only other alternative was to have the receiver wind up the company, with the consequent loss of the remaining 400 jobs at O'Neills (the receiver had already retrenched about 100) and possibly up to another 300 jobs in dependent industries. In addition, creditors would suffer substantial losses with a consequent effect on their operations.

After considerable negotiations an arrangement was concluded with Richton. Golden Breed Proprietary Limited was established with a share capital of \$500 000 equally

divided between the corporation and the Richton group. Richton also provided \$250 000 loan capital and the Government, together with Heller Factors, have equally guaranteed a bank loan to the new company of \$1 000 000. The Industries Development Committee also gave its support to this action.

The corporation has two representatives on the board of Golden Breed Proprietary Limited. The Government made that commitment for the following reasons: (1) to maintain an important industry in South Australia whose product enjoys a substantial share of the market; (2) to protect the employment of at least some of the people employed by O'Neill Wetsuits (Aust.) Pty. Ltd, and also the employment of people in dependent industries; and (3) to protect the position of creditors who stood to lose substantial sums if O'Neills was wound up. As it now stands, 164 of the O'Neill work force have been employed by the new company. The Government is confident that the new company will be profitable and the work force will increase above the initial level. However, it is unlikely to return to its previous level of about 500, as the previous operation appeared to be substantially over-staffed.

In respect to the creditors, all the assets of O'Neills (stock, plant, etc.) have remained with the receiver for the benefit of the creditors of O'Neills. The new company has acquired only the licence to manufacture and market the Golden Breed product. In fact, the establishment of Golden Breed Proprietary Limited has given the receiver an outlet for his major realisable asset (the stock) which would not otherwise have been available to him. The Government is confident that Golden Breed Proprietary Limited will be profitable, and expects to recover its investment in O'Neill Wetsuits (Australia) Proprietary Limited.

#### MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: KANGAROO ISLAND SETTLERS

The SPEAKER: I have received from the honourable member for Mitcham the following letter dated August 16, 1977:

I desire to inform you that today, Tuesday, August 16, it is my intention to move that this House at its rising do adjourn until 1.30 p.m. on Wednesday, August 17, for the purpose of considering a matter of urgency, namely:

That the Government immediately accept the offer of the Commonwealth Government to assume responsibility as principals rather than agents under the War Service Land Settlement Scheme in respect of those settlers on Kangaroo Island who have been experiencing difficulties and that it do not proceed further with action to evict any of such settlers from the lands occupied by them pursuant to their respective War Service Perpetual Leases.

I call on those members who support the motion to rise in their places.

*No members having risen:*

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Hypocrites again!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: You gutless oafs. You fawn all over the Federal Government—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will be seated. The motion not having been supported by four honourable members rising in their places, it therefore lapses.

#### QUESTIONS RESUMED

Mr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Education say whether the Government will revise its policy to provide housing to teachers on the basis of status instead of family needs, a policy which, quite correctly, has been described as elitist? I quote from the *S.A. Teachers Journal* of August 3, 1977, a report of a statement by Mr. Connor, as follows:

I am acutely disappointed that such an elitist concept should be thrust upon country teachers in such a clumsy and autocratic manner, particularly in the light of the Government's alleged commitment to worker participation and industrial democracy. The Government decision, in my view, embraces a philosophy more appropriate to the nineteenth century than the present day. To prescribe a "hierarchy" of house types, apparently intended to match a status "hierarchy", is to ignore completely the legitimate requirements of individuals which relate to their family size and circumstance. I object strongly to the prescription being conveyed bluntly to the authority without prior consultation, and wish to advise teachers that within the authority I will express complete opposition to the acceptance of the Government's direction.

The documents show that Cabinet approval has been given to a set of standards for the provision of Government housing in country areas according to the rank of the tenant. The effect of the standards is that a married principal with one child in a country area could be entitled to live in a brick veneer house of 110 square metres with an *en suite* shower and lavatory, but a teacher assistant with more children could expect a timber-frame house of only 100 square metres.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Mr. Connor is a member of the Teacher Housing Authority, and I have discussed this matter with the authority. I think it now understands that the guidelines will not interfere in any way with the manner in which the authority has previously operated. I think that the authority probably misinterpreted the amount of flexibility available to it under the guidelines. My understanding, having spoken to the authority, is that it is happy that the means by which it has operated in the past will continue in future. If the Leader checks this matter with Mr. Connor, I think he will find that Mr. Connor's attitude has modified considerably since he went into print.

#### ADOPTIONS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Will the Minister of Community Welfare clarify the situation regarding the establishment of an adopted persons' contact register which, I understand, in some circumstances will enable people who have been adopted to contact their natural parents? As I understand the scheme, no compulsion is intended. However, constituents of mine are concerned about the situation, and I think it would be useful if the Minister could allay any fears in this area at this time, especially in relation to those under 18 years of age. I will appreciate any information that the Minister can give on this matter.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I thank the honourable member for raising this matter. I do not know whether it is possible for a third person to allay the fears in the minds of anyone else, but I appreciate the chance to give information to the House in the hope that it will perhaps cause people who have become concerned to reappraise what is proposed and obtain a better understanding of it. It cannot be stressed too strongly that the register is entirely a voluntary concept with no compulsion involved for any adopted person or for any person who may have given a child for adoption. No adopted person under the age of 18 years will be permitted to place his or her name on the register unless they have the written permission of

their adopting parents. Adopted persons over the age of 18 will be free to act on their own behalf. They are, after all, adults under the law, who are able to marry or enter legal contracts without parental permission and, for that matter, to vote at elections. Natural parents must also make their own decision whether they wish to contact the person they gave up for adoption many years before. If, and only if, matching names appear on the register will my department then assist in making a reunion possible. If only one party registers, absolutely nothing will happen. My department will not solicit registration from anyone, or contact anyone, and will disclose no information about anyone, unless the two parties involved, freely and independently, first act on their own behalf to have their names placed on the register.

From my reading of the various objections to the contact register, it seems that two matters are causing concern. The first is that some adoptive parents feel they have not enough say over whether voluntary contacts should occur. I should point out that they do have a say. In fact, while the adopted person is a child, they have the power of absolute veto. Without their written permission, a person under the age of 18 cannot place his or her name on the contact register. Only when an adopted person is an adult can he take action on his own behalf. The other fear expressed by some adoptive parents is that the contact register is the thin edge of the wedge and that it might lead to the kind of legislative action that has been taken in England and Scotland, where an adopted person is entitled to original birth certificate details as a matter of right when he reaches 17 or 18 years of age. This is not the case. The contact register is not the forerunner to anything else: it is a voluntary scheme and will remain so. When I first announced the contact register, I made very clear that it was not the answer to claims made by such organisations as JIGSAW, which supports the view that adopted persons should be given information on their natural parents as a matter of right. I stated that such proposals would require a great deal of public discussion, and obviously strong public support, before that kind of legislative change was even considered. I also pointed out that no such change, in my opinion, should be contemplated until it could be made on a uniform basis throughout Australia. I have not changed those views.

#### ST. JOHN AMBULANCE BRIGADE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry use his influence with the Australian Government Workers Association to ensure that funds are not cut off from the St. John Ambulance Brigade as a result of militant union action? A report in this morning's *Advertiser* from Mr. V. Smith of the Australian Government Workers Association states that funds will be cut off from St. John ambulance if the Barossa Valley service does not employ a Mr. Fraser, who applied for a new position in the Barossa Valley. The facts are that applications were called and that, from 15 applicants, a Mr. Hunter from Loxton was appointed by the local board for the position, because in its view he was the best qualified and most suitable person for the job. Mr. Hunter had only recently joined the union but had had 6½ years full-time service in the St. John ambulance service, whereas Mr. Fraser had had only three years full-time experience with St. John's but had been a long-term union member. During the interview for the position, Mr. Fraser replied to a question from the Chairman of the interviewing board that, if he was unsuccessful in his application, he would not appeal against the appointment made by the local board because

he believed other people who had applied for the job were better qualified. However, he did appeal to a review committee, which consisted of two union members, Mr. V. Smith (the same Mr. Smith who was quoted in this morning's press) and Mr. S. Morrison, of the Australian Workers Union; Mr. P. Eblen, from the Chamber of Commerce; and Mr. R. Schilling, Secretary of the St. John Ambulance Brigade. The Chairman of the review committee was the Acting Registrar of the commission, Mr. R. Holland. The union members supported Mr. Fraser in his appeal against the board at Barossa Valley having appointed the man from Loxton. I have read the complete transcript of the appeal, and I say without any apology that, in my view, Mr. Holland made an ambiguous and puzzling recommendation in Fraser's favour after a two-all vote on the review committee. As a result of this the union, in this morning's press, is threatening that, if the Barossa Valley service does not employ Fraser, it will cut off funds to St. John's. Members of the Barossa Valley board believe that it would be quite impossible to carry on with the new appointment and want the *status quo* to continue. The board will carry on with one ambulance officer, as it has done until now, and will not make an appointment. This action has been threatened by the union, which says that the board must employ Fraser. I therefore ask the Minister whether he is aware of the facts and whether he will take some action with the Australian Government Workers Association to ensure that common sense prevails and that this militant union action does not cut off funds from St. John's.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am aware of the facts of this matter. In fact, the union, through Mr. Smith, thought the matter serious enough to advise me of the problem during the Cabinet meeting yesterday afternoon, when I immediately deputed an officer to examine and report on the situation. As I understand them, the simple facts of the matter are that the Angaston St. John council wants to appoint someone other than the person recommended by the tribunal set up under the terms of the relevant award or agreement.

Mr. Goldsworthy: They made the appointment.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Yes, but under the provisions of this agreement there can be an appeal. If the union, on behalf of member Fraser, desires to appeal and then wins the appeal, surely the decision is binding on both organisations. My information is that, if the appeal had been lost, the union was willing to accept the situation; but, having won the appeal, it expected the council participating in that appeal to honour its obligation under the award. I think that is reasonable. The honourable member described the union action as being militant. The Australian Government Workers Association is not normally a militant organisation; it does not take part in many stoppages or disputes. It is a Government organisation working within the framework of the industrial jurisdiction. Normally it would not be considered to be in the left wing of the trade union movement or to be very militant.

Getting back to the question, certainly I and the Government will do everything we can to solve this problem and see that funds are not cut off. We have already been talking about it today. We have had officers consulting with the union today, and I will also have someone consult with the council. I think we ought to be completely clear in our minds about where we are going. The honourable member has not clearly indicated that there have been two appeals.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The second was to clarify the ruling of the Chairman, who gave an ambiguous ruling.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: There have been two appeals, nevertheless, and on both occasions the union has been able to convince the Chairman that this man is able to do, and capable of doing, the job. Surely that places the Angaston council in a difficult position. Why have an appeal system or participate in that appeal if one is not going to honour the obligations under that appeal. Evidently, it would have been quite prepared to accept the decision had it gone the other way, but it did not go that way. At the moment the union seems to be on the right side of the law; it seems to be carrying out the decision of the Industrial Court, as we all advocate from time to time in this House that unions should do. The Government and I will do everything we can do to see that funds are not cut off and that an amicable solution is found to this problem.

### CLEARWAYS

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Transport inform the House and people in the Unley District how the Highways Department and local government are co-operating, in the interests of shoppers, storekeepers and safety, in the management of Goodwood Road and Unley Road, and say whether traders have had ample opportunity to air their views? Knowing the interest in this matter of the Leader of the Opposition, today I door-knocked in a closely settled area and only one person of the 80 to whom I spoke asked about clearways. As the local member, for some weeks I have not received at my office any complaints from traders about clearways on Goodwood Road. I did not even receive an invitation to attend the meeting on the matter. I had an opportunity to speak on 5DN and TDT. The media has given much coverage to this matter (and there has been much bally hoo) but I have not been contacted about the matter. I am sure the Minister will be able to clarify the position for the benefit of all.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I did see the television interview last evening.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He looked like a militant trade unionist.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: He was attempting to, but it was such a pathetic attempt that it was almost laughable. I think these are the leftwingers that the Deputy Leader is so worried about. If it were not for the fact that the Leader is dealing with the livelihood of people it would be pathetic, but, regrettably, in his search for votes, it seems that he will stop at nothing, even telling untruths. Certainly, yesterday was a clear example of that. Maybe he has been tutored by the member for Hanson (I do not know), but he certainly went down into the depths of despair yesterday. Had he, his officers, or whoever prepared the material for him read what I said in this House a fortnight ago, he would never have been able honestly to embark upon what he did yesterday.

So that there is no misunderstanding, let me repeat that in the hope that either the Deputy Leader or one of the other members will draw to the Leader's attention the facts of the matter when they next see him. The position is that on March 29 last year the Highways Department wrote to the Corporation of the City of Unley stating that it believed the time had arrived when consideration ought to be given to 12-hour clearways and that in the meantime it was proposed that clearways in those areas be implemented on not just Goodwood and Unley Roads but also South Road and other roads so that there was a

clearway on both sides in the morning and again in the afternoon, rather than on the one side in the morning and the other side in the afternoon. On May 4 the council acknowledged receipt of the letter and said, "Thank you very much" and also that it would discuss the matter with the shop proprietors.

On August 19 the council stated that studies were being carried out into the effect of the clearways and that it desired that no alternation take place until those studies had been completed and considered. The Highways Department had no hesitation in giving that assurance. Indeed the position is exactly as I told the House a fortnight ago. On May 24 this year, the Highways Department again wrote to the council and said, "Look, you have had since last September, some eight months. We have not heard from you. What is the score?"

On June 30 the council stated that it had received the report from the consultants and that the owners of abutting shops were being consulted and their opinions sought. On August 9 (a week ago) that report was sent to the Highways Department for evaluation, but it has not yet been evaluated. How the Leader can go out and talk about disallowing regulations for clearways that have not been determined is beyond my comprehension: until agreement is reached, those clearways will not be introduced.

Mr. Venning: Where is that?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I would think that even the member for Rocky River could understand language as simple as that, and I hope that he will be able to convince his Leader.

### MITCHAM JUNIOR PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. ALLISON: My question is directed to the Minister of Education. Following my visit earlier this year to Mitcham Junior Primary School, which was recommended for urgent relocation by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works in April, 1972, and subsequent to my correspondence with the Minister, will he give urgent priority to implementing that Public Works Committee's recommendation during the present financial year? At the request of the Mitcham Junior Primary School parents organisation I attended that school quite willingly—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ALLISON: —in company with the principals of both the primary and junior primary schools. Among certain disadvantages were the lack of fire extinguishers, the fact that the students would have to escape from several classrooms through relatively high windows, there was no provision for the safety hoppers which are standard requirements in wooden prefabricated buildings of modern-day construction (these are antiquated buildings), and the building is located on a small triangle of land between the Mitcham railway yard, Grange Road, and Belair Road. Also, the school has only one-quarter of the land space recommended by the Schools Commission for that number of students, the yard is in bad repair, there is noise from passing trains and vehicles on the high road, and there is no guard-rail for children who might happen to run out from the schoolyard on to the highway. The highway has been broadened and part of the school frontage has been removed by that broadening. The staff kitchen doubles for a children's sickroom and for a wet area for craft facilities. I received the Minister's letter of reply last week, and simultaneously received a somewhat belated request from the member for Mitcham to support his motion, which I refused to do in writing, stating that I

intended to raise this issue personally today, and that explains his alacrity in jumping to his feet so early in this sitting.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! I must point out that the honourable member has spent a considerable time explaining his question. He must now ask the question.

Mr. ALLISON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. However swiftly the honourable member may have leapt to his feet today, it is five or six years since the Public Works Committee forwarded not just a recommendation but an urgent recommendation. The paperwork has been done, the recommendation has been made, and I ask the Minister to investigate this matter with a view to placing this project on the Budget somewhat earlier than he intimated to me in his reply of last Wednesday.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Having seen certain press references to this matter, my first reaction was that perhaps my knowledge of the State's electoral boundaries was sadly deficient. Then it occurred to me that perhaps this Government had so well provided for education in Mount Gambier that the honourable member was seeking to spread his wings a little. Then I noticed that he was accompanied by another gentleman and I realised, with my somewhat cynical mind, what was going on.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Was it the Liberal candidate?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes, the Liberal candidate for the area.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He was proselytising in the school.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Proselytisation or not, I was interested in the way in which the local newspaper ran the story. In 1972, this whole matter was tied up with the disestablishment of the junior primary school, and that was opposed by the school at that time. What I find interesting is that, on two or three occasions, I have publicly called on the member for Mount Gambier and/or his Leader, as Opposition spokesman, to renounce the Federal Government for what it has done to our school building programme as a result of guidelines that Senator Carrick has given to the Schools Commission and of the lousy deal the States have received at Loan Council. I have mentioned previously to this House that, as a result of those two decisions by the Federal Government, we lose more than \$4 000 000 from our school building programme. At no stage has the honourable member been prepared to dissociate himself from those decisions which have so affected our building programme. I am well aware of the situation at Mitcham Junior Primary School. My officers have been aware of it for some time. The local member has written to me on this matter, and we shall continue to keep the matter under review. Perhaps, when the local member gets my reply, he might be good enough to show a copy of it to the member for Mount Gambier.

### SHIPBUILDING

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Premier, as a matter of urgency, forward a telegram to the Chairman of the Joint House Parliamentary Committee on Defence and Foreign Affairs, calling upon him to make further representations to the Prime Minister to implement immediately the committee's recommendations on shipbuilding? The Premier would be aware that the committee to which I refer brought down what were, in my opinion, real and

positive recommendations on shipbuilding. Those recommendations would, if put into operation, retain the shipbuilding industry in this country. The committee is a Joint Parliamentary Committee chaired by a Liberal member of Parliament. In my opinion, the Federal Cabinet has ignored these recommendations. I inform the Premier that I have today forwarded telegrams to the members of that committee along the lines of the telegram I now suggest that he should send. I can only assume that the Prime Minister, by his callous opposition to the recommendations of the committee, is prepared to sacrifice indefinitely the employment of people in this country for, in my opinion, his mad endeavours to solve the economic ills of the mining industry.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I shall send a telegram. I was very dispirited when I received the statement from the Prime Minister by telex that the Federal Government would not accept the recommendations of the committee, would not accept the proposals of the South Australian Government, and would not vary the recommendations of the Industries Assistance Commission in that no further assistance would be provided to the shipbuilding industry. It is quite clear from the text of his letter that all he is prepared to do is have the people go on the dole. His letter states:

As you will be aware, the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations is taking appropriate action to assist those affected to find alternative employment, and will continue its efforts in that direction.

In other words, they have to go along to the unemployment bureau and see whether they can be found jobs in the present situation in Whyalla. The Prime Minister is making clear that the Federal Government is prepared to sink the shipbuilding industry, when other comparable countries are giving very much more assistance to their shipbuilding industries than we are giving ours. In consequence, it is quite clear that he is determined to get rid of shipbuilding in this country, even though, with the reasonable level of assistance which was proposed by the South Australian Government and which would have involved an input from this Government, we would have been able to rehabilitate the yard and make it competitive, in international terms, in the foreseeable future. I was very disappointed. I shall send a telegram, certainly, and we will have to keep on bringing to bear whatever pressure we can on a Government which, as far as I can see, is determined to sink both Newcastle and Whyalla if it can.

### ADOPTIONS

Dr. EASTICK: What public reaction has the Minister of Community Welfare had to the announcement that couples over the age of 40 years will be denied an opportunity to adopt children? An article in the *Advertiser* of May 3, 1977, under the heading "Couples 40 able to adopt soon", gives a wrong impression, as it implies that people up to 40 years of age were to be allowed to adopt children, whereas people up to that age previously had not been able to do so. On reading the article further, it becomes apparent that the original recommendation that the age be from 25 years to 37 years was contained in the recommendations of the Community Welfare Advisory Committee on Adoption Matters. After some public reaction at that stage, the Minister announced a progression from the age of 37 years to the age of 40 years, but that upper limit will still be against the proposal, or against the interests of people wanting to adopt, that had prevailed



previously. It is on that basis that I ask the Minister whether he has received any great public reaction to the fact that 40 years will be the maximum age at which people will be permitted to adopt children when, in fact, there are many people in the community above that age who have been waiting for a considerable time or who in some circumstances may be able to provide a worthwhile home to children of more mature years who may be adopted but who will be denied that opportunity.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I have not had much public reaction to that article which, I think, the honourable member said was published in May of this year. Probably the honourable member is correct in that the inference that could be gained from it was not the true position. I point out that, in his former position as Leader of the Opposition, the honourable member would have found often that what the press printed and what was intended by the originator was not always the same. I can only suggest that that is possibly what happened here, and I am sure that this is what has happened. The question of adoption is always a difficult one, and I think the honourable member would be the first to agree that the reason for setting up the advisory committee was that the waiting list was becoming inordinately long and that the number of children available for adoption was becoming less and less. This trend has continued. I think, in answer to a question a few weeks ago, I said that fewer children were available for adoption in South Australia during the past 12 months. What the committee was faced with was not deciding who should get children but who, because of the limited number of children becoming available, ought to be made available to those children as parents. I hasten to add that I am not taking into account either concern or compassion. I am trying to put to the honourable member (and I am sure he understands) what the position was and what it is now. I do not suggest that there are not many people over that age who would make excellent parents, but the committee had the job in front of it and, with those constrictions, as it were, I cannot understand what other answer it could give. It gave much thought to this matter. The report has been made public, and the committee's reasons for arriving at its conclusions have also been available to the public. I say again that I have no personal knowledge of a large public reaction, but I have had some response to it.

#### TRAM AND BUS DISPUTE

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Transport provide any information concerning the proposed stoppage by the Australian Tramway and Motor Omnibus Employees Association next Friday morning? This morning's *Advertiser* carried a front page storey headed "Tram and Bus Services to stop on Friday." The article continues:

No buses or trams will run in the Adelaide metropolitan area on Friday morning because of a union stoppage. About 1 450 members of the South Australian branch of the Australian Tramway and Motor Omnibus Employees Association have been called to a stopwork meeting at the Trades Hall at 9 a.m. on Friday.

I am concerned that, if the proposed stoppage occurs, workers and schoolchildren will find it difficult to get to work and to school. We do not know how long the meeting may take, but it has been traditional for this union to meet on Sunday mornings so that it does not disrupt the usual work of other people. Can the Minister provide information on this proposed stoppage?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I believe that many people, including me, were rather disturbed on reading the *Advertiser* this morning to ascertain that Adelaide commuters would be without any transport services on Friday. After giving a little thought to the matter I wrote to the tramways union executive, which is meeting now, and asked it to review its decision. I make it quite plain that I believe that the tramways union has a perfect right to call a meeting of its members to consider its position, but in doing so it must consider fully the requirements of other people and, indeed, other workers in the community who will be deprived of transport on Friday if the decision to stop work proceeds. Such a decision will affect schoolchildren, who will find it difficult to get to school, women will find it difficult to shop, and, perhaps worst of all, certainly to those concerned, people who are to leave on holidays on Friday will not be able to do so because of the stoppage. It is with those thoughts in mind that I have written to the union asking it to review its decision. As I understand the situation (I am relying only on the newspaper report, and other factors might intrude that could put a different complexion on the situation), the decision has been made because the Government has declined to provide an additional week's annual leave for members of that union. Previously I have made quite plain to the union, and I have done it again today, that to do so would be to offend against the indexation guidelines. Therefore, the Government is unable to accede, because it is fully committed to indexation. I hope that the union will review its position. I have asked it to consider holding its meeting on Sunday morning, when a minimum of inconvenience would occur, alternatively to meet on Friday but to provide a service before the meeting, as has happened previously when the union has held a stopwork meeting, and to guarantee to the people of Adelaide that services would resume in time to take schoolchildren and workers home. The union is now considering the matter, and I hope that it will comply with the request that I have forwarded to it.

#### ADELAIDE HILLS COMMITTEE

Mr. WOTTON: Has the Minister for Planning considered setting up an Adelaide Hills committee in a consultative or advisory capacity, along the lines suggested by me in the adjournment debate in this House on Wednesday, August 3, at pages 400-1 of *Hansard* and, if he has, will he inform the House whether the Government could support such a plan? If the Government cannot support the plan, will the Minister liaise with the Minister of Local Government in supporting the setting up of a joint authority, consisting of the councils in the Adelaide Hills study area, if the eight councils concerned were to agree to petition the Minister under section 19 of the Local Government Act? In the adjournment debate I have mentioned I referred to a submission put before the Monarto Development Commission by the Adelaide Hills Land Use Committee. Although this committee is strongly opposed to the setting up of a statutory authority to control the Adelaide Hills area, it is now firmly convinced that a consultative committee needs to be set up. The submission suggests that such a committee should consist of a representative from each of the eight councils in the study area and a representative from each of the State Planning Office, the Environment Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Agriculture and Fisheries Department and the Lands Department.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the honourable member would know, I am aware of the submission. I thank him for letting me know that he intended to ask this question today. The submission is certainly worthy of consideration, and I can assure the honourable member that the suggestion that has been made will be considered properly. I have taken up the matter with the Monarto Development Commission but have been told that the commission has received about 20 written submissions and about 50 verbal submissions, and that the report dealing with stage 1 of the exercise should be available soon. In those circumstances it would be sensible for me, as I am not aware of all the other submissions that have been made or whether other suggestions made could be valuable, to wait until I have received the report and considered the matter in full.

Mr. Wotton: Do you see the importance of setting up such a body immediately?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The point that I am trying to get across to the honourable member is that personally I believe the suggestion he has made could be a useful first step, but I wish to know what other submissions have been made on the subject, and it would be foolish for me to prejudge a question when a special investigation into the whole matter has been made and all the submissions that have been received are being considered. I am not aware of many of those submissions. Not only would it be unwise for me to do so but it would be improper for me in those circumstances to reach what might, in the views of others, be a premature decision. I promise the honourable member that the submission about which he is concerned will be given every consideration. I am sure, as he is aware, that the desire to create a greater local involvement on a regional basis, of which the committee that he has suggested would be the beginning, is something in which we are much interested.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Mr. ABBOTT: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say when the Commonwealth Government recognised the unquestionable value of the State Government's Unemployment Relief Scheme and entered the arena by making grants to councils? I am asking the question because today's country edition of the *Advertiser* states that the Federal Government is making grants to the Mount Barker and Strathalbyn councils. The report states:

Two Adelaide Hills district councils have received rural unemployment relief grants from the Federal Government. The Mount Barker council received \$33 000 and the Strathalbyn council \$38 000. More than \$25 000 of Mount Barker's grant will be spent on a survey and design work for a common effluent drainage system at Nairne. At Strathalbyn, \$24 000 will be spent on a foot-bridge and \$11 500 on a new amenities block at the Clayton caravan park.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: This is just another example of absolutely shocking journalism. On August 3 I released two press releases dealing with the matter just raised by the honourable member. I was given an assurance by the local paper in the area concerned that the releases would be published in the local paper strictly in accordance with the way they were released. The first such release was as follows:

State Government Unemployment Relief Scheme grants of \$33 426 have been allocated to the District Council of Mount Barker. The Minister of Labour and Industry, Mr. Jack Wright, said three projects had been approved for grants. He said \$6 056 would enable the current programme of upgrading the Hahndorf Pioneer Gardens to be completed,

A sum of \$2 142 will allow council to undertake a cycle track feasibility study. A larger amount of \$25 228 has been allocated for a survey and design work for a common effluent scheme at Nairne.

The second release is as follows:

The Minister of Labour and Industry, Mr. Jack Wright, has announced that the District Council of Strathalbyn will receive \$38 625 from the latest allocation of State Government unemployment relief funds. Mr. Wright said council would spend \$3 275 to establish a data bank and prepare base planning for future town development. The sum of \$23 834 was granted to renovate the historic foot-bridge over the Angas River connecting the Memorial Park with the Strathalbyn shopping centre. A further \$11 516 would be used to construct an amenities building at the Clayton caravan park.

Obviously, what has occurred is that the *Advertiser* correspondent has watched the local press as part of his job for the *Advertiser* and has lazily picked up this story, has not bothered to check his facts, and has given the Federal Government credit for these grants. I charge that journalist with either doing that deliberately or being totally incompetent. He is either trying to give the Federal Government credit for the grants or, alternatively, he is just incompetent and cannot do his job, because it is the State Government's relief money.

Mr. Mathwin: Stop debating.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am going to explain. I was asked whether the Federal Government had recognised the scheme. The Federal Government has not recognised the SUR scheme at all. Since it first became my responsibility, I have raised the matter at conference after conference in the presence of Minister Street. I have pointed out the number of jobs we have found for people and asked Mr. Street to refer the matter to the Prime Minister, not to supply the State Government with all the money we were spending (that may be too much for the Federal Government, which would not be so humane) but simply to find out exactly what sum the Federal Government would have had to pay in social service benefits had the State Government not provided employment, and then to reimburse the State Government accordingly. That was our proposition; it would not have amounted to half the sum the State Government was paying but it would have been a reasonable contribution from the Federal Government to compensate the State Government. It would have enabled the Federal Government to be humane about unemployment for a change. I have not received a reply from Mr. Street. At one conference, Mr. McKenzie, Mr. Street's senior officer, seemed well disposed towards the proposition, at least within the confines of the conference. I do not know what happened once he got outside. I believe job creation schemes are the responsibility of the Federal Government. When the Commonwealth Labor Government was in office and the unemployment situation was drastic, it authorised expenditure under the Regional Employment Development scheme. It is the responsibility of a Federal Government to provide money for employment. As a fairly junior Minister, I thought this problem of reimbursement of State funds should be passed to the Premier, who in turn referred it to the Prime Minister by letter. To the best of my knowledge the Prime Minister has not replied to that letter.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Verbally, in the conference, he said it was wrong economically to do a thing of this kind.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Wrong economically to create jobs! This Federal Government is always ready to follow the Americans. At the International Labor Organisation conference I attended, Mr. Marshall,

the Secretary to the American Labour Department representative, made an excellent speech during which he said that, if private employers, as the employing class, were not going to take up the cudgels, admit their responsibility, and create jobs, governments would have to do it. The American Government has allocated funds to employ 750 000 unemployed persons. I have Marshall's speech if anyone wants to see it. America has one of the supposedly most democratic governments in the world and we are told from time to time that it is one the finest countries in the world. I do not know whether the American Government is following the policies of the South Australian Labor Government but there is an example of a Federal Government seeing its responsibility, when private enterprise cannot provide employment. The American Federal Government is doing that, and it is time this Federal Government acted more humanely about the situation and found some jobs for Australian workers.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MITCHAM SCHOOL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I appreciate the leave I have been given and I will be quick about this. As the question of the member for Mount Gambier and his lengthy explanation, following his refusal and that of every member of his Party to second my motion about the Mitcham Junior Primary School of which I gave notice today, was misleading, I desire to explain what action I have taken in this matter. I appreciate that the Minister of Education in answering the question referred to me but necessarily, without his file, he was unable to tell the House of all the representations I had made in this matter. I know this school well and its site. It is fair to say that it is historic rather than valuable as an educational institution, historic if for no other reason than that my father went to it, as did Sir Mark Oliphant. The latest approach that I have had on this matter from the school council was a letter from Mrs. Susan Lea, the Chairman of the school council, dated April 15, 1977, and saying that the annual meeting wanted to push this matter. In part, she said:

We are also writing to Mr. John McLeay who as you know has expressed interest in the problem, and plan letters to various other people both in politics and merely hopeful—

I think that is probably where the Liberal Party picked this up—

to try to enlist their aid. If there is anything else you consider we should be doing to help ourselves, we would be pleased to hear from you. Perhaps you would like to come to talk to us?

I replied to that letter within a few days and, as a result of it, arranged to see the Headmaster and Mrs. Lea and one other member of the school council to discuss the matter. I did so in the morning of July 6, and on that very day I wrote to the Minister about the matter, supporting the school council, referring to the Public Works Committee report dealing with the question of fire safety, and saying at the end of the letter:

I have been asked by the school to invite you personally to come out to inspect it and its facilities (or rather lack of them) in the confident expectation that if you do you will be convinced of the urgent need for a new school, away from the present location,

I had an acknowledgment of that letter and then a reply from the Minister on July 30, sending a copy of his letter to Mrs. Lea on July 25. I think I need not refer to that further. Then, having received that, to my surprise I saw in the local paper the following report:

Facilities at Mitcham Junior Primary School have been labelled inadequate, antiquated, noisy and unsafe by Mitcham Liberal Party candidate Mr. Robert Worth. His outburst followed a recent inspection of the school together with shadow Education Minister, Harold Allison.

Having seen that, I wrote to the member for Mount Gambier, stating in part:

I was heartened to learn through *The Courier* of Wednesday, August 3, of your interest in the problems we are having over the Mitcham Junior Primary School. I saw from the report that you had even taken the trouble to visit the school with your Party candidate.

I received a reply on August 11 as follows:

I do not intend to support your notice of motion on Tuesday. I am a little surprised to hear of your concern about the Mitcham Junior Primary School. The matter has been going on since 1972. The Minister of Education has recently given me some indication as to his intentions for Mitcham Junior Primary School. His written reply reached me this week. I am not completely satisfied with this and intend taking the matter up personally in the House.

He did not say it was going to be today. When I discovered this new-found interest of the Liberal Party in this school, I thought I would test its members out and that is why I moved my motion today in the hope that even they, their candidate having said what he did, would be prepared to support me here in this House on this matter. Of course, they did not.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I want to make it clear I have done everything I can to get this school—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member for Mitcham that he has now gone beyond the bounds of a personal explanation.

*At 3.22 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

#### PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the revenue and other moneys of the State as were required for all the purposes set out in the Loan Estimates for the financial year 1977-78 and the Public Purposes Loan Bill, 1977.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to authorise the Treasurer to borrow and expend money for public purposes, and to enact other provisions incidental thereto. Read a first time.

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

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

In so doing, I will explain the proposals in the Loan Estimates which accompany the Bill and which set out in more detail the appropriations listed in the first schedule to the Bill. The expenditure proposals in the schedule aggregate \$259 000 000 for 1977-78, compared with just over \$261 000 000 in 1976-77. The latter figure is reduced to \$257 000 000, if expenditure on non-metropolitan railways is excluded in order to give comparability. That is,

at a time of high inflation and rising costs in the construction industry, the State Government finds itself faced with the situation of having to develop a capital works programme which is, in real terms, less than the preceding year. The Loan funds made available to the State by the Federal Government have been kept at such an unrealistically low level that South Australia, in common with the other five States, will not be able even to meet its previous levels of building expenditure.

The Government has been able to keep the figure at \$259 000 000 only by once again taking money from the Revenue Account to boost the Loan Account. Last financial year, \$15 000 000 was appropriated in this manner, and in the forthcoming year \$12 000 000 will be allocated. Taken in conjunction with past measures and other steps yet to be announced, that transfer will, in effect, eliminate the reserves which South Australia was able to build up following the sale of the non-metropolitan railways to the Commonwealth. The considerable sums which the Government was able to put aside from that arrangement will be completely used to lessen the impact on this State of the most ill-conceived and ill-directed economic policies Australia has seen since the great depression. The view seems to be accepted in some quarters in South Australia that, because we have managed the Treasury well, we have and will have surpluses which are available to fund additional programmes. Let me disabuse everyone of that wrong belief. To maintain existing services and to keep up as much of a building programme as I now outline will take all our resources and will leave the cupboard bare. The reserves are being used to keep the State building programme up and through this to provide contracts and work for the private building industry. The money is also being used to fund unemployment relief programmes to give South Australians jobs at a time when the Federal Government seems intent on throwing as many people out of work as possible. The reserves have also made it possible for the State Government markedly to reduce taxation and thus play a constructive role in reducing inflation. As honourable members would be aware, in the past 20 months the Government has abolished the petrol tax, abolished rural land tax, reduced the incidence of metropolitan land tax, abolished succession duties between spouses, given generous concessions in succession duties to rural landholders and other inheritors and has reduced stamp duties.

Mr. Becker: What about the poor old worker's cigarettes?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I make no apology for not altering the cigarette tax, none at all. Those tax reductions have shown that the State Government, to the limit of its ability, has done its part in helping bring inflation under control.

Unfortunately, the Federal Government's economic policies have not been similarly practical or sensible. Indeed, we now have a Federal Government which is completely isolated from the mainstream of economic thinking and which seems determined to reduce the standards of living for all Australians in the forlorn hope that somehow this will bring about national recovery and prosperity. A major aspect of the policies being pursued by the Prime Minister and the Treasurer is the steady contraction of funds to the States. As I mentioned a few moments ago, this year South Australia will not be able to spend any more on capital works than the year before, and this comes about directly as a result of the Federal Government's determination to cut funds to the

States both directly through the Loan Council and indirectly through the abandonment of the Federal Government's financial responsibility for a range of programmes.

As an example which is pertinent to this works programme, the funds available for hospital development throughout Australia were cut by more than half for this year, from \$108 000 000 to \$50 000 000. South Australia was singled out, once again, for an especially bad deal, with our allocation being cut from \$13 000 000 to \$5 000 000. The Government has been forced, in consequence, to defer the construction of the Para Districts Hospital, a decision entirely imposed on it by the Federal Government's arbitrary and unreasonable cutbacks. This decision was taken most reluctantly after a very careful examination of the overall capital works programmes.

There is a disgracefully long list of similar actions, ranging from the cynical destruction of complete programmes, such as the Australian Assistance Plan and the Area Improvement Programme, through to repeated refusals to tell the States what funds we will get in the future for certain projects. In the case of Adelaide's water filtration scheme this long-term, high budget plan is subject to constant uncertainty because we cannot get a simple answer from the Federal Government as to its future funding intentions. The extent of the disaffection with the Federal Government's programmes can be gauged by the recent meeting of State Premiers in Melbourne. All six Premiers—Liberal, Labor, and Country Party—specifically rejected the policies being pursued by Canberra and called for an immediate mild stimulation of the economy to get the country moving again. That unanimous conclusion came about simply because all of the Premiers put their political views to one side and were worried only about the wellbeing of the States. All the State Treasurers are extremely disturbed at the prospective situation facing their State finances. It is apparent that, while the Federal Government continues its policies, all the States will be forced to plan for lower levels of real effort. Loan Estimates such as this document and the forthcoming Revenue Budget will be severely limited by Federal Government decisions taken apparently quite without concern as to their effects on the wellbeing of the States.

In respect to the Loan Estimates, it has been long-standing practice, when introducing them, to comment on the position of the Revenue Account. That practice developed because until recently a judgment needed to be exercised each year as to the extent to which Loan funds needed to be reserved in order to finance a prospective short-fall of the Government's Revenue Account operations. However, in the past two financial years the situation has been reversed, with Revenue Account being used to support the Loan Account operations. We find ourselves in that position again in 1977-78.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is a position which, historically, has not percolated through to the Leader of the Opposition yet.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I don't see anything wrong with that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The fact is that what we are having to do is use up every bit of our reserves for a lesser programme than is properly needed to maintain employment within this State.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I am talking about a revenue surplus.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no difference between providing a revenue surplus to Loan and a Loan reservation to revenue. The honourable member has not caught up with the press release his Leader made today in

which he said, "It is a woefully dreadful thing." It is a contradiction of what he said 24 hours ago, but that is par for the course.

Against the background of that changing trend, steps have been taken in the 1976-77 accounts to identify more clearly the Government's net reserves held on Revenue and Loan Accounts. At June 30, 1977, those net reserves stood at \$18 400 000, and were recorded as being held on Revenue Account.

By way of brief explanation, Revenue Account commenced the 1976-77 financial year with an accumulated surplus of \$27 600 000. The year's operations showed a small deficit of \$100 000—not a surplus of \$8 000 000, by the way.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Some journalist got his facts wrong, did he?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it is what your Leader told him. Your Leader went out to the press and said that we have an \$8 000 000 bonanza out of which we should reduce taxation. He carefully omitted to mention that we had had a \$13 000 000 shortfall in expected Federal revenue payments to the State and an increase in expenditure in some areas. As a result, there is no \$8 000 000 bonanza: what there is is a \$100 000 deficit. If the Leader proposes to reduce taxation by \$8 000 000, he is going to sack \$8 000 000 worth of the State's public servants.

Mr. Evans: What about the railways?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The railways deal has kept us in the position we are in at present. We have been able to do better than the other States, because of the railways deal. We have been able to keep more money out to the public than have the other States, and that has resulted in the position whereby South Australia for the first time in any economic downturn has been not the worst off of the States, but for most of the time it has been the best off. I suggest that members opposite, since they have shown through their Leader such an abysmal ignorance of the State's finances, might stop and listen a little. The year's operations showed a small deficit of \$100 000 after providing \$17 000 000 to augment development and exploration activities in the Cooper Basin gas-fields, \$15 000 000 for capital works, and \$7 000 000 for unemployment relief works. The Leader today has gone out to the press and said what a dreadful thing it was that the reserves had been run down in that way and that I had spent the money. Of course I have spent it, and he voted for it in the House, but I have not spent any money that has not been voted for in the House. As a result of the year's operations, the accumulated surplus on Revenue Account was reduced to \$27 500 000 at June 30, 1977.

As to Loan Account, the 1976-77 accounts opened with an accumulated deficit of \$8 900 000. The operations for the year, to which I shall refer in more detail in a moment, showed a deficit of \$200 000. As a result, the accumulated deficit on Loan Account increased to \$9 100 000 at June 30, 1977. At June 30, 1977, a bookkeeping transfer was effected to eliminate the accumulated Loan Account deficit of \$9 100 000 and so to reduce the reserves on Revenue Account to a net amount of \$18 400 000. As I have already said, these reserves will be entirely exhausted at the end of this financial year, in order to maintain both the Loan and Revenue Budgets.

I turn now to the details of Loan Account. In August last, I reported to the House that the allocation of new moneys determined by the Australian Loan Council was about \$178 000 000, that repayments and recoveries of expenditure becoming available for respending in 1976-77 were expected to amount to about \$69 000 000, that

borrowing to cover discounts would be about \$600 000, and that a capital expenditure programme of almost \$262 600 000 was proposed. With the aid of a special allocation of \$15 000 000 from Revenue Account, it was planned to achieve a balanced result on the year's activities. In the event, new capital funds were as estimated, repayments, borrowings to cover discounts and payments were all below estimate, and a small deficit of about \$200 000 was incurred on the year's activities, and that was not a bonanza, either.

In respect to repayments and recoveries and borrowings to cover discounts, whereas the original combined estimate for 1976-77 was \$69 600 000, the actual receipts were \$67 900 000. This net decrease of \$1 700 000 was the end result of a number of variations above and below estimate. The major single variation was in respect to an amount of \$9 000 000 that was expected to be received from the Australian National Railways Commission to finance payments expected to be made by the State Transport Authority on behalf of the commission for non-metropolitan rail activities. In the event, only \$2 200 000 was required to finance those payments. The resultant decrease was largely offset by increased recoveries from waterworks and sewers for house connections, sale of plant, etc. (\$1 300 000), contributions from the Australian Universities Commission towards the Flinders Medical Centre (\$2 000 000), receipts from the Schools Commission (\$1 700 000), and repayments of loans under the Loans to Producers Scheme (\$600 000).

As to payments, the original estimate for 1976-77 was almost \$262 600 000, but actual payments amounted to just over \$261 100 000. The net decrease of \$1 500 000 was the result of a number of variations above and below estimate. The major single variation was a special allocation of \$9 000 000 to the State Bank to meet problems arising from a decline in mortgage repayments that are used for relending to prospective home purchasers and also to finance a recently announced Government initiative to provide some stimulus to the home-building industry. That increase was offset by a number of decreased payments including waterworks and sewers (\$1 500 000), Monarto Development Commission (\$1 400 000), Woods and Forests (\$900 000) and, of course, the payments in respect to the Australian National Railways Commission to which I have referred.

As a result of all these factors, the accumulated deficit on Loan Account at June 30, 1976, of \$8 900 000 was run down by a further \$200 000 to an accumulated deficit at June 30, 1977, of \$9 100 000. That accumulated deficit has now been eliminated by the bookkeeping transfer from Revenue Account, as I have explained.

At the meeting of the Australian Loan Council in July, 1977, the Commonwealth Government agreed to support a total programme of \$1 434 000 000 for State works and services. South Australia's share of this programme is almost \$186 900 000, of which \$124 600 000 is to become available by way of loan subject to repayment and to interest and \$62 300 000 by way of capital grant. In addition to the new funds of \$186 900 000, the Government expects to receive various repayments and recoveries of about \$59 500 000. Certain discounts and premiums on loan issues and redemptions, which form part of our loan programme and are expected to amount to some \$600 000, will not have to be paid in cash by us as further loans will be arranged through Loan Council to cover them. Therefore, the Government expects to have a total of about \$247 000 000 becoming available during the year.

If one has regard to the facts that the total of payments on Loan Account in 1976-77, excluding non-metropolitan railways, was over \$257 000 000, that there remains an

urgent need for further hospital buildings, for public transport facilities, for water and sewer facilities and a host of other capital works, that unemployment has reached its worst level since the tragic years of the depression and is showing no signs of abating, that the home-building industry is in desperate straits, then it becomes obvious that planning by this Government of a capital programme limited to the new funds expected to become available, that is, \$247 000 000, would be disastrous.

As was the case last year, this dismal picture is the direct result of two actions on the part of the Commonwealth Government: first, the decision to cut back further on specific purpose loans and grants and, second, the decision once again to support an increase of only 5 per cent in general Loan Council programmes despite increases in cost levels of the order of 12 per cent to 13 per cent a year. At the meeting of Loan Council all Premiers, no matter of what political persuasion, made strong submissions about the need for a more realistic and humane approach by the Commonwealth to the capital works area but their submissions were rejected out of hand. Premiers were unanimous in their concern about the employment situation and the social and economic consequences which would flow from the Commonwealth's actions.

Once again the Prime Minister made much of the new tax-sharing arrangements and was quick to point out that payments to the States under those arrangements in 1977-78 were expected to be some 17 per cent higher than the actual payments made in 1976-77. Of course, he had little to say about specific purpose loans and grants other than to announce that the Children's Services Programme, the Australian School Dental Scheme, and the Hospitals Development Programme would be substantially reduced and that the National Sewerage Programme would be completely abandoned. Further, I have been advised that the water treatment programme has been reduced substantially and there is every indication that further support may not be provided after 1978-79 despite the fact that one of the projects for which the Commonwealth had declared its support will not be completed.

The Prime Minister implied that the broad overall increase in funds to the States for 1977-78 from all sources (that is to say, tax sharing, Loan Council general purpose funds, specific purpose loans and grants and semi-government borrowing) is likely to be of the order of 10 per cent to 11 per cent above the overall funds available from those sources in 1976-77. As that estimate includes special allocations made to New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia, it is evident that the increase for South Australia, Victoria and Tasmania will be somewhat less and, in our case, possibly as low as 9 per cent. That kind of increase would not be sufficient to cover the rises in wages and prices which will be effective in 1977-78. Inevitably it means lesser capital programmes in real terms. It means that we will not be able to carry on with our water treatment programme at a desirable level; it means that we cannot proceed with the construction of the urgently needed Para Districts Hospital that was scheduled for commencement this financial year; and it means that we have had to revise, drastically, our programmes for other essential works and services. All of those revised and unsatisfactory measures are a direct result of the Commonwealth Government's actions.

I am appalled that, in contrast to their Party colleagues in other State Parliaments, Opposition members appear to applaud the Federal Government's actions and make no protest whatever about the treatment the States have received.

Mr. Millhouse: Only Liberal Party members.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I except the honourable member for Mitcham. In respect to housing the Commonwealth's attitude is unclear as yet. It is difficult to believe that funds for 1977-78 would be held to the 1976-77 money level which was, itself, only the same money amount as in 1975-76 and 1974-75. The home building industry in this State faces serious problems. The Government has been quick to recognise them and we are providing additional funds and other assistance to stimulate the industry. However, the greatest need for action lies with the Commonwealth and to curb public expenditure in this area so that, once again, less work would be done in real terms, would accentuate the problem, add to unemployment and contribute to further economic downturn. I will refer to housing again in a minute.

The further curbing of public expenditure appears to be the specific unrelenting policy of the Commonwealth. The South Australian Government considers that it must act to cushion the adverse effects as far as it can, and, in particular, to minimise the effects in human terms if it can. We believe that the most effective approach in present circumstances is to look once again for some support from Revenue Account in 1977-78 in much the same way as was achieved in 1976-77.

At the moment my assessment is that, given a firm control of expenditures through Revenue Account in 1977-78 and the use of our net reserves of \$18 400 000, it should be possible to transfer up to \$12 000 000 to assist in financing essential capital works. At this stage we could not contemplate going beyond that level, as to do so would increase the chance of our having to introduce new and increased taxing measures. That is a course of action which the Government is not prepared to follow at the moment.

Accordingly, the Loan Budget for 1977-78 envisages support of \$12 000 000 from Revenue Account and proposes total payments of \$259 000 000. This would give a balance on the year's operations. The relevant figures and a comparison with the transactions of 1976-77 are set out on page 4 of the Loan Estimates. I should add that, even now, we have not received firm advice on the levels of specific purpose loans and grants in some areas. There are still some uncertainties and risks and the Government will keep these areas under close review.

Of the total semi-government programme of \$1 164 000 000, South Australia's share is \$53 100 000. Within that total the allocations proposed for the individual borrowers are \$29 600 000 to the Electricity Trust, \$15 500 000 to the Housing Trust, and \$3 000 000 to the Meat Corporation; \$5 000 000 has been allocated to meet the needs of the larger local government bodies. In 1976-77 the maximum limit to which individual statutory and local government bodies could borrow, without that borrowing counting against the State's semi-government allocation, was \$800 000. For 1977-78, Loan Council has approved an increase in the individual limit to \$1 000 000 on the condition that this limit will not be reviewed before 1979-80. This increase will be very useful to a number of authorities.

I point out again that for both the larger and smaller semi-government authorities it is a borrowing programme which has been approved. The raising of the funds depends on the liquidity of the institutional lenders and on the willingness of other lenders to advance moneys at the interest rates determined by the Loan Council from

time to time. Nevertheless, we have succeeded in raising the full programme in other years, and I am hopeful that we will continue to receive the support from lenders to enable us to raise the total sums approved. The Government is grateful for their support.

The remaining part of the speech deals with the details of the State's capital programme. I seek leave to have that and the explanation of the schedules inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

#### REMAINDER OF EXPLANATION OF BILL

**HOUSING**—Funds made available under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement are advanced to the State at concessional rates of interest of 4½ per cent in respect of advances to the State Bank and 4 per cent in respect of advances to the Housing Trust. In each case the Housing Agreement provides for the funds to be used for welfare housing. This means that the approval of a loan is granted or the allocation of a house is made primarily to an applicant who falls within the limit of a defined means test on income. The rate of interest charged by the State Bank on loans to persons who comply with the means test is 5½ per cent. The bank makes advances also to persons who do not comply with this primary means test but who comply with a secondary and somewhat less stringent test. The interest rate to these persons is 6½ per cent. The maximum loan available to applicants within each of these categories is \$18 000.

For Housing Trust activities the Housing Agreement lays emphasis on the construction of rental housing, and restricts to 30 per cent the proportion of family dwellings which may be built for sale out of the welfare housing funds. Even in these cases the sales may be made only to persons who meet the means test specified for eligibility for a rental home. In presenting the Loan Estimates to Parliament last year, I indicated that the Commonwealth's allocation for welfare housing was again the same money amount for the third successive year, and I pointed to the serious problems which would be created if the Commonwealth continued to pursue that restricted lending programme. You may recall that South Australia's share of the welfare housing allocation was \$56 360 000 of which \$22 800 000 was allocated to the State Bank and \$33 560 000 to the Housing Trust. I referred to the considerable waiting time for a State Bank loan, in excess of two years, and for a trust rental home, in excess of three years.

I have spoken on a number of occasions about the disastrous consequences which the Commonwealth Government's economic policy of reduced public spending and high interest rates is having on industry, employment and the economic health of the community generally. Its effect is singularly apparent in the home building area where high interest rates are imposing an unduly harsh burden on home purchasers, particularly those purchasing their first home. As we all know only too well, the Commonwealth has refused to deviate from its economic policy and as a consequence the housing industry faces serious problems with a large backlog of unsold homes. In June last, in recognition of those problems, the South Australian Government implemented a \$35 000 000 package to stimulate the home building industry and, as part of that package, provided an extra \$3 000 000 to the State Bank for housing loans and authorised a six-month stamp duty remission on purchases of new homes. The State Government Insurance Commission and the Savings Bank of South Australia also provided significant increased assistance.

I believe that this initiative is already having a favourable effect on the industry and it is my sincere hope that the Commonwealth will now take action to improve the economic climate generally by reducing interest rates and adopting a less restrictive approach to public spending. As part of its welfare housing operation, the State Bank has available to it mortgage repayments from which to finance further lending to prospective home purchasers, and for some years these mortgage repayments have included substantial voluntary repayments. However, recent months have shown a marked and continuing decline in these voluntary repayments and, to offset the adverse effects, the Government made a further special advance to the bank of \$6 000 000 in 1976-77 so that the weekly loan approvals could be maintained at the existing level. That advance took the total special assistance in 1976-77 to the bank for housing loans to \$9 000 000.

During 1976-77, the State Bank advanced \$28 000 000 to 1 539 applicants who complied with the primary means test and qualified for a loan at the lowest concessional interest rate. The bank also advanced \$20 600 000 to 1 190 applicants who complied with the secondary means test and qualified for loans at the higher concessional rate. As to the programme of the Housing Trust, dwellings completed during 1976-77 totalled 2 144, while 1 957 dwellings were under construction at June 30, 1977. The extent to which the physical effort in the welfare housing area can be increased in 1977-78 will be dependent upon the amount which the Commonwealth Government is prepared to allocate to this programme. As yet its intentions are unknown.

The six State Premiers, concerned at this indecision, at their meeting in Melbourne called for an immediate increase of at least 20 per cent in funds available for welfare housing for the 1977-78 year. Having regard to the state of the home building industry, such a course is both necessary and economically responsible. I would find it difficult to believe that the Commonwealth would contemplate holding funds for 1977-78 to the same money amount as for 1976-77 (which is effectively the 1974-75 level), given the present state of the economy, the problems of the home building industry and the needs of people on relatively low incomes. In this State the waiting time for a State Bank loan or a trust rental home is now in excess of three years. For the moment the trust programme provides for the completion of substantially the same number of houses in 1977-78 as in 1976-77, and support provided to the State Bank will ensure that at least the 1976-77 number of approvals will be maintained. Finally I would mention that the trust builds houses for people who do not meet the means test and it constructs industrial and commercial buildings. In carrying out these activities, the trust will have available in 1977-78 some \$17 000 000 of circulating funds and \$15 500 000 of semi-government borrowing.

**LOANS TO PRODUCERS, \$1 300 000**—Advances by the State Bank under the Loans to Producers Act in 1976-77 totalled about \$4 129 000. About \$1 641 000 was made available to fishing enterprises, \$1 718 000 to wineries and distilleries, \$460 000 to canneries, and \$310 000 to cold stores and packing houses. Of the total amount advanced, \$2 316 000 came from State Loan funds, while the remainder was financed from semi-government borrowings and the bank's internal sources. An allocation of \$1 300 000 is proposed for 1977-78. This allocation, augmented by semi-government borrowings of up to \$1 000 000 and by internal funds, will enable the bank to meet commitments which at



June 30, 1977, totalled almost \$3 300 000, and will allow it to assist producer co-operatives in financing further capital replacement and expansion programmes.

**ADVANCES TO STATE BANK, \$9 000 000**—In 1976-77 a total of \$11 800 000 was advanced to the State Bank, comprising \$2 800 000 of normal support for the bank's housing finance services and traditional banking activities and a special allocation from Loan Account of \$9 000 000 to provide further support to the housing programme. That special allocation was required to meet problems arising from a decline in mortgage repayments, which are used for relending to prospective home purchasers, and also to provide some stimulus to the home building industry, which is experiencing the effect of inadequate Commonwealth allocations of welfare housing funds. A further advance of \$9 000 000 is proposed for 1977-78. These funds will be used mainly for housing loans where applicants fall outside the means test under the Housing Agreement, and partly for the provision of working funds to the bank's customers, including those in wine and fruit processing industries. It will also assist the bank to finance a small equity holding in Beneficial Finance Corporation Limited.

**STORMWATER DRAINAGE, \$2 120 000**—Dollar-for-dollar subsidies to assist councils in the disposal of floodwaters amounted to \$1 692 000 in 1976-77. Payments were made to 19 councils and two drainage construction authorities. There are still a large number of projects under construction. They include the Torrens Road scheme and schemes in the Klemzig, Payneham, Bowden, Murray Bridge, and Whyalla areas. There is still an extensive need for adequate drainage, and it is proposed to make \$2 120 000 available in 1977-78 to subsidise local government expenditure on works. Councils will have semi-government borrowings available to them in order to meet their share of the cost of approved schemes.

**LANDS DEPARTMENT—BUILDINGS, PLANT, ETC., \$1 430 000**—A total of \$1 304 000 was expended in 1976-77 on buildings, plant and equipment for the Lands Department. It is proposed to make \$1 430 000 available in 1977-78. That amount provides for the purchase of mapping equipment and electronic equipment for the land ownership and tenure system.

**IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF SWAMP LANDS, \$4 900 000**—In 1976-77 Loan expenditure on rehabilitation of pumping and water distribution facilities in irrigated areas was \$3 601 000. Laying of mains has been completed in the Waikerie area, and progress is now being made on the Berri scheme. However, recently completed works in the Chaffey area have been affected by a succession of high river levels and some modifications to design have become necessary. The proposed allocation of \$4 900 000 in 1977-78 will enable the continuation of works in progress and allow attention to be given to urgent drainage problems.

**REMARK IRRIGATION TRUST, \$800 000**—A total of \$784 000 was advanced to the Renmark Irrigation Trust last year by way of grants and repayable loans towards rehabilitation of the irrigation system in the trust's area. Installation of irrigation pipe mains, drainage caissons and domestic water supplies continued during 1976-77, and work is expected to be completed in 1979. It is proposed to allocate a further \$800 000 for this purpose in 1977-78.

**AFFORESTATION AND TIMBER MILLING, \$8 000 000**—Loan expenditure by the State forestry undertaking in 1976-77 amounted to \$6 643 000. During the year the Woods and

Forests Department completed the construction of two high-temperature kilns at the Mount Gambier State mill and purchased a sawmill in the Adelaide Hills under a joint venture arrangement with Softwood Holdings Limited. Several other improvement projects were commenced and will be continued in the current year so that the sawmills can work at a high level of technical and operating efficiency. Almost 600 hectares of land was purchased in 1976-77 for afforestation purposes. Establishment of the 1977 forest plantation comprising almost 1 300 hectares is now in progress and just over 1 350 hectares were prepared for planting in 1978. The proposed allocation of \$8 000 000 will enable the department to maintain its forestry works and continue a major programme to improve the efficiency and profitability of the Mount Gambier State mill.

**HARBORS ACCOMMODATION, \$9 530 000**—Loan expenditure on harbor facilities and equipment in 1976-77 amounted to \$8 705 000. The containership berth at Outer Harbor and one section of the bulk loading facility at Port Lincoln were commissioned during the year. Progress is being made on a swinging basin and the deepening of approaches at Outer Harbor as well as the rehabilitation of berths at Port Adelaide. It is proposed to allocate \$9 530 000 for the continuation of these works in 1977-78.

**FISHING HAVENS, \$1 300 000**—In 1976-77, Loan expenditure on fishing havens amounted to \$1 272 000. Work continued on the construction of a breakwater at Port MacDonnell to provide protection for the foreshore and the fishing fleet, as well as the construction of a fishing boat harbor at North Arm in the Port Adelaide River. An allocation of \$1 300 000 is proposed to complete these works in 1977-78.

**WATERWORKS AND SEWERS, \$69 860 000**—A total of \$64 336 000 was expended on waterworks and sewerage services in 1976-77. Included in that amount were specific grants and loans from the Commonwealth Government of \$9 558 000 towards the Adelaide water treatment scheme and \$1 000 000 towards sewerage projects. Twenty-four major projects were completed during the year. They included the replacement of the prestressed concrete section of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, Lock-Kimba water supply, four metropolitan water supply projects, six country water supply schemes, major sewerage works at Blackwood-Belair, Christies Beach and Noarlunga, Port Pirie, and Victor Harbor, and smaller sewerage installations and extensions in seven other areas. Progress was also made during the year on 40 other major projects some of which I shall mention in a moment.

The provision of waterworks and sewerage services continues to receive high priority. To finance the continuation of a major programme of essential works to meet the present and prospective needs of the State, we had contemplated the allocation of \$61 900 000 from State Loan funds in 1977-78, in the expectation of receiving Commonwealth grants and loans of \$9 000 000 for water treatment. That expectation recognised only those specific water treatment projects for which the Commonwealth had declared its support. The Commonwealth has now advised that only \$10 300 000 will be available for water treatment projects in South Australia over the next two financial years. This falls far short of the required amount and there are indications that further support may not be provided. It is anticipated that only \$5 600 000 of the \$10 300 000 will become available in 1977-78. By recasting our overall programme of present and future government works, an aggregate amount of \$69 860 000 of State and



Commonwealth funds has been allocated for 1977-78 to continue the department's essential works and maintain employment opportunities.

**METROPOLITAN WATERWORKS, \$19 432 000**—A provision of \$7 300 000 has been made for continuing work on the construction of water treatment and filtration plants in the metropolitan area in 1977-78. A further \$3 761 000 has been allocated to enable construction of the Little Para Dam to continue.

**COUNTRY WATERWORKS, \$14 385 000**—Some of the major country water supply projects included in the 1977-78 plan are: Arthurton Summit storage \$1 098 000, Baroota \$786 000, North Side Hill \$2 513 000, North Yelta-Moonta tank \$420 000 and Paskeville, Kadina and Wallaroo \$729 000.

**METROPOLITAN SEWERAGE, \$17 050 000**—A sum of \$3 076 000 has been allocated for construction of the Southern and Onkaparinga trunk sewer which forms part of the trunk sewer system in the Christies Beach and Noarlunga area. It will serve Land Commission and Housing Trust development towards Hackham. A sum of \$1 135 000 will be made available for the Christies Creek trunk sewer which will serve some existing subdivisions and areas proposed to be developed by the Land Commission and private developers. A further \$1 145 000 is proposed to be allocated for the North-Eastern suburbs trunk sewer reconstruction to eliminate flooding and overflows of sewage into the Torrens River.

**COUNTRY SEWERS, \$6 333 000**—The sum of \$1 788 000 has been allocated to works on the Port Augusta East sewerage scheme. This project will reduce water pollution by preventing drainage of effluent into the gulf near the township. A further \$972 000 has been provided for the continuation of Port Pirie sewerage works.

**RIVER MURRAY WEIRS, DAMS, LOCKS, ETC., \$8 285 000**—During 1976-77, South Australia made a contribution of \$8 626 000 towards capital works carried out under the River Murray Waters Agreement. Of that amount, \$6 751 000 was provided from State Loan Funds and \$1 875 000 by way of a loan to the State from the Commonwealth Government. That loan brought the Commonwealth's financial assistance to the State for the Dartmouth Dam project to its previously approved level of \$8 800 000. The Commonwealth has indicated that it will not go beyond that level. The State will have to provide \$8 000 000 from its own funds in 1977-78, so that this important project may proceed. The State is also providing \$285 000 for other capital works undertaken under the agreement bringing its total allocation for 1977-78 to \$8 285 000.

**GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, LAND AND SERVICES, \$113 755 000.**

**HOSPITAL BUILDINGS, \$28 200 000**—In 1976-77, an amount of \$29 720 000 was spent from State Loan funds on Government hospital buildings and facilities. Included in that amount was \$13 000 000 received from the Commonwealth Government under the Hospitals Development Programme. Works completed during 1976-77 included a geriatric block and physiotherapy and occupational therapy facilities at Port Augusta Hospital, extensions to the diagnostic radiology department of the Mount Gambier Hospital, and installation of computer facilities at the Flinders Medical Centre. The provision of hospital facilities is still a matter of high priority with a growing and urgent demand emerging in the northern sector of the metropolitan area. To finance the continuation of a total government and

non-government hospital works programme designed to meet the present and prospective needs of the State, we had contemplated an allocation of funds aggregating \$43 600 000 in 1977-78. This was in the expectation of receiving \$14 300 000 from the Commonwealth under the Hospitals Development Programme.

The Commonwealth has now advised that only \$5 100 000 will be available to South Australia in 1977-78 under that programme. The short-fall of \$9 200 000, a major setback to our expectations, has made necessary a recasting and reduction in our total hospital works programme, so that in this Bill and in the Loan Estimates only \$38 600 000 is provided of which \$28 200 000 has been allocated to Government hospitals and \$10 400 000 to non-government hospitals and institutions. The urgently required Para Districts Hospital has now had to be deferred as a direct result of the Commonwealth's action. The proposed allocation of \$28 200 000 for 1977-78 provides for commitments on existing works in progress and for a large number of minor works. It also makes an allowance for the commencement of some new works. Some of the major proposals for 1977-78 are as follows:

**Flinders Medical Centre**—The sum of \$6 650 000 is required to complete Phases I to III of this project by the end of 1977, and \$2 350 000 has been provided for work to commence on Phase IV of the project which includes provision of a day hospital for psychiatric and psychogeriatric patients, the completion of a second clinical demonstration theatre, the provision of accommodation for a future cardiac surgery unit, and provision of additional residential blocks. These works will increase the number of patient beds at the Centre to a total of 708.

**Glenside Hospital**—The sum of \$5 766 000 has been allocated to Glenside Hospital for the continuation of work on sub-acute wards, maximum care wards, psychogeriatric wards, frozen food facilities and the administration building.

**Modbury Hospital**—A total of \$3 707 000 is proposed for further development of the Modbury Hospital comprising the construction of a three-storey education block to provide nurse training facilities, the construction of a psychiatric admission block to provide accommodation for 40 in-patients and facilities for 30 out-patients and the completion of two 32-bed wards in the existing main building.

**Royal Adelaide Hospital**—The sum of \$1 856 000 is required for further alterations and additions to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, including redevelopment of the Northfield Wards.

**Frozen Food Factory**—A sum of \$1 716 000 has been provided to enable the frozen food factory at Dudley Park to be completed in 1977.

**Queen Elizabeth Hospital**—The sum of \$950 000 will be expended on additions to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital including the expansion of emergency service facilities.

**Port Pirie Hospital**—The sum of \$1 213 000 has been allocated to the Port Pirie Hospital mainly for the geriatric ward block which is expected to be completed in December this year.

**PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, \$43 800 000**—A total of \$40 481 000 was spent in 1976-77 on primary and secondary school buildings and facilities of which \$13 018 000 was provided by the Commonwealth Government. Details of expenditure are as follows:

	\$
The completion of 48 major projects with a total cost of \$31 340 000 . . . . .	18 502 000
Work in progress on 37 major projects with an estimated total value of \$33 701 000 . . . . .	8 359 000
Purchase of land and property . . . . .	1 259 000
Minor works and buildings, final payments on contracts . . . . .	9 146 000
Emergency classrooms . . . . .	330 000
Furniture . . . . .	2 542 000
Preliminary investigations and design . . . . .	343 000
	\$40 481 000

The proposed allocation of \$43 800 000 is expected to include an amount of \$14 500 000 from the Commonwealth Government. These funds are intended to be applied to work as follows:

	\$
The continuation of work on 37 major projects estimated to cost \$33 701 000 . . . . .	18 663 000
The commencement of 63 major projects estimated to cost \$24 271 000 . . . . .	13 881 000
Purchase of land and property . . . . .	1 500 000
Minor works and buildings, final payments on contracts . . . . .	7 456 000
Emergency classrooms . . . . .	250 000
Furniture . . . . .	1 200 000
Preliminary investigations and design . . . . .	850 000
	\$43 800 000

Further Education, \$12 100 000—A total of \$10 180 000 was spent on further education projects in 1976-77 of which \$2 143 000 was provided by the Commonwealth Government. The payments were made as follows:

	\$
The completion of seven major projects with a total value of \$14 796 000 . . . . .	4 743 000
Work in progress on four major projects estimated to cost \$13 217 000 . . . . .	2 983 000
Land and property . . . . .	650 000
Minor works and final payments on completed contracts . . . . .	1 393 000
Furniture and equipment . . . . .	250 000
Preliminary investigations and design . . . . .	161 000
	\$10 180 000

The allocation of \$12 100 000 proposed for 1977-78 includes an expected contribution from the Commonwealth Government of about \$3 900 000. The expenditure of these funds has been planned as follows:

	\$
The continuation of work on four projects estimated to cost \$13 217 000 . . . . .	7 437 000
The commencement of six major projects estimated to cost \$11 816 000 . . . . .	1 758 000
Land and property . . . . .	530 000
Minor works and final payments on completed contracts . . . . .	2 125 000
Furniture and equipment . . . . .	200 000
Preliminary investigations and design . . . . .	50 000
	\$12 100 000

OTHER GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, \$29 655 000—Expenditure from Loan Account in 1976-77 totalled \$27 497 000. Major works completed during the year included the Education Centre, the first stage of upgrading Parliament House, and the establishment of dental clinics at 15 schools.

A sum of \$29 655 000 is proposed to be allocated for various government buildings in 1977-78. Some of the larger provisions are as follows:

Forensic Science Building—The sum of \$3 159 000 is required to complete this project.

Marine and Harbors—An amount of \$3 160 000 has been provided for work to continue on the office building at Port Adelaide.

Parliament House—The sum of \$1 414 000 has been allocated for further renovations and upgrading of Parliament House.

Country Fire Services Headquarters—An amount of \$881 000 is planned to be expended on a two-storey building at Keswick to accommodate the headquarters of the Country Fire Services.

Dental Clinics—The sum of \$1 113 000 is proposed for 15 new dental clinics to be established this financial year. An amount of \$817 000 was made available by the Commonwealth Government for capital expenditure on dental clinics and training facilities for dental therapists in 1976-77. The Commonwealth has now indicated that its contribution towards capital costs under the School Dental Scheme will be reduced from 90 per cent to 75 per cent and consequently their support in 1977-78 is expected to be about \$650 000.

Parks Community Centre—Work has commenced on the construction of a multi-purpose community centre at Angle Park which includes school, child care, health and recreational facilities. An amount of \$7 222 000 is proposed for this project in 1977-78. It is reflected in allocations proposed for primary and secondary schools, community health and other government buildings. The proposed allocation includes the Commonwealth's contribution to this project of \$3 196 000.

NATIONAL RESERVES, \$1 250 000—An amount of \$1 250 000 was spent on national reserves in 1976-77. During 1976-77 work proceeded on the reconstruction of the Belair golf course and water and sewerage facilities at Belair Recreation Park, the development of facilities at Wilpena Pound and the construction of a visitor centre at Cleland Conservation Park. A parcel of land, comprising 756 hectares, was purchased at Dry Creek. An allocation of \$1 250 000 is proposed for 1977-78.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, Nil—In 1976-77 the capital expenditure of the trust totalled about \$39 000 000 of which \$6 000 000 was advanced from Loan Account and \$12 500 000 was raised under the semi-government borrowing programme. A capital works programme of \$58 840 000 has been planned for 1977-78 of which \$29 610 000 is to be financed from the semi-government borrowing programme and the balance of \$29 230 000 is to be financed from the trust's internal funds. Because of the tight situation created by the Commonwealth Government's limited support for new capital funds, it is not possible to make any State Loan funds available to the trust during 1977-78. The second power generating unit at Torrens Island power station has now commenced commercial operations and the 1977-78 programme provides for a further \$22 860 000 to be spent on that power station. The 1977-78 programme also provides for the installation of gas turbines and associated plant at the Snuggery power station, and development of the Leigh Creek coalfield including relocation of the township.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY, \$4 790 000—In 1976-77 the capital expenditure by the authority totalled \$13 300 000. Of that amount \$7 400 000 was advanced from State Loan funds, \$4 300 000 by the Commonwealth Government under the States Grants (Urban Public Transport) Act, and \$1 600 000 was made available from the internal

sources of the authority. During 1976-77, the Bus and Tram Division commissioned 11 of its proposed new fleet of 310 Volvo buses and opened a new bus depot at Morphettville Park. The Rail Division continued its programme of civil works including work on the Christie Downs rail system and commenced a programme of re-signalling the Adelaide railway yards and the improvement of rolling stock. An allocation of \$4 790 000 is proposed in 1977-78 to provide for the continuation of these major works. The authority will supplement these funds from its own internal sources and from the smaller semi-government borrowing programme to carry out a total programme of about \$23 000 000. The authority is also currently acting as agent for the Australian National Railways Commission in respect to the non-metropolitan railway system pending declaration of the transfer date. In 1976-77, the authority spent \$4 100 000 on behalf of the commission, and this was included fully in Loan Account payments and partly in repayments, being affected by adjustments for the previous year. An amount of \$6 500 000 is expected to be spent in 1977-78 and, with the declared date expected to be fairly soon, it is proposed to handle the commission's transactions outside the Loan Account this year.

NON-GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL AND INSTITUTION BUILDINGS, \$10 400 000—Almost \$12 337 000 of State Loan funds was contributed in 1976-77 towards capital programmes of non-government hospitals and institutions including \$4 485 000 to the Adelaide Children's Hospital and \$6 661 000 to the Home for Incurables. A number of smaller projects at some 18 hospitals and institutions were completed during the year. The proposed allocation of \$10 400 000 will assist 33 institutions in financing their capital works programmes in 1977-78. It includes further grants of \$3 458 000 to the Adelaide Children's Hospital, \$2 100 000 to the Home for Incurables and \$780 000 towards the St. John Ambulance headquarters building.

COMMUNITY HEALTH AND ASSOCIATED PROJECTS, \$800 000—A total of \$919 000 was expended in 1976-77 on buildings, equipment, vehicles and furniture for community health centres. Of this amount \$609 000 was provided by the Commonwealth Government. Projects completed during the year included interim accommodation for health services in the Christies and Noarlunga area, renovations and alterations to existing buildings at Whyalla and Clovelly Park, and the provision of solid construction buildings at Port Lincoln, Tumbay Bay and Lock. The proposed allocation for 1977-78 is \$800 000. The Commonwealth contribution, expected to be of the order of \$400 000, is included therein.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LAND COMMISSION, Nil—Actual expenditure in 1976-77 amounted to \$17 700 000, of which \$1 900 000 was advanced from State Loan funds, \$5 800 000 from Commonwealth funds, and \$4 100 000 was obtained from semi-government borrowings. The remainder was financed from the commission's internal funds, including recoveries from sales of developed land. Of that total expenditure, \$7 000 000 was for the purchase of land in urban areas, and \$9 900 000 for the development of land. The commission's programme for 1977-78 envisages expenditure of the order of \$24 900 000, of which \$16 300 000 is proposed for land development and \$6 300 000 for land acquisition. It is expected that the Commonwealth Government will meet its minimum obligation of \$6 000 000 under the agreement and, if that is so, the commission should be able to meet the remainder of its programme from its internal sources. Consequently no allocation of State

Loan funds is proposed for 1977-78. The commission will be able to borrow up to \$1 000 000 under the smaller semi-government programme.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TEACHER HOUSING AUTHORITY, \$900 000—In 1976-77 the authority spent \$1 700 000 to provide suitable accommodation for married teachers in country areas. An amount of \$1 218 000 was advanced from State Loan funds, and \$800 000 was borrowed under the smaller semi-government borrowing programme. It is proposed to make \$900 000 available in 1977-78 to enable the authority to continue its programme which the authority may supplement from the smaller semi-government borrowing programme.

TRANSPORT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, \$1 100 000—An amount of \$977 000 was spent in 1976-77 on research and development, of which \$380 000 was received from the Commonwealth under the Transport (Planning and Research) Act. The main research projects undertaken during the year included a major planning study of the public transport options for the north-eastern suburbs, the metropolitan Adelaide data base study, and an investigation of the role of electric vehicles in urban transport. An allocation of \$1 100 000 is proposed for 1977-78.

EFFLUENT DRAINAGE, \$1 600 000—In 1976-77 an amount of \$1 450 000 was paid to local authorities by way of subsidies towards the construction of effluent drainage schemes. A total of 13 authorities received assistance with the Corporation of Kadina and the District Councils of Crystal Brook, Port Elliot and Goolwa, and Barossa receiving the major support. It is proposed to make \$1 600 000 available for subsidies in 1977-78.

DEPARTMENT OF SERVICES AND SUPPLY, \$2 040 000—A total of \$1 747 000 was expended by the department during 1976-77 as follows:

	\$
Automatic Data Processing Division ..	900 000
Printing Division . . . . .	500 000
State Supply Division . . . . .	347 000
	<hr/>
	\$1 747 000

The proposed allocation of \$2 040 000 for 1977-78 provides for the purchase of phototypesetting equipment for the Printing Division and some capital works at the Port Lincoln meatworks. The completion of these works was part of the approved arrangement to transfer them to the South Australian Meat Corporation.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—SCHOOL BUSES, \$1 800 000—An amount of \$1 579 000 was expended on the purchase of school buses in 1976-77. Seventy-one buses were purchased, of which 57 have been put into service in country areas. The proposed allocation for 1977-78 is \$1 800 000.

TOURISM, RECREATION AND SPORT, \$1 200 000—A total of \$1 811 000 was spent in 1976-77 on the development of tourist, recreational and sporting facilities throughout the State. Of that amount, \$1 049 000 was made available from State Loan funds and \$762 000 was received from the Commonwealth. Major projects completed during the year included the Elizabeth Leisure Centre, the Kadina and Districts Recreation Centre and a surf life-saving headquarters at West Lakes. Work is proceeding on the St. Vincent's Recreation Centre at Christies Beach and the Marino Quarry Recreation Centre. An allocation of \$1 200 000 is proposed for 1977-78 for the continuation of these and other works.

Mr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

Appendix I  
PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS  
Major Works Completed in 1976-77

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
<b>Primary and Junior Primary Schools—</b>		
<b>New Schools—</b>		
Bellevue Heights Primary—Stage I . . . . .	855 000	Demac
Direk Primary—Stage I . . . . .	988 000	Brick
Flagstaff Hill Primary—Stage I . . . . .	1 145 000	Brick
Highbury Junior Primary . . . . .	614 000	Brick
Lonsdale Heights Primary . . . . .	1 421 000	Brick
Modbury South Junior Primary . . . . .	630 000	Brick
Modbury West Junior Primary . . . . .	576 000	Brick
<b>Major Additions and Upgrading—</b>		
Augusta Park Primary . . . . .	300 000	Samcon
Black Forest Primary . . . . .	167 000	Brick
Camden Primary . . . . .	656 000	Demac
Hindmarsh Primary—Library Resource Centre . . . . .	61 000	Brick
Magill Junior Primary . . . . .	822 000	Brick
Millicent North Primary . . . . .	223 000	Samcon
Nuriootpa Primary . . . . .	1 244 000	Brick
Paringa Park Primary—Stage I . . . . .	716 000	Brick
Salisbury North Primary . . . . .	1 130 000	Brick
Strathalbyn Primary . . . . .	368 000	Demac
Woodside Primary—Upgrading . . . . .	79 000	Brick
<b>High Schools—</b>		
<b>New Schools—</b>		
Modbury Heights High . . . . .	4 535 000	Brick
Morphett Vale East High . . . . .	4 108 000	Brick
Parafield Gardens High . . . . .	4 344 000	Brick
<b>Major Additions and Upgrading—</b>		
Augusta Park High . . . . .	116 000	Demac
Brighton High—Music Suite . . . . .	70 000	Brick
Dover High—Stage II . . . . .	308 000	Brick
Glossop High—Metalwork Building . . . . .	188 000	Brick
Kadina High . . . . .	843 000	Brick
Le Fevre High—Stage II . . . . .	116 000	Brick
Mannum High—Resource Centre . . . . .	105 000	Demac
Salisbury East High . . . . .	616 000	Brick
Stuart High . . . . .	155 000	Demac
Taperoo High—Art/Craft . . . . .	58 000	Demac
Urrbrae High—Resource Centre . . . . .	130 000	Demac
Vermont High—Canteen . . . . .	51 000	Brick
<b>Area Schools—</b>		
<b>New Schools—</b>		
Karcultaby Area . . . . .	1 659 000	Samcon
<b>Major Additions and Upgrading—</b>		
Kingston Area—Resource Centre . . . . .	152 000	Demac
Pinnaroo Area—Home Economics . . . . .	110 000	Demac
<b>Special Schools—</b>		
Ashford House . . . . .	87 000	Brick
Barton Terrace Special Education Facilities . . . . .	58 000	Brick
Kings Park Special Education Facilities . . . . .	105 000	Brick
<b>General—</b>		
Christies Beach High—Overpass . . . . .	50 000	—
Henley High—Parking Area . . . . .	43 000	—
Mawson High—Civil Works . . . . .	45 000	—
Para Vista High—Surface Drainage and Dewatering . . . . .	61 000	—
Port Noarlunga Primary—Civil Works . . . . .	70 000	—
Seacliff Primary—Upgrading of Grounds . . . . .	100 000	—
<b>Subsidised Works—</b>		
Findon High—Multipurpose Hall . . . . .	286 000	Brick
<b>Other Projects—</b>		
Wattle Park Teachers Centre—Stages I and II . . . . .	285 000	Brick
Western Regional Centre (Whyalla) . . . . .	491 000	Brick

Appendix I—continued  
 PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS—continued  
 Major Works in Progress at June 30, 1977

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
<b>Primary and Junior Primary Schools—</b>		
New Schools—		
Hackham East Junior Primary . . . . .	427 000	Demac
Kidman Park Junior Primary . . . . .	750 000	Brick
Morphett Vale South Primary—Stage I . . . . .	1 089 000	Demac
Morphett Vale West Primary . . . . .	1 058 000	Demac
Paradise Primary . . . . .	1 532 000	Brick
Redwood Park Primary—Stage I . . . . .	1 400 000	Brick
Major Additions and Upgrading—		
Coromandel Valley Primary . . . . .	1 180 000	Demac
Croydon Junior Primary—Stage II . . . . .	535 000	Brick
Fairview Park Primary—Stage II . . . . .	257 000	Demac
Frazer Park Primary—Stages II and III . . . . .	371 000	Demac
Port Noarlunga South Primary—Stage II . . . . .	360 000	Brick
Rose Park Junior Primary . . . . .	234 000	Brick
Salisbury Downs Primary—Stage II . . . . .	520 000	Brick
Stirling East Primary . . . . .	397 000	Demac
Woodville Primary—Stage I . . . . .	688 000	Brick
<b>High Schools—</b>		
New Schools—		
The Parks Community Centre (education component only) . . . . .	8 320 000	Brick
Major Additions and Upgrading—		
Banksia Park High . . . . .	301 000	Demac
Burra Community School . . . . .	3 000 000	Brick
Gawler High—Major Additions . . . . .	970 000	Brick
Gawler High—Art/Craft . . . . .	208 000	Demac
Kapunda High—Home Economics . . . . .	104 000	Demac
Marryatville High . . . . .	2 400 000	Brick
Mawson High—Stage II . . . . .	648 000	Brick
Modbury High . . . . .	937 000	Brick
Nailsworth High—Stages I and II . . . . .	2 047 000	Brick
Port Pirie High—Stage II . . . . .	1 100 000	Brick
Salisbury East High—Art/Craft . . . . .	214 000	Demac
Woodville High—Home Economics . . . . .	171 000	Demac
<b>Area Schools—</b>		
Major Additions—		
Oakbank Area—Resource Centre . . . . .	134 000	Demac
<b>Special Schools—</b>		
Whyalla . . . . .	492 000	Demac
<b>General—</b>		
Kidman Park High—Playing Fields . . . . .	83 000	—
Para Vista High—Cold Water Reticulation and Hot Water Supply . . . . .	83 000	—
<b>Subsidised Projects—</b>		
Campbelltown High—Activity Centre . . . . .	696 000	Brick
Enfield High—Activity Centre . . . . .	596 000	Brick
Stradbroke Primary—Activities Area . . . . .	138 000	Brick
<b>Other Projects—</b>		
Central Western Regional Education Office . . . . .	106 000	—
Lower Murray Regional Education Office . . . . .	155 000	—
<i>Major Projects to be Commenced During 1977-78</i>		
<b>Primary and Junior Primary Schools—</b>		
New Schools—		
Blair Park South Primary . . . . .	1 484 000	Demac
North Haven Primary . . . . .	1 600 000	Brick
Reynella East Primary . . . . .	1 700 000	Brick
West Lakes Shore Primary . . . . .	1 600 000	Brick

## Appendix I—continued

## PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS—continued

## Major Projects to be Commenced During 1977-78—continued

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
<b>Major Additions and Upgrading—</b>		
Banksia Park Primary . . . . .	395 000	Demac
Banksia Park Junior Primary . . . . .	269 000	Demac
Bellevue Heights Primary—Stage II . . . . .	364 000	Demac
Blair Athol Primary . . . . .	193 000	Demac
Braeview Primary—Stage II . . . . .	415 000	Brick
Campbelltown Junior Primary . . . . .	900 000	Brick
Crafers Primary . . . . .	220 000	Cement Block
Darlington Primary . . . . .	455 000	Brick
Dernancourt Primary . . . . .	425 000	Brick
Direk Primary—Stage II . . . . .	349 000	Brick
Flagstaff Hill Primary—Stage II . . . . .	366 000	Brick
Hackham East Primary . . . . .	348 000	Demac
Hawthorndene Primary . . . . .	236 000	Demac
Highbury Primary . . . . .	190 000	Demac
Kapunda Primary . . . . .	100 000	Demac
Lobethal Primary . . . . .	495 000	Brick
Marryatville Primary . . . . .	461 000	Demac
Minlaton Primary . . . . .	100 000	Demac
Mitchell Park Primary . . . . .	410 000	Brick
Moorook Primary . . . . .	255 000	Demac
Morphett Vale East Primary . . . . .	318 000	Demac
Mount Gambier North Primary . . . . .	405 000	Brick
Nailsworth Primary . . . . .	430 000	Brick
Parkside Primary . . . . .	187 000	Demac
Plympton Primary . . . . .	450 000	Brick
Renmark Primary . . . . .	230 000	Demac
Seaview Downs Primary . . . . .	414 000	Demac
Solomontown Primary . . . . .	107 000	Demac
Stradbroke Primary . . . . .	440 000	Brick
Tantanoola Primary . . . . .	141 000	Demac
Thorndon Park Primary . . . . .	430 000	Brick
Walkerville Primary . . . . .	201 000	Demac
Woodside Primary . . . . .	231 000	Demac
Victor Harbor Primary . . . . .	495 000	Demac
<b>High Schools—</b>		
<b>Major Additions and Upgrading—</b>		
Balaklava High . . . . .	179 000	Demac
Elizabeth West High . . . . .	475 000	Brick
Enfield High . . . . .	495 000	Brick
Eyre High . . . . .	173 000	Demac
Fremont High . . . . .	140 000	Brick
Glenunga High . . . . .	234 000	Brick
Jamestown High . . . . .	118 000	Demac
Modbury High . . . . .	90 000	Brick
Playford High . . . . .	460 000	Brick
Salisbury North High . . . . .	470 000	Brick
Strathalbyn High . . . . .	109 000	Demac
Strathmont High . . . . .	250 000	—
<b>Area Schools—</b>		
<b>Major Additions and Upgrading—</b>		
Karoonda Area . . . . .	144 000	Demac
Kingscote Area . . . . .	1 600 000	Demac
Maitland Area . . . . .	195 000	Demac
<b>Special Schools—</b>		
Christies Beach . . . . .	100 000	Brick
Hectorville Primary—Special Education Facilities . . . . .	29 000	Timber
Kensington . . . . .	500 000	Brick
Kilburn Primary—Special Education Facilities . . . . .	37 000	Timber
Mitchell Park Primary—Special Education Facilities . . . . .	45 000	Timber
Modbury Primary—Special Education Facilities . . . . .	45 000	Timber

Appendix I—continued  
PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS—continued  
Major Works to be Commenced During 1977-78

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
Subsidised Works—		
Glenunga High—Multipurpose Hall . . . . .	350 000	Brick
General—		
Morphett Vale South Primary—Underpass . . . . .	54 000	—
Payneham Primary—Contribution to Sports Hall . . . . .	70 000	—
St. Vincent's Recreation Centre—Education Contribution	100 000	—

*Major Projects for which Planning and Design is Proposed During 1977-78*

Locality	Type of Construction
Primary and Junior Primary Schools—	
Aberfoyle Park Primary	Salisbury West Primary
Aldgate Primary	Sheidow Park Primary
Barmera Primary	Smithfield North Primary
Belair Primary	Stirling North Primary
Birdwood Primary	Two Wells Primary
Crafrers Primary	Willunga Primary
East Adelaide Primary	Yetto Primary
Gumeracha Primary	Area Schools—
Hackham West Primary	Ceduna Area
Hallett Cove East Primary	Kangaroo Inn Area—Multipurpose Hall
Happy Valley Primary	Kingston Area
Hawthorndene Primary	Meningie Area
Leigh Creek Primary	Pinnaroo Area
Meadows Primary	Port Broughton Area
Noarlunga Primary	High Schools—
Pedare Primary	Elizabeth High—Multipurpose Hall
Pennington Junior Primary	Heathfield High
Plympton Primary	Marden High—Resource Centre
Port Augusta North-West Primary	Millicent High—Multipurpose Hall
Richmond Primary	Renmark High
St. Agnes West Primary	Reynella East High
Salisbury Heights Primary	Surrey Downs High
	Thebarton Community Centre

Appendix II

FURTHER EDUCATION BUILDINGS

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
<i>Major Works Completed in 1976-77</i>		
New Buildings—		
Regency Park Community College—Phase IA . . . . .	14 028 000	Precast Concrete Panels
Major Additions—		
Croydon Park College of Further Education—General Studies . . . . .	146 000	Demac
Elizabeth Community College—General Studies . . . . .	107 000	Demac
Marleston College of Further Education—School of Wool	293 000	Demac
School of Business Studies—Centrepoint . . . . .	81 000	—
General—		
Elizabeth Community College—Car Park . . . . .	55 000	—
Port Augusta College of Further Education—Car Park . .	86 000	—

*Major Works in Progress at June 30, 1977*

New Buildings—		
Regency Park Community College—Administration/ Resource Centre . . . . .	3 831 000	Precast Concrete Panels
Major Additions—		
Croydon Park College of Further Education—Extensions to School of Automotive Engineering . . . . .	1 101 000	Brick
Elizabeth Community College—Extensions . . . . .	285 000	Brick
Whyalla College of Further Education—Stage II . . . . .	8 000 000	Concrete Block

*Major Works to be Commenced During 1977-78*

New Buildings—		
Regency Park Community College—Classroom Block and Mechanical Engineering . . . . .	9 500 000	Precast Concrete Panels
Major Additions—		
City West College of Further Education—Alterations . .	413 000	—
Kensington Park Community College—Alterations . . . .	128 000	—
Riverland College of Further Education—Theatre . . . .	1 425 000	Brick
Regency Park Civil Works . . . . .	256 000	—
Kensington Park Community College—Car Park . . . . .	94 000	—

*Major Projects for which Planning and Design is Proposed During 1977-78*

Elizabeth Community College—Learning Resource Centre
Gilles Plains Community College—Stage I
Noarlunga Community College
Tea Tree Gully College of Further Education

APPENDIX III

STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATION AUTHORITIES FOR ACTUAL PAYMENTS FROM THE LOAN ACCOUNT 1976-77

Loan Undertaking	Appropriation Authorities						Actual Payments	
	Pursuant to the Public Purposes Loan Act, 1976					Pursuant to Section 32b, Public Finance Act		Total Appropriation Authorities
	Schedule to the Act	Variations Made Pursuant to Section 6 (3) of the Act		Total Appropriation Authorities as Varied				
		Increase	Decrease					
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$		\$	\$	
State Bank	Advances for Homes	20 000	—	1 000	19 000	—	19 000	14 805
	Loans to Producers	2 950 000	—	634 000	2 316 000	—	2 316 000	2 316 000
	Advances to Settlers	80 000	100 000	—	180 000	—	180 000	168 864
	Loans for Fencing and Water Piping	10 000	—	5 000	5 000	—	5 000	4 283
	Advances to State Bank	2 800 000	830 000	—	3 630 000	—	3 630 000	2 800 000
	Student Hostels	40 000	—	40 000	—	—	—	—
Highways	South-Western Suburbs Drainage	20 000	—	—	20 000	43 000	63 000	37 436
	Stormwater Drainage	1 450 000	350 000	—	1 800 000	—	1 800 000	1 692 494
Lands, Irrigation and Drainage	Lands Department—Buildings, Plant, etc.	1 510 000	—	—	1 510 000	200 000	1 710 000	1 304 149
	Irrigation and Reclamation of Swamp Lands	3 650 000	—	—	3 650 000	—	3 650 000	3 600 561
	South-Eastern Drainage	80 000	—	—	80 000	—	80 000	78 075
	Renmark Irrigation Trust	600 000	183 900	—	783 900	—	783 900	783 900
Woods and Forests	Aforestation and Timber Milling	7 550 000	—	—	7 550 000	—	7 550 000	6 643 214
Marine and Harbors	Harbors Accommodation	8 350 000	801 000	—	9 151 000	—	9 151 000	8 705 253
	Fishing Havens	1 200 000	95 000	—	1 295 000	—	1 295 000	1 271 827
Engineering and Water Supply	Waterworks and Sewers	65 800 000	—	—	65 800 000	—	65 800 000	64 336 411
	River Murray Weirs, Dams, Locks, etc.	7 070 000	—	—	7 070 000	—	7 070 000	6 750 809
Public Buildings	Government Buildings, Land and Services—							
	Hospital Buildings and Services	33 000 000	—	3 000 000	30 000 000	—	30 000 000	29 719 879
	Primary and Secondary Schools	40 500 000	—	—	40 500 000	—	40 500 000	40 481 438
	Further Education	10 400 000	—	218 250	10 181 750	—	10 181 750	10 180 331
	Other Government Buildings	27 500 000	—	—	27 500 000	—	27 500 000	27 496 804
Environment	National Reserves	1 250 000	—	—	1 250 000	—	1 250 000	1 250 000
Other Capital Advances and Provisions	Advances for Housing	—	—	—	—	13 000 000	13 000 000	9 000 000
	Electricity Trust of South Australia	6 000 000	—	—	6 000 000	—	6 000 000	6 000 000
	State Transport Authority—							
	Bus and Tram Division	1 000 000	—	—	1 000 000	—	1 000 000	1 000 000
	Rail Division	15 800 000	—	1 696 900	14 103 100	—	14 103 100	10 507 837
	South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation	500 000	—	—	500 000	—	500 000	500 000
	Non-government Hospital and Institution Buildings	9 500 000	3 000 000	—	12 500 000	—	12 500 000	12 336 614
	Community Health and Associated Projects	990 000	—	—	990 000	—	990 000	918 842
	Monarto Development Commission	1 400 000	—	—	1 400 000	—	1 400 000	—
	South Australian Land Commission	1 900 000	—	—	1 900 000	—	1 900 000	1 900 000
	South Australian Teacher Housing Authority	1 000 000	218 250	—	1 218 250	—	1 218 250	1 218 250
Miscellaneous	Expenses and Discounts of Floating Conversion and Public Loans	705 000	—	—	705 000	—	705 000	303 421
	Department of Transport—							
	Transport—Research and Development	960 000	17 000	—	977 000	—	977 000	977 000
	Local Government—							
	Effluent Drainage	1 450 000	—	—	1 450 000	—	1 450 000	1 450 000
	Public Parks	300 000	—	—	300 000	—	300 000	300 000
	Mines Department—Buildings, Plant, etc.	400 000	—	—	400 000	—	400 000	399 881
	Department of Services and Supply—							
	Printing Division—Plant, Machinery, Stores, etc.	500 000	—	—	500 000	—	500 000	499 999
	Supply Division—Buildings, Plant, Stores, etc.	500 000	—	—	500 000	—	500 000	346 544
	Data Processing Division—Data Processing Equipment	900 000	—	—	900 000	—	900 000	900 000
	Education Department—School Buses	1 600 000	—	—	1 600 000	—	1 600 000	1 579 145
	Department of Agriculture and Fisheries—Boats and Facilities, etc.	300 000	—	—	300 000	30 000	330 000	301 573
	Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport—Recreational and Sporting Facilities, etc.	1 050 000	—	—	1 050 000	—	1 050 000	1 049 517
	<b>Total</b>	<b>262 585 000</b>	<b>5 595 150</b>	<b>5 595 150</b>	<b>262 585 000</b>	<b>13 273 000</b>	<b>275 858 000</b>	<b>261 125 156*</b>

\*Includes \$182 446 discount on loan raisings



### FILM CLASSIFICATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Film Classification Act, 1971-1974. Read a first time.

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

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

It has two objectives. First, it seeks to increase the maximum penalty for exhibiting an unclassified film from the present rather low \$200 to \$1 000. Unfortunately, certain sex shops in Adelaide are now abusing the freedom they have been allowed in the exhibition of films that have not been classified under the Film Classification Act, 1971-1974. For some years it has been the practice to allow sex shop proprietors to exhibit such films to prospective customers who are genuinely interested in purchasing such a film. Some shops have been virtually operating as theatres, but the various subterfuges employed made it extremely difficult for the police to establish whether or not the audience were prospective customers. Proprietors have been advised that the concession has been withdrawn. It is essential that higher penalties be imposed so that it will be unprofitable for offenders to continue to exhibit pornographic films.

The Bill also seeks to widen the Minister's power to prohibit the exhibition of certain R films in drive-in theatres. There are some R films that are, in my Government's opinion, far too explicit in matters of sexual activity and cruelty for exhibition in drive-ins. At the moment, the Minister has power to issue notices to individual drive-ins prohibiting the exhibition of a particular R film where he considers that the film may be seen from outside the theatre. This necessitates issuing approximately 40 notices. The Act has been widened so that the Minister can issue general or particular notices of prohibition in relation to drive-in theatres, whether or not the drive-in theatre is constructed in such a way that people outside can see the screen. I seek leave to have the remaining explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 increases the penalty for an offence against the section from an amount not exceeding \$200 to an amount not exceeding \$1 000. Clause 3 enables the Minister to prohibit the exhibition of all R films in all drive-in theatres or any specified drive-in theatres, or of any particular R film. The prohibition may be imposed by a general notice in the *Gazette*, or by individual notices served on drive-in theatre proprietors.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

### INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION JURISDICTION (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Commission Jurisdiction (Temporary Provisions) Act, 1975-1976. Read a first time.

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

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

Honourable members will recall the unanimous support given to a Bill I introduced last year extending the period of operation of the Industrial Commission Jurisdiction (Temporary Provisions) Act for a further 12 months, terminable by proclamation earlier if necessary. At the

time, I expressed my concern about the future of wage indexation, particularly in view of the Fraser Government's continued opposition, before the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, to the basic purpose of indexation, which is the preservative of the real purchasing power of wages in a time of inflation.

However, the system is still in operation. A major review of the indexation guidelines is at present being undertaken by the Australian commission and the principal parties in the national wage cases, and this gives some confidence that the system will continue at least in the foreseeable future. The alternative could be to a return to the 1974 wage bargaining situation, which would not be in the interests of wage-earners, employers, or the economy as a whole.

On behalf of the Government, I restate our belief that the system of wage indexation and its guidelines will survive only if the principal parties retain confidence in it. In particular, wage-earners must be assured that indexation is not a device to lower the real value of their wages and depress their standard of living, but is a system which enables their wages to be adjusted in an orderly manner to keep pace with inflation. Unfortunately, not all parties before the commission are prepared to adopt this view.

The current Act, which makes it possible for the State Industrial Commission to apply the Federal decisions to workers employed under State Awards, expires at the end of this year. The Government believes it will be necessary as long as the wage indexation system survives, and it is therefore appropriate to extend the life of the Act indefinitely. However, it must still be regarded, as its title indicates, as a temporary provision because it can be terminated by proclamation at any time when the situation demands it. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation of the Bill inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### REMAINDER OF EXPLANATION OF BILL

Honourable members will recall that the principal Act, the Industrial Commission Jurisdiction (Temporary Provisions) Act, 1975-1976, was enacted so as to ensure that the various industrial tribunals in this State would have jurisdiction to give effect to indexation decisions of the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. In the ordinary course of events, this Act would expire on December 31, 1977, and the effect of this measure is to continue the principal Act in operation until a day fixed by proclamation.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 4. Page 433.)

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): In supporting the motion, I refer to several matters from the Opening Speech to Parliament by His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor. First, I add my regrets about the need for Sir Douglas Nicholls to vacate the position of Governor. It must have been a sorry day for Sir Douglas and Lady Nicholls to have to leave this State and the responsible position that, I believe, they were looking forward to so keenly to occupying in this community. On the one hand, I appreciate the honour (as I am sure all members do) that the Government paid to Aborigines in selecting one of their number to occupy

that position. On the other hand, I hope that it may be a lesson to this Government and future Governments, as it is expecting a lot of a man of those years to undertake the duties of a position like that of a Governor of a State. The position must be very demanding, and one needs to be in good health in order to fulfil those duties.

I now refer to the deceased former members. I knew the late Tom Stott very well from when I was a boy, because I can remember his being a household name from the time I was attending school. In my late father's eyes Tom Stott was the champion of agricultural people in the basic work he did in forming the organisation of which he was Secretary. He seemed to me to be a man who was held in high regard, especially by farmers who passed through the depression years, because the men of the depression had much faith in Tom Stott. Whilst I did not know or understand all the details involved, I know that he must have done much to help relieve the financial burdens of the depression years of those involved in agriculture.

I now refer to Sir Glen Pearson, for whom I had a great admiration. He served his State and his people across on Eyre Peninsula as best he knew. Physically, he gave himself fully to the job and, mentally, he made every possible effort, because he was concerned not only about the material prosperity of the region he represented but also the spiritual lives of those people and of all he met. More than anyone else in my life, Sir Glen stood out as a man who fulfilled all the conditions that we assume when we use the term "Christian gentleman". I admired him for his principles: he was not afraid to express them and was not ashamed of the faith that was so much a part of his life. He was willing to witness that faith in the community amongst men, and I admired him for that. I know that his family and close friends grieved deeply at his passing, because we all believed that we had lost a good and close friend.

I place on record my respects to the late Mr. Clarke and Mr. Shannon and add my condolences to those of other members to the families of both gentlemen. Mr. Shannon became almost a legend in relation to the Public Works Committee. Although I have no possibility of following in his footsteps as Chairman of that august body, I am proud to be a member of it.

Another matter in the Speech to which I refer is the comment about the opening season in the cereal-growing areas, because in some respects this season is quite tragic. At this time last year many farmers did not know whether or not to sow their crops. This year the season has encouraged them to do that, and I understand that in most areas of the State cereal crops have been sown. However, with the lack of rain it is questionable in the minds of agricultural people whether they would have been wiser not to have sown, especially in some areas of this State. In the area that I represent, winds have been quite damaging so that much of the country will need to be resown. Not only have crops been cut off with shifting sands but also many of them have been blown away: as a result so much soil has been moved in some areas that the grain will need to be resown, and this will cause a loss of finance and time that farmers cannot afford.

It is difficult for people living in the metropolitan area and in country towns to understand completely the difficulties facing agriculture in all its many facets. Rising costs have made difficult the meeting of financial commitments, and this situation seems to be related to all agricultural pursuits. If the season is a reasonable one, the graingrower is probably as well off as is anyone, but

in the dairying and cattle industries, and to some extent in the sheep industry, rising costs during the past few years have taken away from the farmer the ability to invest in new machinery and to expand to provide for a son or sons of the family, and have completely restricted these people to the need to make ends meet. Often it is difficult to do even that. I know of some farmers in the Murray Mallee who have suffered from two very dry and difficult seasons, and some of them are wondering, especially if this is not a good season, whether they can withstand any further droughts.

Mr. Venning: Do you think we ought to retain some grain in our silos for seeding in those areas?

Mr. WARDLE: In previous years, when it seemed that we would have a dry season, other members and I have asked whether this could be done, and those questions have been reported in *Hansard*. This is a most important matter. I do not believe that any area in this State that has experienced a difficult season should have the added burden imposed on it of having to bring back to the area grain that has been taken away from it, not necessarily because of poor management but prematurely, before it was completely known what the results of the season would be.

I should think that the wise administration of the bulk handling operation in this State requires thought to be given to areas that are subject to drought, where it seems that there is any possibility whatsoever that certain grain storages ought to be preserved. This should be done not only from the point of view of the resowing of agricultural land in the case of cereal growing but also, perhaps more especially, from the point of view of feeding stock. This is one of the difficult aspects of this season: not only are the prospects for the State's cereal harvest poor but also the prospects of having sufficient stock feed, especially paddock feed, are poorer still. Stock will become cheap if the rains continue to hold off, as they have done over the past month or so.

My district has in it an abattoir that is capable of slaughtering 3 500 sheep a day. With two shifts operating, it will soon be slaughtering 500 head of cattle each day. It takes much stock to keep an abattoir like that in full production. Although many farmers have appreciated the additional returns that have resulted from the exporting of live sheep, there are two schools of thought regarding this matter. The abattoir and its staff are keen to keep at full production, but they will find it difficult to do so. On the other hand, the producer has been pleased to receive what he believes to be (whether this is borne out in fact, I am not sure) a better price for his stock because of the export of sheep to other countries.

One of the tragic aspects of the difficulties being experienced in the rural sector is the lack of encouragement being given to young people. We have read many statistics about the average age of farmers in this State. The tragic thing about that average age is that it is far too old. What encouragement is given for young people to remain on the land? As industrialists are employing fewer and fewer people because of the wage and high cost structures and compensation payments, the farmer is finding that, whenever he can purchase another machine that will enable him to do all the work that has to be done on his property, he does so and, as a result, his son becomes redundant. Really, it is the son who ought to be remaining on the land. However, his father, who may be 52, 53 or 54 years of age, is not of a pensionable age, or the value of his assets is too high for the department to grant him a pension. Such a man is, therefore, isolated. He must remain on the land.

On the other hand, the sons of such farmers are being compelled to leave the land right now. These are the people that ought to be remaining on the land so that they can become the farmers of tomorrow. This is, therefore, a difficult situation. It certainly involves a difficult decision for a farming family when only one person can be employed on the family farm. So often, because of his financial situation, that remaining person has to be the middle-aged father.

I should like now to refer to another aspect of this matter before I leave the rural scene. I refer to the administration of grants under the rural assistance legislation. I believe, as a result of several cases of which I have heard, and because of the cases to which other Opposition members have referred, that the administration of this fund has in the past been fairly conservative, especially from the point of view of sharefarmers who have been unable to receive assistance, because they have not owned land. It seems to me that the administration of the Act in the past has involved the advancing of funds on the security of land only. I have made it my business to check on the administration of similar legislation in other States. Members will recall that in the April-May session this House ratified a new agreement (as did all other States) that was made between the various State Governments and the Commonwealth Government. That new legislation made additional funds available to the rural industries. I hope that, because certain other States are willing to make available loans on the security of plant, and not necessarily on land only, the department, in administering this fund in South Australia, will in future see its way clear under this new legislation to make similar loans available to sharefarmers in South Australia on the basis of the security of plant and not necessarily on the basis of land alone.

Like other members, I consider that the Speech delivered by His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, which basically involves the Government's intentions during the session, was a fairly moderate document that was repetitive of previous documents. About many of the things referred to therein we have known for some time, even though they are continuing projects. I refer, for instance, to the deviation of the South-Eastern Freeway through the Swanport area, by-passing Murray Bridge. I am pleased to see that this project is continuing. This is something that has been with us for years, and will continue to be with us for some time yet. It is interesting to see that this bridge will, when completed, be the longest bridge in South Australia. I am sure that, when members see it for the first time, they will be pleased about the way in which this wonderful structure is shaping up at present.

The Speech referred to the present ageing bridge structure at the town of Murray Bridge. I wonder whether engineers have detected anything in the structure that could be detrimental to traffic crossing it. I sometimes wonder whether Government officers read the speeches of members. I know that some do when it comes to grieving time, because after grieving I was recently contacted by a Government department and I was delighted about that because I was able to give more detail of the problem to which I was referring. A person from that department had telephoned me to say that he had read what I had grieved about a town planning issue and he wanted to know what it was all about. I wonder what the Minister and his officers have in mind about this ageing structure, whether the ageing is causing any great deterioration, whether there is any likelihood of a load limit being placed on this ageing structure, and if there is, what that load limit might be.

It is interesting that at this time each year we have a flood of inquiries and complaints about the condition of the city's water supply. If the metropolitan people lived along the river they would notice the water coming down the Murray River getting milkier and milkier as the days go by because of the water with its suspended clays coming from the Darling River. This happens almost annually and the water reaches the metropolitan area at this time of the year. I suppose discoloured water is not appealing but I do not think there is any greater harm in it than there is in clear water. In fact, there could be less harm in it than there is when the water is clear. I wonder what would have happened if the Government had told a firm constructing water filters that, over a period of years, it would purchase 500 000 filters so that the company could put in the best possible plant and equipment available in order to make them. I also wonder what would have happened if the Government had said it was prepared to subsidise a water filter and rainwater tank for each dwelling. Although we will spend \$135 000 000 in this State on water filtration (that is only the cost estimated so far, and we are by no means half-way through at this stage), I wonder whether it would have been better to assist every household to have its own filtration plant at the back door to filter only the water for domestic purposes, rather than filtering millions of gallons of water for garden use, car washing and toilet flushing purposes.

I recall that years ago, in the corporation of Murray Bridge, figures were taken out to find out why the water level in the town was rising and why people were having more and more difficulty in getting away their sullage water. We discovered that about three-quarters of the total consumption of the piped water to those 2 000 houses was being used other than through the household. It is obvious that about 75 per cent of the total quantity of filtered water, coming from this \$135 000 000 system, will not be used for domestic purposes but will be used for garden watering and so on.

I would like to see the department take out figures on a pilot scheme of filtering a town's water supply by means of a filtration unit for each dwelling. I suggest that a suitable town for such a pilot scheme could be Murray Bridge. There would be no need to supply a rainwater tank in that area because no-one, and I mean no-one, drinks river water, simply because each household has a rainwater tank. I think probably most country people do prefer rain water. Perhaps I might one day suggest to the Minister that a pilot scheme be conducted to see how the costs compare. We will be spending not only \$135 000 000 on the filtration of the Adelaide water supply but over the next 100 years the cost of maintenance and running costs of such a filtration plant must be taken into account. It seems to me that this will be a large sum, and surely that sum would, under subsidy, have given each household an opportunity to install its own filtration system.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: The scheme suggested has been investigated, but I believe there were health and bacteriological reasons against it.

Mr. WARDLE: I accept the Minister's information. Even so, surely in these days of scientific achievement it could have been possible to chlorinate it or in some other way inject into the water supply those things in which it was considered deficient.

Mr. Arnold: Your proposal of subsidising home water filtration units could well be the answer to the question of supplying filtered water to people living in country towns, as it would appear that the Government has no intention of filtering country water supplies.

Mr. WARDLE: I am glad that the member for Chaffey has made that comment because it confirms that he, too, is thinking of a pilot scheme for country towns, and it does not look as though country towns will have the benefit of filtration until the metropolitan area is completed and that will take many years. Perhaps the Government could experiment with pilot schemes in water filtration in two river towns, such as Berri and Renmark.

Mr. Keneally: You won't get filtration if the Federal Government doesn't live up to the agreement.

Mr. WARDLE: One becomes tired of hearing from some members opposite the old, old cry about the Federal Government being the bogey. It is all very well to place responsibility for a lack of development in certain areas across to the Federal Government. That is an easy way out politically.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What do you think of your front bench now?

Mr. WARDLE: The front bench has quality, if not quantity, and I think the same thing about the Government side, the Minister who is now present having been a colleague of mine on the Public Works Committee, the senior committee of the Parliament and probably the most efficient committee that has been appointed in this place.

I now wish to move to the subject of tourist promotion and regional tourist centres. Whilst I guess it could be said that my district does not have anything outstanding in the way of tourist facilities, on the other hand I believe that it has. It has much potential, and there is much potential throughout South Australia just awaiting development. I will quote various passages from a document compiled for the purpose of making a case to the Select Committee on Tourism that was appointed by the House of Representatives a few weeks ago. The case was made out by the Murray Bridge Chamber of Commerce Incorporated and is entitled "Regional tourist and development promotion involving commerce and the three levels of government."

First, I want to have recorded in *Hansard* the reason why the Chamber of Commerce believes that chambers of commerce basically are the best organisations through which to work in district development. We may or may not agree with most of these basics, but I refer to the document, as follows:

The Chamber of Commerce is primarily concerned with commercial matters, but its sphere goes beyond that. It rightly takes notice of, and can play a part in, anything that would make its area progressive and add to the cultural and educational facilities available. It has no political Party ties. On the other hand, it reserves the right to applaud or to criticise any Government, department, or local council, depending on whether or not it approves the actions of same in the light of community interests.

It seeks to confer with the trade union movement for the development of a healthy employer-employee relationship for mutual advantage and for the general raising of the standard of living for all. Membership is open to business proprietors, partnerships, companies, and individual citizens.

A Chamber of Commerce can engage in functions which are thought as belonging to a progress association or tourist association. The chamber's aims then are to promote the well-being of its area whether that be at the local, State-wide, or national level. This commerce movement has earned a reputation for being nationally-minded. Government and municipal authorities look to it to provide well balanced advice on matters that come within its sphere of operations which cover a wide variety of aspects. A chamber of commerce is the only organisation that represents the interests of the whole community.

That is a basic statement that the Federation of Chambers of Commerce in Australia makes, and they are the ideals set out in a Federation booklet that was issued in 1960.

Basing its beliefs on that, the local chamber took up the matter of regional tourist information centres and finally presented this 42-page document to the Federal committee that visited South Australia a few weeks ago.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Do you know whether Barmera made submissions?

Mr. WARDLE: I do not know of any other river towns, or any other towns, for that matter, in South Australia that made detailed submissions to that committee. If one had time to quote more of this report, one could show that these matters are continually brought to the knowledge of people interested in tourism. Often our tourist offices and tourist people are so ill-equipped, and that is where the Murray Bridge Chamber of Commerce made some of its strong recommendations: there should be adequately staffed offices, adequately trained people, knowledgeable people, people who had provided for them the right sorts of maps, information, brochures and everything else dealing with publicity.

When I see the attractions that there are in my district (and probably most other members could say the same of their districts), I realise that, if suitable material in all forms was provided about these attractions, many hundreds and thousands of tourists who now pass across the bridge at Murray Bridge might stay in the area. The Tourist Bureau has said that about 330 000 tourists pass from Victoria to South Australia each year, and perhaps 40 000 or 50 000 of those could be encouraged to stay for one week (most people seem to stay for only one night), each day moving in another direction, so that they would certainly see something different in the area in that week. I want to place in *Hansard* not only the regional areas that this study suggests but also the main purposes of a regional office. They are:

- (1) To bring more people into the region as tourists.
- (2) To hold them for a few days or encourage them to return.
- (3) To assist people by providing all relevant information.
- (4) To obtain more additional facilities and attractions for the region.
- (5) To find ways and means of improving existing facilities.
- (6) To educate the population and the region on the value and importance of tourism to the economy.

The submission goes into much detail about grouping South Australia into regions in order better to organise tourist facilities. The tourist regions are as follows:

Area 1—The West Coast.

Area 2—About from Clare to the North of the State.

Area 3—From Clare, down Yorke Peninsula and to the metropolitan area.

Area 4—From Christies Beach to the Victorian border, the Murray River to the north and Tatiara in the south.

Area 5—Tatiara and the remainder of the State in a southerly direction.

Area 6—The metropolitan area.

They are the six regions that have been recommended by the committee making its submission to the House of Representatives Select Committee on Tourism. I also wish to place on record part of the submission made by the Victorian Chamber of Commerce. It seems that that chamber has gone much further in its investigations and its organisation regarding tourism than has South Australia. Although the submission is fairly simple it is rather important, when a chamber is considering its community needs in order to make them attractive or to encourage tourists, that it should duly consider this submission. It states

that tourist committees should consider commercial, industrial, agricultural, and civic activities. Some of the considerations and recommendations, according to the submission, should be as follows:

1. Is there a need for town planning and zoning?
2. Are the streets adequately named and numbered?
3. Is there enough open space park area to meet the community's needs?
4. Do the parks have adequate playgrounds, picnic equipment, etc?
5. Are there sufficient public playing fields, tennis courts, football and cricket ovals, and other sporting facilities?
6. Have you considered the advisability of a civic centre?
7. Are your school systems adequate, including the adult education facilities?
8. Are railway, road transport and bus services adequate?
9. Is there need for improved local bus transport within your town?
10. Can farmers, tourists and others who come to shop obtain the professional and business services they have the right to expect in your town?
11. Do you have dental, medical and hospital services the size of your town warrants?
12. Are your streets properly lighted and clean?
13. Is your fire-fighting equipment and training adequate?
14. Is police protection sufficient?

That is sufficient of the projects and activities that Chambers of Commerce could undertake in an area to assist the promotion of tourism. If members want a copy of that report, a report apparently considered favourably by the Select Committee on Tourism of the House of Representatives, I should be only too pleased to provide it.

I commend a certain Government department for taking the action it has taken in relation to rye grass toxicity.

Mr. Slater: This will be important.

Mr. WARDLE: It is important, because 76 properties in South Australia have been infested by rye grass toxicity. Last summer, in only a few days, a constituent of mine lost 250 sheep. It has been ascertained that farms outside Truro, Neale Flat and Kapunda have been infested by rye grass toxicity. The Government has seen fit to take what I believe has been commendable action about something that could be extremely serious in future.

Dr. Eastick: The infestation was first found at Black Springs, and is fairly prevalent around Waterloo and down around Naracoorte.

Mr. WARDLE: I thank the honourable member for adding those areas to the list. Evidently, my constituent about 10 years ago brought seed to his property from one of the areas referred to by the member for Light, but it was not until last summer that he suffered the tragic loss of sheep.

The Agriculture and Fisheries Department believes that the stock deaths are the result of a parasitic nematode and a bacteria. No doubt the member for Light could describe the problem more technically than I could. It seems that the problem results when the rye grass flowers transmit bacteria from the plant to the stock. It is believed that a programme aimed at breaking the life cycle of the nematode, by reducing the quantity of annual rye grass on a property, is the answer. Supposedly, this will minimise the problem dramatically, and reducing the amount of annual rye grass seed set will also reduce the risk of the nematode's spreading from a locality.

It is feared that unless this toxicity can be controlled it could spread from the Murray Mallee into the South-East. Of course, much more rye grass is grown in the South-East than is grown in the Murray Mallee. A \$500 grant has been made from the Agronomy Branch to this property, the property owner being financially committed as well. Also, two of the chemical companies which manufacture

herbicides have both generously given grants to this venture, and it will be interesting to see whether, together with agricultural advisers, the local farmer is able not only to decrease considerably the risk of this toxicity in his own stock but also to prevent its spreading on to nearby properties.

Apparently, the farmer has been told that he must not remove hay, pasture or seed from his property, or sell any cereal seed for resowing on another property. Before moving off the property, all his machinery must be thoroughly cleaned. I commend the Agriculture and Fisheries Department for its willingness to participate financially and provide advice and supervision to try to solve this problem, which could cost South Australia many millions of dollars in the future if this disease is allowed to spread and expand.

I want to close my speech and use the remaining few minutes not necessarily talking about the merits or demerits of Monarto but in recalling some of the convictions I had several years ago on this matter. I refer to the report I made on my return from an overseas study leave tour in 1974. I believe that those observations are still relevant, perhaps even more relevant now than they seemed to be then, not that anyone necessarily took notice of what I said. Indeed, one wonders just how many people do read, understand and absorb what we say in a report based on study leave activity.

First, in regard to Monarto, irrespective of the various beliefs in my Party, I have never believed that Monarto was not a good site. I have said that, of all the possible sites in South Australia, the Monarto site was best. I still believe that, whenever Monarto is built, it is—

Mr. Chapman: Do you believe its obviously not a goer?

Mr. WARDLE: It is not a goer at this time.

Mr. Chapman: Nor in the foreseeable future?

Mr. WARDLE: What does one mean by "foreseeable future"? Does that mean, three, five, 10, 20, or 30 years? That is a matter of interpretation.

Mr. Chapman: Do you therefore agree that no further funds should be spent in that area?

Mr. WARDLE: I believe that no further funds should be spent, other than those required to maintain the site, except that we must consider landholders living around the edges of that site and problems associated with vermin, fire, and the like, so some moneys must be spent.

Mr. Chapman: Other than that?

Mr. WARDLE: Other than that, I do not believe there is a future foreseeable, if that means the next three, five or eight years, in the project at this time.

Mr. Chapman: As the member for the area, are you satisfied that the farmers—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Murray is making the speech.

Mr. WARDLE: I was just about to say that, in order to conclude, I will ignore comments from my colleagues. I will tell the honourable member afterwards about that and about whether I feel it is adequate or not. The first point I made in the conclusion of my report (page 28) was that finance was the essential and important thing. I stated:

Adequate finance to satisfy the whole project must be assured or firmly in sight before a planned community is launched and economic appraisals should be undertaken to determine the economic viability.

That was my first point, and I went on to state:

The financial success of the new city will be determined by the "per head of population overall cost" being below that of continuing development in the parent city.

That is important. The second point I made concerned people, and I stated:

The "inspiration" for the most new "growth centre" development is to provide housing, jobs and recreation for people from large densely-populated overcrowded cities of from 1 000 000 to 10 000 000 inhabitants; to syphon off some of the anticipated future population growth in order to slow down the continuing suburban sprawl; and through planned use to provide a new way of life.

I believe that to be an important issue because of, first, a reduction in immigration and, secondly, a reduction in the number of births in South Australia. These two reasons alone are good reasons why there is not a future for Monarto at present. My third point was as follows:

The most successful new communities are those where employment opportunities have kept pace with development in housing, shopping and recreational facilities. The shortage of job opportunities has caused embarrassment in many new town situations.

One of the insecurities of Monarto was that there were no base job opportunities, except for the transfer of Government departments. As employees were informed that they would not have to live on the site, it was presumed that many of those employees would commute. Therefore, I do not believe it is possible to base a new city soundly on that base. I wish to refer briefly to three other matters referred to in my report. I stated:

I believe the "in" word in planning today is flexibility. Too many new towns were developed from a rigid original plan where difficulties were obvious before the plan, or portion of it, was completed.

This could easily happen with Monarto. In 10 years hence the existing plan could be antiquated and out of date in regard to traffic and industrial development, and we could find, in relation to the several millions of dollars that had been spent on planning, whilst some of it might still be basic, much of it would fundamentally have to go by the board because of change in many of the aspects such as business, transport, and power supply. I further stated in my report:

Because of the amounts of money involved, I believe the public sector should initiate, plan and finance the new community but that private enterprise should carry out at least 50 per cent of the construction and build and finance 50 per cent of the housing in particular (including the private ownership of land).

My final point was as follows:

The early years of development are critical and it is here that the battle is largely lost or won.

Glenrothes in Scotland is a classic example of a new city that began with a flourish and, because the mine for which it was built had water come into it, development ceased, and it is difficult to start a new growth centre again once it has experienced that disappointment. It appears to me that it will be necessary to start the new growth centre of Monarto with another flourish and another objective. I support the motion.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): This afternoon, in my speech in the Address in Reply to the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech, I intend to touch on a number of subjects. In fact, if time permits, I propose to refer to each of the important paragraphs in that Speech.

First, I join with previous speakers in expressing sympathy to all family connections of those ex-Parliamentarians who passed away during the last, 41st, session of this Parliament. The late Glen Gardiner Pearson, Knight Bachelor; Tom Cleve Stott, Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire; Geoffrey Thomas Clarke; and Howard Huntley Shannon. These men served, collectively, some 104 years in Parliament in South Australia. It is with

respect that I express those remarks about those late members. I did not know any of them, so I do not propose to talk in any detail about their particular or peculiar contributions in this place.

Since the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech on July 19, we have witnessed the appointment of the Rev. Keith Seaman as the new Governor. I think it is fair to congratulate the Premier on his choice and recommendation to Her Majesty the Queen in this instance. I have not met the new Governor, but reports from my part of the State (the District of Alexandra) indicate quite clearly that his appointment has been well received, that it is most appropriate, and is altogether a very popular choice in South Australia. I take this opportunity, while talking about the role of the Governor, to place on record my support of the British monarchy system generally and in particular my support for the continued representation of governorship both in the respective States of Australia and in the person or office of Governor-General of Australia. I say that with every sincerity.

I was invited to attend a meeting last night addressed by the Rev. Edwin Broomhead on the subject of the monarchy. He has been recognised as the most celebrated authority in Australia on the subject of the British monarchy. That recognition was handed down by Sir Robert Menzies, one of our ex-Prime Ministers. Among other things, the Rev. Broomhead told a rather large gathering about the various benefits of the monarchy, of how we have been, and will continue to be, better served by representation of the monarchy in this Commonwealth country if we retain that system rather than (as suggested by some in recent times) changing to a republic system. He told the gathering that in the 1 000 years that we have been represented by a direct line of the Royal family in Britain we have experienced a malicious attack upon, and the subsequent loss of, only two members of the Crown. By comparison, in the United States over the past 100 years five Presidents, commencing with Abraham Lincoln about 100 years ago, have been assassinated or otherwise disposed of.

The Rev. Broomhead went on to point out many reasons why we were better off under the monarchy system whereby Her Majesty, or His Majesty (whoever is ruling for the time being), represents all the people through the various Parliaments of the Commonwealth countries. Under this system the Opposition is equally recognised by Her Majesty as is the Government of the day, quite distinctly differently from the situation in a republic system where, in America for example, the Presidents are simply the heads of the majority Party for the time being. They are politically biased in their position and directly represent the Parties that foster and appoint them to the Presidential position.

I respectfully remind members that the service we receive through the monarchy system is, when calculated on a per capita basis, a very cheap service to the community. In fact, it costs in Australia, according to the Commonwealth Statistician's figures released in recent weeks, less than 25c per capita per annum to support the monarchy system. The last figure, made available a matter of weeks ago, was 24.9c per capita of the population. In Britain it is considerably less than that: about three pence half-penny, in their currency, a head covers the cost of maintaining the monarch.

Mr. Slater: Kangaroo Island won't be becoming a republic, then?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I note the interjection from the other side, but it is with respect not only to last night's speaker, the Rev. Broomhead, but generally that I raise this subject and place on record my support for the monarchy and Governor system that we enjoy.

The Lieutenant-Governor's Speech traditionally contains early in it reference to the South Australian seasonal conditions. His Excellency set out to indicate to the House of Assembly and Legislative Council members present on that occasion what he understood to be the rural situation in South Australia this year. Indeed, the picture painted was somewhat dismal. I suggest, with great respect to the Lieutenant-Governor, that South Australia generally is facing worse drought conditions this year than it faced at this time last year, or the year before. Accordingly, I am surprised that the Minister of Lands, and/or his Government, have not taken steps or at least published the steps they have taken to prepare for what, obviously, will be a disastrous drought situation over a wide area of South Australia in this coming stock turn-off period and grain season. However, that aside, it is with some pride that I report to the House that the District of Alexandra in both parts, the mainland sector and Kangaroo Island sector, generally speaking is enjoying a healthy rural climate; that, indeed, the rains we have received, whilst below average over most of that area, are sufficient this year to provide in the main for the required pastures for stock and for the required water supplies throughout the district.

We have isolated pockets where my constituents are experiencing much trouble. I refer to the districts of Seddon, Haines, MacGillivray, and American River on Kangaroo Island, around the built-up area of Mount Compass, and in other isolated spots within the Fleurieu Peninsula, where we are experiencing troubles with reticulated and other water supplies and stock watering points. Generally speaking, however, the District of Alexandra (Fleurieu Peninsula and Kangaroo Island) is in what might be regarded as one of the surest and safest rainfall areas in South Australia.

Paragraph 4 of the Opening Speech refers to the monitoring service provided in the Premier's Department, the additional service provided for ethnic groups. This step is favoured by the Opposition, as is the Government's proposed concession programme for a wider range of disadvantaged persons. I see no need to further expand on those remarks.

Paragraph 5 refers to the Government's claim to assist in industrial decentralisation. If ever there was a joke, it is in relation to this paragraph, for industrial incentive, both within and without the metropolitan area of South Australia, is sadly fading under this State's management, and especially under the management of this Government. With workmen's compensation penalties applicable at present throughout industry, with the vicious pay-roll tax at 5 per cent on pay roll, with the threat of enforced worker participation, certainly the threat and the militant action of some of the trade union interference we have experienced in business in recent times, and with the disturbance generally that applies within the ordinary industrial scene in South Australia, we have many factors leading to the breakdown of both industrial development and incentive in our rural and secondary industries in this State. I believe it is important that this message should get over, and I make no excuse for repeating these remarks which reflect the comments of so many members in this session as well as in previous sessions of this Parliament.

Paragraph 6 of the Opening Speech refers to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The Government is to be commended for its agreement to proceed with the water filtration schemes (some seven at this stage) in and about the metropolitan area, and indeed for the provision of \$21 000 000 for desperately needed country water supplies. I referred earlier to the areas in which country water supplies are not only required but are indeed

essential for the healthy living of the respective communities. Whilst the return on the estimated capital required to install water facilities in those areas does not measure up to the policy of the Government, that does not solve the thirst of the people and the stock concerned.

Paragraph 7 of His Excellency's Speech refers to the new terminal and container berth facilities at Port Adelaide, which have cost this Government and previous Governments about \$8 800 000. Again, this is a development supported by the Opposition. I see no reason, when we support such items, to be critical for the sake of being critical, but in all fairness to give credit where it is due. On that, as on several other items I have mentioned, where credit is due to the Government it should be forthcoming. Paragraph 8 begins with the old quote in the Opening Speech, as follows:

My Government will continue to pursue an active building and construction programme.

This is linked to many other areas where its activities, progress, and expenditure will depend on the availability of Federal funds. Here we come again to the old swan song: if the money comes from the Feds, we will proceed, but you know how it is: the Fed's funds have dried up, therefore our funds are exhausted, and we cannot continue to develop. It is the old cry. I should like to dwell on this, and as an example I quote a statement by the Minister of Local Government in reply to the shadow Minister of Local Government, the member for Gouger (*Hansard*, page 3309, on April 12, 1977). He asked the Minister of Local Government about further funding for South Australian roads. The Minister replied, as follows:

He got exactly nothing from Fraser. I want to say to the member for Gouger what I said last week: it behoves the Opposition, as much as every other member of this Parliament, to act in a responsible way and to demand of the Federal Government a fair share of the funds that are allocated, so that South Australia is not getting progressively less and less and less, as will happen in 1977-78.

Let us look at what South Australia did get in 1977-78. These figures were produced by Mr. Nixon's department, following correspondence seeking such detail. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in *Hansard* the statistical comparison of road allocations from the Federal Government between 1976-77 and 1977-78.

Mr. Jennings: No!

The SPEAKER: Is permission granted?

Mr. Jennings: No.

The SPEAKER: Permission is not granted. The figures must be read out.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I appreciate your effort, Sir, to put my request to the House. I deplore the ignorance of the action taken by the member for Ross Smith in his rebuttal of it.

Mr. Jennings: It's all right when—

Mr. CHAPMAN: If he is so interested, I shall read the figures to the House. They are comparative figures of funds from the Federal Government for this year as against last year. They are as follows:

	1976-77	1977-78
	\$	\$
Rural arterial roads . .	3 300 000	7 000 000
Rural local roads . . .	5 300 000	6 700 000
Urban arterial roads . .	7 600 000	4 600 000
Urban local roads . . .	1 100 000	2 200 000
M.I.T.E.R.S. (Minor Traffic Engineering and Road Safety Improve- ments) . . . . .	1 500 000	1 700 000



National Highways—	1976-77	1977-78
	\$	\$
(a) Construction . . .	17 300 000	} 18 200 000
(b) Maintenance . . .	1 400 000	
(c) Export and major commerical roads	1 300 000	

How, on the basis of those figures, can the Minister continually uphold his claims that we would get less and less from the Federal Government, and that we would get less in South Australia for 1977-78? I should appreciate it if the Minister of Local Government would, at the earliest opportunity, not only convey the truth of the matter to the House but also recognise that the Federal Government has appreciated inflation and the added costs of maintaining roads, and has acted responsibly and increased the allocation this year accordingly. The Minister ought to be man enough to stand up in the House and, at the same time as he delivers the message from the horse's mouth, apologise to the shadow Minister of Local Government. I believe that it would be fair, if not informative as well, if he were to do that.

Mr. Jennings: How can he—

Mr. CHAPMAN: I shall ignore the member for Ross Smith, who has so rudely cut across my path this afternoon, and proceed. Among other things, paragraph 9 of the Speech refers to the land price control unit. The purchase of new urban land by the Land Commission is, in some respects, desirable, but what is most unfair is the restriction on genuine private developers that is invariably followed by the swooping in of the commission and, worst of all, subsequent subdivision land valuations in surrounding areas. I do not think that that point needs further explanation. I believe that all members in their respective districts have seen what has happened as a result of the Land Commission's exercising its powers in preventing land developers, in the ordinary genuine sense, from acquiring and subdividing desirable lands.

We have seen the commission come in and purchase land, offering it for resale at sums that artificially inflate adjacent land values, and thus causing undue expense both during the occupation period and as and when the occupier dies, at which stage State and Commonwealth taxes are due. I believe that the member for Light intends to try to overcome that situation by ensuring the true productive value of a property, irrespective of the artificial or promoted valuation of adjacent land.

Paragraph 10 refers to the copper and uranium deposits found recently by the Western Mining Corporation, and this raises an interesting if not a further emotional issue: the mining and export of uranium itself. I am not too sure what is meant by "public debate" (a term that has so often been used in connection with seeking a moratorium). Nowadays, we find many people calling for a stalling period, a moratorium, so that the whole subject may be publicly debated. The only explanation I can obtain suggests that public debate is constituted of letters to the Editor, for example. I do not believe that it would matter if we went on publicly debating the subject via that source for the next 10 years: we would be no better off. Indeed, recently on television we have seen one person supporting the mining, processing and selling of the mineral. On the other hand, we have heard from an equally celebrated expert the opinion that it should be left well alone.

Are we calling on the public to choose between the opinions of two experts, or where are we going in this direction? I am satisfied that the Federal Government,

which is the authority to decide whether or not this product should be raised and exported, has access to sufficient expert opinion to be able to proceed in due course. I believe that, as long as reasonable precautions are taken about where we sell this material and what will be done with it, then the quicker it is raised, processed and exported, the better.

Paragraph 11 refers to hospital facilities, including the 200-bed hospital proposed for Christies Beach. This is yet another project with which we agree, because it was the Opposition's idea that promoted the project in the first instance. It was not until the idea of a medical and hospital facility at Christies Beach was promoted by the Opposition that Government members got off their backsides and considered it. Our candidate for Mawson subsequently came in to support the Opposition's plea. As a result of the collective support from the Opposition, the Government, through the Minister of Health, was required to make an announcement. Only recently the Deputy Premier announced negotiations he had undertaken to gain finance from other States, and so on, as well as detailing plans of what the Government proposed for this hospital.

All in all, we agree, and it was our idea, anyway. We recognise the need and the pleas of the people living south of Adelaide. With Tony Boyle, our local candidate for the district, and Grant Chapman, the Federal member for Kingston who also belongs to our Party, the Opposition got the idea off the ground. Yet again, the Government has come in, and I give it full marks for following a responsible lead. We look forward to the establishment of the 200-bed hospital at Christies Beach, but let us not be too smart about who reaps the kudos publicly, leading up to the forthcoming election, whenever that may be. I expect that the Government will be looking for issues in that area, because it is obviously worried about the calibre of candidates we are running, both in Mawson and in Baudin.

Paragraph 12 refers to expanding the electoral base of local government. Section 65a of the Local Government Act provides for a declared district council to incorporate mayoral status. Section 69 of the Act provides for mayoralty candidates, who shall be drawn only from mayors, aldermen, and councillors who have served a minimum of one year on a council or one year in local government. With great respect to the 37 mayors who have been elected in South Australia, I think it is about time that Parliament amended the Local Government Act and widened the opportunity for local government electors to provide candidate material for the mayoralty. It should be borne in mind that at this stage we can draw only from persons who have served in local government. We have recently seen a widening of the local government franchise, so that virtually everyone over 18 years of age who registers may vote at council elections. Whatever my feelings about this matter, it is part of the law, and we accept that. It has been through both Houses, it has been proclaimed, and it has been implemented at the last council elections.

On Kangaroo Island a few years ago we introduced mayoralty status; I refer particularly to the Kingscote District Council. At that time we had potential mayoralty material, and from that material the community decided at an election on a very capable ex-councillor to act as mayor. He proved to be what we thought he would be: a dedicated and effective man for the job. Mayor Eric Beinke is respected throughout the community. He has been re-elected in subsequent years but, as good as he has been and as good as he is now, he must be replaced eventually.



As a local resident, it is my understanding that soon, if not now, we will be floundering in our search for qualified mayoralty material. Mayoralty status is all-important in a tourist area such as Kangaroo Island. The time has come, particularly in communities like the one to which I have referred, to widen the field and to allow the public to elect from their ranks generally a suitable person as mayor where insufficient suitable material would otherwise be available. I am not saying that we do not have ex-councillors on Kangaroo Island, but it is clear from the recent call for nominations for mayor in that community that there is very little, if any, interest in the job, other than the interest of our respected mayor, Eric Beinke.

I repeat that, while there is a need and while there is no other material forthcoming, I am sure that, despite the load and the expense of the position, Mayor Beinke will continue to carry out the mayoral duties very well. However, in no circumstances should any community in that sort of situation be restricted in respect of the area from which it may draw mayoral candidate material. For example, if a person has served in a progress association or in other community activities and has had experience in leading a band of councillors and working in community service activities, it should not be necessary for such a person to have had practical experience in local government in order to qualify for the position of mayor. The field from which mayoral candidates can be drawn should be widened through a minor amendment to the Local Government Act. Having spoken briefly to the Parliamentary Counsel, I hope my low-key reference to the matter today will cause at least some investigation of it by local government authorities.

Paragraph 13 of His Excellency's Speech deals with the Swanport deviation of the South-Eastern Main Road and other work in that area. I leave this matter in the capable hands of my colleagues from the Riverland. Paragraph 14 deals with residential subdivisions at Berri, Barmera and Waikerie. Again, the member for Chaffey is well equipped to speak on these matters.

In paragraph 15, His Excellency has indicated that tourism is of paramount importance to South Australia. Even though I represent a district that is principally rural, I realise that well planned tourist development in my district is extremely important, also. In paragraph 15 of the Speech, His Excellency states that the Government has demonstrated its interest in tourism with the establishment of the Tourism Advisory Council and he states how co-operation should be fostered in conjunction with local government. I wish to draw attention to how a tourist association in my district co-operates, and will continue to co-operate, with local government. The measures should be heeded by any tourist association seeking to get off the ground.

Mr. McRae: Incorporate your message in *Hansard*, and get on to Sinclair!

Mr. CHAPMAN: I shall be happy to incorporate it. Mr. Speaker, the information is not strictly statistical: it is a newspaper report. I tender a copy for the purpose of inserting it in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: I am afraid I cannot accept that. The only material that can be offered to the House for incorporation in *Hansard* must be of a statistical nature.

Mr. CHAPMAN: This material is constitutional, not statistical. The article, headed "Tourist association explains aims to council," relates to an association in the Alexandra District. It is with pride that I draw attention to the true motives embodied in this article, which states:

The Kangaroo Island Tourist Association feels a strong responsibility towards the local community. This was one of the points made recently when association Chairman, Mr. Bruce Wickham, and Mr. Dudley Farquhar addressed the Kingscote council. Mr. Wickham said that one of the aims of the association is to work in harmony with the community and all local organisations.

We are aware that if we lose the current environment we will no longer have a thriving tourist industry and consequently the island's economy will suffer. Our constitution defines the role of the association as being to: promote Kangaroo Island as a major tourist attraction with paid advertising and publicity; to liaise with all organisations involved in and benefiting from tourism on Kangaroo Island in co-operation with local government and to provide other information either for sale or free distribution.

While that may sound rather an ideal constitutional base, it is an aim that is fostered and adopted in that community, as it is throughout the South Coast section of Fleurieu Peninsula, another valuable tourist area. In close harmony and co-operation with local government, the tourist associations promote their areas. I believe that it is extremely important that councils continue to be involved as sponsors providing their offices and facilities to assist in promoting tourism throughout South Australia. Recently, in reply to correspondence directed to the Minister of Tourism, I obtained from him the sites at which financial and other support is provided through councils in order to assist in the operation of offices by or for the councils in regard to tourism. The list is as follows:

Mount Gambier	Nuriootpa	Burra
Millicent	Lyndoch	Port Pirie
Bordertown	Waikerie	Yorke Peninsula
Victor Harbor	Barmera	(roving officer)
Port Elliot	Berri	Whyalla
Glenelg	Loxton	Port Lincoln
	Renmark	Kingscote

It may be difficult for members to appreciate the geographical pattern of those locations, but I am sure that if we think about it we will appreciate that just south of Adelaide, on some of the most valuable plains of the State in the Southern Vales area, there is a need for an information office and centre at which, with the assistance of the Government Tourist Bureau, persons visiting the area could be appropriately guided. I hope that the newly-appointed Director of Tourism and the Minister will see fit to embark on a programme of providing adequately for that area. I recently visited the Tourist Bureau and, through the courtesy of one of its officers, I looked at some of the promotion brochures and posters that were being prepared. They formed a colourful array. I am pleased that the Premier has returned to the House, because I realise how much he appreciates the need to plan properly and promote tourist development in this State.

Whilst he is present, I add that the only criticism I have of the photography used by the Tourist Bureau (and from whatever other source they received the posters) is that it tends to be a little shallow. When coastal scenes are being photographed for posters, invariably they are taken looking out to sea from the land. With great respect to those who like the seaside, in the foreground are shown beaches, rocks, seals, or cliffs, but most of the poster shows the vast expanse of the sea. I believe that, where possible, coastal scenes could be equally well captured and, indeed, improved on if the photographer went out to sea and photographed the coastal scene with agricultural land or natural bush as a background. When we promote the Barossa Valley, and we refer to it as one of the scenic areas of the State, it is all horticultural or viticultural landscape that captures attention.

It seems that this is an item of beauty in the Barossa Valley but not in the scene adjacent to 4 000 kilometres of coastline in the State. The backdrop would be better if it were a landscape, so that rural scenes could be captured rather than the photograph showing a great expanse of sea, as invariably applies in these posters. I know that the Premier is busy, but I appreciate his presence while I have made these comments. I know of his well-known interest in tourism, and I hope that the Premier's officers will assist by taking that message back to those who take the photographs and to the promoters of tourism in this State. It was with some genuine respect that I referred to the Premier's involvement in this matter.

Although he is never around when I want a water supply for a well-known tourist town like American River, he is and has been around just now and seems to listen with some obvious interest to suggestions for genuine tourist promotion in South Australia. Indeed, I have a document that was produced by the Publicity Branch of the Premier's Department for the Government Tourist Bureau: it is of three pages, and it all refers to the place to which I have been referring—Kangaroo Island. On that note, I can, without any reservations, commend Fleurieu Peninsula and all of Kangaroo Island to all members and the people of this State and beyond, because it is well known that these two areas contain some of the most colourful, peaceful, and delightful tourist places that exist in Australia or even outside it.

Paragraphs 16 and 17 of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech refer to education, and I draw to the attention of members a subject raised by Patrick Tennison on a recent 5DN programme. This information is not statistical, so that I cannot insert it in *Hansard* automatically, but I refer members to an editorial dated July 19, the day on which Walter Crocker delivered the Speech. The editorial states:

Just how sound are our education systems? In Sydney yesterday a visiting American educator gave a startling assessment: one-third of present-day teachers, he claimed, were in fact doing harm. They were inadequately trained to meet the demands of modern teaching. Many Australians involved in education in this country will agree. We've seen a boom in education. We've seen an explosion in the funding of education. We've seen development, innovation, expansion run riot. But, in the long shot, one thing we haven't got is better education systems. Most curious of all, this is one very fertile field where inefficiency can lead to even lusher education harvests.

What a quotation: I believe that this is a valuable editorial and one I commend to the attention of all members. It continues:

As primary and secondary schools turn out ever-higher numbers of semi-literates, more people are required in the tertiary field to instruct in simple basics such as reading and writing. Only now when the great empires have been extended, do a few of our local education authorities begin admitting that, yes, perhaps we have been urging too many students to stay at school too long. But no-one wants the empires to contract . . . least of all the teachers making quite handsome livings out of the ludicrous trade. Then we have the sanctified nonsense of non-courses proliferating throughout the higher education system. In Adelaide, we learn, the latest gimmick is a study of witchcraft—as part of a degree course in education. Elsewhere, courses in topics as varied as kite flying and motor cycle maintenance pose grotesquely as education.

If a concerned Government suggests financial cutbacks for all the comedic display we get the predictable kneejerk protest reaction. But today that reaction can have less effect. Too many taxpayers also happen to be parents of students. They are liking less what they see going on under the broad umbrella of education. So are some of the top educators. Faced with obvious scandal, they realise the erosion has to be halted from within. That way will

be less painful than backlash curbs imposed from without. If we listen carefully, we'll hear more inside denunciations similar to the one declared in Sydney yesterday.

That editorial was delivered by Patrick Tennison on July 19, 1977. I agree that his comments have regard to a fairly delicate area but, in the main, I believe that there is much merit in his remarks, in that we have got into a pattern and system in which we are screaming louder and longer for more funds but we are not exercising our common sense and responsibility in ensuring that the funds are well spent and well invested. Admittedly, there are a number of areas desperately in need of facilities and of additional staff but, generally speaking, it is an area in which we should be tightening our belts and, for more practical education and in order to have better citizens emerging from the schools, added to the curriculum or at least replacing some of the rubbish promoted in this State, we should be introducing lecturers and speakers on community service projects at the high school level. There are plenty of skilled people around to talk to young people about the benefits and the essential role in the community of the Lions Club, Rotary, Apex, the Returned Services League, and Legacy, all of which are real ingredients at the community level, all of which are necessary to assist local, State and Federal Government funding processes, all of which are necessary for the ordinary growing up of young people.

I believe that the students of today would be well served and would greatly appreciate their educational development if they were to learn about the roles of the various service groups in the area, and I can think of no-one better than men like Roy Abbott to do such good work. I am sure that these people would really make themselves available for good, sound education in the ordinary process of assisting these young people to prepare themselves to go out into the community after their school programme has finished.

Mr. Keneally: Ian Sinclair?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Since early this morning the honourable member has been asking me, "What do you think about Ian Sinclair?" He is a Country Party Minister in the coalition; he is 6ft. 6in. tall, or thereabouts, with hands on him like spades, but he has a true Ministerial head on his shoulders, which is the important thing. He is a great guy in my book, despite his affiliation with the Country Party, with great respect to my colleague from Flinders, but doing his job as he was elected to, and doing it very well. What specifically do you want to know about him?

Mr. Keneally: You told me to listen to Ian Sinclair.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I think we all know what he thinks of the Poms, but what is wrong with his statement? He made a statement in Tanunda, or wherever it was in the Barossa Valley, and laid on the line exactly what thousands of people have been saying for as long as I can remember, that among the immigrants we have some roughies and the quicker we deport them the better. This is virtually what he said and at the same time on the very same occasion what else did he say? He said that some of the Australians are roughies, too, and perhaps we should deport those; but, if they are in these roles and not doing the community any good, the quicker they go the better, and I support him, whether they are Pommies or whatever. What is wrong with this? There is nothing sensational in his remarks in the Barossa Valley; the papers have carried on as though, one would think, they had nothing else to talk about. Members opposite have reacted violently, but what he is saying is the truth. Members opposite know that as well as I do, and so does the Speaker. It is

absolutely ridiculous to carry on as members opposite are about that. Otherwise, in his role as Minister for Primary Industry in Australia, nationally he is a great asset and I have every respect for the way in which he is handling his job politically and industrially in this country.

The only problem is that he is not a member of the Liberal Party, but he works for us so, if we get our milk for nothing, why buy a cow? That is good enough for me. I have asked him questions on matters like the War Service Land Settlement scheme on Kangaroo Island that the member for Mitcham tried to promote for political purposes yesterday, but in no way in the world will he get off the ground in his attempts to make capital out of that. However, he has now left the Chamber again, which is consistent with his form.

I agreed earlier to try to touch on all of the matters in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. Paragraph 18 refers to community welfare, paragraph 19 deals with the environment, paragraph 20 with the Estimates of Expenditure, the Budget, etc., as applying for this current period, and finally paragraph 21 deals with the legislative programme. I have not time at this stage to deal with all those matters unless members are prepared to give me an extension of time, if no-one else is to speak before 6 o'clock.

The SPEAKER: There is no hope of that, under the Standing Orders.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I do not know whether or not there will be another speaker before we adjourn, but it occurred to me that it would be convenient to the House generally, if no-one was to speak after me, and to me if I could have an extra 15 minutes.

May I now touch on the unemployment situation; we have heard a hell of a lot about it and how disastrous is the course taken by our Federal colleagues to reduce unemployment. I do not want to go into great detail about it at this stage but may I respectfully draw to the attention of the House that it is certainly not lack of work in the rural sector or the outer metropolitan area that is a contributing factor to unemployment. In our part of the country, there is a desperate need for work to be done at primary and rural levels, both in the practice of farming the sea and in the practice of farming the land. There is a desperate need for work to be done. We forever hear criticism of the Federal Government by our Government here in South Australia because it is politically convenient for it to do that, but it is my understanding that, if not already, certainly in the Budget announcement coming up in a couple of hours, there will be financial assistance to outer metropolitan-based industry to employ labour and so get that work done to which I refer.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Fraser has made another leak, has he?

The Hon. R. G. Payne: How did you get that information?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I think my reference stems from a public statement; indeed, I held discussions on this with several people and it is my understanding that, if not already, certainly within the structure of the forthcoming Budget we shall see a responsible stand by the Federal Government in provision for assistance in the wage structure of employees engaged in the rural scene. So that at least in our community farmers who have not recently been able to hold their families together and their sons on their farms will now be able to engage those boys and receive direct assistance in the way of wage subsidies for employing them. It is not just another subsidy for the

farmers but it will have the effect of getting the essential work done that I have mentioned, employing the boys near to home where they desire to be and where their parents desire them to be, and keeping them out of the towns and the metropolitan area and avoiding the payment of the dole. So, collectively, the contribution of the Federal Government and the wage contribution by the employers will, in total, be taxable.

I have not done a sum on it and I do not know exactly just how beneficial it will be overall to the Federal Government, but it is an initiative and a move for which it should be commended. If my understanding today is the correct position, I hope the Government in this place will be first off the rank to commend the Federal Government for the step it has taken in this regard and, accordingly, cover all the beneficial factors to which I have referred, thereby saving this Government from picking up the tab on some other supplementary or State scheme.

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

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I support the motion. It has been interesting to listen to the large number of contributions that have preceded mine and to recognise the wide area of interest that has been expressed by members from both sides of the House. It is unfortunate (and I genuinely mean this) that we are not hearing more comments from Government members during these latter stages of the debate. Although they have not done so, I know that some Government members have a contribution to make to the debate.

I certainly express my sympathy to the relatives and friends of departed members. I knew and had contact with the four members whose names were referred to in His Excellency's Opening Speech, although I did not know two of them particularly well. I express my regret that Sir Douglas and Lady Nicholls no longer have the opportunity of representing Her Majesty the Queen in this State. It is a great tragedy that a person who has done so much for his race and for Australia, and who was willing and looking forward to making a further notable contribution, had to stop short such a brief time after taking up his appointment. Already, we see that the incoming Governor is finding that the position he is about to occupy may not be as simple to occupy as he initially thought it would be. I accept and acknowledge the appointment that has been made. I do not know of any person in the present South Australian scene who has been more closely associated with the activities of the aged, needy and necessitous (the last of whom cover a much wider area than the needy) or who has gone to bat for a larger number of disadvantaged people than has this gentleman. By the same token, however, if one refers to the Letters to the Editor section in this evening's *News*, one sees one of the areas of conflict that His Excellency the Governor, when he takes up office, will experience. Under the heading, "Personal views become public", the letter states:

If our new Governor intends to represent the people, then might I be so bold as to suggest to him that "personal views" (the *News*, August 8, 1977), once aired in the media, become public and therefore are open to public criticism.

The letter, written by Father Philip Smith, of Glen Osmond, continues:

Let me state categorically that the views expressed by our new Governor concerning abortion are quite abhorrent to me personally and to many other South Australians.

Later, Father Smith continues:

I was, and still am, under the impression that a child is, indeed, a human being. "I believe," said Rev. Seaman, "that a woman has a fairly sovereign right over her child and at the early stage of pregnancy there is not a human being . . ."

This person has already indicated his belief that, as the new Governor has the right to make public statements, he, as an individual, has the right to criticise the Governor's statement once it has become public. Going back through the period of time during which Sir Mark Oliphant graced the office of Governor of this State, this has become a fact of life, and I believe we will see more involvement of this nature in future.

I acknowledge and laud the actions that have been taken on behalf of the people of South Australia for some time by Mr. Walter Crocker, our Lieutenant-Governor. I know, from earlier comments that that gentleman has made, that he did not seek his initial appointment. Certainly, he did not seek to be involved in the situation that has befallen him, in the sense of taking on, for an extended period, what has, in effect, been the Governorship of this State. He has certainly made clear his points of view to the public. He has fulfilled the role of Governor and, I believe, the South Australian public has come to accept and appreciate the contribution that he has made to the State.

I believe that the public is pleased to acknowledge the part that Mr. Crocker has played. Indeed, the public expresses appreciation to Mr. Crocker in precisely the same way that it shows its appreciation to the South Australian Police Force. Although I do not say that they undertake the same role, I make the point that the community accepts that the South Australian Police Force is an important part of the community. I say that because it is a great pity that the Police Force should find itself in the position in which it believes it has been abandoned by the present Government. There has certainly been plenty of evidence over a period of time to enable the police to question the Government's activities, which have placed members of the Police Force in an invidious position. I congratulate the members of the force, who have been willing to speak out and make their point. In this respect, I refer to a letter that was addressed to the Secretary of the Police Association of South Australia. Emanating from one area of South Australia, the letter states:

I have been asked by members of the region I represent to draw your attention to the incident which occurred on the night of April 12, 1977, at Woodville Gardens, involving the firing of a pistol at Reg. "D" constables Burr and Burg. The Chief Justice (Dr. Bray) gave a lengthy description of the incident on page 6 of the *Advertiser*, Saturday, August 6, 1977, and the reasons for his subsequent decision to release the offender, Vincenzo Dato, 33 years, labourer, of no fixed place on a bond (three-year suspended sentence).

Although Dr. Bray rationalised his decision when imposing the suspended sentence, members are extremely disturbed at what appears to be active encouragement by the judiciary for criminals to attempt to avoid apprehension by shooting at police and then availing themselves of the defence quoted by Dr. Bray of "acts committed in an emotional frenzy". Once again, the courts have taken the attitude that the welfare of the criminal is paramount and that the police are expected to accept being "targets and punching bags" as part of their employment.

That is an unfortunate situation, which has become a commonplace thought in the minds of many police officers in this State, because they have been unable to obtain from the Government the type of assistance and recognition that they deserve. In the "Focus" column on page 23 of this evening's *News* there is a report written by Mr. Tony Baker headed "Why police are angry at our courts". It

indicates that "Robert P.", of the South Australian Police Force, is becoming frustrated and angry at the leniency the courts are showing towards criminals. Under the subheading "You see red", the reports states:

But the underlying problem remains. Robert P. says: "The amount of paperwork involved in bringing a case to court—particularly juvenile work—has increased astronomically. "It takes hours to prepare even a simple case, and that's on top of any investigation. And then the offender gets off with a bond. In some cases it's justified. But often it makes you see red."

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

Dr. EASTICK: Another part of the report states:

Carefully choosing his words, the secretary of the South Australian Police Association, Mr. Tremethick, says "the question of penalties" for both adult and juvenile offenders has been a festering sore among the association's 3 000 members for a long time.

"I believe the Attorney-General's announcement will give some lift to police morale. It will give some encouragement. At this stage it's just what we need", says Mr. Tremethick.

As I have said, I laud the fact that members of the Police Force are speaking up for themselves in the present situation and, as I understand the position and the representations that have been made to me by members of the Police Force, I consider that they would have had a much higher morale if Mr. Tremethick had been giving more attention to their affairs. I hope that the comments attributed to Mr. Tremethick this evening are not just a matter of soft-shoeing or pussy-footing as some members of his organisation would believe. I consider that Mr. Tremethick is a responsible officer to his people, and he now has his opportunity to show that authority and to ensure that problems that are causing concern in the Police Force are solved.

There is not only the problem that I have outlined regarding genuine concern at court decisions: members of the Police Force are also concerned at the long on-going argument about the use of firearms, the position of firearms on the body, the nature of the firearms, and such matters. This Parliament owes it to members of the Police Force to assure them that they have not been abandoned as at present they fear they have been. Indeed, it is the responsibility of members of this place to grasp the nettle and make certain that, in the legislation that is eventually to be tested before the courts, wherever necessary and possible, maximum and minimum penalties are included. The fact that there is no minimum penalty in many cases has created a situation where, regrettably, some members of the judiciary at various levels, in having regard to a penalty handed down in another court and in trying to rationalise and justify the penalty that some other person has imposed for an offence, are themselves coming down to that level so that there will be no marked discrepancy between the sentence they impose and other sentences already imposed. I support the suggestion that the members of the Police Force urgently require the assistance that government and Parliament can give them.

We note that not only are members of the Police Force speaking out but, as I have said in this House previously, members of the teaching profession also are speaking out more and more on their concern about various aspects of the education system, particularly education spending. Earlier in this session I have highlighted a report in the *Teachers Journal* from the Forbes Primary School. I referred to the staff of a school in my own district and I indicated to the Minister across the floor of the House that, as soon as I had the permission of the school to identify it, I would do so to him in writing. Having that

permission, I have done so and I now have no hesitation in identifying the school publicly as the Evanston Gardens Primary School. The points that those people have made are now well known to the Minister.

Last Monday, at Campbelltown Civic Centre, the Minister of Education, a representative of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, and other people congregated to talk about education problems. It is interesting to note that, notwithstanding that about 5 000 invitations had been sent out, the total attendance was about 40 people. The commentary that I have received indicates that the meeting was obviously a disaster in terms of stimulating opposition to Federal Government policy on education by blaming, by implication, the State Liberal Party. Indeed, right across South Australia there is positive realisation by members of the public and members of the teaching profession that there has been an attempt to gyp them into taking unrealistic action.

It has also been stated that, at the Campbelltown meeting, the tone was one of much concern for the quality of education, as distinct from quantity, and concern for the need to restructure education in line with economic and community needs. That obviously is a true commentary on the present position. At about the same time, a similar meeting was held at Kilkenny with, I believe, an almost identical result. I refer now to another primary school in my district, the Marananga Primary School. A letter outlining the concern of parents and staff at that school states:

The meeting also expressed concern that more money would be available for the needs in education if:

- (a) The Monarto project did not continue at the expense of adequate funding to education.
- (b) Within Federal and State funding it were possible to divert funds to various areas according to priorities, which may change after the original allocations are made.
- (c) Efficiency between and within Government departments could be increased through more and better communication and co-ordination (e.g., demolishing and replacing buildings only months or weeks after renovations and painting).

A few years ago, the member for Rocky River mentioned in this House that fluorescent lighting had been put into a school that previously had been closed, and there was a somewhat similar situation in my district when a new fence was put up after the school had been closed. They are little things but, collectively, they make an impact on the Budget. The letter from the Marananga Primary School continues:

- (d) The authorities concerned gave due consideration to the research and planning facilities available to them—e.g., the number of students admitted to C.A.E.'s compared with projected school enrolments.

They are the realities that are coming more and more to the fore. I believe that persons in the Police Force and the Education Department are sick and tired of the constant belly-aching by members opposite and their followers. The people concerned are looking for something constructive and for a much better economical and practical use of the funds available.

During this debate, before the House adjourned for a week, I was pleased to hear my colleague, the member for Flinders, refer to a statement made by the British Prime Minister. I will repeat that statement because I believe it is worth repeating. Mr. Callaghan, the British Prime Minister, said:

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

canor that that option no longer exists and, insofar as it ever did exist, it worked by injecting inflation into the economy.

That is not a Liberal member speaking; it is the Labour Prime Minister of Great Britain. Since then, in a document dated July 25, 1977, in a review of his counter-inflation policy, it was stated:

Britain's Prime Minister, Mr. James Callaghan, opened a one-day debate in the House of Commons on July 20 on the Government's counter-inflation policy. Points emphasised by Mr. Callaghan included: "There is an overwhelming recognition by nearly everybody, including trade unionists and especially their wives, that 20 per cent wage increases are of no lasting benefit if they are followed by 20 per cent price increases. Everywhere I go I find widespread acceptance of the view that we must not go back to the madness of two or three years ago . . . The real issue for this country during the next 12 months is whether our democratic structures will enable long-term common sense to triumph over short-term expediency . . ."

Those words could well have been said about the Australian scene because they are important. The action that has been taken in the best interests of Australians is completely paralleled by the views of the British Prime Minister. I would hope that members opposite will let those words sink in and they will act on the message that they contain.

We do not have to go far to recognise the difficulties that exist on the Australian scene. In the *Financial Review* of April 15, 1977, an article at page 13, written by Michael Richardson in Manila, and headed "Philippine's gain is Australia's loss in \$200 000 000 sintering plant", states:

There were some sound technical arguments for locating the enterprise in Western Australia where most of the iron ore feedstock for the sintering process is mined. But Kawasaki balked at the high construction costs and what one company official here referred to as "the many industrial problems in Australia". The Philippines offered co-operative and relatively low wage labour.

I do not suggest for a minute that a worker should receive less than his just dues but, when one reads on, one finds that the all-up cost of a day's labour in the Philippines is \$2 against the Australian \$40, and one rapidly comes to grips with the reason why we have been exporting job opportunities from Australian shores and setting them up in places such as the Philippines. The article continues:

For the past three years Comalco Limited has been working on the feasibility of forming a consortium of aluminium companies and siting a \$A500 000 000 alumina plant at Davao in the Southern Philippines. The processing complex was originally slotted for construction next to Comalco's extensive bauxite deposits at Weipa in northern Queensland on the Gulf of Carpentaria.

Again, the point is made that the decision not to proceed was brought about by the inherent costs of staying within the Australian situation. An interesting report appeared in the *Angaston Leader* of June 2, 1977. Detail contained in the report was provided by Mr. E. Colin Davis, Public Affairs Manager of Goodyear Australia, as follows:

A lot of the mess we're in today is due to the fact that too many people want too much for too little and valuable time is squandered, never to be recovered. Every one of us, regardless of how or where we live and work, has a fixed income of 24 hours a day . . .

He then gave a comparison of that income. A yearly income of \$7 200 is worth 6.5c a minute or \$3.91 an hour. A yearly income of \$30 000 is worth 26.8c a minute or \$16.09 an hour. As the table contains simple statistical material, I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Yearly earnings \$	INCOME	
	Every minute is worth c	Every hour is worth \$
7 200	6.5	3.91
8 000	7.2	4.29
10 000	8.9	5.36
12 000	10.7	6.42
14 000	12.5	7.51
16 000	14.4	8.58
20 000	17.8	10.72
25 000	22.4	13.41
30 000	26.8	16.09

Dr. EASTICK: Dr. Barry Hughes, who is not a person from my side of politics, or necessarily from any side of politics, but who has been retained by the Government to give it an economic appreciation of the Australian situation, wrote an article in the *Nation Review* of June 23-29, 1977, part of which states:

The explosive mistakes aside, wage indexation has shown that it can be a part of a viable incomes policy. And it did cope with maintaining an orderly wage system last year when several hot spots appeared in the economy, probably thereby saving another leap-frogging relativities exercise.

The important part of the article is as follows:

How much longer it can be expected to last is open to question come the recovery. The aftermath of 1974's bull-at-a-gate approach to increasing the wage share may provide a salutary lesson.

One would certainly hope that the salutary lesson has been received and understood by all Australians of all political persuasions. I suspect that in many instances the comments made by members opposite mean that those lessons have not been learnt. I appreciated the reply given earlier this afternoon by the Minister of Labour and Industry, who indicated that the Government recognised that wage indexation was important and that it was committed to full indexation. That is a plus that we can give to the Government, which is in touch with reality on that vital matter. Recently I read a comment that "over-indulgence by greedy people is normally followed by an illness or distress". Certainly we have experienced that situation in Australia ever since the leap-frogging activities of the early 1970's referred to earlier.

Another extremely important matter in this whole issue is productivity. I was interested recently to read in *Australian Productivity Action*, volume 2, No. 2, for July, 1977, a report relating to the activities of the new Commonwealth Minister for Productivity, the Hon. Ian Macphie. The passage to which I refer gives an example of the many useful comments that are raised in the report. The Minister is quoted as follows:

For no matter how idealistic it may sound, substantial national productivity improvement can only come if all of the persons and entities involved, recognise the mutual self-interest which exists with regard to productivity improvement; and that all can benefit if they co-operate in sensible ways . . . I have never been a so-called union-basher, nor would I ever indulge in "management-bashing". But just as it is responsible for management and unions to make constructive criticisms of governments, so it is responsible for governments when charged with long-term economic management and productivity improvement, to point out to management and the unions that there are matters (to which they are responsible) which could be performed rather better . . . and to indicate ways in which this might be done. If one is to make an impact one will sometimes have to provoke, and this I intend to continue to do!

That comment is a useful indication of the commitment of that Government and the Minister to attempt to bring into reality some of the vital requirements of Australia today. The Minister is also quoted as saying:

In Australia, we have been notoriously short-term in our thinking; the aspect of the Department for Productivity which distinguishes it most from other departments, is that it is not concerned with the emotional day to day problems, but . . . to encourage and inspire people to question some of their day-to-day conduct which is ordinarily uncontroversial but which often provides obstacles to productivity improvement.

It has been said that the only certainty about politics is its uncertainty, and I do not think that any member who has spent any time in this place would argue with that general cliché. However, at a time when more and more people are talking about the possibility of an early election, a situation to which I do not personally subscribe (I recognise that an election will be held before the middle of next year and, when it happens, it happens), it seems to me a major indictment of the Government that the very human issues that were canvassed at the time of the last election are still unresolved issues today.

I refer particularly to railway employees who, regrettably, have become very much the "meat in the sandwich" in the transfer arrangements. It was indicated at the last election, and before then, that there was inadequate consideration given to the position of railway employees. We were told publicly and in this House that their position was all but resolved and that there was nothing to be worried about. However, even today there are major problems. In a question which I asked and which was answered on August 2, 1977, under the heading "Railways staff", the relevant information is set out for all members to examine.

I followed up that question with a further question to the Premier on the same day, asking him specifically what was the situation in respect of the State's finances and a forward commitment to long service leave and superannuation. I asked what had been done to clarify the position of the railway employees. The Premier simply replied, fobbing the whole thing off, "There is nothing more that I can say." Let us follow some of the debate in the newsletters of the railway groups. I refer to a newsletter of the Australian Railways Union, South Australian Branch, of March 17, 1977, under the greeting "Dear Comrades", where the State Secretary, Mr. Marshall, who signed that letter, states:

It has been drawn to our attention that the Federal Minister for Transport is insisting the date of transfer shall be July 1, 1977.

He then pinpoints the fact that there are several unresolved issues and states:

These conditions are matters which arise from either State legislation or granted by Cabinet approval.

I stress that. The newsletter continues:

They include: Redundancy agreement; incidental expenses; penalty rates for rostered days off; barracks detention provisions; reduction public holidays; pro rata A.L. when on higher duties; elimination award clause 110 (B); pollution-dirt allowance agreements; promotion payment six weeks after appointment; regression account ill health; shifting allowances, the sum of \$100; arbitrated pay increase arrangements; mileage payments; week-end penalty rates/travelling; gazetted leave added to annual leave; bereavement leave provisions; pro rata long service leave after seven years; sick leave; two days without certificate; eleventh and twelfth shift penalties; and area allowances at Yunta, Ceduna and the like.

On March 17, 1977, these unresolved matters were highlighted to members of the Australian Railways Union. On July 27, 1977, we find the following statement in the newsletter:

On June 6, we met officers of the A.N.R.C. and discussed the various disputed points on awards and Ministerial agreements. As a result, some points were resolved to our satisfaction and no doubt to the satisfaction of the members. However, some points have remained unresolved.

On July 20 a further meeting of divisional and sub-branch secretaries was held and addressed by officers of the A.N.R.C. who have indicated that acting on direction from the commission they can no longer negotiate and that the offers made so far are final. Major issues such as barracks detention, interval between shifts, penalties for travelling on Sundays, the return of perway employees and others in the excess shift penalties clauses, severance pay, shifting allowance and rents are still unresolved and must be fought for with common sense and precision in order not to jeopardise other benefits the A.N.R. has offered.

At the same time, the Australasian Transport Officers Federation (South Australian Division), in one of its newsletters (May 6, 1976), makes the following statement:

To enable those transferring to continue to enjoy the benefits of the South Australian Superannuation Fund scheme and in keeping with the principle that no employee is to be disadvantaged by the transfer, there appear to be two courses of action available to us. First, the State Superannuation Act could be amended to provide that those transferring, and if they so elect, to continue to contribute to the South Australian Superannuation Fund.

I should point out further that clause 15 of the agreement, which deals with the transfer of staff, envisages that officers and employees will be given the opportunity to elect whether they desire to transfer or not prior to the declared date. Clearly, the staff concerned cannot make such an election without a satisfactory resolution of the superannuation problem.

That was the situation on May 6. In the newsletter of July 20, 1977, of the Australasian Transport Officers Federation the following statement is made:

A letter has been sent to Mr. G. T. Virgo requesting him not to sign the transfer agreement at this stage because of the large number of outstanding matters. Members are again advised not to sign to transfer to the A.N.R.C. until all matters have been finalised to the satisfaction of the Executive and council and a recommendation made by them on the matter. By not signing the S.T.A. will have staff and no positions whilst the A.N.R. will have positions and no staff to fill them.

In the newsletter of the Australian Railways Union (March 30, 1976), following some argument between members of the organisation and its officers, the following statement was made:

I want to assure members that everything will be done to ensure that, in transferring to the A.N.R., members of the A.R.U. will not be disadvantaged. We will not hesitate to call upon the united strength of the A.R.U. membership should their interests be in any way threatened as a result of the transfer.

I make these points because, obviously, going back to the first discussions on the railways transfer, members of the public in South Australia were being hoodwinked by the Government into believing that it was only a matter of a short time before the transfer could be effected, providing for a complete transference of superior conditions for South Australian members going to the Australian National Railways Commission. Obviously, that position could not occur, creating privileges for one section which were not universally enjoyed by all members. This was an attempt to create a false impression as to the validity of the arrangements entered into between the South Australian and Federal Governments.

From the information I have read out, the declared date would appear to be a movable date. Most recently it appears from one document to be September 1, while in another document it is referred to as October 1, and one wonders whether it will be concluded by August 16, 1978, a year hence. However, the following would appear to be the four options open to officers and employees of the State Transport Authority. Option No. 1 would be to remain an employee of the S.T.A. and a contributor to the State superannuation scheme and be ceded to the A.N.R.C.

Option No. 2 would be to remain a contributor to the State superannuation scheme, transferring employment to the A.N.R.C. as a non-permanent employee. There are serious problems for a person who finds himself a non-permanent employee. Option No. 3 would appear to be to opt out of the S.T.A. and the State superannuation scheme, drawing all past superannuation contributions in cash, and then joining the A.N.R.C. as a non-permanent employee. Option No. 4 would be to opt out of the S.T.A. and the State superannuation scheme, using the cash received back from the Treasury to buy into the Commonwealth superannuation scheme and becoming a permanent Commonwealth employee. There will be a major conflict among the members of the S.T.A. in determining what is the best for each of them in this somewhat awkward and difficult situation.

Obviously many of them will, when they go, want to take all of the cash which is credited to them or to which they can lay claim when, for example, they can get 10 per cent a year for three months fixed or withdraw on 30 days notice from their own credit union. A document I have clearly indicates that the Railroad Savings and Loans Society Limited, based at 102 North Terrace, Adelaide, was making such an offer recently. If this be the election of many members of the railways union at the declared date, obviously the State's financial affairs will be in considerable disarray because of the large sums involved in that election. I refer again to the fact that both union representatives have indicated that the Minister is not to sign. I refer again to the statement contained in the document dated March 30, 1976, wherein the A.R.U. indicates its preparedness to use "muscle" to gain the benefits it believes its members should have.

Paragraph 9 of the Speech, referring to the planning of the new Housing and Urban Affairs Department, uses such terms as "enhance efficiency and minimise social inequity", "containing urban land prices with a view to their ultimate stabilisation", and "methods of controlling private development". We have, by virtue of several failings in the overall area of forward planning, found that South Australia has started to export to other States many jobs and considerable capital sums that would otherwise be available in the development field here.

It has been impossible for some people in this field to obtain co-operation between the Government and the private developer. The *Planning News* for June, 1977, states:

July 1, 1977, marks the tenth anniversary of the coming into operation of the Planning and Development Act. The Act established the State Planning Authority, the Planning Appeal Board and gave local councils extensive new powers. The achievements have been considerable.

The report contains a list of those achievements. Regrettably, it does not detail the losses that have been suffered by the South Australian public or the tremendous financial loss that has been forced on many young people by indeterminate delays in the processing of their titles and various other authority requirements that delay building. The review being undertaken by Mr. Hart at present is an important one. Page 3 of the *Planning News*, under the heading "Inquiry into control of private development", states:

The Minister for Planning, Mr. H. Hudson, has appointed Mr. S. B. Hart to review the controls affecting private development in South Australia. The terms of reference of the inquiry are:

To inquire into the objectives and methods of controlling private development in South Australia and make recommendations on any desirable changes thereto, to the Minister for Planning.



There is this constant direction about the "investigation into private development". I wonder whether the Minister would, for the benefit of members, table the document which is available to him indicating that a consequence of the further operation of the Land Commission will be that private land developers becoming casualties—again an indictment of a Government which is hell-bent on destroying the co-operation that should exist among all sectors involved. The Autumn/Winter, 1977, edition of *Living City* (Volume 21), issued by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, states, under the heading "Metropolitan farming: a case study":

Based on the recommendations contained in the non-urban areas report, the M.M.B.W. in March, 1976, commissioned a further study covering farming activities in the metropolitan planning region. This study had three main aims: (a) to determine if, and how, the metropolitan planning scheme has contributed to rural hardship within the planning area; (b) to predict the environmental, social and economic consequences of no further intervention by the M.M.B.W. as Melbourne's planning authority; and (c) to suggest planning, or other initiatives, which might be taken to help achieve the planning objectives for the non-urban zones.

In considering South Australia's planning difficulties and planning future, it is important that we recognise the need for a thorough investigation of the farming potential of the Adelaide metropolitan area. At Virginia, Waterloo Corner, and Angle Vale we have a large amount of vegetable production which plays a significant role in determining the cost of living of Adelaide residents. It is necessary to recognise how important it is that some form of farming should continue in the metropolitan area. I suggest to the Minister that we should consider preparing a report similar to the report entitled *Metropolitan Farming Study* prepared by Aberdeen, Hogg and Associates Proprietary Limited for the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. This sizeable report has many features that reflect on South Australia's needs. The edition of *Living City* to which I have referred recommends to the Victorian Government the levying of all property taxes on a valuation which accurately represents current market value. We will be discussing that question next week in relation to South Australia when we consider a motion on the Notice Paper. Further, *Living City* makes the following recommendation:

The Minister for Local Government be requested to consider modifications to the municipal rating system by amending the Local Government Act to require all municipalities to redistribute the cost of their services to more accurately reflect the distribution of benefits. At the time of publication, an inquiry into rural rating by a special committee appointed by the Minister was imminent.

In other words, the Victorian Government has grasped the need for action, and has acted. *Living City* also recommends that the Dog Act be amended so that compensation is available to owners for stock losses caused by marauding dogs on the urban fringe. The member for Fisher has had much to say about the question of dogs. There are problems of this kind in the Gawler area in my district.

I refer now to the great Bolivar debacle, where millions of litres of water urgently required for agricultural purposes are going out to sea. Before you, Mr. Speaker, came here there were several inquiries into the socio-economic difficulties of people in the Adelaide Plains area. It was recognised that those people experienced major problems. Because of the nature of the last two seasons, many vegetable properties at Angle Vale, Virginia, Two Wells, and Gawler River have not had a subsoil moisture intake. The amount of water required by the crops is far greater than normal. Of necessity, the crops are planted well in

advance of the farmers' knowing what the season will be like. Large sums are involved in the planting of seed potatoes, onion seed, peas, cauliflowers, cabbages, and other crops in anticipation that normal winter rains will follow and that the amount of water required for irrigation will not be excessive. In the present circumstances, many growers in those areas are facing economic disaster in consequence of the letters recently sent to them by the Water Resources Branch, indicating that they have over-used their supply and that they will be prosecuted if they use more.

We should urgently consider the socio-economic problems at present facing these producers. We need to consider urgently a scheme that I promoted in this House 18 months ago on behalf of a constituent by the name of Nankivell; there was an agreement that there be a five-year quota, with the opportunity of adding to or deducting from the amount of water available to the individual, depending on the season. Because the weather is so uncertain and because it has such an effect on production, the Government should ensure that the people on the northern Adelaide Plains and elsewhere experience no further problems of this kind.

We already have a major social problem looming, because many producers have children of marriageable age who will be forced out of the industry if they cannot obtain an improvement in their water entitlement for their properties. If we do not use the people born into the industry and if we do not use the water available at our doorstep (the Bolivar effluent) to help relieve the drain on the underground water supply, we will force many vegetable-growing families out of the industry. As a result, we will greatly increase the cost of production of vegetables for the Adelaide market, and the people of South Australia will suffer for a long time. The Government should do something about this worrying matter. The Opposition has consistently stated that this matter is urgent, and we will support all reasonable steps to get a solution under way. Certainly, it behoves no Party to ignore difficulties that are forced on those suppliers by weather conditions.

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

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): In supporting the motion, I congratulate His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. W. R. Crocker, C.B.E., on the way in which he delivered the Speech. I am sorry that I cannot congratulate the Government on the contents of that document. However, it was a pleasure to be present and hear His Excellency deliver the address.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor was born in the Peterborough area, and Peterborough folk are very proud of him as an ex-citizen; he is in great demand for any functions occurring in that district. So far he has attended two official centenary functions in the district; namely, the Yongala centenary a few years ago and the centenary of the Peterborough township last October. I understand that he will visit Terowie next October to take part in its centenary celebrations and, all being well, I hope to be with him again on that occasion.

I extend sympathy to the relatives of those former members who have died since the opening of the previous session of Parliament. I first refer to the late Sir Glen Pearson, who was a member of this House for 19 years. I did not know Sir Glen personally until after I had become a member, but I recall that in 1968 there were seven new members of the Liberal Party, and I am sure that all of those members would admit that Sir Glen was like a father to them: he gave us much guidance and



information, and those recollections will remain with us for a long time. The late Mr. Tom Stott, C.B.E., a member of this Parliament for about 37 years, was well known throughout the wheatgrowing districts of this State for many years. He was another who gave the younger members much information and advice when we first came to this place. The late Mr. Geoffrey Thomas Clarke and Mr. Howard Huntley Shannon, C.M.G., were unknown to me, but they gave outstanding service to Parliament. Those four gentlemen had an accumulated service of 104 years as members of Parliament, and I think that would be a record in any Parliament.

I was disappointed at the contents of the Opening Speech, and this is not casting reflections on His Excellency, because it is well known that the document is prepared by the Government, although delivered by the Lieutenant-Governor. One would think that the whole of the address would refer to matters that the Government intended to undertake in future. I was looking forward to hearing what the Government intended to do in the ensuing year but, when the Speech was analysed, much of it was in the past tense, some in the present tense, and not much referred to the future. I am sure that most people would be disappointed especially in that regard. During the previous year we had a visit from Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and, as most of the Opening Speech referred to matters in the past tense, I thought some reference would have been made to her visit. Most of us would have appreciated having such a visit placed on record, but it was not referred to.

However, I was pleased that the Government placed the agricultural industry high on its priority list, as paragraph 3 of the Speech states:

As a result of a very dry summer which followed a poor season, stock numbers in the State have been reduced by some 12 per cent. The opening season in the cereal-growing areas of the State has not been accompanied by sufficient rains to provide an appropriate degree of subsoil moisture but, notwithstanding this, a record barley acreage has been seeded, and areas sown to wheat are about the average sown over the past 10 years.

I draw to the attention of members that the Speech was delivered on July 19 and, judging by its contents, it was prepared the same morning. Even so, July 19 is more than a month ago, and seasonal conditions in the State have deteriorated alarmingly since then. However, all is not lost yet if we have sufficient good rains soon, as all areas inside Goyder's line will then be able to produce some cereal crops. We must hope that this eventuates but, if it does not rain sufficiently within a few weeks, we will be placed in a serious situation.

On Tuesday, July 26, the member for Mitcham asked a Question on Notice, as follows:

1. Is it proposed 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 member for Mitcham was complaining because he had not received a reply by July 26 to a letter he had written on June 20; that is, he had been waiting for six days more than one month for a reply. I can tell the honourable member that he should not complain about waiting for replies from the Premier or from any department. I can quote several instances in which I have been waiting for up to five months for replies from some departments. My pending file is about 3in. to 4in. thick, and I have selected five outstanding examples.

The first is a letter written on March 15, 1977, to the Minister of Transport about installing an all-weather airstrip at Marree. The present strip is too small, and the

Flying Doctor Service, which regularly services Marree, cannot use it. A new strip has been graded, but it is too dusty at present and cannot be used by the new plane of the Royal Flying Doctor Service. I wrote to the Minister asking whether something could not be done about making it an all-weather airstrip, and I understand that he has referred the matter to the Premier.

Mr. Nankivell: What did they want—did they want it sealed?

Mr. ALLEN: No; I think all they wanted was some rubble on it to keep the dust down so that the larger planes could land. They do not want it sealed; they just want a metal base of some sort. Twice, I have telephoned the Premier's office and received information; both times I was promised a reply, but I am still waiting, and that was some five months ago. I went to Marree last Wednesday and I had not been in the town for five minutes before I was asked, "What is happening about our airstrip?" I replied, "You tell me and we'll both know." I did try the day before I left to get some information but it could not be obtained.

Mr. Gunn: The first you will hear will be a press statement, and then you will get a letter two days later.

Mr. ALLEN: The second matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the House also concerns the Minister of Transport. It is a letter written on May 2, 1977, some 3½ months ago, about the passenger bus service to Eudunda. I wrote to the Minister and received a reply on June 23, as follows:

The problems to which you refer are being investigated by the State Transport Authority and I anticipate that a decision in this matter will be reached shortly.

"Shortly" was June 23, and I still have not received any further information on that matter.

Mr. Boundy: Another broken promise.

Mr. ALLEN: That is so. I have another 20 in my "pending" file. The third letter refers to the Minister of Education. The Oodnadatta School Council wrote to me on April 18, 1977, about the fence that surrounds the Samcon school at Oodnadatta. That school committee knew that I had asked the Minister of Works a question on this matter in 1973 and he had promised immediate action. The school council wrote to me and I immediately wrote to the Minister of Education.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What was the date of your letter?

Mr. ALLEN: I wrote to the Minister of Education on April 29 and I also told the Minister what I had said to the Minister of Works in this House by question. That was on August 14, 1973, when the Minister of Works replied:

The five-wire fence at Oodnadatta was erected for the sole purpose of delineating the boundaries of the school. However, consideration has been given to the erection of a wire-mesh fence at this school and, following consultation with officers of the Education Department, it has been agreed to provide a fence of this type, and arrangements are in hand for the work to be undertaken as soon as possible.

That was exactly four years ago. The progress association wrote to me to point out that the matter still had not been dealt with. The Minister of Education acknowledged the letter on May 5, 1977, saying he was looking into the matter and would write to me "as soon as possible". The next letter is to the Minister of Education about the air-conditioning of the Peterborough Primary School. The ex-Minister will know that a nice primary school has been erected at Peterborough, which is in a disadvantaged area, and it is agreed that air-conditioning is essential in these

schools. However, provision was made for air-conditioning in this school, but it has never been completed and the staff of this school are very concerned, so much so that they wrote a letter to me on February 15, 1977, in the form of a petition with 23 signatures of teachers at the school. I took that matter up with the Minister of Education and received an acknowledgment from him on March 16, saying he was "looking into this matter and will write to you as soon as possible". That is five months ago, and the Minister is still looking into it.

The last letter is from the Lands Department. I wrote to the Minister of Lands on March 23, 1977, when people in the Flinders Range approached me and asked what was the situation in relation to pastoral leases. Up there, the roads are not fenced and at holiday time hundreds of caravanners camp in the area and drive indiscriminately over private land. The people there wanted to know what the situation was: could they order people off this land or could they erect notices pointing out that it was private property and no camping was permitted? I wrote to the Minister on March 23 seeking this information. He acknowledged the letter on March 29, and he replied on May 26, but the reply was negative, because it stated:

I refer to your letter of March 23, 1977, on behalf of several pastoral leaseholders who are concerned at the public using this land for camping purposes. The question of the rights of lessees to order people from the property and to erect notices has been referred to the Crown Solicitor for his opinion. I hope to be in a position where I can advise you further in the near future.

Perhaps it is the Crown Solicitor who is holding it up.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It is three months ago—you must not exaggerate.

Mr. ALLEN: It is four or five months ago for a reply.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Three months.

Mr. ALLEN: Three months—all right, we will not split hairs.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It is not even three months.

Mr. ALLEN: But you must admit that here is the member for Mitcham complaining that he has not got a reply in 4½ weeks, and it is three months as far as I am concerned, and the Minister is questioning my statement! I was surprised there was nothing in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech about relocating the township of Leigh Creek. I am happy that the Minister of Mines and Energy is in the House when I make these statements. I should have thought that the Minister would come out well before this with really big headlines pointing out that the township was going to be relocated. I may have missed the statement but, to my knowledge, he has not come out with a statement of this nature. I was in the area a few weeks ago; the Electricity Trust officers were very good. They took me into an office and showed me the plans and then the site of the new township.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What do you think of the site?

Mr. ALLEN: Very nice. A few weeks later, the conservation writer of the *Advertiser*, Mr. Kym Tilbrook, was in the area and carried out an investigation. He wrote a good article in the *Advertiser* on Saturday, July 16. It is an informative article that gave me much more information than I had; at the same time, I was pleased to get it. There are some excellent photographs and the Leigh Creek folk will be proud of this work when it is finished. I am surprised the Minister has not made much more of it than he has. The article states:

Leigh Creek is to be relocated, during the next three years, 13 kilometres south of the present township . . . Construction of the new town will cost \$30 000 000 . . .

The present town sits upon the deep "Lobe B", from which 85 000 000 tonnes of coal will be taken during the next 25 to 30 years . . . We have to get more coal out, which means going to greater depths than were ever envisaged when the town was put there. With advanced technology it can now be mined . . . Residents can't be blamed for being anxious. They take great pride in the town which became an oasis in the desert with streets tree-lined, gardens well looked after and social life well developed.

I can vouch for that because last week I was in the area. I took to the area two people who had never been there before, and they were amazed at the little town of Leigh Creek, how well it is set out, the number of trees there, and the sealed streets. It is a credit to the Electricity Trust the way it looks after that town.

Many people in South Australia have never been there and do not know how well this town is laid out. At present in Leigh Creek the streets are numbered First Street, Second Street, Third Street, and so on. I suggest to the Minister that, when the new town of Leigh Creek is relocated, one of the streets in that town be named Pierpoint Street. I do not know whether any members know Mrs. Pierpoint, who is the proprietor of the Copley Hotel and who is usually referred to as "the mother of the North". On Saturday morning, I had to go to the laundry to find Mrs. Pierpoint, who is 86 years of age, doing her week's washing. She is indeed a wonderful woman, who was originally Mrs. Dunn and who has married for a second time. About 12 months ago, she was awarded the British Empire Medal for services she had rendered to the community, something of which she is certainly proud.

Mr. Nankivell: She was at the Lyndhurst Hotel, first.

Mr. ALLEN: That is so, and thereafter she went to the Copley Hotel. I have been told that at certain times in the early days the Lyndhurst Hotel was more like a hospital than it was a hotel, because she had so many sick people there to look after. I suggest to the Minister that the main street of New Leigh Creek be called Pierpoint Avenue, or something like it, to recognise the services that this lady has rendered to the district. There are also the names of other early settlers in the district whose names could be used for streets, rather than using, say, First, Second, or Third Streets. Admittedly, it might be easier to find the streets if they were named in that way. However, I think it would be preferable and mean more to name the streets after people who have given outstanding service to the district. The report to which I have referred continues as follows:

The whole town is expected to be completed in three years. Two years from now, people will move in.

The new town is being referred to as "New Leigh Creek", although I understand that no real decision has yet been made on that matter.

Mr. Nankivell: Why don't you call that "Pierpoint"?

Mr. ALLEN: I imagine that the new town will initially be called New Leigh Creek, although eventually the "New" will be dropped and it will remain Leigh Creek, as it is now. The report continues:

There will be basketball courts, a bowling green, swimming pool, hockey field, and, to the north, a golf course and pistol range with joint facilities.

I suggest that, as the term "bowling green" is mentioned, and as Leigh Creek does not at present have a bowling green, the Parliamentary Bowling Club should issue the first challenge to these people when they have a green on which to play. Although I will not be a playing member, I hope that I will be an honorary member of that

club, and it will give me great pleasure to return and play with the Parliamentary team on a bowling green at Leigh Creek. The report continues:

As we inspected the site, Mr. Pázsit said housing costs were expected to be between \$10 000 000 and \$12 000 000 . . . the only buildings which will stay on the present site will be the coal production department and the E.T.S.A. workshops.

The report later continues:

The combined union council hopes also to see squash courts and the establishment of a bus service from Adelaide. The only public transport at the moment is the Ghan train, which goes to Adelaide on Friday and back on Monday. "The air fare of \$128 return is unreal," said Mr. Fuchs. "You can't expect the average bloke to pay that sort of money."

This is a matter that I have been taking up with the Minister for a long time: the people of Leigh Creek are certainly disadvantaged in relation to transport. They have 160 kilometres of unsealed road between Leigh Creek and Hawker, comprising mainly creek gravel, which, as most people know, is all right for a wet-weather road. However, in dry weather it becomes corrugated. If these people cannot use their motor cars to travel south, they must travel on the Ghan. The fare is about \$50 and it takes them 14 hours to get to Adelaide, so that they have less than half a day here before they must catch the same train back. Also, it costs them \$128 for the return air trip. These people are, therefore, disadvantaged.

There are over 1 000 people in Leigh Creek, who are mining coal, which is one of this State's essential commodities. The Government should pay more attention to expediting the sealing of the road to which I have referred. Although it is being sealed at present, only about 10 km a year are being sealed. The work should be stepped up in fairness to these people, who are providing a real service to the people of this State. The report continues:

However, the long-term future of the new town is uncertain. One thing is known: it will last for at least 30 years, which is the estimated life of the coalfield.

So, members can rest assured that Leigh Creek will survive for at least another 30 years.

I am concerned about another matter. Many people are at present claiming that the dingo should be protected. However, such suggestions usually come from people who are ill-advised on this matter, regarding which there has been much publicity in the press recently. To illustrate the point I am making, I will refer to two press reports, the first of which is a report that appeared in the *Advertiser* a few weeks ago. It was stated therein that someone was going to train a dingo as a seeing-eye dog. Such a scheme could well be successful, as the dingo is an intelligent animal. Although it is unfortunate that the dingo runs wild and does so much damage, I have no doubt that it could be trained as a seeing-eye dog and, if it could, I would say "Good luck" to those involved. We would all like to see such a scheme survive. Some people are advocating that the dingo be protected, mainly because they are afraid that it may become extinct. However, I can tell members that it will never become extinct. The dingo breeds in Queensland's channel country, and it comes down from Queensland into South Australia. There will always be dingoes; they have been here for much longer than has the white man.

Last week, I was in this area, and on Friday evening, just before sundown, my companions and I drove from Etadunna to Cooper crossing, a distance of about 10 km. during which trip we saw three dingoes within 50 metres of the side of the road. We could have shot the whole three; that is how thick the dingo population is at present,

yet people advocate that they should be protected. I am sure that those in the pastoral industry would not agree with such a suggestion.

I refer now to the Aboriginal population at Oodnadatta. It was pointed out in a report in the *Advertiser* a few weeks ago that there was a lack of welfare officers at Oodnadatta to care for these people. Only six or eight months ago they had two welfare officers in the town. However, both those officers have since left, and the people of the area are making do with a clerk and an assistant. Unfortunately, the Aborigines, particularly the older ones, are not receiving the attention that they have received previously. Once, when I was in Oodnadatta, I went to the Aboriginal welfare office and sat in for an hour or two to observe the way in which the welfare officers handled their work.

It was interesting to see the elderly Aboriginal ladies who had no idea of handling their money. When they received their pension, they would go to the welfare officer, who would instruct them what to do with their money. He told them to be sure to pay the grocer, or for the fire-wood that they had got the previous week. He would tell them to be sure to pay their rent, and to keep back some money for the next week. It was interesting to see how these officers handled the elderly Aborigines. It grieves me to think that at present there are no welfare officers at Oodnadatta to carry on this good work. Although the department has advertised several times, it is finding it difficult to get people to go there to take on this work. I agree that it certainly would not be attractive to go to Oodnadatta, particularly in summer time, in a temperature of about 40 degrees Celsius. However, these people certainly need attention to get them through their troubles.

This will be my last Address in Reply speech in this House. I said that my speech last year would be my last, but that was sheer speculation. This year it is not. Members may recall that, in my first Address in Reply speech, I said that I was a man of few words, and the member for Ross Smith took me up on that. However, I think he will agree that what I said was correct. I do not say much: I always maintain that actions speak louder than words. I am satisfied with what I have achieved, perhaps not in this place but in my district. After all, that is what counts most.

I am disappointed at the result of the redistribution of electoral boundaries. That would be natural for a person who has been representing such a huge district. I am positive that people in the North will not receive the same representation as their city cousins, because the areas in the North will be getting bigger and bigger and it will not be humanly possible for one man to do what the member for Eyre and I have done previously. However, that is the name of the game and, doubtless, the present member for Eyre will be representing the district after the next election. I cannot think of anyone more qualified to do that.

He is a young man, full of energy, with seven years experience in representing an area similar to the one that he will take over. He has had experience in the mining industry, in primary production generally, and in local government. He has also had experience in dealing with Aboriginal problems. He should be able to handle the district of the size that it will be. I say, "Good luck." Whoever wins will have my sympathy in trying to cover the area.

As this is my last Address in Reply speech, I want to mention one matter in particular. I refer back to October, 1968, when, as most members will recall, I received a bomb at Parliament House, through the mail.

Over the years, people asked me many times, "Have they ever tracked down who actually sent that bomb?" Naturally, I have had to say, "No, they have not been able to find who sent it." First, police must find a motive for the offence and, having done that, the problem is half solved.

In this case, they could not find a motive. They checked everything of a personal nature and could not find anything that anyone had against me personally, so they came to the conclusion that it was someone who wanted to get rid of the Government, because you will recall that at that stage the Hall Government did not have an outright majority. It was in a somewhat similar position to that in which this Government is today. Having found out that someone wanted to get rid of the Government, where would one look?

It was left along these lines, and I have always told people the situation. Now that I am going out of Parliament, I can add a little more information. I was told many years ago that the Police Department was confident that it had interviewed the person concerned but that there was not sufficient evidence to launch a prosecution, so the whole matter had to be dropped. The Police Force was confident that it interviewed the person. I knew the person whom the police interviewed but I knew him by sight only. I have never spoken to the man in my life. However, the man is now dead, so nothing will be gained by mentioning any names, but I felt that I had to make that statement because many people have asked me what has been the true situation. Now the matter of the bomb incident will be a closed book. I hold no malice against the person concerned. He probably was not a supporter of the Government at the time and they were his views.

I have been asked many times why I chose to enter politics. Most members of this House probably have been asked this question from time to time, and it is a most difficult question to answer. Having given the matter thought, I usually have replied that I suppose it was an accumulation of events over the years, and I think this was the position in my case. I say that because over the years, in taking an active part in various sporting organisations and in taking a turn in local government, one gets an insight into what is necessary and what can be achieved for one's district. I believed that if I entered politics, I could perhaps help my district.

The opportunity does not come to many people but it came to me and, after much hard work, I entered this House in 1968 as the member for Burra. After two years, I went to the District of Frome. I am satisfied with what has been achieved in that time. I believe that I have given service to the districts that I have represented. I have drawn up a list of what has been achieved in that time and I am very proud of those achievements. The thought that prompted me to enter Parliament was that I could help my district and, as I will be leaving Parliament in a few months anyway, I will go out knowing that my judgment was correct in deciding to stand for Parliament. I support the motion.

Mr. HARRISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WHITTEN (Price): I was concerned to read in a recent newspaper article a statement attributed to the Leader that the Premier was afraid to go to the people on his own record and that South Australians were questioning the Government's performance as they had never done before. I am willing to give the Leader the benefit of the doubt that he did not say that, or that he at least was misinterpreted, because he would know (or he should know) that the Dunstan Government's record of achievement has made this State the envy of Australia.

The Leader stated that the Premier had backed away from compulsory unionism and exempting trade union officials from civil actions and has even watered down his industrial democracy and worker participation policy at least for the time being. He also said:

"But there is no reason to suppose he won't go ahead with these obnoxious proposals if he wins Government again."

The Dunstan Government stands by its industrial policies and is proud of them! Members on both sides of the House have heard the Minister of Labour and Industry say on many occasions in this House that there are fewer strikes, fewer disruptions to industry, and fewer days lost over industrial matters in this State than in any other State in Australia. I know that members opposite find that statement of fact extremely difficult to swallow. That Party has committed electoral hari-kari by committing itself to the disastrous industrial policies put up by that amateur industrial affairs observer, the member for Davenport. It is interesting to note that only members opposite have supported the member for Davenport's policy. Industry certainly has not supported it, as it knows his policies belong in the nineteenth century. Even the honourable member's colleague in Canberra, Mr. Street, knows that because only last weekend in Tasmania he said that the number of industrial disputes had dropped dramatically over the past year. To his credit, he had the guts to say that. What he said was reported only yesterday on the A.B.C. and would have caused much embarrassment, I am sure, to the Prime Minister, the member for Davenport, and other members opposite.

It is perfectly obvious that the Liberal Party in South Australia is in disarray with heads being lopped off right, left and centre, and many more heads will be lopped off, too. If Mr. John Vial was still the Liberal Party Director the ludicrous policies now being put forward by the Opposition would not have seen the light of day.

Jim Forbes, the former Federal member for Barker, put paid to that. I regarded Mr. Vial as a conservative Liberal, but he was still too radical for the Liberal Party. I am sure that Dr. Forbes was quite delighted to give him the chop.

In reality, the Liberal Party's troubles were only just beginning. It had abolished the position of Executive Director and created the position of State Director. Four months after Mr. Vial was sacked the Party employed Mr. Brian Taylor to fill a newly created job. That was to be the Liberals' master stroke. Mr. Taylor, being an ex-television journalist, was going to take the front bench under his wing and improve its performance. God knows it needed it, but he has not done much of a job.

The first inkling that the Party had pulled a major blunder was at the press conference called to announce Mr. Taylor's appointment. I am informed reliably that the journalists who gathered to report the event were stunned by the news, and television journalists in particular were dumbfounded. Of course, they knew only too well of Mr. Taylor's background. In the days when Mr. Taylor worked in Adelaide he was not too highly regarded

by his peers. He was ruthless and arrogant, and he was not one to allow truth in reporting to interfere with his scramble to get to the top of his profession.

In fact, Mr. Taylor featured prominently in libel proceedings taken out against Southern Television Corporation for what happened on *Newsbeat*. Mr. Taylor was Executive Director of *Newsbeat* at that time. He took on a medical group that had allegedly intimidated a young doctor into leaving. The group of doctors was supposedly attempting to monopolise the Port Noarlunga area, and most of the townspeople in Port Noarlunga were said to be dissatisfied with the medical service that the group was then providing.

These facts are well known by honourable members, and I think it gives a valuable insight into the man now at the helm of the Liberal Party. We all know that the administrative wing of the Party guides the fortunes of members opposite, and should the Leader achieve the impossible, of gaining the front benches after the next election, whenever that might be, Mr. Taylor (this man who unfairly libelled a group of medical practitioners, this man who just is not interested in fair play) would be elevated to a position of quite unbelievable power!

It is not necessary for me to bring the full facts of the court proceedings before this house, but I do believe I should read what Mr. Justice Wells had to say when he handed down his judgment on August 11, 1972, as follows:

In my opinion, this libel was a bad libel, and I do not think that the \$20 000 awarded as damage is one cent too much. I fully recognise that it is desirable for the news media to give appropriate publicity to matters of public concern; that is one of the important aspects of our whole community and our way of life. But if a news medium sees fit to prosecute someone at the bar of public opinion, then it seems to me that they ought to accept the responsibilities of prosecution, and any ordinary prosecutor worth the name, who receives information that even suggests that the charge is without foundation, immediately seeks an adjournment and considers his position. In the same way it seems to me that, if television studios are about to embark upon this sort of prosecution—as this was—and receive information that even suggests that the allegations are without foundation, they should not hesitate to cancel the programme and consider the position. On the evidence led before me in this case, I think that the person immediately concerned with the television broadcast, Mr. Brian Taylor, showed what amounted to irresponsibility and cynicism, and all I can say is that, if the television broadcast company employs people who take the sort of attitude that he took, then they must accept the consequences.

The trouble associated with Mr. Taylor's appointment appears to be steamrolling. In the past month Mr. Spencer, who had been associated with the party's administration wing for the past 17 years, has handed in his resignation.

Mr. Venning: What are you talking about?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Rocky River is out of order.

Mr. WHITTEN: Margaret Croser also resigned. Apparently she, too, found Mr. Taylor too difficult to work with. Who is next? The Liberal Party President? We know what happened to the Liberal Party President in Kadina—he could not even win his job as the Mayor. Then, there is the Leader's press secretary. Who comes next?

Mr. Venning: What's that got to do with this House?

Mr. WHITTEN: I do not think the member for Rocky River will be here much longer. I am sure that the honourable member will not be in this House after the next election, because he is done like a dinner. Although members opposite will not admit it, morale

in the Liberal Party is at an all-time low. They will never regain any prestige whatever. They will sack their present Leader, as they have sacked so many. If the Opposition will take a little advice, it should get rid of Brian Taylor, or there will not be any Opposition members returned to this House after the next election, whenever that may be.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity to say a few words having listened to the diatribe of nonsense from the member for Price, who should be the last one to talk about leaderships. The man who purports to be the Federal Leader of the Opposition retained his leadership by only two votes—his own and that of his son.

Perhaps for the benefit of the member for Price I should read to this House the letter written by Mr. Clyde Cameron to the Secretary of the Australian Labor Party. Even better, the honourable member should read that letter to the House so that the people of this State and nation will be fully aware of what Labor Party members of Parliament think of their Leader.

However, there are one or two matters to which I should like to direct my attention. First, I refer to statements made by the Attorney-General about me. I have been informed that, on a recent visit to Andamooka, the Attorney had the effrontery to suggest to several of my constituents that, when amendments to the Mining Act were before Parliament, I made no protest. I was pleased to hear from my constituents that the correct position was pointed out to the Attorney, that a letter was produced, and that the Attorney asked his army (I do not know whether they were the press people or private secretaries that he carts around the country with him) to check the file. The secretary concerned had been somewhat remiss, as the dossier was not up to date. For the benefit of the Attorney-General and those other members who travel around my district making statements about me, I point out what I had to say about the matter last year, as reported at page 2852 of *Hansard*, as follows:

This Bill, which has been rushed into the House, contains many matters about which I am concerned. I have not had the opportunity to have proper discussions with my constituents about it. The Bill affects my constituents at Andamooka and Coober Pedy. The Minister has assured me that my constituents at Andamooka are pleased with the Bill.

That is what the Minister said. Later, I also said:

I make clear to the Minister that the Liberal Party stands fairly and squarely behind the opal miners.

My Party will protect the rights of the opal miners against any large company or group of companies that tries to interfere with their right to go about their business of opal mining. We believe that the prescribed area should not have been reduced, but should have been extended to include that area around Stuart Creek which the miners have requested.

Mr. Keneally: What about Mount Cooper?

Mr. GUNN: If he wishes, the member for Stuart can try to drag red herrings across my path. I continued by saying:

However, as a Party that believes in free enterprise, the Liberal Party intends to ensure that these individuals, who are engaged in a free enterprise activity, that is, mining, are properly protected. We do not intend to allow any large multi-national company to come into the area and stampede over their mining rights, and we stand by that.

The Hon. Mr. Whyte tried to convince the Minister in charge of the Bill in another place that he should delay the legislation, but the Minister refused to do so. The Minister had the legislation proclaimed, and the opal miners rightly

objected to it. I then took the opportunity of arranging a deputation to meet and discuss the matter with the Minister. I have had considerable correspondence with the Minister on this matter, and it is untrue for the Attorney-General to say that I have made no protest. My constituents, who are fortunately aware of the situation, are now armed with photostat copies of the relevant *Hansard* extract.

Last week, the Minister of Mines and Energy took it upon himself to visit Andamooka, where he addressed a meeting. I would have expected him to have the common courtesy to advise me that he was going there.

Mr. Keneally: Your constituents didn't want you to be there.

Mr. GUNN: That is not correct, because, when I spoke to some of them the day before the Minister arrived there, they were most concerned that I had not been invited. It does the member for Stuart, who has been tramping around my district, no good to try to protect his Minister. In a few days, I shall be in possession of a tape of the proceedings of the meeting relating to the statement the Minister made about uranium mining. I was informed during the course of my visits in my district that it was well known that the Minister of Mines and Energy had been in trouble with his colleagues over the attitude he had adopted to uranium mining overall. The Minister has been censured and has been having some difficulty. I understand that he told the people at Andamooka that mining would not take place at Roxby Downs unless the Federal Government agreed to the mining and export of uranium. I wonder whether the Minister would support that course of action, because it would appear from the noises he made some time ago, when he went overseas hawking around the report supporting the establishment of a uranium enrichment plant at Redcliff Point, that he supported uranium mining. I shall be interested to get the full text of what the Minister said; I understand that it will be illuminating.

The Attorney-General appears to have a personal hatred of me. I was surprised and saddened to think that the only criticism that the Attorney-General could level at me was that I did not talk to him. He knows that that is not correct. Outside the Chamber, I have never had a cross word with him, and I am hurt that he thinks I have some personal grudge. I make no apology for not supporting the extreme left-wing political views to which he subscribes. It is obvious that the only criticism the Attorney-General can launch at me is personal. I hope he continues because, when the people go to the polls, that sort of attack will be reflected in the ballot-box.

The Premier has been quoting a set of figures in relation to personal taxation levied per capita throughout Australia. I suggest that the Premier should be honest and should deduct the mineral royalties from State taxation. If he did that, the people in this State would see how badly they have been treated and how well the people in Western Australia and Queensland have been treated by the responsible Governments there.

Mr. Keneally: When you were in office, why didn't you attempt—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: I do not need the honourable member's assistance. The people of this State would then be aware that the Premier has been attempting to hoodwink them.

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

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I wish to place on public record my attitude to the very important question of

the mining and export of uranium. I read in the press today that the Federal Government intends to make an announcement in the next few days—if we can believe the press! Possibly the decision has already been made. I have no doubt that the decision will give the go-ahead to the multi-national mining companies for the mining and export of uranium. It is estimated that Australia has immense uranium reserves. At current prices the huge reserves could provide extraordinary profits for the multi-national mining companies that will process the deposits. The decision to which I have referred will be made by the Federal Government despite a movement, gaining in momentum, in the Australian community opposing the mining and export of uranium. A recent poll indicated that an increasing number of Australians was opposed to the mining and export of uranium. It is accepted that we live in a technical age, in which technology has been of some benefit to mankind. It has assisted the living standards in some areas of the world, but this technology has not always been applied for peaceful uses. One discrepancy has been that mankind many times has used this knowledge and technology to counter and contain the order of things that one would probably describe as nature. It must also be accepted that the side effects of this technology have already become evident in the pollution of the atmosphere and of the environment in which we live. The big question regarding further advances in nuclear power, when known resources of fuel are not infinite, is whether man can take the risk of further damage to himself and the environment by using nuclear power.

Mr. Nankivell: They're doing it everywhere in the world.

Mr. SLATER: Maybe, but that does not make it right. If the honourable member will be patient, I will make my position clear in regard to what I believe is the right process and the method in regard to uranium mining. So far the debate has focused only on the nuclear reactor, and, of course, this is only one component of the whole fuel cycle. Uranium has to be mined, milled, enriched, processed, used, and reprocessed, and of course waste products have to be contained for hundreds and thousands of years. There are risks in almost every process regarding the use of uranium.

For the past two decades the United States of America has led the world in the use of and experimentation with nuclear reactors. However, it must be remembered that other Governments are also interested in the enrichment and processing of uranium and the use of nuclear reactors, and I have no doubt that greater use of the fast breeder reactor will occur. As I said previously, that does not make it right. The dangers will become more evident as more reactors are used. It must be remembered that not only are Governments interested but also private companies operate and supply power. Their attitudes can be activated by profit rather than by the safety of the environment and of mankind.

Nuclear power involves risks which are different from those involved in other energy sources. A human error or an accident can have immense consequences. The most immediate danger to human life following a serious accident would be from a cloud of radioactive material that would be released. The consequence would depend on the population density of the area, on climatic conditions, and perhaps the evacuation procedures used. The point is that nuclear power and its safety are a matter of risk and, on the balance of probability, is it worth taking that risk?

Mr. Nankivell: It's been taken.

Mr. SLATER: It may have been taken but is it worth our taking it? Should we condone the situation entirely? We are being pushed into a situation by international corporations which have a vested interest in the mining of uranium and the end product. These corporations are using the end product, so they want a source of raw material. Are the multi-national mining companies that we speak of—

Mr. Nankivell: Which ones—name them.

Mr. SLATER: I will in a moment. Pan Continental is probably the major concern in the Northern Territory at present, but there are plenty of other interests: General Electric, Westinghouse, Utah Mining, Riotinto, and its Australian subsidiary Conzinc Riotinto of Australia, Mitsubishi, Hitachi, and the Rockefeller people—they are all interested in uranium mining. Our previous experience of these people certainly says "No" to the mining and export of uranium in Australia. We have to be conscious of the effect not only on mankind but also on the ecology generally; I speak of other living organisms which may prove far more sensitive to the side effects of nuclear

fission. I speak of plants and animals that may upset the whole ecological system.

The risks in that regard are too great, not only for mankind but for all the associated situations that make life tolerable on this earth. I think that risks are there, that the storage of nuclear waste has not been proved to be effective. There have already been some accidents in that regard and I am sure that, with the proliferation of the nuclear reactor in other parts of the world, this will occur even more frequently, to the detriment of mankind in general. So I believe that the resolution carried in this House some time ago, that the mining and export of uranium should not be undertaken until all adequate safeguards have been assured, is the correct decision we took at that time. It is a decision we took in the interests of the world generally and not only as a parochial outlook or a rather inverted outlook, which is the outlook that the multi-national mining companies are taking in this regard.

Motion carried.

At 9.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 17, at 2 p.m.