

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 25, 1977

The **SPEAKER (Hon. G. R. Langley)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**PETITION: RAPE**

Mr. **GROTH** presented a petition signed by 32 residents of the electorate of Salisbury, praying that the House would urge the Government to ensure that those convicted of rape be dealt with more severely, that they serve the full term of the sentences given them, and that the police be given the power to take samples of hair, blood, skin and semen as evidence to help in establishing the possible guilt or innocence of the accused person.

Petition received.

**PETITION: UNIONISM**

Mr. **TONKIN** presented a petition signed by 7 671 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to abandon any legislation which would deprive employees of the right to choose whether or not they wished to join a trade union or to provide for compulsory unionism.

Petition received.

**PETITIONS: TRADING HOURS**

Mr. **WHITTEN** presented a petition signed by 166 citizens of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Shop Trading Hours Bill to retain the current trading rights of existing exempt shops.

Mr. **WILSON** presented a similar petition signed by 114 citizens of South Australia.

The **Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** presented a similar petition signed by 497 citizens of South Australia.

Mr. **BECKER** presented a similar petition signed by 3 842 citizens of South Australia.

Petitions received.

**PETITION: MEAT SALES**

Mr. **DEAN BROWN** presented a petition signed by 16 241 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to include meat sales in the Shop Trading Hours Bill thereby allowing purchases of fresh meat during all hours the store would be open for business.

Petition received.

**PETITION: NORTH PLYMPTON TRAFFIC LIGHTS**

Mr. **BECKER** presented a petition signed by 831 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to install forthwith road traffic lights, including pedestrian activated lights, at the corner of Galway Avenue and Marion Road, North Plympton.

Petition received.

**ALDGATE PRIMARY SCHOOL**

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works,

together with minutes of evidence, on Aldgate Primary School.

Ordered that report be printed.

**QUESTIONS**

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

**LAND AGENTS**

In reply to Mr. **GROTH** (October 6).

The **Hon. PETER DUNCAN**: The firm of Casserly and Mitchell acted as agents for the vendors with respect to the sale of a property to the constituents of the honourable member. After signing a contract to purchase a property, the purchasers' financing arrangements fell through. In the interim period the purchasers had been granted possession of the subject property pending finance being available. When the financing arrangements fell through, the vendors alleged that the purchasers had been guilty of various breaches of the agreement pursuant to which they had been granted possession of the property. The vendors gave written instructions to the agents not to release the deposit moneys paid whilst the vendors obtained legal advice. That advice has now been obtained and the vendors' solicitors have instructed the agents to release \$2 164 of the deposit moneys. The agents propose to release that sum and are seeking independent legal advice to determine whether or not the balance should be released. In the circumstances, it appears that the agents are the meat in the sandwich with respect to a dispute between vendors and purchasers. The agents propose to be guided by their legal advice and, in the circumstances, it is considered that no further action is warranted.

**CORONER'S BRANCH**

In reply to Mr. **BECKER** (October 19).

The **Hon. PETER DUNCAN**: From information presently available it is expected that the Coroner's Branch will move to the new forensic science building towards the end of January.

**CONSOLIDATED REVENUE**

Mr. **BECKER** (on notice):

1. What are the amounts due and unpaid on Consolidated Revenue account as at June 30, 1977 for:

- (a) succession duties;
- (b) land tax;
- (c) business franchise;
- (d) pay-roll tax;
- (e) gift duties;
- (f) waterworks and sewers;
- (g) railways;
- (h) harbors;
- (i) irrigation and reclamation;
- (j) hospitals;
- (k) lands;
- (l) education; and
- (m) licensing fees?

2. How do these outstandings compare to each of the past two financial years?

3. What action is being taken for recovery and after what period?

4. What is the total amount written off in each category for the last and two preceding financial years?

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

1, 2 and 4. The information sought by the honourable member for the year ended June 30 appears in the Report of the Auditor-General on pages 21 and 22. Rail Division is not included in this list because it has ceased to pay cash collections into revenue. Accordingly, there are no amounts outstanding on revenue as at June 30, 1977, in connection with the Rail Division. The amounts as at June 30, 1976, are published on pages 20 and 21 of the Report of the Auditor-General for the financial year ended June 30, 1976. The amounts as at June 30, 1975, are published on pages 15 and 16 of the Report of the Auditor-General for the financial year ended June 30, 1975.

3. Recovery action in respect of overdue payments is a continuous process and includes personal contact by telephone or letter, the imposition of interest, penalties and fines, and court action where necessary.

**HEALTH STAFF**

**Mr. RODDA (on notice):** What was the number of staff employed by:

(a) the Hospitals Department (excluding staff employed by Government hospitals) on June 30, 1975 and June 30, 1976;

(b) the Hospitals Department and S.A. Health Commission on June 30, 1977;

(c) Medibank on the three abovementioned dates, respectively; and

(d) private health insurance funds on the three abovementioned dates, respectively?

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

(a) Hospitals Department (excluding Government hospitals) employees as at:

30/6/75—

Central Office (clerical and administration) .....	205	
Scholarships .....	65	
	—	270
Eden Park training centre .....		11
		—
	Total	281

30/6/76—

Central office (clerical and administration) .....	233	
Scholarships .....	57	
Medical cadetships .....	34	
Nurses Board examiners .....	32	
	—	356
Office of the Minister .....		10
Eden Park training centre .....		15
		—
	Total	381

(b) Hospitals Department (excluding Government hospitals) employees as at:

30/6/77—

Central office (clerical and administration) .....	267	
Scholarships .....	91	
Medical cadetships .....	10	
Radiography students .....	43	
	—	411
Office of the Minister .....		11
Eden Park training centre .....		13
		—
	Total	435

South Australian Health Commission as at 30/6/77—Nil.

(c) This information should be sought from the Commonwealth Minister for Health.

(d) This information should be sought from the private health insurance organisations.

**TRENCH DIGGERS**

**Mr. GUNN (on notice):**

1. Are trench diggers "declared equipment" under the Mining Act?

2. Are there any conditions attached to the use of trench diggers in opal mining areas and, if so, what are they?

3. Are any bonds required for the use of trench diggers within the designated precious stones prospecting areas?

4. Are underground tunnelling machines "declared equipment" and, if so, why?

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

1. Yes. However, proposed new regulations will provide that only units greater than 75 cm in width will be classified as "declared equipment", in future.

2. The conditions for operation of trench diggers are those under the Mines and Works Inspection Act which relate to safety and protection of the public. Approvals for use in the smaller sizes will be required in proposed new regulations.

3. There are no conditions for bonds when using trench diggers.

4. At present underground tunnelling machines are not "declared equipment". Proposed new regulations for units greater than 75 cm in diameter would make tunnelling machines declared equipment. The main reason for doing this is that the tunnelling machine is a mining tool and not a prospecting tool. With this machine, claims could be worked out within a month. Furthermore, safety is also involved where underground units may make an excavation close to the surface and later surface work could endanger operators. These matters have all been discussed with the mining subcommittee of the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners Association.

**COOBER PEDY ELECTRICITY**

**Mr. GUNN (on notice):**

1. When is it anticipated that the Electricity Trust of South Australia will be taking over the Coober Pedy power supply?

2. Does the Government intend to compulsorily acquire it?

3. Who will determine the valuation?

4. Is it intended that the Electricity Trust of South Australia will upgrade the existing facilities and extend power to areas which are not already serviced at Coober Pedy?

5. Have the present facilities been valued and, if so, by whom and what was the valuation?

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

1. The Electricity Trust has agreed to negotiate the purchase of the electricity undertaking at Coober Pedy on behalf of the Government and to arrange for the operation of the undertaking until a suitable local authority can be set up to assume responsibility for it. Negotiations for purchase are virtually complete but arrangements for operation are still to be settled. Transfer of ownership of the undertaking is expected to be arranged by about mid-December 1977.

2. No.

3. A purchase price has already been agreed with the present owners, Coober Pedy Power Supply Proprietary Limited.

4. Existing facilities will be upgraded. Extensions to areas which are not already serviced will be examined in due course.

5. The Electricity Trust made a valuation for its own purposes on which the purchase offer was based. The company has asked that figures relating to the purchase should not be publicised.

#### COOBER PEDY WATER

**Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Does the Engineering and Water Supply Department have any plans to improve the Coober Pedy town water supply and, if so, when is it anticipated that the improvements will be implemented?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Improvements and additions to the existing desalination plants are scheduled during 1978-79, 1979-80 and 1980-81; subject to the availability of funds. Final details of the quantity and quality of water available from a bore sunk some 23 miles from Coober Pedy are not yet available.

#### MARINE FIBRES

**Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): What action, if any, does the Government propose to take to avoid ecological damage in the harvesting of marine fibres in the St. Vincent and Spencer Gulfs?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The present licences issued to Lithominerals Proprietary Limited under the provisions of the Fibres and Sponges Act are for exploratory purposes only, are limited to a two year period expiring on July 31, 1979, and stipulate, *inter alia*, that the company must:

- (1) only obtain or remove (and exploit commercially) sufficient marine fibre to determine the nature and extent of the deposits.
- (2) on the expiry of the licences submit to the Minister of Fisheries a report on the economic, technical and environmental feasibility of full scale extraction of fibre.
- (3) prepare for the Minister for the Environment an environmental impact statement and subsequently forward to that Minister all submissions made thereon for consideration prior to the issue of further licences.

A further clause stipulates that the Minister of Fisheries may terminate operations if there is evidence of interference with the fishing industry, the growth and propagation of fibres or navigation. Appropriate monitoring of the operations has also been established under the provisions of the Fisheries Act.

#### STOCK INSPECTOR

**Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Has the Government any plans to again station a stock inspector at Ceduna and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Currently, Western Eyre Peninsula is being serviced by the Animal Health Adviser who is stationed at Cleve, and who spends one full day at Ceduna fortnightly, attending to work en route on the days before and after that day. Any emergency situation in

the district will also be met. It is not proposed in the foreseeable future to alter the present arrangement as all available staff are already deployed where work priorities are high.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT CHARGES

**Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. What is the Government's policy for the payment by its various departments of charges provided for under the terms of section 319 of the Local Government Act, 1934-1977?

2. When some departments only make these payments, or where a particular department makes payment on some occasions only, what are the criteria used for making such decisions?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** In certain circumstances councils are empowered to recover from the owners of ratable property abutting on a public street or road, an amount of up to \$5 per metre toward the cost of constructing kerbing, water tables, footway and roads. The Local Government Act provides that any land owned by the Crown and leased to any person and (following an amendment to the Act in 1974) any land or buildings held by the Crown or any part of such land or buildings whether occupied or unoccupied but intended for occupation with a period of 12 months, as a dwelling house or for any other purpose not being a public or education purpose, are expressly made ratable and the Government is therefore liable for the payment of the moieties in respect of these properties.

In addition, the Highways, Public Buildings and Engineering and Water Supply Departments, with the approval of the appropriate Minister of the Crown, make an *ex gratia* payment in respect of work carried out adjacent to such public facilities as schools, police stations and Government offices.

#### JUVENILE OFFENDERS

**Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

How many of the:

- (a) 3 296 juvenile offenders appearing in the juvenile courts in 1976-77,
- (b) 3 503 juvenile offenders appearing before the juvenile aid panels in 1976-77,
- (c) juveniles appearing before juvenile courts involving serious crimes of violence in 1976-77,
- (d) juveniles appearing before the courts on charges of rape in 1976-77,
- (e) juveniles appearing before the courts on charges of sexual offences other than rape in 1976-77, were:
  - (i) first offenders;
  - (ii) second offenders;
  - (iii) third offenders; and
  - (iv) those who had offended on four or more occasions?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The reply is as follows:

(a) Of the 3 296 juveniles appearing in juvenile courts in 1976-77;

1 472	were first offenders
661	were second offenders
430	were third offenders
and 733	were fourth or subsequent offenders
<hr/>	
3 296	

(b) Of the 3 503 juveniles appearing before juvenile aid panels in 1976-77;

2 897	were first offenders
474	were second offenders
93	were third offenders
and 39	were fourth or subsequent offenders
<hr/>	
3 503	

(c) Of the 61 juveniles appearing before juvenile courts on charges of serious crimes of violence in 1976-77;

16	were first offenders
11	were second offenders
7	were third offenders
and 27	were fourth or subsequent offenders
<hr/>	
61	

(d) Of the 8 juveniles appearing before juvenile courts on charges of rape in 1976-77;

5	were first offenders
—	were second offenders
1	was a third offender
and 2	were fourth or subsequent offenders
<hr/>	
8	

(e) Of the 49 juveniles appearing before juvenile courts on charges of sexual offences other than rape in 1976-77;

18	were first offenders
9	were second offenders
4	were third offenders
and 18	were fourth or subsequent offenders
<hr/>	
49	

Note: 1. For the purposes of the above tables children are categorised as first offenders only if they have not previously appeared before a court or a panel.

2. The figures relate to individual children involved in appearances where an offence is heard and a result proclaimed.

**INSTITUTIONS' STAFF**

**Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. How many staff resignations were there in the years 1975, 1976, and 1977, respectively, from the following institutions:

- (a) McNally Training Centre; and
- (b) Vaughan House?

2. How many of those who resigned were females and in which years?

3. Were any of the resignations due to injuries sustained as a result of assault by inmates of these institutions and, if so, how many were there, at which institutions and in which years?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The replies are as follows:  
McNally Training Centre

Date	Total Resignations	Female Resignations	Resignations Resulting From Assault by Inmates
1/1/75-31/12/75	12	3	Nil
1/1/76-31/12/76	12	1	Nil
1/1/77-30/9/77	14	5	1

**Vaughan House**

Date	Total Resignations	Female Resignations	Resignations Resulting From Assault by Inmates
1/1/75-31/12/75	6	4	Nil
1/1/76-31/12/76	9	4	Nil
1/1/77-30/9/77	5	3	Nil

**EYRE PENINSULA WATER**

**Mr. BLACKER** (on notice):

1. Has an assessment been made of the long-term requirements of water on Eyre Peninsula and, if so, will existing services be adequate in the future?

2. Has there been any indication of falling water levels in the:

- (a) Uley-Wanilla Basin;
- (b) Lincoln South Basin;
- (c) Polda Basin; and
- (d) Kappawanta Basin?

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

1. An assessment has been made. Existing services would not be adequate to meet expected future demands.

2. No.

**PREMIER'S VISIT**

**Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice): Does the Premier intend to make an overseas trip later this year and, if so:

- (a) what are the dates of the proposed trip;
- (b) for what purposes is the trip being made;
- (c) what is the proposed itinerary of the trip;
- (d) is he intending to visit Malaysia and, if so, for what purposes;
- (e) who will be accompanying the Premier; and
- (f) what is the anticipated cost of the trip?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Some months ago I received an invitation extended by the National President of the Australian Institute of Management to address the Asian Association of Management Organisations (AAMO) in Singapore on November 2, 1977. I intend to take the opportunity while visiting Singapore to have discussions with the Federal Government of Malaysia and the North Malaysian States regarding the ongoing activities of the South Australian Government in Malaysia and planning associated with the next Adelaide visit to North Malaysia. At this stage details have not been finalised.

**COMPLAINTS**

**Mr. WILSON** (on notice):

1. How many complaints of undue noise caused by patrons of hotels in North Adelaide and Walkerville were received by the North Adelaide police station during the 12 months to June 30, 1977?

2. How many reports of vandalism were received by the North Adelaide police station during the 12 months to June 30, 1977?

3. How do both figures compare to the previous two years?

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

1. The North Adelaide police station provides only an

office service and has restricted operating hours. It would not be the usual reporting place for complaints relating to noise in the vicinity of hotels in the North Adelaide and Walkerville districts. The few complaints received there would be referred to Police Headquarters, Operations Room, for attention. At Operations Room, calls of this nature are coded under the general heading of "disturbances" and are not listed specifically as occurring in the vicinity of hotels. Therefore, the number of complaints received at North Adelaide would not be a true indication of any trouble which might be caused by patrons of hotels in the district during the 12 months to June 30, 1977. Nor is this information available from Police Operations Room without making a visual check of all tasking messages for that period and in the time available it was not possible to carry out this task.

2. Thirty-five cases of wilful damage were reported at the North Adelaide police station for the year ended June 30, 1977. For the reasons stated above, this would not be all the offences of this type committed in the North Adelaide and Walkerville districts; nor did all these offences occur in the vicinity of hotels. In order to produce a total figure, it would be necessary to manually check records of this offence for the whole State and at short notice it is not possible to produce an answer.

3. Statistics relating to specific districts were not maintained in 1976 and the only method of determining the figures requested is by manual check of reports of the nature referred to for the whole of the State. At short notice, it is not possible to produce an answer. Since July 1, 1976, statistics are being related to districts and once this data is able to be computerised it will be possible to produce information such as requested in this case.

#### MINISTERS' CARS

**Mr. WILSON** (on notice):

1. What was the total cost, in the financial year 1976-77, of running the Ministerial car fleet?
2. What was the total, including overtime, of the salaries of the drivers involved?

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

1. \$47 375, apart from salaries.
2. \$312 470.

#### ELECTORATE OFFICES

**Mr. WILSON** (on notice):

1. What was the cost for the financial year, 1976-77, of running the electorate offices for members of Parliament?
2. What was the total of the salaries for the secretaries employed in these offices?

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

1. \$168 356, apart from salaries.
2. \$445 971.

#### EXHAUST EMISSION CONTROL

**Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. Is the Government aware of widespread dissatisfaction within the community with the current standards for exhaust emission control?
2. Have these standards increased fuel consumption for the average vehicle compared to fuel consumption with the previous standards?
3. Have Ministers of Transport throughout Australia

discussed the possible dropping of the present standards for exhaust emission and reverting to the previous standard or at least a lower standard and, if so, what agreement, if any, has been reached?

4. Does the Minister support the lowering of the emission control standards?

5. If the standard is expected to be changed, when will action be taken to do so?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** At a meeting held in July, 1977, in Perth the Australian Transport Advisory Council considered the effects of the implementation of Australian Design Rule 27a (exhaust emission control). Ministers agreed that the January 1, 1979, implementation stage of ADR 27a be deferred for one year (that is, until January 1, 1980) on the understanding that the industry undertake to make available durability data in relation to fuel provided in motor vehicles.

The council also agreed that a special study group be established to study deterioration factors and the effects of ADR 27a. The membership of the special study group includes one officer from each of the States and also from the Commonwealth Department of Transport, Department of Environment, Housing and Community Development, and Department of National Resources. The study group has met on a number of occasions, but has not yet submitted a further report to members of the Australian Transport Advisory Council.

#### GOVERNMENT DEBT

**Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice): How much money was owed by the Government at the end of June, 1977, to contractors for construction work certified completed and due for payment?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Because of the cash system of accounting undertaken by all Government departments as distinct from the accrual method of accounting of commercial undertakings, the work required to obtain this answer is beyond what would be reasonable.

#### AFLATOXIN CONTAMINATION

**Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice):

1. Is the Minister aware of the known carcinogenic effects of aflatoxins in animals and the high correlation in some parts of the world between the incidence of certain types of cancer in man and the level of aflatoxin contamination in food offered for sale in those areas?

2. Is the Minister aware that the present Australian peanut crop is contaminated with the mould, *Aspergillus flavus*, which produces and secretes aflatoxin?

3. Is the Health Department monitoring the level of aflatoxin in foodstuffs and, if not, why not?

4. What precautions are being taken to ensure that South Australians are not exposed to aflatoxin contamination in peanuts and/or peanut products?

5. Has the Health Department prepared a report on the dangers of aflatoxin contamination in foodstuffs and, if not, why not?

6. Has the Minister or department considered prohibiting the sale of foodstuffs contaminated with aflatoxin and, if so, what action will be taken and when will it be taken?

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

1. Yes. However, there is little information available on the toxicological affects of aflatoxin ingestion by humans.
2. Yes, some of the crop is contaminated.
3. Yes.
4. Sampling of peanuts and inspection of conditions

under which peanuts and their derived products are stored.

5. No. The main means of controlling aflatoxin levels in foods likely to be implicated, such as peanuts, grains, and legumes, is to ensure good practices to prevent conditions favouring mould development during storage and distribution.

Reported instances claiming to have involved aflatoxins have been associated with people in countries having climatic conditions favouring the growth of moulds; consumption of poor quality food due to food shortages and consumers being in a state of poor nutrition. These conditions do not generally prevail locally.

6. So far, it has not been necessary to prohibit the sale of food as contaminated. Food unfit for human consumption could be seized and destroyed under the provisions of the Food and Drugs Act.

**MOTOR REGISTRATION DIVISION**

**Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. What amount of stamp duty was collected by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles on all new and used vehicles for the financial years 1973-74 to 1976-77, respectively?

2. What was the total revenue from motor vehicle registrations for the same periods?

3. How many applications for a driving licence were lodged with the Marion branch of the Motor Vehicles Department during 1976-77 and of these—

(a) how many applicants were successful in gaining a licence on their first, second, and third tests, respectively; and

(b) how many of those applicants who failed were in the age groups of 16 years, 17 years, 18 years and 19 years and over?

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

	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77
	\$	\$	\$	\$
On value of vehicle	6 037 092	8 578 999	12 811 184	15 423 525
On insurance	1 095 564	1 433 420	1 829 468	1 828 383
2.	20 639 967	26 544 497	29 033 593	38 433 481

3. The practical driver testing of applicants for drivers' licences from the Marion branch of the division commenced in November, 1976. In the period of 11 months ending September 30, 1977, 3 577 people have been tested for their first licence or for a change in class of their licence. Of this number, 2 036 passed and 1 541 failed. However, the division does not keep statistics in respect of the number of tests an individual has taken or on the age groupings of those who have failed. Indeed, the results of the failed tests are destroyed after a short period of time.

**EVANSTON PARK HOUSES**

**Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. How many houses has the South Australian Housing Trust contracted to build in Evanston Park and what is the location of each one?

2. When were the contracts let and to whom?

3. What was the contract completion date of each house and the actual completion date?

4. On what dates did the trust take delivery of the keys

of each house and on what date was each house actually allotted to the individual purchasers?

5. If there was any delay between acceptance of the keys by the trust and allocation to a purchaser, what were the individual delays and why?

6. Was any delay period considered satisfactory and, if not, why not, and if the delay has been unnecessarily long what measures have been or are being taken to reduce such delays in the future?

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

1. The trust contracted to build 32 single units on scattered allotments in Evanston Park.

2. The trust approved the awarding of a contract to Alpine Constructions Proprietary Limited, of 44 Greenhill Road, Wayville, in June, 1976. The builder took possession of the allotments on July 12, 1976.

3. When the contract was awarded to Alpine Constructions, the date for the completion of the first house was set for February 18, 1977, with the completion of all the units scheduled for July 8, 1977. However, due to delays beyond the control of the contractor, the first hand-over date was extended to June 13, 1977.

4. The dates of handovers of the keys so far extend from June 24, 1977, to October 12, 1977.

5. No abnormal delays have occurred, other than in one case.

6. The delay in offering one house has possibly been longer than normally experienced, but this can be attributed to the pressure of work resulting from the increase in hand-overs in the metropolitan area due no doubt to the availability of all trades in the building industry. In fact, in the metropolitan area, the trust's contractors have handed over 343 single unit houses for sale since August 1. Steps have already been made to increase the sales staff to allow earlier allocations and avoid delays of this nature.

**MUNDULLA WATER SUPPLY**

**Mr. RODDA** (on notice): What progress has been made with investigations into the underground waters which will enable a reticulated water supply to the township of Mundulla, and when can residents of the town expect such a supply?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Results of wells drilled to date indicate supplies that are doubtful in quality and are insufficient in quantity to ensure a satisfactory and continuous supply to the township of Mundulla. Investigations are still in hand but difficulty is being experienced in obtaining an assured supply of good quality water. Under the circumstances it is not possible to give any meaningful indication of when Mundulla can expect a reticulated water supply system.

**COAL**

**Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. What are the present freight costs for the transport of coal from Leigh Creek to Port Augusta and when was the figure established?

2. Has a price been established for the foreseeable future and, if so, what is it and what effect, if any, will it have on the cost of electricity in the future?

3. If negotiations are not complete, when is it expected that finality will be reached?

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

1. The freight charge for the transport of coal from Leigh Creek to Port Augusta was agreed in August, 1977, and consists of two parts:

- (a) a fixed annual sum; plus  
 (b) a variable rate per tonne depending on actual coal carried and actual operating costs.

The nominal freight rate for the year ended June 30, 1977, totals \$2.25 a tonne, but this figure is subject to review in the light of actual tonnes carried and actual running costs. Final figures are not yet available from Australian National Railways, but the figure is expected to be below the nominal figure.

2. This method of charging will apply in the future. Because part of the charge is a fixed sum and the remainder depends on actual costs, there should be a favourable effect on electricity prices especially when additional amounts are carried for the operation of the new northern power station.

3. Not applicable.

### ELECTRICITY

**Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. What are the relative costs of providing electricity connection to individual allotments—

- (a) underground; and  
 (b) overhead—  
 (i) with new works; and  
 (ii) from existing facilities?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to progressively place underground existing services and, if so, on what basis and in what order?

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

1. (a) The average cost of installing underground electricity distribution mains in a typical new residential subdivision is approximately \$800 per allotment plus approximately \$100 for wiring, which the consumer must install from the service point at the front property boundary to his house.

(b) (i) The average cost of installing overhead electricity distribution mains in a typical new subdivision, including the overhead service connection to the consumer's house, would be approximately \$350 per allotment.

(ii) The average cost of an overhead service connection to an ordinary house from existing overhead street mains will vary from \$60 to \$130 approximately, depending upon whether the house is on the same side of the street as the mains or the opposite side.

2. The Electricity Trust does not have any plans for progressive undergrounding of existing overhead electricity mains.

### TORRENS ISLAND POWER STATION

**Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. Who has been judged responsible or alternatively has accepted responsibility for the damage to No. 3 turbine in Section A of the Torrens Island power station?

2. At whose cost will the damaged blading be replaced and what estimated cost is involved?

3. Has any allowance been made or is it to be permitted in the cost of No. 3 turbine to compensate for its limited capacity to function from 1975 to 1978?

4. Why has there been such a long delay in effecting satisfactory repairs and/or commissioning?

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

1. The damage was due to a combination of factors, and a clear judgment of responsibility could not be made.

2. Because the event occurred well after the expiration of the contract maintenance period, the Electricity Trust is

responsible for repairs. These will cost approximately \$200 000, part of which is covered by insurance.

3. No.

4. Because of the long delivery of replacement parts. These were received earlier this year, but it has not been convenient to take the unit out of service solely for this work. The new parts will be installed next year in conjunction with other maintenance.

### NORWOOD BUILDING

**Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government, following the forced eviction of Live Along Workshop Incorporated from the property at 258-264 The Parade, Norwood, to retain the present building on site and, if so, has the building been relet and to whom?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The Highways Department intends to retain the property. The building has not yet been relet.

### RELEASE-TIME SCHOLARSHIPS

**Mrs. ADAMSON** (on notice):

1. How many release-time scholarships were awarded in each of the academic years 1973 to 1977, inclusive?

2. For what periods have teachers been released from schools on these scholarships?

3. What areas of study have been undertaken by release-time scholars?

4. What was the cost of:

- (a) salaries;  
 (b) scholarship funds; and  
 (c) special student allowances,

for release-time scholars in each of the above years?

5. What is the proposed number of release-time scholars in 1978?

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

1. 1973 .....	80
1974 .....	269
1975 .....	311
1976 .....	325
1977 .....	305

2. Varies from one academic term to one full year.

3. General, Libraries, Special Education, etc., Educational Administration, Aboriginal Education, Remedial Education, Commerce, English, Outdoor Education, Curriculum Design, Educational Technology, Film Study, Italian Language, Community School Relationships, Health, Migrant Education.

4. (a) 1973 .....	\$527 000
1974 .....	\$1 556 000
1975 .....	\$2 466 000
1976 .....	\$2 993 000
1977 .....	\$3 441 000 (projected).

(b) Not applicable.

(c) Not applicable.

5. 236.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WALLAROO JETTY

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I would like to relate to the House the sequence of events which have occurred since the Chinese vessel the *Wuzhou* caused extensive damage to the bulk loading plant and jetty while berthing at Wallaroo at 0720 hours yesterday, October 24, 1977.

The vessel (16 436 gross registered tons) is owned by the Chinese Ocean Shipping Company of Shanghai and is on its first visit to South Australian ports (Wallaroo and Port Lincoln) for the purpose of loading 24 000 tons of wheat. Preliminary assessments of damage indicate that—

- (a) Three spans of the approach section of the conveyor gallery and the whole of the shipping section of the bulk loading plant were demolished. A further two spans were damaged and may be economically repairable. An approximate estimate of replacement cost is \$750 000.
- (b) The vessel, in penetrating about half-way through the jetty, severely damaged three pile bents, one bulk loader foundation, a considerable area of decking and seven small buildings. An approximate estimate of replacement cost is \$250 000.
- (c) Three privately owned vehicles parked underneath the loader gallery were damaged.

One section of the damaged gallery sitting on top of a partly demolished building is in danger of further collapse, and this will be rendered safe today. Feasibility studies are proceeding into ways and means of making the berth usable at the earliest possible date for shipments of other than bulk grain. The bulk grain loading plant will be out of action for nine to 12 months. Urgent departmental investigations into the cause of and responsibility for the accident commenced yesterday morning, and these inquiries are continuing. The vessel was under compulsory pilotage, and inquiries into the berthing, pilotage, shipping and engine performance are being undertaken by the Assistant Harbormaster, Port Adelaide (Captain N. R. Carr), assisted by the Senior Ship and Engineer Surveyor (Mr. R. Round).

Reports received to date including a report from the ship's master and the Harbormaster and Pilot (Captain J. Morley) indicate that the vessel failed to go astern at a critical stage of the berthing manoeuvre. It is not possible at this stage to be precise about the cause of this failure, but from facts available it seems highly improbable that pilot error was involved. In addition to the departmental investigation, a Government investigator from the Legal Services Department has been sent to Wallaroo to initiate investigations into indirect effects of the accident, for example, property damage to third persons and loss of income return. He is also assisting in the investigation into the cause of the accident. I expect to have a full report later this week.

The damage to the Wallaroo installation is extensive, and in order to protect the Government's interests I issued a detention order on the ship pursuant to section 124 of the Harbors Act, 1936-1974. This order was served on the master of the vessel shortly after midnight today. The South Australian agents (Patrick Agencies) were similarly served on their own behalf and on behalf of the vessel's owners this morning. The effect of the order requires the owner, the master or the agent of the vessel to pay actual damages or a deposit equal to the claim made by the Minister for the estimated amount of injury. The claim based on preliminary indications of cost is for \$1 000 000. Pilotage and mooring services will not be provided to the vessel until this matter is resolved. Commonwealth authorities were notified immediately this action was determined.

A check has been made with the principal users of the wharf to see how they will be affected and to help alleviate as far as possible any economic effects. The phosphate stockpiles at the Adelaide-Wallaroo plant are sufficient for normal production until February, 1978.

It will be six to eight weeks at the earliest before the next call by the sheep vessel currently using the port. It is hoped that the jetty can be restored sufficiently so that these two activities will not be adversely affected. Damage to the ship was negligible and there was fortunately no personal injury. I would like to stress that I have no intention of delaying the ship for longer than is necessary.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CONSUMER AFFAIRS

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** On July 20, 1977, the member for Hanson raised in this House the alleged delay by the Public and Consumer Affairs Department in investigating a complaint lodged by one of his constituents. The honourable member on that occasion quoted a letter that he had received from his constituent in which the Consumer Affairs Branch and its officers were referred to in extremely derogatory terms. The honourable member supported those remarks and saw fit to add his own criticisms of the branch to those of his constituent. The record should be put straight on this matter.

The letter referred to by the member for Hanson was dated December 7, 1976; it reached the branch on December 10. The constituent alleged he had been deceived over the engine capacity of a 1975 Mazda supplied to him by Barry Skinner Motors. The engine was allegedly smaller than he had wanted. At the time of this complaint the motor vehicles section of the branch had 306 investigations on hand. The letter was acknowledged on January 7, 1977. In the absence of Mr. Barry Skinner, sole Director of the company, the investigating officer spoke with Mr. J. Hickey, the employee who had delivered the Mazda about which the complaint had been received.

Mr. Hickey was unable to give details of the transaction, which he understood had been arranged personally by Mr. Barry Skinner, a friend of the constituent. Mr. Skinner and the constituent had worked for Cambridge Credit Limited before a liquidator for that company was appointed in 1975. Mr. Skinner was absent interstate and could not be contacted until February 22, when he denied emphatically that he had sold the vehicle. He said what had actually happened was that he had been approached by the constituent to sell a Fairlane and to try to get a smaller replacement vehicle. Three vehicles (a Capella and two Mazdas) were taken to the complainant constituent for examination. He selected one of the Mazdas.

This vehicle had been obtained from Bob Dawes Motors, Barry Skinner not having a vehicle in stock to suit the complainant's requirements. The Fairlane was then exchanged for the Mazda on a "straight swap" basis, no money changing hands. Three days after this information was supplied by Skinner, a sarcastic letter was received from the complainant requesting action on his complaint. The investigating officer unsuccessfully tried to contact the complainant by telephone on the Tuesday following, March 1.

Because of the unusual nature of the case the file was then submitted for legal opinion to the branch's solicitor. The opinion given was that the complainant was entitled



only to the warranty protection afforded by the Second-Hand Motor Vehicles Act. In point of fact, however, there was at no time any suggestion that the vehicle required any warranty work to be carried out on it. On March 22, the dealer's records were checked to ensure that the requirements of the Act were being complied with. On the same day the complainant's home was also visited by one of the officers of the branch, but no-one was home.

On March 25, the investigating officer again called, and this time spoke to the complainant's wife. She said that her husband was at work, but she did not know where he was employed. The complainant appeared to have made no attempt to contact the branch after this visit, and further inquiries were therefore made to find out where he worked. As a result, he was visited on March 28, by an officer, who rightly felt that the outcome of his inquiries should be conveyed personally to the complainant, who would then have the opportunity to ask whatever questions he might wish. No questions were asked on that occasion by the complainant, who said that he fully understood the situation as explained to him.

It would seem that the member for Hanson has either taken his constituent's reference to "over five months since I bought the car" as being a reference to the branch having taken five months to investigate the complaint, or else has assumed that his constituent's letter of May 31 was sent immediately after the branch had reported to him the outcome of its inquiries. The complainant's letter, however, was sent a clear two months after the branch had reported to him on March 28. The complainant himself has made no allegation of a five-month delay and, while the case certainly took much longer than normal (3½ months), there are unusual circumstances attaching to this particular inquiry that account for the delay.

The member for Hanson says that his constituent, in his letter, "thanked me very much and said that I must have telephoned them [the branch] and sprung them into action". The obvious implication of this comment is that the branch would have taken even longer than the imaginary five months had the honourable member not intervened. The truth, however, is that there is no record of the member for Hanson's having contacted the branch at any time on his constituent's behalf. When the member for Hanson raised this matter in the House, amongst other equally irrational statements, he said:

I want to warn the Government that it is under attack: its image is slipping. It knows it is in trouble, but it should not play the people of this State for fools. They are not fools, and neither are Opposition members.

It can be left to the House and the public to decide the veracity of those words. The member for Hanson has again shown his disrespect for facts. His frolic on this occasion proved upsetting to the staff of my department and costly and time consuming to research, simply in order to ensure that the true story could be told.

## QUESTIONS RESUMED

### MIGRANT EDUCATION

**Mr. TONKIN:** I had intended to ask a question of the Premier, but I understand that he is in Canberra filming Labor Party election advertisements.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** Which is a disgrace.

**Mr. TONKIN:** It is an odd priority. I therefore direct my

question to the Minister of Education. Is it not true that the responsibility for cutting back the courses offered by the Language and Migrant Education Centre is entirely the Minister's, and why does he perpetuate the fraud that the Federal Government is to blame for his decision? The announcement in this morning's press that language courses for migrants would be cut gave reduced funds for migrant education as the reason, and, true to form, the Minister blamed the Federal Government. The Federal allocation for the Technical and Further Education Department was increased by 22 per cent to \$9 300 000 this year, of which South Australia was granted \$423 000, also a 22 per cent increase on last year's allocation of \$349 820. This sum is a base grant.

All State Ministers, including our own Minister, who knows this very well, have been guaranteed by the Federal Government additional or supplementation grants provided they are applied for, to cover increased salaries or increased demands for adult migrant educational services in this financial year. These supplementation grants have been applied for and received by the States in the past, and there is no justification at all for the Minister's taking the base grant as the total figure for this year. The Minister has two courses of action open to him. He should apply to the Federal Government for a supplementation grant, and he should be vigorously pressing the State Cabinet for a share for his department of the 17 per cent increase in tax-sharing receipts (about \$507 000 000 this year) with which the Premier—

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** Are you saying—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister is out of order.

**Mr. TONKIN:** I am interested in the truth, and in the fact that Ministers opposite are consistently and constantly distorting the truth.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition is now commenting.

**Mr. TONKIN:** Whatever course of action the Minister adopts, he cannot absolve himself from the total responsibility for having cut back migrant language courses. In playing on the fears of the migrant community in this way, when there is no justification at all, the Minister is indulging in very shabby politics indeed.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I thank the Leader of the Opposition very much for that question, because only this week I have posted off to Senator Carrick a letter summarising the concern of this Government and of the Further Education Department about the situation—

**Mr. Tonkin:** Then why did you—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition is out of order.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** —in relation to adult migrant education.

**Mr. Dean Brown:** That's—

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

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The Leader of the Opposition cannot get out of the situation which applies in that the Further Education Department was advised by way of letter on September 5, 1977, as to the funds which would be available for us under the adult migrant education scheme. The amount is \$423 000, which falls far short of what is required in our programme. This has severely disrupted the adult migrant education programme for this year. I will spell out in a little bit of detail for the benefit of the House what that means. A withdrawal of Commonwealth commitment on 5½ lecturing positions previously funded has reduced the educational programme for 1977-78 by more than 37 000 student contact hours, and also affects important tasks relating to curriculum and

counselling. This represents a reduction of 18.3 per cent on the present programme. If further funds are not forthcoming from the Commonwealth, serious consideration must be given to retrenchments.

There has been no satisfactory solution of this problem. There has also been a withdrawal of funds for part-time lecturing positions. The result of the Commonwealth Government's decision not to fund commitments has effectively reduced the programme for part-time lecturing by \$145 000, a reduction of 34.3 per cent. This means that four advanced courses have been terminated; one course for Spanish speakers has closed down; two classes at B.H.P., Whyalla, have been reduced to one; and a one-day course for women at B.H.P., Whyalla, has been terminated. Two basic day courses and two basic evening courses were reduced from six hours to four hours, and other classes have been reduced by varying lengths of time.

It is interesting that we have received information from Canberra that Senator Carrick himself is concerned about this situation, and that is precisely why the letter has been sent at this time. I am hoping the Senator will have ammunition from all State members to get more funds from the Federal Treasury in order to get proper support for this programme. The Opposition cannot deny the level of support maintained by this Government. For example, no State can come anywhere near South Australia in the percentage of the total capital programme supported from State funds and, although the other States are closer to us in terms of recurrent expenditure, no-one can say in any way that the South Australian Government has let down the Further Education Department in funding support. The clear facts are there in relation to Commonwealth commitments which we have previously had in relation to support of Commonwealth migrant education classes, support which is no longer available, with the consequent lamentable results which I have just outlined.

We have written to the Commonwealth, requesting of Senator Carrick that he make additional efforts in order to obtain more finance from his Government. I hope we will have support from the Leader of the Opposition in this matter and that he will not continue to knock in this respect. I understand that all State Ministers, irrespective of political colour, are concerned about the matter and, as I have said, that Senator Carrick is also concerned.

#### SECURITY OFFICERS

**Mr. OLSON:** Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to protect the public against the irregular practices of security officers in departmental stores? My attention has been drawn to the method used by security officers from John Martin and Company Limited, in interviewing a customer at home, because they knew for a fact that this person had used another person's account without permission. Despite a strong denial by my constituent that this had occurred, the security officers told this person to sit down and listen to them, and that she would be charged with fraud.

The security officers asked who would look after her two small children and demanded that the woman accompany them back to John Martins store, where she was further questioned by the credit manager and security officers for a considerable time, and then permitted to leave. It seems that, because John Martins failed to check properly its accounts, this lady was accused of having a poor credit rating, and was considerably upset with the thought of a fraud charge, a suggestion that proved to be

groundless. The credit manager has since apologised to my constituent, indicating that John Martins will back her to the hilt, and this seems little enough in a case in which people use unauthorised power without proper control.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The circumstances of the matter described by the honourable member sound appalling. I do not know of this case, but I will have it examined. Apart from that I can say that Cabinet has approved of legislation to amend the Commercial and Private Agents Act in order to extend its provisions to ensure that so-called store investigators, detectives, and security officers will be covered by it, will have to be licensed, and will have to show publicly that they are people of good character suited to holding such positions.

**Mr. Chapman:** What about those who do not have those qualifications?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Some may not have those qualifications. I do not know the details, as the honourable member does not know the details, of persons involved in this industry. However, we have received enough complaints to indicate that it would be remiss of the Government if it did not seek to protect peoples' rights and privacy in this matter by ensuring that those who hold these positions are of good character. Therefore, at the earliest opportunity we will introduce amendments to that Act in order to give effect to licensing provisions to apply to store detectives and store security officers.

#### JAM FACTORY

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I wanted to ask a question of the Premier but, as he is away politicking, I have to address it to the Deputy Premier.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! That is not part of the question: the honourable member can do better than that.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Do the investigations into the trip of the former Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Jam Factory workshop authority reveal whether, while overseas at public expense, any material was collected for a private commercial partnership? During the Budget debate last week, when the matter was raised by the Opposition, the Premier, in reply to me, stated:

From the trip done by Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier, Mrs. Lemercier was able to demonstrate to Dr. Hackett as Chairman of the authority a series of craft areas which, without her expertise, South Australia would not have been able to get at all.

Later, the same evening, in reply to the member for Fisher, the Premier stated:

I personally expressed some disquiet at the total cost of the trip, because I believed that it was high, and I asked that this be fully investigated and accounted for. It was accounted for, but I think at a level which was more than would be the normal basis on which we would afford for this to be done.

It is reported in the Auditor-General's Report that Dr. Hackett and Mrs. Lemercier were away for nine weeks, that a consultancy fee of \$14 300 was paid to Mrs. Lemercier, and that the cost of travel and accommodation for the two of them for nine weeks was \$20 500. I undertook a study tour for the Parliament for about 13 weeks at a cost of between \$7 000 and \$8 000 and was accompanied by my wife. It seems to me that the cost of the trip to which I have referred was clearly excessive. I understand that soon after Dr. Hackett returned to South Australia he resigned as Chairman of the authority. Under the heading "Bird-picture scoop for new partnership", I read the following recent newspaper report:

This exquisite collection of hand-painted lithographs forms the nucleus of offerings for Chesser Prints—Adelaide's

newest art dealing partnership, Mrs. Karin Lemercier and Dr. Earle Hackett. The idea germinated from a shared interest in prints and areas of complementary knowledge and skills in the art world.

I therefore ask whether any of this material was collected during that trip, which was made at considerable public expense.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I will get a full report for the honourable member on the points that he has raised, and bring it down as soon as possible. I am not in a position to enlighten the House about anything the honourable member has raised in connection with either the trip or whether or not the opportunity was taken by the people concerned to collect anything in connection with the business to which the honourable member has referred.

### SCHOOL CERTIFICATE

**Mr. KLUNDER:** Can the Minister of Education give an indication of the status of the secondary school certificate and of any attempts to upgrade that status? The secondary school certificate is one of the two Year 12 certificates that are available to students. The other is the matriculation certificate. The secondary school certificate has generally been considered inferior to the matriculation to the point where some employers apparently prefer a student who has failed the matriculation to one who has passed his secondary school certificate. Since this is an inaccurate assessment of the relative merit of the two certificates, I would appreciate being informed if it is proposed to educate the public in this regard.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** The position as outlined by the honourable member is an admirable summation of what obtains at Year 12. It is of some concern to us that the internal matriculation, which was generated largely in consultation with employers, tends to be by-passed by them. In his policy speech, the Premier announced that we would be setting up a committee to review the whole of the assessment at Year 12 level. Whether that review will lead to an upgrading of the internal certificate course remains to be seen. It would be competent for the committee to make rather more radical recommendations. As the honourable member told me earlier today that he intended to seek information in the House on this matter, I have brought down with me the terms of reference of the inquiry which have now been accepted by Cabinet and which are as follows:

(1) To investigate and report on the suitability and adequacy of present forms and standards of assessment and certification at Year 12 level as preparation for:

- (a) the various forms of post-secondary study;
- (b) post-secondary employment.

The committee should consider the influence that Year 12 certificates have on selection procedures for students to enter Year 12.

(2) To examine and report on the future needs for:

- (a) certification by the Public Examinations Board and the Education Department at Year 12 level;
- (b) external assessment for entry to universities and other post-secondary educational institutions.

(3) To examine:

- (a) the future of the Public Examinations Board and the secondary school certificate administrative structure;
- (b) the advisability of establishing a single authority to administer all Year 12 certification.

(4) To recommend any necessary legislative changes.

I expect to be able to announce in a week or so the membership of the committee.

### URANIUM

**Mr. MATHWIN:** Can the Minister of Mines and Energy state whether the South Australian Government intends to continue the search for uranium in this State even though the Premier is today in Canberra filming a television commercial in which he advocates an indefinite ban on the mining and export of uranium? The Premier's jaunt to Canberra is the latest attempt by the Labor Party to explain its way out of the dilemma that it now faces on the uranium issue.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** You're in a dilemma.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. MATHWIN:** I will never be in as big a dilemma as has the Attorney-General in the past six months.

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** You're not—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Attorney-General is out of order.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** He always has been.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable member for Glenelg to continue with his question.

**Mr. MATHWIN:** The Labor Party, while in power in Canberra between 1972 and 1975, hawked Australian uranium around the world. It would have sold it to anyone! The Labor Party in Opposition, and our Premier, found themselves at the mercy of the left-wing extremists at the Australian Labor Party Conference in Perth, and the Party now advocates an indefinite ban on the mining and export of uranium. That is why the Attorney-General is so upset about it.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** The Government's view on exploration is that we have a right to know what are our resources, and those who explore for those resources have a right to know the limitations that might be placed on any exploitation of those resources.

**Mr. Chapman:** Take it out and have a look, and then put it back again.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** You do not get it out to have a look. The member for Alexandra is known to be ignorant, and he does not know what is involved in exploration. I think we had better ignore that interjection. May I say to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There are far too many interjections. I assure honourable members that I will not allow them any longer.

**Mr. Chapman:** There are far too many—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is out of order. Last Thursday I said that I would warn him. I hope he will now remain silent.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I understood that every member of this House, apart from the five new members on this side, and the member for Torrens and the member for Coles, voted for a proposition that no mining or export of uranium should take place from South Australia until we were all satisfied that it was safe so to do.

**Mr. Millhouse:** There was no opposition to that at all.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** True. Presumably members of the Opposition were rung up from Canberra the next day and were told off about the matter, and they have been trying to make it good ever since. To suggest, as does the member for Glenelg, that anyone who takes a position opposed to the mining and export of uranium is a left-wing extremist is introducing the politics of Joh Petersen into this State. One of the problems with the member for Glenelg in using these epithets is that he would not even know what a left-wing extremist was.

**Mr. Mathwin:** I'm talking about—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr. Mathwin:** —the Labor Party, and—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the honourable member for Glenelg. I was on my feet. He knows better than that. For the last time, I point out that I will warn honourable members on both sides.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** No mining or development of uranium will take place in this State until the Government is satisfied that it is safe to export uranium to a customer country. The Government is not so satisfied at the present time. Unless honourable members opposite are complete hypocrites, I would have thought that a number of members opposite hold that view genuinely, also. I know that the honourable member for Mitcham does. I would be interested to know which other members on the Opposition side hold that view.

The worst thing we can do, so far as any company is concerned, is create the expectation that something will take place which does not. It is not true that the Whitlam Government would have sold uranium to anyone. The member for Glenelg seems to have conveniently forgotten that it was the Whitlam Government that established the Fox inquiry and made clear that nothing would happen until the results of that inquiry had been obtained. That was the position. The member for Glenelg is seeking to suggest that anyone who is opposed to his point of view is in some sense a left-wing extremist, impossible, or not to be trusted. This simply will not do.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** That's always his attitude.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Henley Beach is out of order.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** Yes, Sir, he is very naughty.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister is naughty, too.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I apologise, Mr. Speaker. Every exploration company that is exploring for uranium in South Australia understands the position of the South Australian Government. I add that the main exploration activity, and the very big boost in exploration activity, is for copper and other minerals of that nature.

**Mr. Millhouse:** What do you propose for Roxby Downs?

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

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** It is true that, with the discovery of copper, uranium may also be found. If the resource is not viable without the production of uranium, obviously it will not be developed. Western Mining Corporation has another two years further exploration at Roxby Downs and many studies to undertake before it is in a position to decide anything about future exploitation of that resource. We can go on with all the puff in the world, but we will not know precisely what can be carried out at Roxby Downs for at least another two years.

**Mr. Millhouse:** And if your policy—

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** If the member for Mitcham (and I guess he might get a week next time) cared to read the supplement in the *Advertiser* this morning he would have seen that it was suggested that on the time scale involved at Roxby Downs there will not be any production before 1985.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I'm afraid you're twisting it a bit.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I could say things about the honourable member and about twisting things, but I will not.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** He would only be embarrassed.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** I think 1985 may be a bit

too far in the future. It is possible that production could get under way, I suspect, in about 1983, but it is a long way off. It will be a considerable time before it will be possible for anyone, let alone Western Mining Corporation, to determine whether any project is viable and what form the project will take—whether it should be open cut or underground.

**Mr. Millhouse:** But—

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** There is much work to be done; the member for Mitcham can ignore that point if he wants to.

**The SPEAKER:** I hope the honourable Minister will ignore any further interjections.

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** It is very difficult, because, if the member for Mitcham lacks anything, he does not lack persistence.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! This has been a very long answer. There is nothing in Standing Orders to stop this, but I hope the Minister will make it short.

**Mr. Millhouse:** I hope—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order; the next time I will warn him.

### NATIONAL PARKS

**The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL:** Can the Minister for the Environment inform me of his department's intentions regarding the staffing of our national parks and conservation parks? There has been some unfair criticism recently about such staffing, and I am aware that it has been the department's philosophy that it has been most important for us to expend as much available money as possible on the purchase of land for national parks before they are cleared. Accordingly, we have now reached a situation where this State's national park proportion of land stands up very well compared to that of other States. However, because so much expenditure has been directed toward the purchase of land for our parks, it could well be that we have not kept up with our staff numbers to manage those parks. Can the Minister tell us the current position in relation to this matter?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The points made by the honourable member are most relevant. The Government's policy is that 5 per cent of this State's land mass would be reserved in representative samples for national parks. I established that policy in 1966, when, as Minister of Lands, I was responsible for this State's national parks. However, that target has not yet been quite achieved. The honourable member is correct in saying that it was a deliberate policy of the Government to devote resources, financial and otherwise, to be set aside for national parks before it was too late. That policy has been followed consistently not only by this Government but by the Hall Government and the Walsh-Dunstan Governments in the 1960's. I have posed to the Acting Director of the department, and through him, to the person responsible for the management of this State's national parks (Mr. Lyon), a series of questions designed to enable me to review the current situation as to whether or not the Government should now place added impetus on the development and management of national parks, or a greater effort than has been the case in the past. I hope that the information I have sought from him (I think it was only last week that I sent the request for the various points) will be forthcoming soon, and that it will enable me to head up a proposal to place before Cabinet. If the points I have raised are met, and if the queries I have raised are as I suspect they might be, I will head up a proposal to Cabinet that might lead to an increase in the

staffing regarding the development and management of this State's national parks. That is the current situation, and just as soon as I am able I will inform the House of any change of policy in this matter.

#### MARINE FIBRE DEPOSITS

**Mr. WOTTON:** Can the Minister for the Environment say why the Government has granted 137 licences for the exploration of marine fibre deposits in St. Vincent and Spencer Gulfs, despite a warning in a recent environmental report that the mining of marine fibres would create enormous ecological problems? The licences, which cover 68 square kilometres, have been granted in full to Lithominerals Proprietary Limited, a subsidiary of Centamin Limited, whose Chairman is Mr. L. M. Lee. The Government has apparently chosen to ignore a report which was prepared by the Agriculture and Fisheries Department and Flinders University and which warns of the dangers of marine fibre mining. According to a recent report in the *Advertiser*, Lithominerals has already made extensive investigations into this project.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** As I understand the situation, the Agriculture and Fisheries Department has issued these licences for exploration purposes. It is my information that they are purely exploratory and that any decision to mine seaweed will be viewed at such a time as any use can be found for it. I understand that there is no useful economic purpose for the harvesting of seaweed.

**Mr. Wotton:** The licences have been granted.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Exploration licences, yes. They are not for the mining or collection of seaweed. I think they are to enable the parties concerned to take small amounts of seaweed to see whether or not any use can be made of it.

**Mr. Millhouse:** You gave me the answer.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** There was a Question on Notice. I thought the member for Murray had asked it, but apparently it was the member for Mitcham. The licences are purely exploratory, and certainly the environmental aspects would be considered before any licences were issued to mine or collect seaweed. It will be two years before any decision of that nature will be taken.

#### INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

**Mr. ABBOTT:** Has the Minister of Labour and Industry any up-to-date information on the extent of industrial disputes in South Australia as compared to the rest of the nation, and can he furnish the House with that information? The Australian media and people generally are becoming more aware that there is an alternative to the bluster and confrontation being practised by the Federal and State Liberal Governments in industrial affairs, as is shown by the increasing number of references in the media to the consensus policies of the South Australian Government. I ask my question so that the House and the people at large can be given an opportunity to judge the success of those policies above the ones practised in other States—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is commenting.

**Mr. ABBOTT:**—that produce the disputes that make the headlines.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I am pleased that the honourable member has seen fit to ask this question. This is an area in which we keep a close watch. We have a keen

interest in it, and we have a reputation at stake. The reputation of South Australia is being enhanced and improved daily.

**Mr. Chapman:** It would want to. It's been bad for a long time.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** It might have been bad under a Liberal Government, but it has not been bad under a Labor Government.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Alexandra is out of order. I intend to warn the honourable member on the next occasion.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** The member for Alexandra well knows that, for a continuing period of about seven or eight years, South Australia led the field in industrial relations. That is indisputable. Only someone inexperienced in industrial relations and as naive as the member for Alexandra would make that statement. The Bureau of Statistics has just released the figures for industrial disputes in July. In terms of man-days lost, the national total rose slightly in July from 158 300—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister is answering the question.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:**—to 160 000, and in South Australia the total fell by 25 per cent from 2 400 to 1 800. For the second month running, we had the lowest total of any State, including those with a work force smaller than ours. The figure represents 1.1 per cent of the national total, whereas this State has more than 9 per cent of the national work force. In every month of this year, and in all but two of the past 12 months, South Australia has had the lowest total of all the mainland States, and generally far below the next lowest.

I think it is incumbent on me to make a few comments. The situation in South Australia, as in other States, has not been easy for industry or for trade unions operating within the wage indexation system. I think the employers and the trade union officials and members in South Australia should be commended for their attitude over the past 12 months. There has not been any attempt by either side to promote disputes in this State. The record speaks for itself, and the Government alone cannot take the credit. I believe that everyone who has worked in industry, and industry itself, can take some share of credit for the present situation in South Australia. I commend those parties.

#### MURRAY RIVER SALINITY

**Mr. ARNOLD:** Can the Minister of Works give details of the three-State plan to reduce salinity in the Murray River, and does he see more value flowing from this proposal than was achieved from the Gutteridge, Haskins and Davey report? In today's *Advertiser*, an article reporting on the three-State and Commonwealth meeting of Ministers in Canberra yesterday states:

A steering committee of senior Commonwealth and State officers had been appointed to engage and direct consultants in the development of the plan. The consultants will be asked to assess present and potential salinity and drainage problems in the Murray Valley, to identify all options for dealing with them, and to recommend priorities for their implementation. No doubt many people in South Australia are concerned about this matter (and if they are not, they should be) and take it seriously. I am interested to know what details the Minister can give, and whether he can see greater benefits flowing from a further inquiry, which I hope sincerely there will be, than was achieved from the Gutteridge report.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** At the outset I can tell the honourable member that the consultant's work will not be in any way similar to the work undertaken by the Gutteridge, Haskins and Davey inquiry. The honourable member would be aware (and I make this point to the House) that that report, which was received in 1970, emphasised the need for further investigation. I have made the point previously to the honourable member that only two of the recommendations in the Gutteridge report were found to be feasible. The honourable member and other Opposition members have been critical of the Government because of the lack of speed with which we have come forward with solutions to this problem. From time to time I have heard Opposition members (and not necessarily the honourable member) asking why we did not give effect to the recommendations of the Gutteridge report. The answer, frankly, is that we could not have done so and, if we had, we would have wasted the Government's money. I am delighted that the honourable member has raised this question, because I view yesterday's conference as a major breakthrough (in fact, one of the most important breakthroughs we have had) and as being far more important than the extension of the functions of the River Murray Commission, because this is a concerted approach by the three State Governments and the Commonwealth Government to the salinity problem in the Murray Basin. The consultants to be employed by the steering committee set up yesterday by the Ministers' conference (and the committee will consist of very senior officers from each State and the Commonwealth) will select consultants, and the terms of reference have been laid down for the consultants. I do not have them with me now, but I will obtain a copy for the honourable member. Basically, the consultants will be required to examine various projects that each State has developed in connection with salinity mitigation within its State, and will establish a priority that will enable the Federal Government to fund, for the first time, and assist the States for works within the State boundaries. In other words, if it is considered by the consultants that it is important, for example, to do work in Victoria that will have a beneficial effect on the whole system, that work will gain priority over anything else.

**Mr. Arnold:** That's the way it should be.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I agree with the honourable member. It will require a statesman-like approach by the various States, because it is inevitable, for political and other reasons, that pressures will be brought to bear on various Ministers from time to time to have work done within a State's boundaries. State Governments are competent to do that work from their own funds. The priorities that States place on work within their own borders will not be interfered with. That is also important. It will be a guide more than anything else to the Federal Government in relation to its funding of salinity mitigation measures along the whole system.

For two reasons it has been a major breakthrough. First, we have a recognition by the Federal Government that its financial participation in the matter is necessary and, secondly, we have, I hope, a properly planned and properly based priority of work for the first time ever. It will be a concerted and co-ordinated attack on the problem. The honourable member would know that within our own State we have issued for public consumption a series of options that we could put into effect within our State's boundaries.

It is possible that the Federal Government could assist us with some of these works. As the honourable member would know, 60 per cent of the salt that goes into the sea from the Murray mouth emanates from outside our State's

border, and 40 per cent emanates from within the border.

**Mr. Arnold:** I thought it was more than that.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** The latest figure I have seen is 60 per cent. I sighted that figure yesterday. The honourable member would appreciate that anything that is done in the other States to alleviate the situation would be of dramatic benefit to South Australia. It would be useless for South Australia to spend vast sums of money to diminish the salinity problem in our own system within our own State if further expansion occurred upstream that aggravated the situation.

Yesterday, to enable us to stabilise the situation and attack the problem, I sought from both the New South Wales and Victorian Ministers an assurance that increased activity would not occur. The River Murray Commission will also be involved in this matter, because the Executive Engineer of the River Murray Commission, Mr. Johnson, will be a member of the steering commission that will be involved in setting up the consultants. The consultants will be required to report to the Federal and State Governments within six months. We are not wasting any time on this matter; indeed, as the honourable member would appreciate, we have been long enough already in reaching this situation.

I am delighted to say, without trying to capture any kudos for myself, that it was a letter which was drawn up by my department and which was sent by the Premier to the Prime Minister back in October, 1976, that led to yesterday's conference. The conference took place because the other two States involved got behind us. I have been talking constantly to representatives from those States and impressing on them the need to do something about the situation. I have highlighted the fact that South Australia is at the bottom end of the system and is therefore far worse off than is any other State that benefits from the great resource of the Murray River. I am absolutely delighted that that has happened. I am confident that, with the spirit that prevailed yesterday at the conference, something positive will come of it.

#### WEIGHBRIDGES

**Mr. GROTH:** Has the Minister of Transport any details regarding the erection by the Highways Department of new weighbridges on the Main North and Port Wakefield Roads? I have been prompted to ask this question by a report that appeared in the *Salisbury, Elizabeth, Gawler and Munno Para News-Review* of Friday, October 14. The report is as follows:

Good news for those householders who have long been suffering from the noise and exhaust pollution of heavy trucks, which should really be using the Main North Road and the Wakefield Road. Last week I noted contractors building a large weighbridge on the side of the Wakefield Road and well north of Adelaide. Reliable sources indicate that similar things are to happen on the Main North Road. When the work is completed it will be a waste of time for the drivers of heavies to come through the built up areas to evade a weight test. They will have to face the northern bridges, no matter how many detours they make.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** There are two weighbridges now under construction, first, there is the 50-tonne twin deck weighbridge being erected on the Stirling North deviation of the Main North Road about five kilometres south of Port Augusta, a contract for the erection of which was let to Allco Steel on August 31, 1977. That weighbridge is due to be completed on December 31, 1977. At the same time, a similar weighbridge is being

erected on the Port Wakefield Road just north of Port Wakefield on the Adelaide side of the Snowtown turnoff. The weighbridge is being erected under a contract to L. M. Robertson. The contractor has work well in hand, and I expect the weighbridge to be in operation next month.

#### CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS ACT

**Mrs. ADAMSON:** Can the Attorney-General say whether the Classification of Publications Act breaches the articles of the United Nations Treaty No. 710 which the Australian Government has signed and ratified and which controls the circulation and traffic in obscene publications?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

#### WALLAROO MISHAP

**Mr. VENNING:** Will the Minister of Works try to ensure that compensation covering all aspects associated with or caused by the Wallaroo mishap will be covered? I commend the Minister for his quick action in placing a ban on the vessel concerned leaving Wallaroo. I hope that the Minister can expedite in a similar manner the reconstruction of the mishap. In his statement to the House today the Minister said that the problem of loss of work to waterside workers must be considered in relation to compensation. When I was at Wallaroo this morning (and I was there as the member for the district and not as someone associated with bulk handling) I saw trucks being loaded with grain. After making inquiries I ascertained that 6 000 tonnes of barley was being road transported to Ardrossan to a ship that had been diverted there from Wallaroo. I have referred to some of the implications and complications of the mishap. I therefore ask the Minister whether he will try to have all these aspects covered by the compensation side of the problem.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I take it that the honourable member wants me to reconstruct not the mishap but the facility.

**Mr. Millhouse:** The damage caused by the mishap.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** Exactly. In my statement this afternoon I said that an investigator from the Legal Services Department had been sent to Wallaroo to initiate investigations into the indirect effects of the accident. I referred to property damage to third persons, loss of income return, and things of that nature. I will ask the Legal Services Department to ensure that that aspect is considered or is covered in any inquiry or investigation made.

The honourable member would appreciate that the claim that could be made by the Government in this matter could be disputed by the shipowners, their agents or whoever acts for them and that we could well have some difficulty in that area. However, we will do the best we can.

#### YOUTH PROJECT

**Mr. MAX BROWN:** Could the Minister of Education examine the possibility of allowing old discarded school dwellings that were used originally by the special school in Plum Street, Whyalla, to be relocated in the Whyalla-Stuart area for use as a recreational youth activity project? I understand that this project is now being examined by a small community group interested in providing an amenity

for young people in the area. There is real need in Whyalla for a project to be established mainly for young people that would more or less get them off the street and involve them in recreational occupations. The area where it is foreseen that the project will be established has for many years sadly lacked a community project of this description. If I could get the Minister's assistance for this project, I believe it would provide a real avenue of recreation for this type of person.

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I had not visited this school. The implication from the honourable member's question seems to be that the buildings in question are timber transportable buildings. I will ask the Regional Director (Mr. Edwards) whether these buildings are needed urgently elsewhere in his region. If this is not the case, we will do whatever we can to satisfy the request.

**The SPEAKER:** As I earlier mistakenly called on successively two members of the Opposition to ask their questions, I will now call on a second successive Government member.

#### NORTH-EAST ROAD INTERSECTION

**Mrs. BYRNE:** Will the Minister of Transport obtain information on the latest position relating to the installation of traffic signals at the intersection of North-East and Hancock Roads, Tea Tree Gully? I have explained on previous occasions why this intersection needs a high priority. From time to time, I receive representations from constituents expressing concern at the dangerous situation at this intersection. The last time I raised this matter I received a reply from the Minister dated March 17, 1977.

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** I thought I had the programme for this year with me but I do not have it. I will certainly obtain the information for the honourable member and let her have it.

#### APPRENTICES

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Will the Minister of Labour and Industry investigate immediately the apparent shortage of teaching staff in certain trade areas, a shortage that has meant that two employees who were apprenticed in January, 1977, have not been able to commence training until now at the Marlestone Technical College? Will the Minister bring down a full report on all areas where the Further Education Department has not been able to meet the demands for the training of apprentices?

It was recently brought to my attention that two employees who were apprenticed to L. G. Abbott and Company Proprietary Limited in January, 1977, had not commenced, as of last week, their trade training at the Marlestone Technical College because of the lack of teaching staff at the college. I understand that one employee started training this week, and the other will start on November 14 with block training. When the South Australian Glass Merchants Association asked the reason why this situation had arisen, the following reply dated September 20, 1977, was received from Mr. C. I. Hayes, Chairman of the Apprenticeship Commission:

I have now a reply from the Principal Education Officer which is as follows:

1. The department has only one glass-working teacher who has a full teaching load teaching second and third year apprentices and it is therefore correct to say that first year apprentices have not yet commenced their training in 1977.

2. The department has advertised seeking another glass-working teacher, but they are not easy to find. Some applications have been received, and if they are of a high enough standard to warrant employment it is hoped that the apprentices will be called up for training in 1977.

Another case where training could not commence was brought to my attention in March. Where the training has not commenced, the employer does not receive the rebate from the Commonwealth Government. In view of high unemployment, it is important that Parliament be informed of the extent of this shortage of teaching staff.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I will be delighted to pass on the question to the Minister of Education, who is clearly responsible for this area. I suppose the honourable member could really have asked him the question.

*At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

### PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 6, Page 21.)

**Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition):** I support the Bill. Because of the election having been called well before its time, this Bill has been presented to the House for the second time. The second reading explanation has been altered, but only marginally. Obviously, the Premier has now seen the error of his initial intemperate criticism of the Commonwealth Government, particularly in relation to urban public transport, and there is a clear lesson indeed to be learnt. I am pleased that the Acting Premier, acting perhaps not as well as his Thespian colleague but nevertheless acting, seems to be taking such an interest. I hope he will learn something. There is no question at all that the original speech made in relation to these Loan Estimates was made before the introduction of the Federal Budget. There is no excuse for any State Treasurer, no matter where he comes from, no matter what is his Party, to level the sort of criticism which has been levelled by our State Premier and Treasurer against a Federal Government on the basis of hearsay and supposition, and with politicking his major consideration.

It was a sharp and amazing contrast to see the report of the Premiers' Conference held last week. It was a vastly different reaction from that normally made by our State Premier. Normally he is the first one on television immediately the conference concludes. Breathing fire, doom and destruction, he uses every opportunity he can to blame the Federal Government for everything he possibly can. This time after the conference he was quoted as saying, "I am as happy as I can be."

That is an interesting situation because nothing has changed. The Right Honourable Mr. Lynch in August, 1977, made some quite definite statements as to how much the South Australian Government was likely to get, and he quoted the sum of \$507 000 000. He said that under the tax-sharing entitlement for this financial year we would get that sum, which represented an increase of 17 per cent over the previous sum. All of that was well known to everyone and certainly to any State Treasurer who cared to acknowledge the fact. Yet before the State election we heard doom and destruction being preached by the Premier on every possible occasion with blame appor-

tioned to the Federal Government without any credit being given to it of any sort. Now after the State election we have heard the Premier saying, "I am as happy as I can be." Yet nothing has changed, and this shows how strongly some people can be motivated by purely political reasons.

There is every reason for all Premiers to be happy at the virtual completion of what amounts to the first stage of the Commonwealth-State tax-sharing arrangements. These are matters vital to the consideration of the Loan Estimates because of the present need, the reverse of that in years gone by, for the transfer of funds from general revenue to the Loan Account. This has been the situation in the past few years and demonstrates the growing ability and responsibility of the States to decide their own priorities, which is exactly as it should be. That is pleasing to a Party such as ours, which is dedicated to returning as much financial responsibility as is possible to the States, instead of having total control from Canberra.

One of the most insidious and effective methods of achieving Canberra control of the States under the Whitlam Administration was the ever-increasing use of the system of tied grants, under section 96 of the Constitution, to provide funds for the States, particularly funds for specific projects. I think it is wise, particularly in today's economic and political climate, to remind the people of South Australia and members of this House of the situation which applied under the Whitlam Administration, a situation that very nearly saw the demise of State Government responsibility in this State. A reference to the Premier's statement on the Loan Estimates in 1974 will give a clear indication of the extent to which the affairs of this State were at the mercy of the Federal Labor Government at that time. Obviously, it is pertinent now to examine the situation as it was then, so that we can more easily appreciate the much better situation that this State enjoys now.

I do not think anyone would deny that the situation is very much healthier in South Australia as a result of the change in Federal Government than it would have been at this time if we had gone on being slowly strangled by the system of tied grants imposed by the Whitlam Administration. That statement in 1974 contained references to "The Australian Government", which honourable members will recall was the Labor Party's term for the Federal Government, 46 times in its 19 pages. It referred to requests for additional grants from the Australian Government and the whole tenor was one of complete dependence on Federal funds. In fact, there was a total uncertainty about that document which was quite amazing. On August 13, 1974, I said in this House:

I know that it is Australian Labor Party policy, as stated in its book, to say that, as the Australian Government is providing most of the money, it should have most of the say as to what shall be done with the money.

This totally ignores the fact that the money comes from the taxpayers' pocket, whether it comes from the Commonwealth or the State. I went on to say:

I do not agree that, because the Commonwealth Labor Government raises most of the revenue in Australia, it should have the entire say as to how the money shall be spent, yet that is exactly what the Treasurer's second reading explanation states.

It quite clearly supported the principle that, because the Commonwealth Government was the tax raising agent, it should have the total say as to how every bit of money should be spent. We all know why. I went on to explain that by saying:

This State is virtually being told that, unless it agrees to use money for loan purposes in the way the Commonwealth



Government says it must use it, it will get no further grants. Although it is not actually spelt out in so many words, the meaning and inference are basically clear. There is no doubt that the Commonwealth Government controls the purse strings of the State, that the Treasurer is nothing more than a puppet, that he does what he is told and so do his Ministers. They say, "Yes, please" every time the Commonwealth Government offers them special grants.

I think it is worth recalling those days and worth looking back to see what a degree of influence the Whitlam Administration was able to exert over a passive and, in fact, willing State Labor Government which was prepared, when threatened with rape, to lie down and invite it, because that was exactly what was happening.

The State Labor Government in South Australia not only welcomed the advances of the Federal Government but also encouraged them. There is no doubt in my mind that the Federal Labor Government was, at that stage, well on the way to the total financial control of South Australia, and this situation was repeated again in 1975. As so often happened, the Loan Estimates were introduced into this House before the Commonwealth Budget was introduced, and the introduction of the Whitlam-Hayden Budget caused considerable embarrassment to the State Government at that time, because it did not know where it stood and what funds it was getting. It became quite apparent in the Treasurer's document that it did not have a clue. It was full of hopes and expectations; that is all it had. I referred at the time to Mr. Micawber and the continual hope that something was bound to turn up, because that is what the Treasurer's document resembled.

There was even some suggestion at that time that the document should have been withdrawn, redrawn, and resubmitted to this House, because the actual decisions in the Federal Budget materially affected the expectations in the State's Loan Estimates. Again, I said at that time:

The . . . thing that comes out clearly from this document is the almost dependence that this State now has on the Commonwealth in relation to specific grants made for specific purposes under Section 96 of the Constitution and the amounts made available for allocation and consideration in this Loan Estimates programme. After the Commonwealth Budget we can clearly see the dangers that arise from that attitude, from that total dependence on the Commonwealth Government. Not only are we dependent on the Commonwealth Government for our money supply but we are totally dependent on the Commonwealth Government to determine our priorities. No longer have we in this State the ability to decide our own priorities for spending; those decisions have largely been taken out of our hands and taken over by the Commonwealth Government, because those who pay the piper call the tune. Whether or not we want them to pay the piper is another thing: We are not given any option in the matter. This degree of dependence has been arrived at by collusion between the State Government and the Commonwealth, which are both working to implement Australian Labor Party policy for centralism. They both have, as their long-term objectives, clearly and obviously stated, the abolition of the States, and the sooner they can get this State into a totally dependent condition where it will have to sell out all its assets to the Commonwealth and cease to exist as an entity the sooner they will be pleased. This is something we must continue to keep in mind at all times.

That situation still pertains. That is the ultimate aim and objective of the Australian Labor Party. This was in fact the situation when the Whitlam Government was forced to face the people at the end of 1975, and the people of Australia, and of South Australia, made their views known decisively and without any question of doubt by

reflecting the Labor Party and it aims. It was not common to hear the Premier blaming the Whitlam Federal Government at that time. He made one or two token exercises, but there was nothing sustained about it.

In fact, because of its wide-spread control over the State's affairs, he had every justification for blaming the Whitlam Government. But the instant the Fraser Federal Government was chosen by the people, he began to blame it most vociferously for everything he could. Can the people of South Australia forget that under the Whitlam Government, supported by the Premier, the inflation rate in South Australia reached an all-time high of almost 18 per cent. Can we forget that, even now, the present inflation rate in South Australia is higher than in any other State?

Can anyone doubt that, following the irresponsible spending of the Whitlam era, severe measures were necessary to counter the disastrous inflationary trends which resulted? Can anyone doubt that the Labor Party, if ever given a chance to work in a Federal-State, Whitlam-Dunstan partnership again, would adopt exactly the same stance as before, and rapidly reduce this country to its knees again?

The Premier and his members may protest all they wish, but they cannot erase from the record the list of reprehensible actions, against the best interests of this State, which they took during the term of the Whitlam Administration. The Australian people learnt their lesson the hard way, but they have learnt it well.

There is no doubt that restraints on Commonwealth public spending have imposed a need for stringency and discipline on State expenditure, particularly, of course, on the capital works programme. This restraint has been felt more severely because of the stark contrast which it offers to what was virtually a free-wheeling economy, a free-wheeling approach with an unlimited supply of funds, a concept created by the Whitlam Government.

The past two years have not been easy ones; nobody pretends they have been. They have not been easy for individuals or for any States, and it is a great credit to the Australian people as a whole and the sense of responsibility they have developed that they have recognised that overspending and overcommitment in previous years have made this degree of restraint necessary. It is also quite evident that the South Australian Premier is totally out of step and out of sympathy with his colleagues, the Premiers of other States, as well as with the Commonwealth Government. We can accept that he will be out of step with the Commonwealth Government as a matter of principle, regardless of the rights and wrongs of it. The Premier is not only out of step with the Commonwealth Government and the Liberal Premiers but also he is out of step with his Labor Party colleagues, and it is about time somebody told him that.

The Premier has consistently advocated increases in public sector spending and reduction in tax rates as a way of overcoming inflation and unemployment but there is no doubt that at any time he is quite content to add whatever difficulties he can to the Commonwealth Government's handling of what has been recognised as one of the most difficult inflationary situations ever to face not only Australia but the world as a whole.

He is still depending, I suspect, on an artificially high inflation rate to finance his works. He is still back in the Keynesian era. He has not yet recognised that advances have been made and that there are now differences in accounting and in economic theories. He still holds to the Keynesian theory as his bible. In doing so, he shows himself to be totally and absolutely behind the times and outdated. He hopes that inflation will provide for him the

additional funds he needs to finance his own works. He wants to have an artificially high inflation rate so that he can ask the Commonwealth Government for higher payments. That is an easy way of running a State, but it is not the best way of running a State or of managing an economy. It is a very selfish approach, one which does not take account of the best interests of the country as a whole or of South Australia. Now, we are beginning to see the results of that attitude in South Australia's high inflationary rate and the rapidly increasing rate of unemployment in this State—a rate which, I point out again, is increasing more rapidly than that in any other Australian State. It is soon most likely that we will equal the highest rate there is, and it is nothing of which we, as South Australians, can be or want to be proud. It is nothing of which this Government can be proud.

Fortunately, it is a great credit to the Federal Government (let us give credit where credit is due) that its economic policies have now been further vindicated by the release of the September quarter consumer price index figures. The underlying rate of inflation has fallen substantially, but not as it should have done, in South Australia. It has gone up over the previous quarter by 2.5 per cent, the largest increase of any capital city in Australia, and the change from the corresponding quarter of the previous year shows that the c.p.i. in Adelaide has risen 14.7 per cent, which is again the highest of any capital city in Australia.

The effects of the Premier's outdated economic theories and the fact that he is out of step with the rest of Australia are now becoming obvious to South Australians, and this is reflected in increasing prices and in the cost of living. Contrary to the Premier's claims regarding uniform criticism of Commonwealth policy by himself and by the Premiers of other States, the facts are (as they have always been, and as they have been seen to be by other State Governments) that a reduction in the Federal deficit was a necessary prerequisite and a fundamental and cardinal requirement to controlling inflation and building a basis for an early economic recovery.

All State Governments have been restrained during the past two years, and there are now signs that the Federal Government is preparing to relax some of its stringent restrictions. Planning for future capital works can proceed on this basis. It is completely consistent with our attitude that inflation must be defeated in order to use public works involving private enterprise in the building and construction industry as a vehicle for expanding employment and stimulating the level of economic activity. I had said elsewhere, and on several occasions, that I hope that interest rates will fall. I believe that this will occur, as the Commonwealth Treasurer and the Premiers of Victoria and Western Australia have already indicated. With many others, I am concerned at the consequences of interest rates, which have been sustained at high levels because of the rate of inflation. This prolonged and sustained elevation of interest rates has a lasting effect on the cost structure of the whole nation, and this must be avoided if at all possible. This effect does not disappear even when interest rates fall. The burden is felt in increased charges for energy, water, costs of manufacturing and distribution, on working capital of small businesses and farmers, on local government rates, on household budgets, and on the capacity of young couples to buy a house, and on every single aspect of our everyday life.

The scheduled aggregate of expenditure proposals for 1977-78 is \$259 000 000, compared to the actual figure of \$261 125 156 for 1976-77. The Loan Council approvals for 1977-78 account for \$186 853 000 of the aggregate. There

is a \$12 000 000 special transfer from Revenue Account, and \$59 547 000 through other repayments and recoveries. The absolute decline in the scheduled aggregate is therefore explained by State accounting procedures and regeneration of funds at the State level.

The Premier made a great deal of his assertion (now thoroughly discredited) that South Australia had been singled out for especially bad treatment by the Federal Government. This remarkable misrepresentation has been repeated in his second reading explanation of this Bill and, because of this, it is necessary to have another look at the facts and spell them out yet again. This preposterous statement should never have been made in the first place. It is estimated that in 1977-78 South Australia will receive \$1 130 000 000 in funds from the Commonwealth, compared to \$959 000 000 in 1975-76 under the Whitlam Administration. If anyone needs reminding of it, that Labor Government was completely disowned by the South Australian Government during the 1975 State election.

Per head of population, South Australia is due to receive an estimated \$882.90, compared to the six-State average of \$772.58; this amount is about \$120 a head more than South Australia received under the Whitlam Government in 1975-76, and represents an amount per head appreciably above that of other States. For example, in the current year New South Wales will receive \$658.34 a head, Victoria \$646.60 a head, and Queensland \$749.76 a head. The funds allocated to South Australia for hospital development have been the subject of statements by the Premier that are completely ridiculous. He said:

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.

On examination, we find South Australia's allocation was treated similarly to that of other States, except that Tasmania, which is a Labor State, received an increase of 82 per cent. South Australia's reduction of about 61 per cent was the same as that for Western Australia, and only marginally more than that for New South Wales. New South Wales and Victoria both had a reduction of 56 per cent, whereas Queensland's reduction was 58 per cent. To suggest a deliberate maltreatment of a particular State by the Commonwealth Government (no matter what its political complexion might be and what State is involved) is a deliberate attempt to mislead the House and the people of South Australia, whom this Parliament represents.

South Australia scored the third highest increase in total payments to the States (12.7 per cent) and the third highest increase in total payments and Loan Council borrowings (11.8 per cent)—ahead of Victoria, Tasmania, and Queensland. Victoria received an increase of 10.9 per cent, Tasmania received 10.5 per cent more, and Queensland received 9.7 per cent more. How on earth can the Premier stand up publicly and justify making the kind of statement that South Australia has had a particularly raw deal? There is only one word for that kind of comment, namely, garbage, and the Premier knows it full well.

The Premier made the following idiotic political remark:

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 all the States what funds we will get in the future for certain projects.

That sort of statement would be laughable if it were not made by someone of considerable position and authority in this State.

**Mr. Mathwin:** The song and dance man.

**Mr. TONKIN:** It is a song and dance. Other Ministers

have made similar statements in the past, and only today we saw the Minister of Education abrogating his responsibility. In the answer he gave to a question I asked on funding for migrant language services, he carefully said that various positions had been cut, and that it would be necessary to cut back on the courses. He did not say, however, that it was his decision to make those cuts. He tried to throw the blame on the Federal Government for lack of funding, but he was saying really that he had not pushed hard enough and made the appropriate application for supplementation grants. He had not pushed hard enough in his own Cabinet to get funds allocated from the additional funds due to the State from the tax-sharing arrangements to apply to his own department's programme.

**Mr. Mathwin:** He's no—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I am listening intently to the Leader of the Opposition, and during the course of today I have allowed the member for Glenelg to go on interjecting for some time. I hope he will cease interjecting.

**Mr. TONKIN:** That situation applies to all Ministers. They have for so long successfully abrogated their responsibilities by blaming the Federal Government for a lack of funds (a claim which is now palpably false) that they do not know how to stand up for their departments, putting the case for their departments and battling and fighting for their share of the available funds. All Ministers opposite are guilty of this. Instead of lashing out and blaming the Federal Government at every opportunity, regardless of the facts, the Premier and his Ministers should accept their responsibilities for managing the State and for looking after their own departments, and they should face facts. This is something, obviously, which they are not prepared to do. We have seen other examples of this; the Premier and the Minister responsible for housing will not accept what everyone else in Australia knows: the cost of building in South Australia is higher than that in any other mainland State. If Ministers and the Premier will not accept that a problem exists, how can they set about remedying it? That is the dilemma in which South Australia finds itself today.

Let us look at the payments to the States for 1977-78. South Australia received the largest increase of all States in the areas of technical and further education (and this is particularly significant after what we have heard the Minister of Education saying today; his is the department which is responsible for migrant language courses); in senior citizens centres; growth centres; leisure and cultural facilities; and in the dairy adjustment programme. Approvals for State works and housing indicate that South Australia will receive more per head of population in 1977-78 than will any other mainland State. Where are the Premier's claims now? South Australia will receive an estimated \$191.73 a head for State works and housing, compared to the six-State average of \$132.04 a head.

On the other hand, South Australia receives the lowest estimated per capita figure for State, semi-government, and local authorities, at \$71.21 a head, compared to the six-State average of \$115.27. If we take those figures together (total State works and housing, semi-government and local government authorities), it means that South Australia will receive an estimated \$262.93 a head. This compares with the six-State average of \$247.31 a head, and is again the highest of all the mainland States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, has the Premier the gall to stand up anywhere and say that South Australia has been getting a particularly bad deal? The smile on the face of the Minister of Labour and Industry clearly indicates that the Premier does not have to worry any more. He has got through his election. He has peddled his distortions of the

truth and assertions twisting the facts. He has won his election and, for the next two years at least, he does not have to worry about the truth any more. That is it. He will start distorting it again when we head up towards the next election. The tragedy is that no-one, until now, has questioned it and he has got away, as was said during the election campaign, with blue murder. The Premier has been far from honest in his approach until now, and the figures show that.

Let us admit that South Australia has not received as much as the Government of this State would like, but neither has any other State. In comparison with the other States, we have done well indeed, but still we have not received everything we would like. Every State Government, of whatever complexion, likes to receive as much as possible for its own State and its own people, but we have not heard the same screams of anguished outrage from the other Premiers as we have heard from the master of the soft shoe shuffle opposite. All other States have indicated that they accept the situation, although reluctantly. It was a situation which they say resulted from the colossal overspending of the Whitlam era, and they are getting on with the job of making the best they can of the situation. That is their job.

Finally, if the Government placed more emphasis on budgeting and control of expenditure, it would have more funds available to deploy in the direction of people in need; if that is its real problem and its real aim (and I would say this is the problem of every Government), it should look at its own administration. This subject has been raised many times in the brief period since this Parliament was called together, and it will be raised again and again until someone in Government takes some sort of notice. If the people in Government take no notice, the people of this State will want to know why. Government achievements can be measured not in terms of total money spent but only in terms of value for money. I restate my attitude towards this by invoking the remarks of the Auditor-General in his 1970 report. He has summed it up well. The report states:

In spending, the criterion should not be how much has been spent but the value that is received for that expenditure, to ensure the provision of projects of adequate standard at a minimum cost. Too much emphasis is placed by some on the amount spent rather than the effectiveness for a given cost. It is obvious that, if costs are minimised, more projects can be undertaken.

I have frequently stated the Liberal Party's adherence to the preceding philosophy of how any Government should use taxpayers' funds. As far as I can see, there has never been any commitment by the Labor Party in similar terms, either in its rhetoric or as evidenced by its actions in Government.

There are several instructive examples in this year's Auditor-General's Report, and again I shall quote some of them. Regarding budgeting and control of expenditure within the Education Department, the following statement appears on page 87 of the report:

It is considered that budgeting should be carried out in much greater detail to enable the appropriate authorities to make sounder judgments of the estimates. In some cases, for example, staffing, costs should be recorded in similar detail to enable periodic comparison with the budgets with the objective of exercising greater control of expenditure.

Page 125 of this year's report contains the following reference to lack of budgeting and control of expenditure in the Environment Department:

As stated in my previous report an officer from the financial consulting unit of the Public Service Board was seconded to the department to assist in developing an

effective budgeting and financial management information system. Following investigation, the officer has submitted this report to the Steering Committee. No proposals contained in the report had been implemented to June, 1977.

What everyone in South Australia wants to know is why these proposals have not been implemented in order to minimise the costs of projects and thereby render more effective the use of taxpayers' funds. Page 151 of the report indicates that there is considerable delay in implementing the financial and management accounting system. The report states:

The setting back of the completion date, and on the experience of the past year the likelihood of further delay, is a matter of great concern.

This is an indictment of the priorities set by the Minister for broken promises, and I ask him what he intends doing about it. The Premier is not here today, but he should be informed about what has been said. Everyone in South Australia wants to know what is being done about saving the taxpayers' dollar, in order to ensure that we get value for that dollar. As far as can be seen, it is very little. I am tempted to use stronger language. Pages 158 and 159 of the report refer to the inadequate budgetary control, and the need for an effective internal audit programme within the Hospitals Department. The priority given to financial responsibility by the State Labor Government, and it is a pretty low one, could not be better demonstrated than by reference to the Marine and Harbors Department. On page 220 the report states:

Further to previous comments regarding improvements considered necessary in budgetary control and responsibility accounting in the Glanville workshop, the department has now advised that this matter has been further deferred on account of other work of higher priority.

What higher priority can there be in the control of expenditure and Loan funds, moneys which have come from the pockets of taxpayers, than to make certain that the money is spent in the best interests of taxpayers? It is simply not good enough for a Government which is too prone to calling for more funds from and tax cuts by others, but which is evidently quite unprepared to get its own house in order.

We are told that by the end of this financial year the cupboard will be bare. Indeed, the Premier is already making noises about higher taxes to finance his schemes, but he is not willing to impose tighter control of Government spending. Where is the accounting expertise of which he boasts so often? This is within the context of State Government policies that are totally devoid of the intention of maintaining our industrial base, let alone expanding it.

It is time that this Government told Parliament, and through it the people of South Australia, what its long-term plans are. Where does it think we are going in the next two, four, 10 or 20 years? If we follow the direction being charted for us now by this Government, we will keep going backwards, and no matter what happens at the next election when the Liberal Party takes over Government, it will have just as difficult a job to reverse the direction and put this State back on to a prosperous footing as the Fraser Government has had. We will be successful, but it will not be an easy task. The sad thing is that it should never have been necessary. This Government has no blue-print and has no ideas. The future of this State looks bleak, especially when compared to the position in other Australian States. Massive progress has been made in Western Australia and Queensland.

Members of the Labor Government should stop bleating and blaming others, and cease skirting the periphery of problems and face them squarely. They

should get on with the job they were elected to do—that of running this State in the interests of all its people. That means treating taxpayers' money with great respect; let the Government make sure that people do get value for the tax dollar. The Government should accept its undoubted duty to decide priorities for spending: that is what the Government and Cabinet are for. This Government takes credit for everything it can, but it has never given credit publicly to the Federal Government. It cannot avoid its responsibilities for unpopular decisions that have to be made, such as that made by the Minister of Education in the past few days. He has decided to cut back migrant language courses: it was his decision and he cannot pass on to the Federal Government any blame that may be cast on him. Blaming the Federal Government for everything that goes wrong, for every piece of mismanagement, and for every item of wasteful expenditure is a tactic that is wearing very thin indeed. I believe that we will soon see how thin that tactic is wearing. I support the Bill.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** It is unfortunate that the Premier is not here during the course of this important debate, which is part of the consideration of the finances of the State for which he is responsible. I understand that he is strutting the Australian stage and trying to whip up support for a pretty tired horse, the Australian Labor Party on the Federal scene led by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Whitlam. I believe the Premier would be doing far more good if he were here seeing to the business for which he is responsible, namely, the finances of the State. Nevertheless, we are obliged to be here and to give these papers due consideration.

The Premier's statement that accompanies the Loan Estimates is couched in the same intemperate language as was used in his Budget speech, and there is again an unremitting attack on the Federal Government, quite without foundation. The Premier continues to persist in this attack. On the first page of his second reading explanation, he states:

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.

I should like to examine that statement in some detail and point out the true position in relation to the States of Australia, their financial dealings with the Federal Government, and the so-called ill-conceived policy of that Government. Compared to the Federal Government, the States are in extremely good shape. In his second reading explanation, the Premier said that he believed that he had a measure of agreement from other Treasurers. He 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.

The facts are not borne out by an examination of the Budgets of the other States. The financial year just concluded showed the following results in the various States: in New South Wales, there was a deficit of \$500 000 which, in terms of that State's Budget is quite a small deficit; in Victoria, there was a surplus of \$9 100 000; and in Queensland, there was a deficit of \$1 000 000, and I point out that in that State \$5 000 000 was put aside from the Budget just concluded to be used in the next financial year. In fact, if that money were counted the surplus would have been \$4 000 000.

South Australia had a deficit of about \$100 000, which is quite a small deficit; Western Australia had a surplus of

\$3 400 000; and Tasmania had a surplus of \$1 600 000. Those figures do not indicate that any of the States are experiencing dire financial trouble in relation to their annual State Budgets. Let us consider the current Budgets that have been passed by the various State Parliaments, of which South Australia's, I think, is the most recent. For the coming year, the States are budgeting as follows: New South Wales for a deficit of \$400 000, quite a small deficit; Victoria for a \$500 000 deficit, which is again a small deficit; Queensland for a surplus of \$400 000; and South Australia is budgeting, in effect, for a deficit of \$18 400 000 because, in South Australia, the Government plans to spend not only revenue income this year but also to run down the State's reserves of \$18 400 000. So, in effect, the South Australian Government is budgeting for a deficit of \$18 400 000 that will wipe out accumulated surplus. Western Australia has passed a balanced Budget, and Tasmania has budgeted for a deficit of \$2 900 000. Tasmania has also put aside accumulated reserves to meet its deficit. None of those State figures indicates a particularly tight situation or stringency in relation to State Governments.

What this highlights is the relatively poor position of South Australia in relation to the other States. Not only is the unemployment figure in South Australia climbing more quickly than the figure in the other States, although it is still slightly below the national average, but it is doing so in the light of South Australia's budgeting, relative to the other States, for a deficit of about \$20 000 000 to wipe out the State's reserves. If South Australia can only sustain a deteriorating situation in relation to the other States, which are aiming to balance their Budgets in the coming year, it indicates that all is far from well with the financial management of this State.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Couldn't it be that we are going to do a lot of public works?

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** The Premier's explanation was that it was intended to continue the unemployment relief scheme and to create more temporary employment by way of that scheme, which has been running for some time now.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Very effectively.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** It has created temporary short-term employment.

**Dr. Eastick:** At high cost—plus 20.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Yes. There is nothing permanent about it, nor does it stimulate the long-term growth of South Australia. Effectively, the scheme has padded the unemployment figures in this State in the climate of a rapidly deteriorating situation in South Australia. If one examines the other States, where they did not have the benefit of the great bonanza of flogging off country railway services, one realises that not only has South Australia had that financial bonanza and the benefit of not having the deficit from country railways, but it will also run down its finances by \$18 400 000 this year, whereas the other States will virtually pass balanced Budgets. This will happen in a climate where unemployment in South Australia is climbing faster than elsewhere. That is not a record of which any Government could be particularly proud.

This gives the lie to the attacks that the Premier is making on the Federal Government for its parsimony to the States. The South Australian Premier claims the support of the other Premiers of Australia; I do not believe that for a moment. We know that it is historically expedient for State Premiers, of whatever political complexion, to complain loud and long about the deal they are getting from the Commonwealth Government. It has been a convenient scheme for State Premiers to go to

Canberra asking for money and not to have the principal odium of raising it. Whilst that situation persists in this country, where the Federal Government is the chief collector of revenue and the States are large spenders, we will have this historic clamouring for more and more funds and the criticism of the Federal Government's parsimony.

The figures I have quoted indicate that the States virtually balanced their Budgets last year, some with quite sizeable surpluses. With the sole exception of South Australia, the States aim to balance their Budgets this year. South Australia's financial situation will run down the surpluses by about \$20 000 000. So much for the Premier's criticism of the Commonwealth's "idiot" policies, as he calls them.

How would the Premier grapple with a Budget deficit on the Federal scene of about \$2 000 000 000 or \$3 000 000 000? The other pertinent point, apart from the States balancing their Budgets, is that they have cut taxes. All the States have managed to give relief from taxes. Pay-roll tax exemption has been lifted in New South Wales, as have probate and stamp duty exemptions. Figures are not available regarding the cost of pay-roll tax exemptions, but the relief afforded from the other two measures amounts to about \$36 000 000 a year. In other words, the New South Wales Government has effected tax relief of \$36 000 000 a year, with another benefit as yet uncosted, and has still balanced its Budget.

Victoria has granted further pay-roll tax concessions for which figures are not available. It has also lifted the probate exemption level. It has cost Victoria \$12 000 000 to provide a whole range of exemptions. Queensland has lifted the pay-roll tax exemption level. That will cost \$12 500 000. Probate in Queensland was abolished on January 1, 1977, as was gift duty. No wonder many people wish to live in Queensland. The land tax exemption in Queensland was lifted, but no figures are available. Regarding pay-roll tax, probate and gift duty, it is costing the Queensland Government \$42 500 000 a year for those cuts. I do not believe that Joh Bjelke-Petersen would complain about parsimony from the Commonwealth Government, at least not to the tune that the Premier of this State does.

South Australia has always, under Labor, been slow to relieve the burden of taxation, but it has followed the lead of other States and has lifted the level of pay-roll tax exemptions. That occurred during the recent election campaign, after the Liberal Party announced a scheme which the Premier said was unworkable but which was used word for word in the New South Wales Budget speech a week or two later. The South Australian State Government went part way in easing the tax burden, and it is estimated that that relief will cost \$1 000 000 a year.

Probate abolished between spouses will cost between \$4 000 000 and \$5 000 000 in South Australia, and the land tax concessions and exemptions will cost \$6 400 000. The reductions in rates of stamp duty will cost about \$3 000 000. The tax reductions in South Australia, however, do not equal those in other States. In Western Australia pay-roll exemption relief will cost \$4 400 000, and stamp duty relief on home purchases will cost \$7 070 000, not a great deal. No land tax is payable on residential houses in Western Australia, which is a reform we could well institute in South Australia. Death duties have been abolished between spouses, and that will cost \$3 000 000. In Tasmania, the relief from probate will cost \$1 500 000, land tax reductions will cost \$1 000 000, and no figures were available on pay-roll taxes. These are all cuts in State taxes that have been implemented in the past couple of years in the light of a Federal economic situation that has been nothing short of disastrous.

It ill behoves the Premier to persist in his continuing criticism of the Federal Government on economic grounds or to refer to the idiot policies of the Federal Government. I should say that the idiot policies are right here. I have pointed out the deteriorating situation in relation to South Australia. We know the unemployment relief scheme is a short-term palliative, which is extremely costly to the South Australian taxpayer. It will chew up all the State reserves this year, and heaven knows what will happen next year.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** It will provide work for 2 000 people this year.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Unfortunately for the Minister and the Premier, there will be another year after this year, and the State reserves will be wiped out. We are deteriorating at a rate faster than any other State. I think there may even be a change in the idiot policies of the South Australian Labor Party. The Premier has also been extremely critical of the Federal Government's federalism policy. This State has done extremely well from that policy. My Party endorses wholeheartedly the basic philosophy behind the federalism policy. We do not have to have long memories to recall the days of galloping centralism under the Whitlam Administration with its series of ill-fated Treasurers. We well know that more and more decisions were being made in Canberra, decisions that intruded on the whole way of life in South Australia and indeed in the whole country. It is the genuine attempt of the Federal Government to reverse that centralist policy of the Whitlam years.

The Federal Government is now guaranteeing the States a fixed percentage of revenue which is raised, and it is also giving the States the opportunity of having the responsibility of not only spending that money but also of giving a rebate. The States can either give a rebate on taxes or, if they want to spend more, they can increase taxes. That is the rub which hurts the Premier because he might have to be responsible for some of the decisions he makes. The federalism policy has put more money in the hands of local government. We know the Labor Party does not have much time for local government. We believe local government is an important arm of government, and vastly increased sums have been flowing to local government, as a result of that federalism policy, on a fixed percentage basis so it knows what it is going to receive.

The Premier has made a statement about the economy which boils down to increasing Government spending at the same time as reducing taxes, particularly indirect taxes. That is economic nonsense. This is what a rather more prominent spokesman on Labor policies than the Premier has said about this. The Prime Minister of Great Britain (Mr. James Callaghan) in an address to the Labour Party conference on September 18 last year 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 candour that that option no longer exists and that insofar as it ever did exist it worked by injecting inflation into the economy.

Yet that is the Premier's solution. He has also been critical of the fact that the Federal Government has sought to keep the brakes on the money supply in Australia. We know that Dr. Cairns believed the answer was to get out the printing press and churn out money. He did not last very long. We know what happened to inflation during the Cairns years. I have just quoted what Mr. Callaghan said in a rare glimpse of economic sanity by a Labor Party spokesman. If he were to examine the economic policies being followed in Australia at Commonwealth and State level he would have to say that the South Australian

policies are idiotic. The following article by Mr. Lee D. Eckermann, Master of Economics, who lives at Glen Osmond, is headed "Where is the Australian economy headed?" The article states:

The most significant way in which such huge deficits and consequent inflation rates can arise is through an increased reliance on Government spending to alleviate unemployment and stagnant production levels. By relying on ever-increasing spending by Governments little of direct assistance is provided in increasing the output of productive goods and services in an economy and hence in providing increased long-term job opportunities.

The Premier and the Minister are lauding their unemployment scheme in South Australia and the Premier is suggesting that he is the economic saviour of Australia by increasing Government spending and reducing taxes, but if we examine what responsible Labor Party spokesmen are saying elsewhere and what responsible economists are saying, we realise the Premier is talking nonsense. All we will do is increase inflation and we cannot do anything in the long term to create long-term employment opportunities. It is refreshing to know that despite the attacks of the Premier the Federal Government is coming to grips with inflation, and it is achieving the goals it set out to achieve.

The State Government overlooks just what has been happening in Australia in the past year or two. It forgets that real gross non-farm product has increased in each of the first three quarters of last year and is now 7.6 per cent above the 1975 level. Industrial production has been firming after a growth pause and year-on-year gains are spreading. Registrations of new motor vehicles seasonally adjusted rose to 63 000 in December last year, a record monthly level, and 1976 registrations were higher than 1975 and again higher this year. The year when sales tax was substantially reduced to boost the industry, 1975, the recovery was nothing like that of the following year under a Liberal Government. Real private investment in dwellings for six months to September was 26 per cent higher than in the same period a year earlier, and real private investment in plant and equipment was higher. We hear the Federal Labor Party making noises about removing the investment allowance, and saying that benefits are being given to sectors that do not need it. If that investment allowance were removed the results would be disastrous.

It is an acknowledged fact that long-term employment in this country, and in the State, will be provided by the private sector. It is the only sector where long-term employment can be provided because it is the sector which is productive. The State Government cannot go on willy nilly increasing the size of the Public Service. I mention, as I have mentioned previously, the impact on State finances of increasing the State Public Service at a rate faster than anywhere else in the Commonwealth.

If there is an increase of 3.2 per cent in the South Australian Public Service personnel and an increase of 6.5 per cent in wages in one year (which is a modest increase), there is a 59 per cent increase in the State Budget over five years, a tremendous growth. If we held the Public Service steady with no increase in personnel, but with a 6.5 per cent increase in wages, it would represent a 36 per cent increase in the State Budget in five years. The monetary difference between those two figures would be \$168 000 000. Surely that is a consideration that should be borne in mind by the State Government. If the State Government continues to increase the Public Service at the present rate, some of the taxes it has been able to reduce this year will have to be reimposed. I fear what the situation will be at the end of this 12-month period when

the State reserves are exhausted and when our situation has declined dramatically in relation to other States.

I refer, as the Leader has referred, to some disturbing references in the Auditor-General's Report. People tend to be *blase* about the situation in public enterprise. People tend not to expect the public sector to be efficient. Some people think that once they are in the public sector they are set for life. This is an unfortunate attitude, which is reflected year in and year out in the Auditor-General's Report. I refer to some of the statements in the report in the section dealing with the Public Buildings Department. On page 257 of the report, the Auditor-General states:

The department's attention was drawn to the need for action on numerous projects where expenditures exceeded approved funds, including major work excesses of \$18 000 000.

That is a large amount of money to be in excess of approved funds. I do not know whether that amounts to illegality but when departments spend in excess of approved funds to that order the explanation is necessary. Another quote from the Auditor-General's Report states that a number of instances have occurred where rented office space has been vacant for protracted periods of time. When I raised this matter, the Minister did not seem to think it was serious. He said that it takes time to get offices ready but, if one looks at the breakdown shown in the Auditor-General's Report, one sees that it costs the taxpayers of South Australia almost \$500 000 for office space which the Government rented but did not use. A table appearing on page 266 of the Auditor-General's report shows that the Government had two floors of building A rented that were vacant for 10 months, the rental cost being \$132 000. That is a shocking indictment of organisation and administration. In building A another floor was vacant for eight months at a cost to the taxpayer of \$63 000. Another two floors were half occupied for 10 months at a cost of \$70 000.

In building B, there were seven seven floors vacant for an average of six months at a cost of \$134 000. There was another floor vacant in that building for four months at a cost of \$11 000. Building C had three floors which were vacant for periods varying from five to 11 months at a cost of \$29 000 to the taxpayer. Building D had one floor which was vacant for seven months at a cost to the taxpayer of \$15 000. I cannot envisage the private sector operating in that fashion.

Numerous passages in the Auditor-General's Report indicate inefficiency, lack of suitable audit arrangements, and tardiness in instituting satisfactory auditing arrangements. Then there is the example I have just quoted where \$500 000 of taxpayers funds have been expended on renting buildings that have been vacant for periods up to 11 months. I do not think that is satisfactory. With these remarks, I give my traditional support to this Bill.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before calling on the honourable member for Torrens, I point out to the House that the future speakers should confine their remarks to the Public Purposes Loan Bill, to capital works. While I do not suggest that previous speakers have not confined their remarks to that particular subject, there is a suspicion that has not been the case.

**Mr. WILSON (Torrens):** I support the Bill. I had not intended this to be my maiden speech, as I intended to leave it until the Address in Reply debate. I wish to pay compliments to many people, but I will do that during that debate. However I congratulate you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on your appointment as Chairman of Committees.

I will confine my remarks to two statements made in the

Loan Estimates, first relating to the State Transport Authority, where an allocation is made of \$4 790 000 and, secondly, to Transport Research and Development, which has an allocation of \$1 100 000.

Various plans have been submitted since 1962 that have been paid for by the taxpayers of this State. These plans are many in number, and I mention them because they have an important bearing on what I am about to say. In 1962, there was the Metropolitan Development Plan; in 1968, we had the famous (or should I say infamous) MATS plan; in 1970, there was the Breuning Report; in 1973, we had the Scrafton report; and, in 1977, only six or eight months ago, there was the Metropolitan Adelaide Planning Study. We now have North East Area Public Transportation Review, which has another year to run. Also, we have the Metropolitan Adelaide Base Data Study.

These plans represent thousands of hours of work by dedicated people and millions of dollars of expenditure of taxpayers' money. What results have we got from these studies? The Minister of Transport said that he endorsed the plans and priorities of the Scrafton report, part D, to the letter, yet all we have seen is the extension of the Christie Downs railway line. I implore the Government to take action on the recommendations of these dedicated people of high expertise, because the longer action is delayed the more costly the schemes become. We are talking about escalations of millions of dollars, especially when talking about transport.

I will confine my remarks to the impact of these reports on transport in the northern suburbs. First, we need to look at population projections, and I quote from the latest of these plans, namely, the Metropolitan Adelaide Planning Study of February, 1977, as follows:

The present metropolitan development plan envisages that the population of metropolitan Adelaide could reach 1½ million by 1991, and land deemed sufficient to cater for that number of people is shown on the plan. It now appears likely that the population will not reach 1½ million by 1991, due to reductions in the birth rate and migration. However, the land zoned for urban purposes on the plan is all likely to be needed by that date to house a lesser population.

That is an important point. The study continues:

This low density spread has disadvantages. The time, distance and cost of travel increase, the cost of providing public services per head of population becomes higher, more land is removed from productive agriculture use, and the central area becomes more difficult to get to from the new outer suburbs.

These are not my words but the words of the Government's own experts. The population growth in the north and north-east has meant that Tea Tree Gully has an estimated population of 100 000; Salisbury and Elizabeth each have estimated populations of 100 000. Now we have to add two more factors to this projected growth: Golden Grove, in the north-east, and Munno Para. Let us look at Munno Para—and I quote from a report appearing in the *Advertiser* on August 25, 1977, as follows:

A multi-million dollar district centre is planned for Munno Para, between Elizabeth and Gawler . . . The District Clerk (Mr. Wormald) said yesterday the centre would cater for a new town of 100 000 people. Mr. Wormald said the centre would provide a full range of community welfare, civic and recreational facilities, as well as shopping . . . The development in the Smithfield area will complete the urban link from Salisbury to Gawler, a northern sprawl which now houses more than 250 000 people.

Another quote contained in the same article is as follows:

The Minister for Planning (Mr. Hudson) said yesterday the land was owned by the State Government and its

development would be a combined effort of private and public enterprise over the next 15 years.

What is the total effect of this population of 500 000, and what is the effect on the northern suburbs as regards transport, especially when we add in industry and decentralisation that could take place in the North of the State, where heavy vehicles move from the North, bearing in mind the recent sealing of the Eyre Highway, along which many passenger vehicles come from the west? We intend to have the Stuart Highway sealed, which will bring more traffic down from the North. All roads lead to Adelaide. We have not only the dormitory population in the northern suburbs but also the population and vehicles generated by that population from the whole of the North of the State. We should be evaluating the cost and questioning the necessity of the urban sprawl, together with the inherent cost of schools, transport, shopping facilities, and the human and social costs of isolation. Let us deal with these transport problems one by one. I quote again from the Metropolitan Planning Study, as follows:

It was estimated that while the population might double during the ensuing 30 years—  
and this applies to the 1962 development plan—  
the amount of daily travel would nearly treble.

The critical thing is that the amount of daily travel will nearly treble. A further quote states:

The Adelaide city centre should be retained as the focus and main interchange of the metropolitan public transport system.

Regarding new developments in the North, no mention is made in the statement from which I have read of any new industry. If there is to be industry in these new areas, the people would be able to work in their local areas. They will not be working in their local areas, because no provision is made for industry. So, they will have to travel to the city, and the Government's own planners have said that the Adelaide city centre should be retained as the focus.

We have this enormous problem; what options are available to these northern areas? First, we have the provision of fast commuter trains, and we can use the existing Gawler railway for that, together with cross-town feeder buses to get people to the stations. This course is essential. Undoubtedly, this must be the first option, but what about the road system? Upgrading of the road system is also essential; otherwise, public transport cannot do the job.

Despite what we say about the energy crisis and the demise of the internal combustion engine, they are many years away. Even if we go to alternative forms of transportation, such as electric cars, we will still need the roads, because the public transport system will be unable to handle the situation. I am still talking about the north; I am not yet concentrating on the north-east. Let us see what is said about the north-south corridor in the metropolitan data study. The study states:

The original plan—  
referring back to 1962—  
showed a freeway route from Gawler in the north passing west of the city to Adelaide to Noarlunga in the south. Subsequent amendments to this route included the deletion of the section between Gawler and Port Wakefield Road. A new route was introduced from Hillbank to the centre at Modbury in the north-east. The future adequacy of the amended proposals has been questioned and investigations are needed to determine whether the original concept of a route south from Gawler and west of the railway should not be reintroduced.

This was said only eight months ago:

The arterial roads in the corridor carrying the heaviest loads lie immediately to the north, west and south of the city of Adelaide. If no new highway is constructed congestion at peak hours could be considerable by 1991—  
which is not far from now—

Some detailed amendments of the routes shown on the plan for new arterial roads are necessary.

That is in the Government's own report of only eight months ago. It has certainly kept its options open, and it seems to me that the Government's own planners are planning for an extension of the highway system.

I turn now to the north-east. The north-east corridor extends from the city of Adelaide to the city of Tea Tree Gully. The major movement is likely to continue to be to and from the city of Adelaide. Once again, they are not my words, but the words of the planners of the North-East Area Public Transportation Review, with which I will now deal. The review (NEAPTR, for short) deals with the massive population increases in the areas of Tea Tree Gully, Modbury, and Golden Grove. The NEAPTR study recommended, only a month ago, that seven options were available for public transport to and from the city. They were: a basic improvement to present bus services; bus lanes and bus priority measures; a major freeway; a busway; light rail transit; heavy rail through the north-east corridor; and heavy rail as an extension of the Northfield railway line to Tea Tree Plaza.

Already, four of those options are precluded by the Government's previous decisions. The Government has made a moratorium on freeways for 10 years, from 1971 to 1981. The Government has set its heart against a busway, a special bus lane built up the north-east corridor; it has come out against heavy rail in the north-east corridor because of the cost and the environmental destruction. It has also come out against heavy rail as an extension of the Northfield railway line because of the cost, and not because of the environmental considerations. I shall deal with the options one by one. The first is the basic improvement to present bus services. The report states:

Basic improvement involves extension of bus services into new areas. The environmental and social impacts: increasing air pollution; traffic congestion; noise and traffic hazards along arterial roads.

That is the first option, which can be introduced soon. The second option covers bus lanes and bus priority measures. Bus lanes and bus priority measures on the major arterial roads would improve service reliability. However, as to the environmental and social impacts, social effects similar to those on clearways, such as removal of parking for shops along the roads, would be involved. I quote from the supplement a few weeks ago in the *Advertiser* covering this report on bus lanes (and this has the imprimatur of the Minister of Transport), as follows:

The introduction of special bus lanes and priority measures is an option. The bus lanes would improve timekeeping and reliability at a relatively low cost. However, road space limitations and frequent intersections rule out any significant improvement to travel times.

That is important, because if it will rule out any significant improvement to travel times why should we put up with the environmental and social impacts that we have with clearways, such as the removal of parking for shops along the roads?

The third option is a major freeway. The Government has come out quite strongly against this, and no decision will be made on major freeways until 1981. I agree completely with the Government's decision, because I believe that freeways are an environmental disaster. However, should the Government set its heart against a major arterial road, which would not take up the same



amount of space as a freeway and would not require the amount of acquisition that the freeway would need?

The next option, which also will be precluded by the Government, was a major busway. I agree with this, because of the environmental and social impact of a major busway up the north-east corridor. The report states:

Noise and air quality are areas of concern. Because use of the corridor involves potentially significant effect upon the Torrens River and adjacent residential areas at the city end, a range of alternative routes are being considered.

That need not be considered, because the Government, months ago, before the report came out, decided that it would not be a viable option.

The next recommendation concerned light rail transit or trams. The modern version of trams will use its own right of way in the transport corridor. It would require people to transfer from feeder buses or cars at various points along the route. The line could link through to Glenelg and benefit the south-western suburbs. I believe the Government has made up its mind to introduce this proposal. In most respects, this is supported by the Opposition. The Government should get on with the job, making the decision and getting on with building it, because many millions of dollars will be added to the cost if the decision is delayed.

The sixth option concerned heavy rail, or trains, in the corridor. This option has serious environmental considerations. The railways are intrusive. There is no possibility of locating the line out of the corridor, and the noise is a great area for concern. The cost is almost prohibitive. It may have been possible five or six years ago, but there is no way now that the State can afford it.

The seventh option concerned the heavy rail extension of the Northfield railway line and, as an alternative to the use of the north-east transport corridor, it is feasible to extend the Northfield railway to Tea Tree Plaza. Travel times would be 23 minutes to 28 minutes from Tea Tree Plaza to the Adelaide railway station. This assumes only four stops and depends on the Gawler line requirements. The environmental and social impacts include a significant property acquisition outside of the corridor, and an impact on established residential development and on Dry Creek. However, this option has a minimum impact on the Torrens River.

This option has also been precluded already by the Government, but I suggest the Government should relook at this matter. Even if it does not extend the line to Tea Tree Plaza, it could be extended to Ingle Farm and, by introducing feeder buses from Pooraka, Para Hills, Ingle Farm, Valley View, and Para Vista, it would increase public transport availability from those areas and relax the vehicle load on roads such as Bridge Road and Hampstead Road, which join up with North-East Road.

The NEAPTR study has been misrepresented to the public, because it was supposed to have been open and objective, and yet statements by the Minister of Transport indicate that the essential decisions have been taken already. The NEAPTR team, in my opinion, was given an impossible task. It was asked to plan transport within a non-existent framework of development plans for the area.

That sums up the transport situation in the north-eastern suburbs except for one final point. If we take an arc, a sector of a circle, from the Gawler railway line to North-East Road, we have an area with a population potential of 500 000 people. I have shown that the Government's experts say that travel to and from the city will be the primary aspect. Therefore, where does this immense volume of traffic travel to get to the city? It comes down Main North Road and down North-East

Road. It will go along Bridge Road and down Hampstead Road, and join up with North-East Road.

At the moment, Main North Road in the area between Nottage Terrace and Robe Terrace has a vehicle population of 40 000 a day. The area of North-East Road between Smith Street and Northcote Terrace has a vehicle population of about 35 000 a day. That is now, not in 15 years time. All this traffic will finish up in the base of the triangle in the District of Torrens, because there is nowhere else for it to go. The District of Torrens is placed across this stream of traffic like a wedge. In addition, an immense volume of traffic travels east and west, across the north-south line of traffic from the north and north-east suburbs.

The Government has to face up to the situation of deciding now, otherwise the problem will become insoluble. I believe that this situation applies not only to the District of Torrens but also to the District of Ross Smith, because if the Government proceeds with another arterial road it must pass through that district. Government planners have laid that down as an option, which I think they believe it is essential to begin. Despite all the grandiose plans we have had (and I admit that two of the planning studies were done under the aegis of Liberal Governments) that money and the work by dedicated people must not be wasted. The work that has been done on the most recent of these plans, the NEAPTR study, must not be wasted, and I ask the Government to consider carefully the recommendations received from this study and to put them into effect as soon as possible.

**Mr. RODDA (Victoria):** In supporting the Bill, I welcome the member for Torrens as a seasoned speaker and commend him for the subject matter of his speech. I tell the few Government members present that we have half a dozen more candidates as good as he is, and it will not be long before they will be joining the member for Torrens, so that the only Minister now in the House will have to look to his laurels. I commend the member for Torrens for the diligent consideration he has given to his district and to the planning that will be necessary to allow people to travel into the metropolitan area via the important area he represents.

In his second reading explanation, the Premier did not take long to continue with his hobby-horse of having a crack (ungratefully, I believe) at the Commonwealth Government. We are in a new ball game with the 47 new low fences that have been erected in South Australia, but this Loan programme has been drawn up to serve an area concentrated in little old Adelaide, which will become an isolated backwater, while about 12 of us will be driving around this barren countryside that is now devoid of members and representation. That is the electoral environment in which we now find ourselves.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** I don't quite follow!

**Mr. RODDA:** I would not expect the honourable member to follow it, because he is huddled in a little speck of South Australia in which representation is concentrated. That is the socialist policy of this Government. It is all very well for the Premier to ridicule "the serried ranks of ignorance", which he called the Opposition recently, when we drew attention to the financial position in which Adelaide finds itself compared to the situation in other States. Last year, when introducing a similar Bill, the Premier said that he had been able to aggregate \$259 000 000 for capital works that would provide funds to build fences and buildings in this State. However, last year, when we considered the financial documents, we found that we were over-taxed by \$8 000 000. In South Australia we pay 5½ times more in taxation now than we

did in 1970, when the Labor golden era started. We now pay twice as much pay-roll tax.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I point out to the honourable member that these taxes are referred to in the Appropriation Bill, which the House debated last week. We are now considering the Public Purposes Loan Bill.

**Mr. TONKIN:** On a point of order: in the statement of the Treasurer concerning the Loan Estimates, reference is made to a transfer to the Loan Account of funds from the General Revenue Account. I believe that the honourable member is linking his remarks to that transfer.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before ruling on that point of order, I suggest that it would have been appropriate for the Leader to wait until I finished my remarks before taking a point of order. I was about to point out to the member for Victoria that it would be appropriate if he linked his remarks with the Public Purposes Loan Bill.

**Mr. RODDA:** I was referring to the financial environment in which we found ourselves. Last financial year the Premier said that \$15 000 000 was appropriated from Revenue Account to bolster the Loan Account, which is the subject of this Bill. I was referring to whence that appropriation came, and to the Revenue Account which supplied the money and the background to it. I seek your indulgence, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I want to develop that aspect. In the past six years the consumer price index in Adelaide has risen faster than it has in any of the State capitals. Our food and clothing costs are higher than similar costs in any capital city of this country, and our building costs are higher than those of any mainland capital.

The average size house in Sydney is 134 square metres, while the average sizes for Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide and Perth are 147, 134, 141 and 146 m<sup>2</sup> respectively. The all-cities average is 142 m<sup>2</sup>. The average costs a square metre are as follows:

City	Average cost
	\$
Sydney .....	189
Melbourne .....	202
Brisbane .....	181
Adelaide .....	215
Perth .....	192
All-cities average .....	196

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** What sort of house is that?

**Mr. RODDA:** That is for an average house.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Is it for a timber house?

**Mr. RODDA:** I am speaking about average cost, the best and lowest all thrown in. Regarding the c.p.i., when it was raised on this side, the Premier had the audacity to talk about the serried ranks and it was a reflection on me when he attacked me for the crass ignorance, although I do not think he used the word "crass". That is the facade behind which the Premier is hiding in his cavalier treatment of probing from members on this side. This Bill is one of the most important documents that we will discuss this session. The appropriation is the funding that will carry on the progress of the State. I express my resentment at what the Government has done regarding the political representation and the environment in country areas.

I refer now to the more factual things in the Loan Estimates. For woods and forests, the proposed expenditure will total \$8 000 000. This is an area in which the Government can be commended for keeping up investment and promoting a commodity that is, I think, our second biggest import and something that makes a big input into capital works and State development. Mount

Gambier sawmill will be upgraded, and work will be done at Nangwarry.

This area is one of the profitable areas of Government development. I cannot say too much for our foresters and their work in my district as well as in the District of Mt. Gambier. Kiln-drying facilities at Nangwarry sawmill will be upgraded and building improvements made. In that area, big advances are being made in timber handling, and all I am sorry about is that the appropriation is not larger.

Regarding the provision for lands and irrigation, I will be asking questions when we are dealing with the lines. Provision is made for land ownership and tenure system, land purchases for development and sale, purchase of machinery for survey division, and purchase of waterfront holiday home sites. I am wondering what the provision for purchasing holiday home sites is all about. I will be asking questions about this when we are dealing with the lines, and I draw the Minister's attention to this matter, because I assure him that more than 100 000 people are interested in what the Government has in store for them regarding holiday shack sites.

For the Engineering and Water Supply Department, there is a formidable list of items for which expenditure is provided. It is significant that Mundulla water supply is not mentioned. Mundulla, one of the oldest towns in the State, is a productive and prominent part of my district. The people there depend on underground water supply, with their own bores. However, the water is extremely hard, the salts are extremely concentrated, and the people are having difficulty with bowling green watering and town beautification. The citizens there are public spirited, and I draw the Minister's attention to the need to connect Mundulla with the Bordertown supply, which I think is only three miles away. I understand that drilling done near Mundulla has given an unsatisfactory result.

The provision of \$113 000 000 for public buildings is a large percentage of the total proposed expenditure of \$259 000 000. As would be expected, most of the expenditure on public buildings will go to the city, but a large amount is being appropriated for schools. I am pleased, for the sake of the member for Eyre, that Karcultaby school is mentioned. That project has been on the waiting list for a long time.

However, Lucindale school is not mentioned in this document. In the 13 years that I have been a member of Parliament, that is the only school in my district that has been on the waiting list all that time, apart from the work of upgrading and renovating some rooms. I draw the Government's attention to the fact that Lucindale is expanding and that it is in the part of the State that enjoys an excellent rainfall. The population there is being maintained. I hope that the Minister will see his way clear soon to bring the programme for Lucindale school nearer to the top of the priority list.

Before the recent election, the areas of Millicent and Mt. Burr and the hundred of Mayurra were added to my district. Probably, Millicent is one of the great growth centres in South Australia. I notice that a large provision is made in the Electricity Trust appropriation to build the Snugery power station. This is virtually in the suburbs of Millicent. I also understand that plans are forecast for a big expansion in electric power supply in South Australia. I couple this with a need to examine the conservation of underground water and perhaps to consider the effect of drainage that is under the control of the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Far too much groundwater is making its way into the sea. A detailed examination should be made of the effect of the weir in this area. I do not say that drainage has not increased the productivity of the South-East, because it

has done so markedly, but it has also cut deeply into the underground basins and, because of the geographical formation of the area with the necessary defiles that cut through the ranges and the swales that retain the underground water basins in their effective locations, water ends up either in the Coorong or the sea. The real need for irrigation is being eroded by the extensive drainage system we have in the area. I well remember the late Harry Kemp saying in the other place while we were all lauding the advent of the drains that we would, before long, wish to fill them in. I do not believe that we want to fill them in, but we must examine closely with a panel of experts the need to weir-up the basins and retain nature's holding basins. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading. I will raise more specific points when the lines are discussed.

**Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** I support the second reading and, in doing so, I pay a tribute to the speech made by the member for Torrens, who showed considerable understanding of the problems of metropolitan living, especially those associated with transport, industry and accommodation. As the member for Victoria said, I am sure that the member for Torrens will be an asset to the Opposition with his obvious clear perception and analysis of the Adelaide situation.

I take this opportunity, as a post-election matter, to express some appreciation to the Government for the money which it has not only committed to Mount Gambier over the past two years but which it is obviously spending there. It is not just a commitment: it is a firm commitment.

**Mr. Tonkin:** You've achieved much.

**Mr. ALLISON:** I am somewhat pleased about the result of two years of honest endeavour. I have been told by the Australian Labor Party candidate for the district that, in the preceding 11 or 12 years, about \$4 000 000 was spent in the district. My own detailed analysis of the situation arrived at a total of about \$33 243 000 having been committed to the area in the two years since. I do not believe that the Government realises how much money has been committed in the South-East because, early in the recent election campaign, I remember the Premier quoting a rather nebulous sum, which he brought down to \$25 000 000. I can assure the Government that the sum committed is well documented.

I express gratitude for a few of the major commitments, especially the completion of the Port MacDonnell breakwater scheme, which is included in the present Estimates, and the continued spending in the South-East by the South Australian Housing Trust. The sum of \$1 500 000 has been committed in the South-East for that purpose. The sum of \$1 250 000 has been allocated for Government offices in the area, although I understand that that sum has been allocated by the State Government Insurance Commission.

The sum of \$8 300 000 is to be spent on machinery and equipment for the Woods and Forests Department. I am grateful for that allocation, but the Public Works Committee pointed out that the allocation was a little belated because the department's equipment has become considerably out-dated. The Mount Gambier mill was reaching the stage where it was becoming non-competitive. The sooner that money is spent and the equipment installed the better will the Woods and Forests Department be served in Mount Gambier.

The Mount Gambier District Council saleyard has been allocated the sum of \$117 000. I have said previously that Mount Gambier and Millicent are now facing substantial debts on their saleyards. Both towns hope that a recurrent grant will be made to help them over a difficult situation, particularly at Millicent.

A promise has been made to spend \$11 000 000 on gas turbines. I understand that the initial siteworks for the project have been commenced at Snuggery. I appreciate that project's commencement but I would have preferred the gas turbines to be commenced before the Woods and Forests Department and Electricity Trust complex was altered. The trust's part of the complex was phased out last October and the South-East now lacks an emergency electricity supply. The first \$7 500 000 has been allocated for three turbines to be installed not far from Millicent on the Snuggery site. I am pleased that adequate power will be supplied for the South-East in the case of a breakdown in the grid system from Adelaide. The three gas turbines will be able to supply the South-East independently of the Adelaide supply in the event of a major breakdown.

Another commitment that is probably not quite so definite is the \$800 000 allocation for the Mount Gambier Road Safety Centre, which is still the subject of a report from a Parliamentary committee. It has also been the subject of support from the Mount Gambier city and district councils and people in the South-East generally, but it has been opposed by the Royal Automobile Association, which believes that the allocation of such a large sum in one district is not the sort of commitment that that organisation would expect for a relatively lowly populated area of South Australia. However, I hope that the child instruction centre, which was recommended by the R.A.A. and others as an important integral part of such a scheme, will get under way soon.

Last but not least is the recent commitment by the Minister of Works who, during the election campaign, made an issue of the cost of \$3 400 000 for the sewerage extensions of and completion in 1978 of phase 2 of the Mount Gambier and district sewerage scheme. That project is not in the Loan Estimates we are considering, but I am looking forward to its being included in the 1978-79 Loan Estimates, since the sum has been committed tentatively. The initial inquiry for the project has already been completed with a comprehensive report being handed down recently by the Minister.

Also included in the Engineering and Water Supply Department allocation is \$600 000 for the immediate extension of departmental offices in Mount Gambier. The allocations to which I have referred are the major sums committed to about 20 or 30 individual projects in Mount Gambier and the South-East over the past two years, predominantly in Mount Gambier and district.

As I said, I am extremely grateful to the Government for the money it has spent, because I have no doubt that Mount Gambier in the past two years has served as a major development centre. I have said many times in the House that I would have preferred Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Port Pirie and Murray Bridge (major country centres) to have been treated in a similar manner as major growth centres for development before the \$20 000 000 was spent on Monarto.

Imagine what the \$32 000 000 in Mount Gambier has done for the local scene, and imagine what that \$20 000 000, which was expended on Monarto, could have done for the scene in other parts of South Australia that are existing growth centres. They are areas where people have expressed a desire and a willingness to settle. I should like to think that the surveys to be conducted by the Government will point the way to helping decentralisation in much the same way as they have helped in Mount Gambier.

My major regret in respect of the expenditure of over \$30 000 000 is that we are still not fostering a vastly improved industrial base. Perhaps the Loan Estimates in future years will make provision for this, too. I draw the

attention of the House to the Modulock project, which was promised before the 1975 election and which involved a \$1 000 000 expansion of industry. A New Zealand company was to commit \$500 000 in the right to a patent, with the South Australian Woods and Forests Department committing another \$500 000 in capital to provide a \$1 000 000 industry to construct transportable prefabricated houses or, at least, housing units.

That project just did not come off. I realise there was opposition from South Australian companies, and I can well understand that. Surely, if the Government had to enter a joint venture it could have done so with a South Australian firm such as Atco, Lloyds or any other prominent manufacturer of transportable houses, rather than going overseas for an investment. Some rather odd aspects emerged during the past two years. From inquiries I made about why the project had not got under way, I was told there were problems with the patent, that it might not in fact be granted. Some few months afterwards I asked whether there were any major problems with the patent and the Minister of Forests said that there were not any real problems. When there were rumours about the New Zealand firm that was to participate in this project, I took it on myself just before the recent State election to contact the Managing Director in New Zealand, who said that he was still awaiting news from this Government, that nothing concrete had been said, and that his company was in a state of limbo, still willing to come over here. He understood that the delay may have been related to the Redcliff development, and that that was why his company was not being asked over here. Whatever the reason, that industry did not become established in Mount Gambier.

Almost simultaneously we lost the Electricity Trust power plant, with 50 jobs being lost to the district. True, the employees were transferred to other jobs within the city but, nevertheless, those jobs were lost from the district. Moreover, the industrial base seems to be diminishing because of automation and the general phasing out of people in industry in the South-East, and this also seems to be occurring in Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney and throughout the Western world. It is a general problem of machines becoming more important, more profitable and less troublesome than are people. We must solve that problem in the name of humanity.

I have been most concerned that we have been tackling problems in the middle and not getting to the real source. In that respect I refer to the difference between expenditure on primary and secondary schools. I am pleased to see several new primary schools being catered for in the Loan Estimates now before this House. I am especially concerned about primary schools. Secondary schools have a better staffing ratio, with about one staff member for every 13 or 14 students. In primary schools we have one staff member for every 23 or 24 students. Yet throughout Australia we find constantly that there will be students coming through from primary school to secondary school needing remedial work in the basic communication subjects of English and mathematics.

In the school where I used to teach, I found that students who came to me for counselling represented about 16 per cent of the school population. Most of these students were having trouble in English and mathematics as well as in their social life. There seemed to be some degree of correlation between the two matters.

**The SPEAKER:** I hope the honourable member is relating his comments to a specific line.

**Mr. ALLISON:** I am speaking on the line dealing with the development of primary schools. I am explaining why I am pleased about that, as primary schools are of prime importance in the education system.

**The SPEAKER:** There is nothing in the Bill concerning staffing—it deals with buildings.

**Mr. ALLISON:** I appreciate that. Therefore, I hope the students who are to be catered for in our primary schools will enjoy a better student:staff ratio than has applied in the past. Further, I am pleased that South Australia, along with several other States, has already achieved its goals for 1980 and 1982 for secondary and primary school construction and staffing. This highlights the fact that South Australia, along with other States, has been able to expend much of its own funds (that is, funds handed down through federalism grants) for the construction and staffing of those buildings; this is expenditure over and above the tied grants specifically allocated for education by the Federal Government. It is pleasing that Governments have seen fit to take on the responsibility of improving education without simply waiting for Federal Government grants.

For that reason I am pleased to see in the Loan Estimates for Mount Gambier two commitments that were made prior to the last election: one for Mount Gambier North Primary School for a new open-style unit at a cost of about \$405 000, and another commitment is being met for a school at Tantanoola. The Minister of Education recently took issue with me on the question of open units in schools. I am pleased to see that in the construction of schools Government departments have actually indicated that the old six, eight and nine teacher open-plan units are found to be too large. Indeed, this was the issue which I took up several months ago and in relation to which I received criticism from the Minister. However, the whole point of that criticism was that my personal investigation had revealed that teachers did not like to teach in extremely large open spaces, and that it was difficult to get seven, eight or nine teachers who were simultaneously compatible, and who were teaching along the same lines, because as soon as one teacher breaks down the discipline, or even the quiet study, the rest of the room also breaks down. It was found that two, three or four teachers generally combined better than did larger numbers. There were also several other reasons given in favour of smaller open-space units.

I appreciate that in Mount Gambier we have one larger open-space unit. That is a science unit. True, it is of admirable design as it lends itself to the isolation of at least two or three classes because of its unique shape. Generally, the basic concept of open-plan units seems to lend itself better to a smaller type of building. It is significant that the Education Department (and I refer specifically to the primary branch) has asked for buildings to be constructed according to a four-teacher design.

The construction of the buildings has been found to be simpler, with smaller spans, cheaper forms of construction, better insulation, better lighting because of the narrow sections of the building, cheaper heating and generally better student-teacher orientation in the smaller, closer, more familiar situations. I am not being especially critical of open-plan teaching, *per se*, but I am pleased to see that the scale of the open units has been reduced considerably.

The State Transport Authority received a subsidy in the State Budget.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is nothing about the Budget in this Bill.

**Mr. ALLISON:** I am referring to the Loan Estimates at page 16.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, the honourable member is in order.

**Mr. ALLISON:** The amount was \$4 790 000. I hoped that somewhere in the allocation for the State Transport

Authority there would be specific provision for rural transport systems. The Minister has indicated that applications will be considered. In the South-East in particular, as in any other region remote from metropolitan Adelaide, we find that we are handicapped by remoteness. The State Transport Authority is expending money on the metropolitan railway system, having sold the country railway systems to the Federal Government. I feared, some two years ago, that we might not be quite so well looked after, and this is borne out by the fact that there is no provision for the replacement of the sleeping car which travelled from Adelaide to Mount Gambier. The State Minister of Transport has implied that that is a Federal responsibility, but when that sleeping car was damaged it was still a State responsibility. It has depreciated over 40 or 50 years (if the photographs I have seen of it are to be believed). I believe that there should have been some compromise between the State Government and the Federal Government about providing another sleeping car for that run. Many people have petitioned the Government about it, and I am disappointed that there is nothing in the Loan Estimates for the purchase of a new vehicle. It would be a substantial expenditure of about \$250 000, I am informed by the Minister, but I am still hopeful that that situation will be remedied.

The fishing haven at Port MacDonnell, which is due for completion under the 1977-78 Loan Estimates and is mentioned in the Premier's preamble on page 11, I am sure is going to prove to be a dual attraction; it will benefit the fishing fleet by providing shelter during the stormy season and it will contribute to the welfare and well being of the people of Port MacDonnell by providing a substantial increase in the tourist industry. Already many people are going to Port MacDonnell for the sheltered swimming, boating and fishing, and I look forward to the time when that work is completed.

The member for Victoria referred to drainage in the South-East, and I support his remarks. I believe there has been excessive drainage and that the provision of weirs along many of the canal systems would be advantageous. In wet seasons the water can course quite freely and wash the land of its accumulated salts, taking that salt out to sea. This happens in the Black Water drain, which is a very saline drain. However, in relatively dry seasons such as those of 1965-68, and again during the current year, the provision of weirs along that canal system would have helped to retain the water during the dry winter months, which in turn might have helped to hold water long enough to let it soak into the water table. In the wet seasons the swamps to be seen throughout the South-East are merely a surface expression of the excess water in the water table. We have a rainfall of about 28 inches. In dry seasons the water drains off too quickly, because it needs several months to soak into the underground water table. The drainage system might benefit from the provision of weirs along the major drains in the South-East.

The irrigation and reclamation of swamp lands has benefited the Eight Mile Creek district. I express my appreciation to the Minister of Works for the consideration he has given to the settlers and landholders in that area. There is no doubt that the drainage scheme in that region had been the subject of considerable subsidence; the levels water was being impounded behind the roadway, and the money which is being expended on irrigation and reclamation will be beneficial to the people in that area. As the Minister has said, there is nothing people in that district can do other than look to dairy farming for their livelihood, and the drainage of their land ensures that at least part of it is usable all the year and is

therefore the only way that they can be assisted.

I refer now to the proposed allocation of money for afforestation and timber milling. A diminishing amount of land is available in the South-East for afforestation. Land is becoming increasingly more expensive, and the poorer sandy, marginal land that was suitable for forestry has almost all been purchased and planted to forests. We should be thankful that forestry has enabled that inferior land to be utilised so effectively. It has produced a fantastic amount of revenue for South Australia. It is unfortunate that the cost of adjacent farming land and opposition from farmers had prevented further afforestation. Perhaps we are nearing the time when farmers will be looking to get out from at least some of the districts in the South-East thus permitting more afforestation.

There is an increasing amount of competition from Victoria. That is one aspect of forestry one cannot afford to overlook, because the South-East of South Australia is dependent on that industry as a major source of revenue, and if there is too much competition from Victoria it can only be detrimental to the South-East of South Australia. This should be kept in mind when the Premier's Department does the survey into the potential of the South-Eastern triangle, which has been extended into the green square, involving Portland and western Victoria. Excessive development of western Victoria may militate against South Australia rather than for it. Perhaps there should be some compromise.

**Dr. EASTICK (Light):** In approaching this document and the announcements and statements by the Premier, one wonders how long it will be before people finally recognise that the little boy is crying "wolf" once too often. Those who can think back to that story being told to them by their parents will clearly understand many of the protestations made in this document by the Premier, particularly in the original presentation before the most recent election.

As the Deputy Leader said this afternoon, the statements were made on assumptions of what might happen and subsequently they have been proved to be wrong—certainly the announcements by so many of the Premier's colleagues (I mean the Premiers of the other States) of their acceptance of the situation in which they find themselves and of their acceptance more particularly of the most recent decisions taken last Friday.

Over a long period of time, even though the political philosophies involved in discussions have been somewhat different, according to whether one happens to be on the right or left of the political scene, discussions have taken place for the introduction of a new federalism policy, which allows for a sharing of income but which, most importantly, gives each State the opportunity to determine for itself how it will utilise the funds made available to it. It will be in a position to determine its own priorities, and it will not find itself in the awkward position in which States found themselves following the 1972 Federal elections, when they were told what projects would be advanced and what projects they would have to fund themselves. The Federal Labor Government was determining the priorities of so many of the capital works of the States, and those State Governments that were prepared to run along with the Federal Government (and that certainly applied to this State Government) suddenly found themselves channeling large sums of money into areas not specifically required by the States.

We can think seriously of the large sums of money that came into this State and were used at Monarto and in the Land Commission. They were sums of money that will eventually advantage South Australia, I recognise that, because they purchased commodities (in this case, land) at

a time when they were cheaper than they are today. However, they tied up large sums of money, some of which has to be serviced by interest payments, which are not being exploited and for which the State as a result is not receiving an adequate return. So today we are in the position of having to service Loan funds and projects that are not immediately returning us an income and are preventing us from undertaking, to the same degree as some of the other States, our own capital and budgetary involvement.

I know, Sir, that you said earlier this afternoon that we were looking at a Loan document. I also appreciate that it is difficult, particularly in view of the way in which the South Australian Government is shuffling money from Loan to revenue and from revenue to Loan, to dissociate our thinking and discussion on the two involvements—Loan and revenue. I will not transgress even though I make passing reference to the revenue consideration.

Great play has been made by the Premier about the run-down of the State's reserves, which in this sense are being reflected against our Revenue Account; in other words, we have sold off capital assets in the form of our railways and have put that into revenue, and we are progressively appropriating that now considered revenue fund, which is really a capital fund (waiting to be re-introduced into capital), and trying to hoodwink the public of South Australia, and indeed the members of this place with a suggestion that inadequate Loan funds are available for works in South Australia.

In the documents on the Loan Estimates, the Premier indicates there will be an injection of so much funding which will come from Loan raisings, and added to that sum will be returns received from services and from repayments, which will also be considered as part of the Loan funding programme. I refer now to page 5 of the Premier's statement, where he states:

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 is the point I was making before—that the total Loan amounts available were the \$178 000 000 of newly raised funds, to which was to be added \$69 000 000, which was the expected amount of repayments and recoveries of expenditure.

The Premier went on to indicate that, so far as the year 1977-78 and the repayments, recoveries and borrowings to cover discounts are concerned, whereas the original combined estimate for 1976-77 was \$69 600 000, the actual receipts were \$67 900 000. In other words, there was slightly less there. He went on to indicate his expectation for this year.

Against those recoveries we must surely consider the amount being injected into capital works from the Revenue Account, which is the amount that has been held in trust from the sale of the railways. I dispute the Premier's claim made on so many occasions that revenue is being used for Loan works because of the Federal Government's failure to make available adequate funds for Loan works in South Australia. We are carrying out Loan works in conformity with funds that are truly committed Loan moneys.

I now make the point that with the new federalism policy, which is reflecting right through our whole fiscal policy, the Federal Government has once again made available to the States the right to determine their own priorities—a situation of self-determination and of being adaptable to the immediate needs of the country or of the

State, and not to the whim of some planner in a far away place. The important thing is that it is the State Government which is able to determine whether the funds will be made available for capital involvement, as specifically involved in the documents we are considering, or whether they will be used more in people involvement, in the sense of syphoning off some of the funds for ordinary budgetary considerations. Whether or not we look at these funds under Loan or Budget, we must accept the situation that eventually the greater part of them is being made available for person employment. Person employment is the important issue on which we should all be setting our sights—the involvement of people in works that will benefit the State in which we live.

What we are most vitally concerned about, what we must be concerned about, and what has been said in the House for a long time by the Opposition but appears to have fallen on deaf ears on the other side is that we must look for a return on the dollar spent, whether it be for capital works or on people employment that is going to give progressive productivity or advancement to the State. Regrettably, we are still in the situation where we are not getting a degree of productivity, regardless of where we direct our funding.

Earlier today, the Minister of Labour and Industry and other Government members were interested in comments being made by one of my colleagues relative to the farcical, unattractive and failing employment scheme that has been instituted by this Government. I accept that there has been a need for the Government to consider unemployment works, but I again criticise the manner in which it has been done, the fact that there has been too much temporary involvement, and that only five men are being employed with money that could have enabled the employment of six men.

I come back to the comment made across the Chamber by the newly elected member for Ross Smith the other day, when he commented on my earlier statement that, in this unemployment scheme, the State Government Insurance Commission was undertaking the workmen's compensation aspect of the work programme at over 15 per cent when, indeed, the ordinary organisation (local government, or other authority undertaking the work) could get covered for less than 7 per cent. He said, "But the Government's getting it back. So what?" The Government might be getting it back, but there are ways and means of stimulating the economy in this State and in other areas of industry at a figure much less than the wasteful 15-plus per cent involved in the commission's underwriting of workmen's compensation for the unemployment scheme. That matter needs urgent consideration, because every dollar saved is another dollar that can be put into the scheme. It is a payment toward the employment of another person, be it on a public works programme under the Loan Estimates or on works undertaken under the Budget. These matters are extremely important.

The next point I make is that every business in South Australia and, indeed, every household and every member of every household, are aware of the responsibility they have to cut the coat according to the cloth. This truism is a simple statement of fact which this Government has consistently failed to face. Times change and circumstances alter, and it is necessary in these changing circumstances and in the best interests of the people overall that one is prepared to admit the redirection or changes that have occurred and to adjust to them. Businesses and households have to do it, so why should the Government not have to do it? I reject the Premier's statement that we should be willing to pay more and more

and to accept the overpayments associated with our State revenue income to provide the services for the State. I say that the State has to provide services which are commensurate with the financial situation ruling at any time.

As a member representing a country electorate, I warn the Government that it has not yet felt the full brunt of the difficulties besetting the rural sector. It has been my experience for a long time that metropolitan dwellers, be they blue collar or white collar workers, manufacturers, service providers, or whatever, take between three and a half months and 11 months to feel the impact of a deterioration in the financial position of the rural scene. The number of members of the rural community today who are having difficulty in providing the wherewithal to pay their tax commitments, the numbers who are having difficulty in meeting their local council rates, and the numbers having grave difficulty in meeting their forward financial commitments for machinery and other services they have received over a period of years, has yet to be felt in respect of their spending power and in the lack of their spending power in the reduction of the selling power of the city base.

**Mr. Wotton:** Very few people realise how serious the situation is.

**Dr. EASTICK:** It is deteriorating almost daily, associated with the unfortunate aspects of the drought that are having a serious effect on the matters I have raised, and also because of the declining return from expenditure in the rural scene. That is going rather beyond the requirements of the measure now before us. However, it will have severe effects on the income available to the State, be it for the servicing of the loans we are now considering for the provision of the staff which is going to make use of the capital works involved in this Loan programme. The Premier uses a few turns of phrase purely and simply to excite people or to get them emotionally upset. He talks about leaving the cupboard bare.

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

**Dr. EASTICK:** Before the dinner adjournment I was discussing the inter-relationship that exists between the Loan Estimates and the Budget, a matter that I said I would not pursue much further. However, in respect of both of those measures, one of the major issues which is a component and which must be considered is the effect of inflation. Only last week, when dealing with the Budget, the Opposition was able to show that the documents that we received 12 months previously referred to an inflation rate of 21 per cent in the services and wages associated with Government spending. By the Premier's own admission, we are looking at a figure of about 10.5 per cent to 12 per cent for the current year. I hope that, following the most recent announcement, the figure will be less than 10 per cent.

Regarding inflation, I wish to refer briefly to something that I read recently. In relation to business activity, the person concerned indicated that there were obviously signs of a reduction in the rate of inflation. He said:

Whilst I have no doubts that there are now very definite brakes on inflation, it is exactly the same as a speeding motor car: it requires a certain distance to reduce speed and slow down, and this naturally takes time.

Regrettably, we must still wait for some time before all the influences that the massive inflation following the 1972-75 era has introduced into our activities are shown in Loan works and normal budgetary considerations.

In the remaining few minutes at my disposal, I should like briefly to refer to the activities associated with

hospitals and education. I notice it is stated in the document that major works at the Para Districts Hospital have had to be deferred for some time. That hospital has attracted much comment in the newspapers that circulate north of Adelaide. Apart from the difficulties associated with it (and I remind the Government that it determines where it shall spend money and what are its priorities at any time), there are other hospital projects that are in mid-course. If, as the Government has suggested, funds for those projects are reduced, resulting in the removal of the work force from those developments, it will reduce our ability to use the resource, work on which has already been partly completed. Also, this will tend greatly to escalate the eventual cost of the project.

I refer particularly to the Hutchinson Hospital at Gawler, the second phase of which, it had previously been stated publicly by a member of the Government was a "goer", is urgently in need of being confirmed. In the same blanket comment that related to a pull-back on the Para District programme, the Hutchinson Hospital programme was also included in some local reports.

I note that the Government is to spend the considerable sum of \$12 000 000 on capital works associated with further education. There is on page 14 a list giving details of the expenditure of \$10 180 000 in 1976-77, and an outline of where the \$12 000 000 will be spent in 1977-78. There is a grave fear in the minds of many people who have watched the progress of some Government projects that too much money tends to be put into a few projects, resulting in a denial of funds for many smaller projects that would benefit a larger number of students.

Although one realises the size associated with the Regency Park College of Further Education, one would have to question the sum of money being spent on it when there are so many other further education projects which, if only one-twentieth or one-fiftieth of the money being spent on the one edifice to which I have referred was spent on them, would be able to give students a better opportunity for education than that which is currently available.

The Minister of Transport, who is in the Chamber this evening, would, if he was willing to do so, be able to indicate clearly that many road projects throughout South Australia are in jeopardy because practically all the available funds are being concentrated on the one major project, the South-Eastern Freeway. Although one realises that the eventual completion of that project will be of tremendous advantage to the people of this State, to interstate travellers, and in relation to the delivery of many of our goods to the Eastern seaboard, it still does not detract from the fact that the direction of most funds into one project is denying dozens of other projects even a small consideration.

I suspect that the Minister's most recent announcement of the updating of our rail services will have a similar effect on a number of other methods of public transport that are urgently required in many areas. My colleague, the member for Torrens, in his maiden speech, highlighted clearly the difficulties associated with transport in the north-eastern suburbs. He referred also to the difficulties that are being forced on Torrens District by the movement of traffic from the Gawler, Elizabeth and Salisbury areas.

The inability to proceed with a number of urgent projects in the northern and north-eastern areas will be a direct result of the allocation of money to the new railway system. Certainly, we need all these systems. However, I question, in relation to the transport, further education and hospital programmes, whether we might not be tending to build some rather large edifices and not giving

due consideration to the multitude of requirements in those urgent areas to which I have referred.

I should like also to refer to education spending. The tremendous sum of \$43 800 000 is to be spent on primary and secondary schools. There is a long list of schools that are under consideration at the planning stage during the 1977-78 financial year. I regret that no consideration is being given, even at the planning stage, to primary school facilities needed urgently in the Evanston-Gawler area. The primary school which was developed at Evanston a few years ago and which was expected this year to have a total student population of 580 to 600 children in fact has nearly 700 students.

The increase in population in this area has resulted in the school's getting about 50 extra students each term. Despite that, we have no plans for further primary school activities in the Gawler area, notwithstanding that in the corporation area alone about 1 200 allotments are currently available or due for release.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. Before calling on the next honourable member, I hope that members of the House will show the usual decorum on this occasion. The honourable member for Coles.

**Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles):** I support the Bill and, in speaking on the Loan Estimates, I first congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to your office. I know that members on both sides have been impressed with your fair-minded manner and the approach you have shown, and your sense of humour and fairness with which you conduct your duties, and we wish you well in your high office. I also congratulate other new members on their election and on their maiden speeches, especially my colleague, the member for Torrens, who made his maiden speech this afternoon.

In addressing myself to the Loan Estimates, I am very conscious of the people whose representative I am in this Parliament. The District of Coles comprises a diversity of people settled in both old-established and newly developing suburbs. There is a broad range of age groups, nationalities, backgrounds and occupations. Yet I believe that people living in Coles, and indeed in all districts represented in this Parliament have one thing in common, irrespective of the political philosophy they espouse, and that is a very strong wish that they, as individuals, could have a greater influence on Government decisions that affect them. There is a yearning in our own community and nation, and indeed all over the world, for Parliamentary democracy to work as ideally it should: that is, for the maintenance of the rights, freedoms, and responsibilities of people rather than for the administrative convenience of politicians and bureaucrats.

We are all aware, many of us through personal experience, that one of the major problems that besets democratic nations and engulfs totalitarian States today is the pervasive feeling that individuals have little or no power to influence events and that they are at the mercy of remote Governments. This frequently justified feeling is the enemy of democracy. It leads to negativism and frustration on the part of individuals and to alienation between Government and society, with all its attendant evils of anti-social behaviour. It has the cumulative effect of making people more and more dependent upon Governments. It makes them willing to sacrifice more and more of their rights and freedoms, while at the same time abdicating more and more of their personal responsibilities.

This issue is emerging all over the world as the powers of the modern state develop and gather momentum to the point where Governments threaten to become the masters

and not the servants of the people who elect them. This issue is, I suggest, very relevant to the debate on the Loan Estimates. The central theme of the Premier's speech is about economic power as it is distributed throughout the federal system of government in Australia. In that the theme is about economic power, it is strongly linked to political power, because the two are indivisible and both have a profound effect on the lives of ordinary citizens.

The Premier has used his statement on the Loan Estimates as the basis for an attack on the Commonwealth Government's federalism policy. In doing so he has revealed a great deal about his attitude to the federal system of government, to political power, and to individual liberty. We all know, of course, that the Labor Party, as a socialist Party, is opposed to a federal system which effectively divides power, and that it advocates a centralist system of government in which all power is concentrated in one Parliament, and one House of Parliament at that. Liberals, on the other hand, believe firmly in the separation of power, seeing it as the mainstay of the continuation of democratic government. It was said by Lord Acton, nineteenth century British historian and moralist, that "Of all the checks on democracy, federation has been the most efficacious and the most congenial. The federal system limits and restrains the sovereign power by dividing it and by assigning to government only certain defined rights. It is the only method of curbing not only the majority, but the power of the whole people."

Lord Acton's definition holds good today. Its basic principle is expressed in the Liberal National Country Parties' federalism policy, which states.

We support the concept of federalism in which there are three areas of government—Federal, State and local—and in which the powers and functions are distributed to achieve continuous response and to provide an effective barrier against centralist authoritarian control.

The policy continues:

In a crowded world of massive and growing complexities of laws and regulations, individual freedom is increasingly threatened unless the nature and shape of our democratic institutions adapt themselves to provide safeguards. Federalism, therefore, is not merely a structural concept. Its principal justification is a philosophical one. It aims to prevent dangerous concentration of power in a few hands. In so doing, it provides a guarantee of political and individual freedom.

A system of government which is truly federalist, not only in its structure but also in the way in which that structure is used to implement policies, provides the most effective way by which individuals can influence decision making. If a Government is to fulfil its constitutional and legislative responsibilities, it is essential that it be provided with the resources to do so. That is precisely the basis on which our federalism policy was developed, and it is that philosophical basis which the Government of this State so clearly opposes. The Premier's opposition to the concept of decentralised power is so intense that he deliberately distorts facts and uses figures selectively to support his contention that South Australia has been financially disadvantaged by the Commonwealth. When the whole picture is revealed, we find that South Australia is in fact much better off, not only financially but more importantly in terms of its own sovereignty and independence as a State. As a consequence, the people of South Australia have greatly improved opportunities to influence Government decisions which will affect them.

As a result of the Federal Government's providing South Australia with a guaranteed increased share of resources, this State is now in a better position than it has been for decades to determine its own priorities. There is



no excuse whatever for the Premier's claims that in health, housing, transport, and education, South Australia is hampered by lack of Federal funds. The truth is that the only thing that hampers South Australia's advancement in these areas is the State Labor Government's reluctance to use its own capacities to meet our needs.

A summary of the general revenue grants from the Commonwealth Government to South Australia shows the falsity of the Premier's claim that there has been a steady contraction of funds to the States. In fact, the reverse is true. In 1976-77, South Australia's total revenue assistance from the Commonwealth was \$432 500 000, an 18.3 per cent increase on the previous year. In the current year, the amount is \$507 700 000, an increase of 17.4 per cent, which is massive real growth by any standards. Looked at in conjunction with special purpose payments from the Commonwealth to South Australia for the same period, the picture emerges of a State which has been released from financial bondage under a Federal Labor Government and which is now, if it chooses, free to exercise its own independent judgments and determine its own priorities. In 1975-76, specific purpose recurrent payments to South Australia totalled \$232 300 000; in 1976-77, the total was \$243 500 000 (a 3.5 per cent increase); and in 1977-78 the figure was \$285 600 000 (a 17.3 per cent increase).

It is true that, as the Premier claims, special purpose capital grants dropped from \$205 500 000 in 1975-76 to \$178 800 000 in 1976-77, a decrease of 13 per cent. In the current year, the special purpose capital grant is \$175 900 000, a drop of 1.6 per cent on the previous year, but in practical terms this simply means that the Commonwealth has on the one hand deliberately diminished its power to dictate spending priorities to South Australia, whilst on the other, through revenue sharing, it has greatly enhanced our ability to spend our income as this Parliament, not the Federal Parliament, chooses. In areas such as housing, health, transport and education, surely this is what the people of South Australia want. These are areas of State responsibility. It is our elected representatives, not a Federal Cabinet, who should be the ones to decide what proportion of revenue is allocated to these areas, yet clearly the Premier yearns for the days when Canberra called the tune for South Australia.

Probably he would like a return to the era of 1974-75 when the Whitlam Government's extravagance was at its height and special purpose grants increased by almost 90 per cent in one year. Under Labor the number and volume of specific purpose grants under section 96, which allows the States to act only as agents of the Commonwealth, increased as a proportion of all Commonwealth grants from 28.73 per cent in 1971-72 to more than 49 per cent in 1974-75. This provides a classic example of the kind of control that a socialist central government instinctively exerts; that is, an expansion of its own powers over other spheres of government and the representatives and their electors in other spheres of government.

The Premier laments what he describes as the "abandonment of the Federal Government responsibility for a range of programmes", yet there is no acknowledgment whatever of the indisputable fact that the total non-repayable Commonwealth payments to South Australia have increased from \$862 900 000 in 1975-76 to \$914 100 000 in 1976-77 (an increase of 5.9 per cent) and that in the current year 1977-78 the amount is \$1 031 500 000, an increase of 12.8 per cent. When Loan Council money is included in the total Commonwealth payments, the figures show a growth from \$975 800 000 in 1975-76 to \$1 032 700 000 in 1976-77 (an increase of 5.8

per cent), rising to \$1 156 000 000 in 1977-78, an increase of 11.9 per cent. Not only is there real growth in non-repayable grants, but there is also real growth in total payments to this State. Despite the plaintive and deceitful cry that South Australia has been "singled out for an especially bad deal", the total percentage increase of 11.9 per cent in Commonwealth payments to South Australia compares favourably with the six-State average of 11.8 per cent. Significantly, it exceeds the 10 per cent growth which the Commonwealth has allocated to itself.

So, Mr. Speaker, the facts and figures, when presented in total, provide a considerably different picture from the myopic view put forward by the Government in the Premier's statement on the Loan Estimates. There is yet another aspect to the favourable situation which the Federal Liberal Government has created for South Australia and which has received no acknowledgment in the Loan Estimates statement. It is an aspect which is vital to the principle that decentralisation of political power, which enhances individual liberty, depends on decentralisation of economic power. I refer to the right of local government to be a responsible partner in our federal system by having access to a guaranteed source of funds which enable it to meet constitutionally its commitments. One of the most exciting developments in inter-government relations in Australia has been the determination of the present Federal Government to provide local government with the resources it needs to fulfil its responsibilities as the local community and its elected representatives see fit.

Local government has been made a partner in the tax-sharing arrangements, with an annual entitlement to a 1.52 per cent share of personal income tax. Under these arrangements, \$14 220 000 has been provided as grants to South Australia for on-passing as general purpose assistance for local government authorities. This is a 19 per cent increase over the previous year's allocation of \$11 900 000. This does not include road funds which nevertheless form a major part of Commonwealth funds to local government and for which in 1977-78 a total of \$40 400 000 is provided for South Australia.

In the present difficult economic circumstances this very substantial increase is clear evidence of the Commonwealth's determination to see that the needs of local government and the important function it performs are recognised. The tax-sharing entitlements provided to each State for on-passing to local government are made available in a single lump sum, resulting in a considerable increase in local government funds early in each financial year. This eases the situation created by the usual tendency for rate payments to occur in the latter half of the financial year, and consequently represents an additional benefit.

This is in direct contrast to the centralist arrangements set up by the Labor Government, under which the grants to local authorities were used as a means of imposing Canberra-inspired schemes on States and local government authorities, irrespective of their needs and wishes. All this is part of a conscious effort by the Federal Government to decentralise power. Looked at from the point of view of the individual's influence on decisions, it can best be illustrated by contrasting the situation which was developing under the Whitlam Labor Government with the much healthier situation which now applies from the point of view of the individual voters in the districts we in this House represent.

Consider yourself in two situations as a householder with damaged kerbing outside the entrance to your house. In a few years' time, assuming the A.L.P. had continued in power federally and fully instituted its system of regions

controlled by a central Government to take over the function of local government, you would have telephoned your local council to complain. It would have referred you to the public servant in charge of roads in your region and he would have said that the grant allocation for roads in this region was currently being considered in Canberra, and "We will advise you when a decision is made," (the A.L.P. Federal Government having previously said to the local council "We'll take over the responsibility for roads from you: after all, with your meagre resources you can't really afford to do it properly.") As a householder, you would have no control whatsoever over the public servant and even less chance of influencing the fellow who is making the decision in Canberra, so you would grit your teeth and think "What's the use?", because you have no control over a sphere of government.

Contrast this with the situation today of telephoning your local council, which tells you kerbing is fitted into a works programme decided by the council and financed by guaranteed revenue sharing. The councillor for your ward is Joe Blow. You telephone him, raise the matter of the kerbing, ask him how his campaign for the next election is going and rest content that he is going to fight mighty hard in council for kerbing repairs in your street. If he does not, he may find himself replaced by someone who has a better understanding of the needs of his electors.

Once again the people of Coles provide excellent examples of how the provision of guaranteed, untied funds to local government has enabled individuals and local communities to make their own choices and decisions free from the dictates of another sphere of government which is, by its nature, remote from their needs. In each of the local government areas of Campbelltown, Burnside and East Torrens, which fall within the boundaries of Coles, local government has responded magnificently to the challenge that has been afforded by greater financial independence under fiscal federalism. Provision of amenities which local people really want and need has been made possible by the provision of a guaranteed source of income.

The Government has, in effect, budgeted for a deficit of \$18 400 000. It has done so in the knowledge that it has very substantial accumulated reserves because of the transfer to the Commonwealth of its responsibility for country railways. Having off-loaded an area of State responsibility, it was rewarded handsomely by the Whitlam Government for doing so. However, this Government now refuses to apply the capital gain to the benefit of South Australia, and constantly demands that the Commonwealth Government should pick up the tab for its expenditure. On the one hand the Treasurer claims the credit for cutting State taxes, an action which reduces the State's capacity to finance its needs, and on the other hand he urges Federal tax cuts whilst simultaneously denouncing the Federal Government for not throwing more money in South Australia's direction.

There is neither consistency nor integrity in this approach. It is basic to democracy that the politicians who spend the money are identified as the ones who extract it from the taxpayer. The Commonwealth has directed an overall increase in funds to South Australia, yet nowhere in the Loan Estimates statement is there acknowledgment of this.

Our purpose in this Parliament is to give effect to the will of the people in a way that most accurately reflects their needs and wishes. In the Australian context, the framework that was created to make Government responsive to people's needs and wishes is the Federal system. Like all forms of democratic Government, the Federal system is not static but dynamic; it is constantly

changing and being modified to adapt to changing situations. The dynamic nature of inter-governmental arrangements means that Governments are drawn into new fields or shift emphasis between fields in response to either electoral pressure or political convention, or both. Inter-governmental lines are inevitably influenced by any major new initiative. The home ownership and education policies of the Menzies Governments, or the urban policies of the Whitlam Government, which all developed in response to emerging national needs and aspirations, represented major redefinitions of the role of Government as a whole at the time they were introduced.

The introduction of revenue sharing is a direct response by the Federal Liberal Government to the clearly expressed wish of Australians to have a greater say in the decisions that affect the day-to-day lives of individuals and families: what kind of classrooms we should have in our schools; what kind of transport services we want; what level of housing is acceptable; what quality of health care is necessary.

Having been allocated a fair and reasonable share of the taxpayers' dollar, this State Labor Government must spend it in the best interests of South Australians and, in doing so, assume its constitutional and moral responsibilities and not thrust them back on to the Federal Government.

In condemning fiscal federalism, this State Government is out of step with what Australians today are wanting. South Australians and the people of the other States do not want the Canberra piper to call the tune. They want a fair share of the nation's resources so that their needs can be met in the way that is best suited to their own State. By allocating 39.7 per cent of income tax to the States, the Commonwealth Government has given us both the liberty and the responsibility to satisfy our needs and wishes in our own ways to do what South Australians believe is important and to exercise our own choice as to priorities.

This alone can be regarded as a major step on the road to that ideal situation which citizens of all democracies seek and to which I referred earlier. Fiscal federalism, as practised by the Commonwealth Government, has for the first time for decades created the potential for our system of government to work as ideally as it should; that is, for the maintenance of the rights, freedoms and responsibilities of all Australians and the enlargement of their opportunities to influence Governments and, in doing so, to determine their own destiny. I support the Bill.

**Mr. BECKER (Hanson):** What a pleasure it was to hear the speech made by the member for Coles. All members would acknowledge and realise not only that she has made an excellent contribution to this debate but also that she will make an excellent contribution to this Parliament. We on this side of the House have lacked something since Mrs. Steele, the then member for Davenport, left us. When I was first elected to this House I occupied the cross benches with Mrs. Steele, who was a tremendous help and guidance to me in my early months in Parliament. The member for Light and I now have the pleasure of assisting the member for Coles, but from the way she has contributed to the debate it seems that she will need no more assistance from us. I congratulate her on a clear, well-presented and precise speech.

**Mr. Gunn:** How did it compare with what we've heard from those opposite?

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

**Mr. BECKER:** It was a far better speech than any the previous member for Coles would have made.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is nothing in the Loan Estimates about the former member for Coles.

**Mr. BECKER:** As I develop my contribution, perhaps I could link it with some of the duties that that honourable member, as Minister of Works, must supervise. Introducing the Loan Estimates, the Treasurer reminded us that the expenditure proposals in the schedule aggregate \$259 000 000 for 1977-78 compared to just over \$261 000 000 for 1976-77. The latter figure is reduced to \$257 000 000 if expenditure on non-metropolitan railways is excluded in order to give comparability. The Treasurer stated:

That . . . 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.

He then reminded us that the Government had been able to keep the figure at \$259 000 000 by again taking money from Revenue Account to boost Loan Account. Last financial year \$15 000 000 was appropriated in this manner for the forthcoming year, and \$12 000 000 will be allocated. That is where I have my first argument with the Treasurer because, as at June 30, 1977, a book-keeping transfer was effected to eliminate the accumulated Loan Account deficit of \$9 100 000 in order to reduce the reserves on Revenue Account to a net amount of \$18 400 000. The Treasurer continued:

. . . these reserves will be entirely exhausted at the end of this financial year, in order to maintain both the Loan and the Revenue Budgets.

It is a pity that he has seen fit to take money again from Revenue Account in order to prop up Loan Account. It is clear that he and his Government have no intention of abiding by the recommendation to live within the Budget: they are trying by every means possible to continue with their programme of Loan works at the expense of the taxpayers of South Australia.

Every loan raised places a greater burden on the Revenue Account through interest payments, and taxpayers have to meet that bill. I should like to give one example of how costs can get out of hand in relation to major capital works and building programmes. I refer to the Flinders Medical Centre and the report of the Public Works Committee of April 14, 1972, which informs us that the proposal to build and establish the centre was put to the committee at an estimated cost of \$32 000 000. On page 16 of that report in paragraph VI under the heading "Budget Cost and Cost Planning Procedures" the following statement was made:

The estimated cost of \$38 700 000 based on construction costs as at July, 1971, has been prepared to establish a budget cost within which the proposed 710-bed hospital and medical school can be built to the standards of practice, design and finish implicit in the brief.

Paragraph VII on page 17 under "Rise in costs" states:

In our opinion the statistical increase over the next 10 years will be approximately 5 per cent per annum. However, after analysing the actual increased costs for the past 10-year period based on the tender market, we are of the opinion that a rise of between 60-80 per cent of the statistical rise or 3.5 per cent per annum has occurred. This situation is the result of a highly competitive tender market combined with increased efficiency in the building industry.

Yet the Treasurer admits that rising costs in the construction industry have had a tremendous effect on the Loan Account. On page 17, under the heading "Financial Aspect", the report states:

The committee was told that the estimated cost for the Modbury Hospital was in the vicinity of \$24 800 a bed, and that when allowance of about 5 per cent per annum was made for price variation since the tendering of evidence, the costs

being incurred on the project were comparable with the estimates submitted to the committee. On this basis the estimated cost as at June, 1971, would be in the vicinity of \$29 800 a bed, whereas the hospital component of the Flinders Medical Centre is estimated to cost slightly in excess of \$34 000 a bed.

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** It's a teaching hospital.

**Mr. BECKER:** It is a teaching hospital, and I recognise that. I trust that the Government does not misunderstand me in this respect, as I am not totally criticising the concept of the Flinders Medical Centre, because I believe we need it, and in 1971-72, when the centre was first mooted, people in the south-western suburbs were delighted to think that, at long last, they were to get a first-class teaching hospital.

However, the costs associated with a project of this magnitude can get out of hand, and inflation, which no-one at that stage could foresee, can creep up, so that, with a limited Loan programme, one has to meet these increased costs while still carrying out a constructive capital works programme. This is the real problem facing the Government, which is under much pressure to find other accommodation, etc.

When looking at the value of Parliamentary committees, especially the Public Works Committee, one understands the frustrations that such committees must experience from time to time. I refer to the Public Works Committee's report on the Flinders Medical Centre Development—Phase IV, of June 23, 1976, as follows:

In 1971 representatives of the joint planning committee which had been charged by Cabinet with the responsibilities for the planning and construction of the Flinders Medical Centre, submitted a development plan which envisaged a four-phase project which on completion would give some 700 patient beds plus all the supporting facilities for a full integrated medical school/teaching hospital.

At that time the joint planning committee sought approval in principle to the complete programme broken down into phases to simplify planning construction, commissioning and finance. It suggested that the centre should be planned initially for 710 beds but that site planning should be based on the possibility that the ultimate number of beds might reach up to 1 000.

The joint planning committee established by Cabinet examined this project, and it was broadly suggested that provision should be made for 1 000 beds. On August 4, 1977, the Minister of Health in another place was critical of a statement I made, as follows:

It is suggested that another 300 beds be added, at an unknown cost, but which could certainly take the project over either the \$100 000 000 mark.

The Minister then asked:

Who made that suggestion?

He then indulged in the normal tirade of abuse that I have become used to receiving. I have given the lie to the Minister's statement, because a joint planning committee examined the Flinders Medical Centre project, and that committee was established by Cabinet, so even the Minister is not fully aware of what is going on. Indeed, I remind the House that in its findings the committee made several strong statements, and it should be borne in mind that, when we approve any project, we must bear in mind what can happen. On page 19 of the report on the Flinders Medical Centre Development—Phase IV, the Public Works Committee stated:

The findings of the committee are as follows:

The actual population increase in the catchment area has been slightly less than originally estimated, but even when Flinders Medical Centre is fully operational the number of

hospital beds per thousand of population in the south-western suburbs will still be relatively low.

Whilst the mounting capital cost of the project is disturbing the resultant annual charge against general revenue is relatively small when compared with the direct running costs of a teaching hospital. Last financial year the deficit charge against consolidated revenue for Government teaching hospitals was about \$52 000 000. The committee considers that a further deficit of about \$6 000 000 will be incurred when the Flinders Medical Centre becomes fully operational as a teaching hospital . . . .

In recent years the Hospitals Department has been extending out-patient services at teaching hospitals. This trend has been continued at the Flinders Medical Centre. The out-patient services at teaching hospitals which are both equipment and specialist intensive cost about \$30 per consultation.

We are now told that is about \$50. It is hard to assess, in dollars and cents, the cost of each consultation because, as I maintain, one cannot put an actual cost on the benefit to the community. The report continues:

On world standards 708 beds in a teaching hospital are adequate for about 64 medical students a year. Whilst the immediate intention is to have an enrolment of 64 students each year for the medical school the design capacity is for 96 students and consideration will need to be given to the problem of where a further 300 beds of suitable patients will be available for teaching purposes.

If there are not sufficient suitable and available teaching beds at nearby hospitals consideration may need to be given to providing an ultimate capacity of 1 000 beds at the Flinders Medical Centre in order to have correct correlation between the services, teaching and treatment facilities, as well as greater potential for more effective use of highly expensive specialist equipment.

Prior to approving the scheme in principle, the committee was told in evidence that the target cost set was realisable in buildings of the size and form described, that there was no intention of increasing floor areas within the limits set nor of increasing costs, and that a statistical price rise of between 3.5 per cent and 5 per cent could be expected during the construction period. The target costs set for Phases I to III were exceeded. The committee is disappointed that Phase IV now described to it is estimated to cost \$14 070 000, which is about four times that amount included in the initial submission.

The initial estimate in 1971 was \$3 400 000. The Auditor-General refers to an estimated cost of \$90 197 000 and to a total of payments to June 30, 1977, of \$60 954 000. On page 165 of his report, the Auditor-General states:

The building of the centre, comprising an integrated teaching hospital and medical school, commenced in June, 1972. Phases I and II, comprising 10 buildings, are completed. The one building for Phase III is nearing completion. Phases I to III provide an approximate 500-bed capacity. During the year, plans for Phase IV were recommended by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works. The works proposed include extending bed capacity to approximately 700, and are estimated to cost \$23 301 000.

In the short period since June 23, 1976, when the Public Works Committee approved the additions of \$14 000 000, the amount has now increased to \$23 000 000. There is no doubt that, regrettably, that figure will increase, demonstrating what tremendous pressure is placed on Loan Account.

One must bear in mind the servicing of the loans, running of the hospital, and so on, these matters having been dealt with in a previous Parliamentary paper. This brings us back to a statement made by the Auditor-

General that was reported in a *News* editorial on Wednesday, September 11, 1974, as follows:

Government departments have always been the "Aunt Sally" for public gibes and criticism. Now the Auditor-General has confirmed some of the general suspicions with a damning set of complaints about a whole range of departments. His job is to act as the public's watchdog over what goes on inside the Public Service corridors. His annual report invariably reveals some shortcomings. But this year's report, released yesterday, makes a host of serious charges involving a waste of money and manpower. At a time when every dollar becomes increasingly more important, it is alarming that the Auditor-General should find the principles of real budgeting are "not appreciated or practised" by some departments.

In the Public Buildings Department, for instance, the Auditor-General expresses concern over the spending of \$11 600 000 on building maintenance when much of the work was neither scheduled nor estimated. He found some departments had virtually ignored his previous advice, and others failed to provide sufficient details of their activities. Every taxpayer will be concerned about these findings and the disturbing picture they paint. Now it is up to the Ministers in charge of departments to make sure something is done. Down through the chain of departmental command, inefficiency and budget mismanagement must not be tolerated, particularly in the coming months when the economy is going to be a strain to everyone, in and out of the Public Service.

More so today than at any time in this decade are those remarks apposite. I am sceptical about whether the Government will be able to keep to the actual figures in the Loan Estimates, and I wish it luck in that project.

The Treasurer, referring to Government buildings, land and services, involving an allocation of \$113 755 000, said that \$6 650 000 was required to complete Phases I to III of the Flinders Medical Centre project by the end of 1977. The Treasurer continued:

\$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.

So the allocation for Phase IV, which is just being started, has increased from \$3 400 000 to \$14 000 000 and then to about \$23 000 000. That is a warning that the start of this financial year is not good and that inflationary problems will make budgeting difficult.

I am pleased to note that \$950 000 will be spent on additions to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which will include the expansion of emergency service facilities. It is a pity money cannot be found to expand the car park, although it is better at this stage to concentrate expenditure on the hospital facilities. Other interesting items of expenditure include \$3 159 000 to complete work on the forensic science building; \$3 160 000 to continue the work on the Marine and Harbours Department office building at Port Adelaide; and \$1 414 000 for further renovations and upgrading of Parliament House.

At page 262 of the Auditor-General's Report he refers, in connection with stage 1 of a major upgrading of Parliament House, to an approved expenditure of \$3 650 000 and total payments to June, 1977, of \$3 713 000. For stage 2 the approved expenditure was \$2 000 000 and, as at June 30, 1977, \$391 000 had been spent, so the \$1 414 000 should round off stage 2, bringing the total cost of the project to about \$5 650 000. This again

demonstrates the need to keep up the maintenance on very large properties such as this building.

I believe that hardly any maintenance had been done on this building for many years. When I came here the plumbing and wiring were visible, so it is no wonder that we have had to approve an expenditure of about \$5 600 000. But this can be said of various other Government buildings, and it is interesting to note that in 1974-75 the Public Buildings Department had to find some \$2 800 000 for rent for Government accommodation, in 1975-76 that increased to \$3 900 000, and in 1976-77 it was \$5 131 000.

However, on the credit side at least, the Government is doing something in the building of various Government projects throughout the city. The Flinders Street office block, which is a new building, will cost some \$16 033 000. I think that is almost finished, and the cost, up to June 30, 1977, was \$15 734 000. The forensic science building was estimated to cost \$9 026 000; at the end of June, 1977, it had cost \$5 956 000, and we need another \$3 059 000 to finish it off; that brings it up pretty well to budget, which is commendable.

The Motor Registration Division building was estimated to cost \$5 819 000; the total payments to June 30, 1977, were \$5 280 000. That building has been completed and is occupied. However, no matter what the Government does or where it turns regarding buildings in trying to provide reasonable estimates, as has been done in this document for Government work, it is very difficult. Even new schools are costing a considerable sum of money these days compared with the past.

**Mr. Gunn:** That is because of fires.

**Mr. BECKER:** That is not quite right, although fires are expensive. It is disappointing that they do occur. Camden Primary School has been completed at a final cost of \$656 000, which gives Morphett its first primary school. I hope the member who represents that district will look after it, and I am sure that the staff and students will receive benefits from the new school.

I was delighted to discover that Plympton Primary School is earmarked as a major project to be commenced during 1977-78; we are to get a brick construction at a cost of \$450 000. The Plympton Primary School has faced extreme difficulties over many years, and during the past seven years the school council and staff have done all they can to try to have the situation resolved. It is the only school I know that is established on three separate blocks. The big problem is to come up with a system of closing some roads. I know some students are very happy to think that some of the roads will be closed in the interests of the safety of the children and of providing better facilities for the staff and the students. This project must be undertaken and must be commenced without further delay. The Minister, who is now in the Chamber, visited the school a few years ago and no doubt from that visit he promised to do something for Plympton Primary School. We are grateful that at long last the project is under way. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

**Mr. GUNN (Eyre):** I support the Bill. In doing so, first I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to the office you hold. On the last occasion, I overlooked congratulating you. I hope you have an enjoyable time as Speaker. I commend the members for Coles and Torrens on the way in which they addressed themselves to this Bill. It was refreshing to see those new members making such fine contributions. It is obvious that both members will have a long stay in this Chamber and, if the Liberal Party can attract candidates of that quality at the next election, the people of this State, given the opportunity, will see that they change sides with some Government members.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** You'll only have to get rid of some of your dead wood.

**Mr. GUNN:** I suggest that the Minister look behind him; but I will not be sidetracked. In reading the Loan Estimates, which is probably the second most important financial measure to come before the House each year, it is interesting that the Premier has again gone into a diatribe against the responsible policies of the Commonwealth Government. He seems to be completely obsessed with hatred of the Prime Minister and the logical policies he is putting into effect. Having listened to his speech and the comments that emanated from Canberra (I think on Friday) I am wondering how the Premier can equate the two situations; but, of course, he has a short memory.

In looking at this document, one should examine the situation that has caused the Commonwealth Government to have to adopt the policies it has adopted. I shall link up my remarks with this Bill because the Premier has in great detail talked about the revenue that the State has received. Ever since I have been in this House, we have heard from the Premier that he has never received enough money. He has criticised everyone who has held the position of Prime Minister. At various times he has attacked his own colleagues, though not quite as vehemently as he has attacked Liberal Prime Ministers, but there has not been one Prime Minister who has pleased the Premier. I wonder who is right and who is wrong, because the other Premiers have at times been critical, but they have mostly accepted that the Commonwealth does not have a big bag of money which it can throw around like Father Christmas throwing out lollies going down the street.

The Premier appears to believe that the Commonwealth has a huge bag of money in Canberra that it can continue to throw out to the States and anyone else, because during the whole time that the Premier has been attacking the Commonwealth Government, both now and in the debate on the Appropriation Bill last week, he has never once clearly explained to this House or to the people of this State where he thinks the Commonwealth Government would collect all its extra revenue. That is a question that must be answered.

It is all very well to advocate an increase in the expenditure of money, particularly taxpayers' money, from Loan funds and general revenue. Every member of this House and of every Parliament in Australia could sit down and within 10 minutes think of many projects he would like to see completed in his electorate costing millions of dollars; it would be nice to have at our disposal the money to complete those projects. But, unfortunately, someone has to pay for them, by taxation either direct or indirect. During the whole of the Premier's attacks upon the Commonwealth Government, he has never told us which programmes it should cut out and which new ones it should introduce.

He was most critical of the decision to index personal income tax—something which saved the taxpayers considerable money and which was long overdue. The only time I could get any indication from him was when I interjected and he said, "The Commonwealth would get it from its taxation revenue." He was obviously advocating an increase in personal income tax. If that is his philosophy—

**Mr. McRae:** He didn't say that.

**Mr. GUNN:** Yes, he did. I had to repeat the interjection twice. The honourable member ought to see what the Minister of Transport had to say on that occasion. It was most illuminating to me to realise that the Premier obviously thought that the Commonwealth had unlimited resources, as he must have done for him to make such a suggestion.

**Mr. McRae:** He was seeking a reduction from the Commonwealth in personal income tax.

**Mr. GUNN:** He was putting on one of his theatrical performances in the House, demanding more funds, and accusing the Commonwealth of starving the States of money. Where does he think the Commonwealth will get the extra revenue?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I think that the honourable member should get back to the Bill and link his remarks to it.

**Mr. GUNN:** It was obvious from his remarks that he was advocating an increase in taxation. If we examine the sums of money that will be allocated, we will see that advances to the State Bank, of about \$9 000 000, have been made to provide funds to enable it to make advances for housing. That allocation is interesting, because I believe that every person who wishes to own a house should have the right to do so. Houses should be made available to people as cheaply as possible, and they should be of the highest quality. However, South Australia faces the problem of having the highest building costs in Australia.

**Mr. Chapman:** Why do you think that should be?

**Mr. GUNN:** I will explain, because last week I drew to the Premier's attention a statement by a person in the building industry who is well versed on this subject, and the Premier got up and personally attacked him. I draw again to the attention of the House some of the costs involved, together with land prices. The Premier and his Ministers have been claiming that we do not have the highest building costs in Australia, but the information I have has been supported by the Master Builders Association, the Housing Industry Association, the Institute of Quantity Surveyors, and the Australian Bureau of Statistics. The bureau is unlikely to provide incorrect information; after all, it is a completely independent organisation.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** It made a mistake in the c.p.i. It admitted that yesterday.

**Mr. GUNN:** We are fortunate to have with us the economic genius, the Minister of Mines and Energy. The Government should be thoroughly ashamed of this State's housing costs. If we look at the cost in Sydney, we will find that the average commencing value is far lower than it is in Adelaide. I should like the Premier to explain to the House and to the people of South Australia why this situation has arisen. Does he consider that the effects on the building industry of workmen's compensation, the long service leave legislation for building industry employees, and the manner in which builders licensing regulations are applied are the major factors in increased costs to the industry? I think they are, and the Government should examine the situation closely. I hope that the Government will do something about it during the coming year.

There are many projects in my district on which the Government could spend money. I point out that my district, which comprises about 86 per cent of the total area of this State, has tremendous potential for development. One of the things that this State has lacked is that we have been unfortunate because we have only a small return to the Treasury from mineral royalties. Although the project at Roxby Downs could provide tremendous income to this State, unfortunately the current policy of the State Government is to leave uranium in the ground. There is no way, to my knowledge, in which a copper mining project could get off the ground, bearing in mind world copper prices. Unfortunately, the project at Kanmantoo has folded, and one could not say that the operation at Mount Gunson was a booming success. Therefore, it is unlikely that Western Mining Corporation

would invest the many millions of dollars required to set that project in operation, if it cannot mine and export uranium. The South Australian Government would receive many millions of dollars in royalty payments if that project could get off the ground.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Can the honourable member tell me the line to which he is speaking?

**Mr. GUNN:** I will find it for you, Sir.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** You were talking about revenue.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Eyre has the floor.

**Mr. GUNN:** I am speaking in regard to the \$450 000 allocation to the Mines Department for building, plant, etc.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not think that relates to uranium.

**Mr. GUNN:** Yes, it does.

**Mr. Chapman:** It's a very appropriate line.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Chair will decide that.

**Mr. GUNN:** Obviously, the Mines Department would be co-operating with the mining company in carrying out tests and supervising what was taking place. The department would be using some of the equipment in supervising the project. I think it unfortunate, not only for the people in South Australia but also the people of Australia, that the Labor Party has adopted the policy it has adopted. I believe it is time that it rethought its policy in view of the many crocodile tears that have flowed from the Government at a time when it has had the opportunity of creating meaningful employment for many people for many years by supporting this project. It is only a matter of time before it will be forced by sheer economic necessity to change what, in my opinion, is a ridiculous policy. It is interesting to speak to people involved in the mining industry and to see what they think of the policy. Men in my electorate have said, "Get the project going as quickly as you can, because we are looking forward to going up there and getting a job. The money will be good."

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is nothing about staffing in the Estimates, either. The honourable member is getting away from the Bill.

**Mr. GUNN:** If one examines what the Premier had to say in his second reading explanation, one will see that he had something to say about unemployment. However, I will not labour that matter. I have probably said enough with regard to that project but on another occasion I will elaborate still further on the matter. On examining the document still further, I was interested to note that the Government has provided \$150 000 to build a slipway at Thevenard to service the fishing vessels in that part of my district. This project, which is long overdue, has an interesting history, and I hope it will be completed as soon as possible, because that port has tremendous potential for deep sea fishing in the Australian Bight.

I should like now to refer to another matter that is of concern to my constituents. During my regular visits to Whyalla, I have been perturbed at the quality of water that Whyalla people have had to put up with. I am pleased to see that \$155 000 has been provided for the establishment at Lincoln Gap of a chlorination station. I sincerely hope that that station will improve greatly the quality of water that my Whyalla constituents will receive.

I refer also to another interesting item dealing with the provision of the Country Fire Services headquarters at Keswick. I hope that that project will commence smartly. Only \$41 000 has been provided for the construction of single men's quarters for the Police Department at Oodnadatta. That is indeed only a small sum, as a number of single officers are stationed at Oodnadatta. I wonder whether this is merely the initial allocation. I intend to

take up this matter with the Minister at the appropriate time.

When reading through the list of allocations, one finds, tucked away where one was probably meant to overlook it, an allocation of \$210 000 for accommodation for the Publicity Branch of the Premier's Department. I do not know what are that branch's activities. However, one could make a calculated guess and say that this involved yet another part of the Labor Party's publicity machine. What are the duties of these people, and why is this \$210 000 being spent? There are far too many of these people already: they do not appear to be making any contribution to the welfare of people of this State, yet \$210 000 is being spent on accommodation for them. Whether they are to take over a completely new building, or whether this money is being spent on furnishings only, I do not know. The way the Government is going, it will make the Whitlam media department look like a Sunday school picnic!

In my district, there is one of the most important areas in South Australia: the Leigh Creek coalfields. I am pleased that the Government intends to allocate nearly \$1 000 000 for the relocation of the town of Leigh Creek. Having had the opportunity to inspect the new site and to examine plans, I know that it is an exciting development. I hope that this project will receive adequate funds and that it is in no way stunted. Leigh Creek is, as I have said, one of South Australia's most important areas, providing coal for the production of most of our power requirements. I hope that the Government will co-operate and do everything possible with the same enthusiasm with which it set out to build Monarto, the city that never was.

I hope that the Monarto Development Commission can, for the first time since its establishment, play a useful role. Until now, it has done nothing, although it has spent \$20 000 000 of public money. That sum has already been wasted without anything being achieved. The commission has had a fair bit of practice at wasting taxpayers' money, and I hope that on this occasion it will do something constructive.

The sum of \$350 000 is allocated for national parks, and \$1 200 000 is allocated for sporting facilities under the aegis of the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department. In this respect, I should like to link up my remarks with a letter that I received today from a constituent who is most concerned at the behaviour of tourists. The Government is spending a large sum of money providing national parks, and I hope that some of that money will be used to build houses so that rangers can be appointed to these areas to guide people so that some of my constituents will not in future have to put up with the type of behaviour that has been experienced by the writer of this letter. Written on October 22, the letter states:

Dear Mr. Gunn, I am writing to you to see whether you can do anything about the tourist problem we have had over the past few years.

**Mr. Whitten:** You were truthful and said, "No".

**Mr. GUNN:** I received the letter only today, and I will reply to it. The letter continues:

I will give you a run down on the more serious happenings that tourists have caused over the last 12 months.

1. Every signpost on the place shot up.
2. The rain gauge at the homestead blown to pieces.
3. The grader out on the dog fence riddled with bullet holes.
4. Windmills and gates shot up.
5. Fences cut, gates left open.
6. Obscenities written over signs.
7. My wife has been abused and subjected to intimidation while I have been away.

8. After having an argument, I was told I would be shot one day.
9. Four-wheel drives and trail bikes roaring through the house yard, endangering children and pets.
10. Petrol stolen.
11. One night when I was away trucking cattle my wife found three men in the kitchen helping themselves.
12. People making a general nuisance of themselves, so that during the tourist season we cannot go away and leave the place unattended.

My constituent went on to say that, if something was not done to alter the situation regarding these ignorant ratbags and people travelling around the country, he would have to take strong action. He pointed out, too, that he lived 216 kilometres from the nearest police station.

That is a situation that no-one should have to put up with. It is high time that strong legislation was passed to protect people from this sort of intimidation. If this sort of thinking occurred in the metropolitan area, people would be jumping up and down and shouting, the television and press would be out there, and Ministers would be making Ministerial statements.

We have spent millions of dollars creating national parks, yet the Government will not allow tourists to enter them. Some parks have been fenced, work that was long overdue. The general public should be permitted to go into certain of these areas that have been set aside in the North of the State. Property holders and leaseholders who are trying to make a living during a difficult period should not have to tolerate the sort of behaviour to which I have referred.

I hope that the legislation dealing with off-road vehicles will control these people. Unfortunately, only a minority of tourists act in such an irresponsible manner. However, it seems to me that that minority will create a situation in which the majority will have to be subjected to fairly stringent regulations. If these people abuse the right to carry firearms, I am afraid that they should face severe penalties.

One of the problems of irresponsible persons carrying firearms is that they have had no training; nor do they understand what damage can be done. I do not believe that the average person should be permitted to buy high-powered rifles. No person should be permitted to buy, for instance, an Armalite rifle unless he is a member of a club, where the rifle is used for, say, target practice. I cannot understand, anyway, why anyone else would want such a weapon. People buy automatic weapons: they see something and put a magazine in it. If they had only single-shot rifles, these people would be a little more careful and it would not be so easy for them.

I have strong views on this matter. If people have a reasonable excuse, they should be permitted to own firearms. However, a responsibility goes with such ownership, and I hope that the police will be able to apprehend anyone taking the sort of action to which my constituent has been subjected.

A constituent living in another part of my district told me that he had a valuable horse in a paddock. Two people went out shooting and, because they could not find anything else to shoot, they shot the horse. They put four bullets into the horse, mortally wounding it. Two days later my constituent found the horse, which had to be destroyed. That is the sort of action being taken by people who have no regard for the rights of others.

I hope that rangers in the National Parks and Wildlife Service will be able adequately to patrol these areas. If the Government would open up some of the vast national parks that would solve the problem, especially if the parks were managed properly. We will spend another \$350 000,

although some of the Government's previous purchases leave much to be desired. They have interfered with people involved in agricultural enterprises, and no consideration has been given to what effect establishing a park in some areas would have on adjoining landholders. A better management programme by the Government would mean not only a better relationship with these landholders but would also do more to conserve our flora and fauna. I noticed that the former Minister is smiling: I could say one or two things about some of the parks that he purchased, but perhaps I had better not.

The funds provided in these Estimates will not enable all the projects to be undertaken that I should like to see established in my district. I am sorry that there is not a substantial allocation to upgrade many water supply projects, and it would be remiss of me not to discuss one or two of them. Some time ago the member for Hanson said that city people were subsidising country water schemes. That was a misunderstanding by him, and he is now fully aware of the facts. My district covers about 86 per cent of the land mass of this State and, from my travels in it (and I have received little assistance from the Government), I have been made fully aware of the urgent need to upgrade water supplies.

One could start at Yunta; there are problems at Coober Pedy; and further problems for people living west of Ceduna. I hope that, when we discuss a similar Bill in future, funds will have been provided to upgrade these water supply projects, which are so necessary and which will enable people living in country areas to receive some of the benefits received by people who live within a few kilometres of the G.P.O. Such people take these supplies as a right, but some country people, certainly up to now, have not enjoyed a similar right.

I support the Bill, but I am disappointed that the Premier has used this document as a vehicle to attack viciously the logical and sensible policies of the Fraser Government, a Government which has tackled the problems of this country in a diligent and workmanlike way. I fear to think what would have happened to this country if the Whitlam Government was still in power: inflation would probably have been at a rate similar to that in a banana republic in South America. Today, inflation is coming down and taxes are being cut by a good Federal Government.

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I agree with the remarks of Opposition speakers who have complimented the two new Liberal members who made their maiden speeches in this debate, the member for Coles and the member for Torrens. They received the respect of the House, as they should during a maiden speech, and I believe that they both made a great contribution. They have accepted the challenge of becoming prominent in this House and in the work entailed in their districts to promote the Liberal philosophy that believes in the freedom of the individual, and the opportunity for individuals to use their initiative to progress without being retarded, restricted, or regulated overly so by any Government instrumentality, and that is the direct opposite to the thinking of the present Government in this State. I found it interesting to read the Premier's statement in which he praised his Government for controlling inflation, when he said:

Those tax reductions have shown that the State Government, to the limit of its ability, has done its part to help bring inflation under control.

Immediately after that comment he said:

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 of all Australians in the forlorn hope that somehow this will bring about national recovery and prosperity.

The whole approach of the present State Government is to attack the Federal scene. How can the Premier honestly say that the Fraser Government's policies have not controlled inflation? It is a fact that inflation has been controlled by that Government much better than it has been controlled by the State Labor Government. We all know, if we were all game enough to admit it, that we have the highest percentage increase in housing costs of any mainland State in Australia. If this means controlling inflation, I do not understand what inflation or control is. That is a fact, yet the Premier does not have the political honesty to say, "Yes, what the Federal Government is doing is being tough", and Fraser said it would be tough, but he is achieving his goal of controlling inflation in this country in order to give business some confidence, and to give those who have put some money away for the future the confidence to know that it will be there in future.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** What about confidence for those out of work: have they confidence?

**Mr. EVANS:** That is a good comment, but if the Whitlam Government had remained, unemployment would be worse than it is today. The honourable member would know that one of his Federal colleagues said that, if unemployment reached a certain figure whilst his Government was in office in Canberra, he would resign. The political honesty of that man is apparent, because he did not resign when the figure reached 300 000. It was a statement of political expediency.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** Will you resign if it gets to 400 000?

**Mr. EVANS:** If I get \$400 000 in income, I will consider it. We know of aged people who have put money away for the future, only to see it being eroded by inflation, until now they do not know what the future holds for them. Inflation destroys the dignity of human beings: unemployment does the same. What is the worst time for this to happen? If it happens when a person is aged and after he has given all he can to society and work effort and has put something away for the future, it is a terrible thing when it is then taken away by inflation. If the person is young and suffers a setback, he may have a chance to overcome it.

**The Hon. G. R. Broomhill:** It is not all young people who are getting put out of work.

**Mr. EVANS:** I agree, and I wish the honourable member had lost his job a few weeks ago: in fact, I would have helped him lose it. It was interesting to note what the Premier said about taxes, as follows:

As honourable members would be aware, in the last 20 months the Government has abolished the petrol tax . . . He did not have the courage to say that he imposed a tax which was unacceptable to the community and which was an inflationary tax. He did not say that a few months later he thought he would withdraw it and he got his Cabinet colleagues to agree. He tries to get the credit for taking away a tax that his Government had imposed. I suppose the people put so much pressure on him that he decided it would be good to take it off.

He said that the Government had abolished rural land tax. However, that is not a fact. I would not say that anyone who said it was a fact was a liar, but it is not a fact and, as such, it is a lie. Rural land tax has been abolished for only a section of society. Many people are being taxed off their properties by land tax because the present rural recession has pushed their income from the rural sector to a low level. Their rural income is less than the other income that they receive because the wife is working as a shop assistant, a teacher aide, or in some other field, and



the property is in joint names. Because the property is in joint names, with one person getting an income from another area, and the income of that family has been reduced so that they do not now get a substantial payment from rural pursuits, they do not get the exemption from land tax.

Rural land tax has been abolished only for those who have a high enough income from property to survive. I say "survive" because many people in the rural sector are only existing. They are getting sustenance. About 50 per cent of the dairy farmers in the State are under the poverty line. If that happened to anyone else in the working community, those who belonged to the Labor Party would be attacking the problem with enthusiasm, but this Government has no enthusiasm to take those people out of the difficult situation.

**Mr. Wotton:** Do you think this Government is concerned about rural industry?

**Mr. EVANS:** No. When I am speaking about income, I am speaking about people who may have an investment and a heavy mortgage on the property which may be worth \$100 000 but on which the mortgage may be \$60 000. Those people are trying to pay interest on that, while the money coming in puts them below the poverty line and they cannot survive. If the wife earns something to pay the interest for the mortgage, the family has to pay rural land tax. To me, that is hypocrisy, and, in the way it is written in this document, it is an untruth, not a statement of fact. For the Premier to hang his hat on that shows that he is dishonest or that he does not understand the situation. As a man who keeps in reasonable contact with his officers and departmental heads, he knows that the statement to which I have referred is dishonest.

I stress that land tax has not been abolished. If it had been, some people would be in a better position and would be able to survive, at least until the rural sector picked up. We must remember that, for every person who leaves the land today from an economic point of view, few people are willing to try to make it economic, so we create another section of unemployed and through that measure the State Government is contributing to unemployment. On page 4 of his statement the Premier says:

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.

My Leader in particular and my Deputy Leader have emphasised the benefit of giving value for the dollar. The Deputy Leader spoke about the financial position of the States, comparing that to the Federal Government's Budget position. Doubtless, the Federal Government faces a serious situation. It took over a serious situation, a deficit of about \$5 000 000 000, and now, although it has brought about tight monetary planning and, to a degree, made the position tighter for all Australians, requiring them to knuckle down, as it said it would do, that Government still faces a deficit of about \$2 500 000 000.

Regardless of the Premier's statement to which I just referred, every State has either a balanced Budget or a Budget that is nearly balanced. Where are the monetary problems for the State Governments? They are not there. The Federal Government has carried the baby for the States, with the abuse it has received from the South Australian State Labor Party. When the Leader of the Opposition made a statement of fact about that Party and what it was doing to the State, the Government said that he was knocking South Australia. However, what has the Labor Government done to this State? It has done the same thing on a continuing basis for a long time and is still

willing to do it, even to the point where its Leader will go to other States and try to promote the socialist philosophy when we are debating the Loan Estimates.

Recently, the Minister in charge of housing has spoken of the new Commonwealth-State housing agreement and he has mentioned some areas of concern to him. He said he feared that the Federal Government would make it tougher for the State and more difficult for those who wished to get welfare housing. I believe that, with the attempt being made to reach an agreement, and on the information that the State Minister has made available to the House, the States and the Federal Government, if they follow the path Mr. Newman has suggested, will be moving in the right direction. We will have more money to build houses and more people setting out to own their own house. We will eliminate those people on the higher incomes who pay privileged rents when they should not get them.

I am speaking of people who earn \$15 000 or more, people with two or three incomes, holiday shacks, speed boats, and caravans, who can take trips around the world or to other parts of Australia and still pay a low rent. If those people had been encouraged to buy their own house earlier by their having to pay more realistic rents when their incomes increased, they would have moved out of privileged or discounted rents and they would be buying their own house, thus helping the building industry, the Housing Trust, and the South Australian taxpayer. In particular, they would get building up a security for themselves.

I think we are going in the right direction, and I am not unsympathetic to what the State Minister has said in using caution and trying to plead for a better deal. I think that he, with the Housing Trust, has moved gradually in the right direction. Some of my colleagues will say that I was criticised when I supported increased rents for those people who could afford to pay more.

I did not criticise that, even though it may be traditional for the Opposition shadow Minister to do so. If one believes that a correct decision has been made, one should not attack the decision but should say that it is the correct decision. That is what I did. People who are in the low income group, who are struggling to meet their commitments in life and who obtain only the bare necessities, should be helped. They are the people for whom welfare housing should be made available. I hope that we can continue helping them and can ensure that those who deserve help receive the help they deserve.

The Premier stated that \$1 811 000 was spent in 1976-77 on the development of tourist, recreation and sporting facilities throughout the State. Of that sum, he said that \$1 049 000 was made available from State Loan funds and that \$762 000 was received from the Commonwealth, which is more than a third of the money allocated for tourism. That is a considerable effort by the Commonwealth Government. It is not an insignificant sum, and it would have been fitting for the Premier to say so. However, he chose not to be politically honest in that sense. It is worth giving praise in tough monetary times if a contribution that is worth while is made.

Recently I have become disappointed that the Government has not taken up the challenge in relation to the Pioneer Village situated on the South Road, Morphett Vale. However, I congratulate the Government's move on acquiring the Birdwood Mill Museum, which was an expensive venture. I am disappointed that that venture is running at a huge loss of about \$50 000 a year. I cannot understand why that is occurring, but one would need to spend some time at the museum to try to understand the problem before criticising the loss. Each year, because of

the age of the exhibits at the museum, their value will increase at a much greater rate than the normal inflation rate. Therefore, the State has acquired an asset that will grow in value as the years pass.

I put the Pioneer Village in the same category as the Birdwood Mill Museum. The village was opened by the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, on February 24, 1972. Since then the owners have poured all the profits from the village back into improving the original constructions. Unfortunately the family's being tied seven days a week to the village and the problems of operating and upgrading it to the standard they like are a burden and the family hopes that the Government will buy the village. They have approached the State Government with the suggestion, but they have been unsuccessful.

Perhaps the Premier remembers the village as it was when he opened it, but it has improved much since then. The owners of the village would like the Premier to assess for himself, apart from the assessments made by his officers or the local member, the Minister of Education, who represents the area. I am not saying that the Minister of Education has not put in a report about the village, because I expect that he has done so indicating that he either supports or does not support such a move by the Government.

Last year the Commonwealth Government released a report in relation to man-made historical attractions in Australia. In that report the Pioneer Village rated amongst the top six historical displays in Australia, displays that included Swan Hill and Sovereign Hill in Victoria, both of which are Government aided projects. The owners of the village have asked the Government to buy it from them for \$235 000. The village was on sale at auction with a reserve price of \$280 000 or \$285 000 (I am not sure of the sum involved). That price includes all the real estate, authentic buildings, private residence (which would be suitable for caretaker accommodation), and a collection of ever-increasing value, the same as applying to the Birdwood Mill Museum.

It would not now be possible to construct a similar village, complete with its collection, for anything like \$235 000. I do not know why the Government is unwilling to negotiate in relation to the village. At the end of March next year the owners will move out. There are no ifs or buts, no blackmail or threats about that. The owners have planned their life so that next March the Pioneer Village will close if they still have to maintain and operate it.

At that time they will auction and dispose of the collection as individual items if the village is not bought by the Government or someone else for \$235 000, or near offer. The items in the collection have been valued and will no doubt net more than \$235 000 if they are sold individually. The owners have put 20 years effort into creating the village, collecting the historic items and vehicles and building the village out of authentic materials that were pulled out of old buildings. The owners used photographs and paintings of old buildings as models when no other feature was available for construction purposes. The owners do not wish to see the village split up, but they are genuine about what they will do.

The family really wants the village saved for the State, but they cannot afford to carry the load. If the Government acquires the village I believe sincerely that it will not depreciate in value. About 10 000 schoolchildren and 20 000 adults inspect the village each year. The village is publicised little. If one were to walk down Rundle Mall on a Saturday morning and ask people one by one whether they had heard of or visited the Pioneer Village I am sure that only a small percentage would say that they had. The lack of publicity results from the family concerned not

having the resources to publicise the village. The Tourist Bureau has not given much help in this direction, either.

Because it is such a good tourist attraction, I would hope that through the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department line the village could be purchased. I make a solid promise that I will not criticise or attack the purchase of this venture, because I treat it in the same light as I treat the Birdwood Mill Museum. It should be considered as an investment for the State, and it is the sort of project in which the State Government should be involved.

Money should be spent, either under this line or another, on something that Adelaide lacks as a city—public toilets. Nowhere in the world, not even Melbourne or Sydney, could one find such a scarcity of public toilets as one finds in Adelaide. Rundle Mall does not have a public toilet nearby. Tourists coming to Adelaide from other parts of the world find toilets are scarce here.

Members may think that that is an insignificant matter, but I believe it is significant and that it is something we have overlooked for a long time. Toilets are located in the middle of Victoria Square and in Hindley Street, but in most other cases one has to go into a hotel, theatre or shop property, although some people find that inconvenient, as they believe it infringes upon some privileged area.

I believe we could easily work with the Adelaide City Council to create more public toilets within Adelaide proper; in particular, in the Hindley Street and Rundle Mall area. Perhaps honourable members think it is an insignificant matter, but I ask them when they visit other cities to see what public toilet facilities are available. They will then see that Adelaide does not have anything much in that field at all.

Finally, I refer briefly to schools. People in the district of Fisher are thankful that the first stage of the Bellevue Heights Primary School is open. They are thankful that the Government, through the Minister, has seen the need for a second stage, which will probably be available for the beginning of the next school year. They are also thankful that the Coromandel Valley Primary School is almost completed in its centenary year and will be available and operating in the near future. The community appreciates that.

We appreciate that the Stirling East Primary School has also gained to the extent of works costing about \$397 000, especially as people at this school have been waiting for some time for that development. The Crafers Primary School, which just falls outside my district and which is in the district of Kavel, caters for many students from my district and constituents are pleased that major works have started there on a cement brick structure to cost \$220 000. Hawthorndene is now getting \$236 000-worth of Demac improvements, but that school is over-taxed, as it is in a growing community. However, I commend that school for the number of trees and shrubs planted there and the interest the committee has taken in the school grounds. The new school is now satisfied that it has received the recognition it seeks.

I am pleased that recently the Public Works Committee recommended that the Aldgate Primary School development should proceed at the new site. The difficulty in that type of area is to find a suitable site, and the committee's report recognised and understood the difficulties of obtaining a suitable site for an oval and a primary school. The oval is slightly under primary school standard, which is a disappointment to the local community as it hoped that there could be have been a sharing of this facility between public and school use.

Happy Valley Primary School is being considered for further additions, and I hope they will proceed quickly.

Finally, since 1963 the Eden Hills school has been waiting for an activities room, and I hope it will have it before the next year, as 14 years is a long time to be promised an activities room. I hope that room will be provided so that the school can appreciate the benefits of the better facilities that most other schools have. I support the second reading.

**Mr. VENNING (Rocky River):** I support the second reading. First, I congratulate the two new members, the member for Coles and the member for Torrens, for their contributions to this debate. It was interesting to note that being their man and maiden speech they were heard in silence and, as a consequence, honourable members who listened to their contributions learned much from them. In the future, although these two honourable members will have to put up with all the interjections that the Speaker or Deputy Speaker will permit, after a while they will learn that they can build their debates upon interjections. I remember that a former member for Wallaroo spoke for three hours in this Chamber. For three hours he said nothing, although he developed his speech on the interjections made by members opposite him.

Much has been said about the State Government and its condemnation of our Federal Government and our Federal Leader, Mr. Malcolm Fraser. I am proud to think that in Australia, still, we have a man of the calibre of Malcolm Fraser, who is willing to give his time and attention to the needs of the Australian people. It would be easy for Malcolm Fraser to say, "Damn the people with all the strife that the unions are bringing on today (Communist inspired in many cases). I could go back to my farm and live an easy life." I am proud and pleased to think that he is willing to put the whole of Australia before his own personal needs.

I refer to the Premier's condemnation of our Federal Government when introducing this Bill, and I emphasise that the State Government will never have enough money. Even if the Americans poured into South Australia a large sum of money or if funds were available from other oversea countries, apart from funds provided by our Federal colleagues, the Government will never have enough because it does not know how to handle finance. If one does not know that, one will inevitably be in trouble. This is the situation in which South Australia presently finds itself—the Government does not know how to run financial matters.

When asked for a contribution to a project, if the Premier is in favour of it he will fund it, but if he is not in favour of that project he will blame the Commonwealth Government and say that there is not enough money. That is how the Premier operates and how we know he operates. With the practice he has developed over a period, he has become an astute performer in this Chamber.

In introducing the Bill, the Premier spoke of expenditure totalling \$259 000 000 for 1977-78, compared with just over \$261 000 000 in 1976-77. The latter figures are reduced to \$257 000 000 if expenditure in respect of non-metropolitan railways is excluded in order to give comparability. Once again we have heard about the non-metropolitan railways. From time to time the Premier has said what a wonderful deal the railways transfer has been for us. He has even built the sum involved up to \$600 000 000, but still the deal has not been finalised. There are bits and pieces to be attended to.

The Minister of Transport wants to have the best of about six or seven worlds instead of being willing to meet the Commonwealth on a reasonable basis. Certainly, we will come out of the agreement well, but we have to learn

to be fair and reasonable in respect of minor matters. The Treasurer continued:

The Government has only been able to keep the figure at \$259 000 000 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 for 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 the arrangement will be completely used.

He said further:

Unfortunately, the Federal Government's economic policies have not been similarly practical or sensible.

What a lot of nonsense. He continued:

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.

Malcolm Fraser and the Federal Government will bring about national recovery and prosperity. They have reduced inflation in Australia. If people would only recognise the facts of life and get behind the Fraser Government, our problems would soon disappear. I know that Mr. Fraser took on an immense task when he took over the leadership, but I believe that, despite the lack of help he has received from the non-Liberal Governments and the unions throughout Australia, Malcolm Fraser and his Government have done a wonderful job. The Treasurer also stated:

The container ship 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.

It is well known what happened at Wallaroo in the past day or so. As a consequence I hope that everything will be replaced and that the Government will consider upgrading those facilities. The existing facilities gave a loading rate of about 400 tonnes an hour, which on modern standards is far below the requirements of an important port. The Government has upgraded the loading facilities at Port Lincoln to about 2 000 tonnes an hour and I hope that the Government will consider upgrading the facilities to handle in excess of 1 000 tonnes an hour.

I have much sympathy regarding the problems confronting the Electricity Trust, which has to pay into the State revenue about \$7 000 000. This is a continuing embarrassment to the trust and, as it will receive no money from Loan Account this year, it must obtain money from other sources. This is a disturbing situation for the Electricity Trust, which does such a wonderful job in South Australia in supplying electricity not only to main towns but also to the rural areas. One only needs to look to Western Australia, which does not have the s.w.e.r. system that we have here throughout the country areas.

I am pleased to see that after many years the Port Broughton Area School is on the major project list for which planning and design is proposed in 1977-78. That school, which has been promised over a period during which there have been five Ministers of Education, may now come to fruition during the term of the present Minister of Education. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy)** moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mrs. BYRNE (Todd):** I express my concern about the number of young people involved in road accidents, regrettably sometimes fatal. I refer especially to the continued death and injury toll involving motor cyclists. Australia has a highly motorised society, and the climate is suitable for fresh-air travelling, and this two-wheel type of travelling appeals mainly to the young. We have a large road network with vast interstate highway distances, which are ideal for fresh-air travelling in good weather. Thankfully, minor accidents in motor cars rarely involve injury to the occupants. Regrettably, however, motor cyclists are more vulnerable as they have little protection, and that is why special attention must be directed to reducing motor cycle accidents.

It has been suggested that, compared to motor car drivers, motor cycle riders or pillion passengers have four times the chance of being killed and eight times the probability of being injured. The report of the South Australian Road Traffic Board for 1975 gives statistics under the following heading and subheadings: "Road traffic accidents, South Australia, persons killed and injured", "Type of road user killed or injured", and "Motor cycle rider". In 1968, eight people were killed and 630 injured; 1969, six killed, 728 injured; 1970, 12 killed, 812 injured; 1971, 14 killed, 930 injured; 1972, 28 killed, 1 313 injured; 1973, 23 killed, 1 736 injured; 1974, 46 killed, 1 820 injured; and 1975, 30 killed, 1 738 injured.

I do not have the 1976 figures, but the figures for pillion and sidecar passengers in the same years commencing 1968 were: 1968, one killed, 77 injured; 1969, four killed, 101 injured; 1970, one killed, 118 injured; 1971, seven killed, 169 injured; 1972, three killed, 208 injured; 1973, nine killed, 281 injured; 1974, six killed, 293 injured; and in 1975, five killed and 276 injured.

I am sure that all members will agree those accident figures are far too high. I am sorry to have to say that, even since I decided to speak on this matter, I noticed on reading yesterday's *Advertiser* that again at the weekend two young men were killed in motor cycle accidents. One, of course, can imagine the distress and anguish of the family and friends of all the people concerned, not only now but over the past years. I consider there have been far too many motor cyclists killed or injured. This does not mean that the riders were responsible for the accidents in which they were involved or, for that matter, that they were legally in the wrong. It has been alleged that most serious motor cycle accidents involve larger bikes, and it appears that in many cases the riders have had little or no experience in handling them.

Unlike a motor car learner, when a motor cyclist is learning he has nobody with him. It is essential that riders be competent, and it is desirable that they (and I refer particularly to the young here) learn about their machines before they get on vehicles that have too much power for everyday use. Because of action taken by the New South Wales State Government, as from January this year all new motor cycle riders are given graded licences, making it illegal for them to ride any machine bigger than 250 cc for the first 12 months. This means that young people wanting motor cycle licences will first have to learn to ride smaller bikes before graduating to larger ones. I hope this step taken by the New South Wales Government will have the desired effect.

I mention, too, that other organisations also share this concern because in February this year it was reported that

the main article in the January issue of the *Medical Journal of Australia* had once again drawn attention to the dangers of motor cycles on the road. It was further reported in April of this year that an annual roadworthiness inspection of all motor cycles was among recommendations put to the South Australian Government to improve motor cycle safety. The Motor Cycle Industry Association of South Australia submission further supported first-year riders being restricted to machines of 250 cc or less, as is the case now, as I have already stated, in New South Wales. It was further stated that this association also recommended that all motor cycles have headlights automatically switched on when the engine is in use, day of night. (Some motor cyclists, as we are all aware, already take that precaution.) This association also urged education programmes to make the motorist more aware of the motor cyclist, and I am sure this is necessary; and it wanted reflectorised number plates made compulsory.

However, I am not advocating how accidents of this kind can be reduced and what safety improvements should be effected; I will leave that to the judgment of the experts. Recognising the seriousness of the problem, our Minister of Transport (Hon. G. T. Virgo) announced early this year that the State Government was looking at ways of introducing a system under which only experienced motor cycle riders would be allowed to ride high performance machines. I am pleased that another member in this House shares my concern, and no doubt there are others on both sides of the House who share my concern. I refer to the question asked recently by the member for Price, to which the Minister replied that the matter was still subject to consideration by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and that when a report was received it would be made available to members. He further stated that the Registrars of Motor Vehicles from the various States had, at their annual conference last month, discussed this matter with a view to seeing whether some uniformity could be obtained in the grading of licences throughout Australia. I trust that this matter will be finalised urgently.

**Mr. WILSON (Torrens):** Before moving on to the subject I wish to canvass, I take this opportunity of congratulating the member for Coles on her maiden speech this evening. It was a delight to hear her speech.

Although I intended to canvass this matter during the debate on the Estimates in relation to health, because of the lateness of the hour I did not pursue the matter. In the Auditor-General's Report, we see that the cost of drugs supplied in public hospitals during 1977 was \$4 800 000. Although we cannot extract the sum for the coming financial year, because the facts are hidden in the total estimates for the Health Commission, I believe that a worsening situation is taking place in the supply of drugs in hospital outpatient departments. (I make no criticism of the supply of drugs to inpatients.)

The situation is that the cost of drugs is paid, under the Medibank agreement, half by the Commonwealth and half by the State. A very serious situation is arising, and it has been arising for a number of years, because of the over-supply of drugs to patients in hospital outpatient departments. What I hope will eventuate is an inquiry by the Health Commission into this matter. I also make it plain that most of the hospitals themselves are well aware of the situation, but it is an extremely difficult problem for them to solve.

When drugs are supplied in hospital outpatient departments, they are supplied on a dose-time basis; that is, if a patient is to take a drug, say, tablets three times a day, and if his next appointment is in one month's time, he will be given 100 tablets; if his next appointment is in two months time, he will be given 200 tablets; and if his

appointment is in three months time, he will be given 300 tablets. I make it plain that no-one wishes to see chronically ill people deprived of these benefits or to see people who are in financial straits having to pay any extra for their drugs, because that would be inhumane. But a survey recently completed in the Flinders Medical Pharmacy Department indicates that the following facts are relevant: the proportion of patients receiving up to one month's supply of drugs was 42 per cent; up to three months supply, 50 per cent; up to four, five or six months supply, 9 per cent.

What is occurring is that some patients are receiving 20 to 30 times more than the usual supply received by patients outside the hospitals, and I will give some examples. Cloxacillin, one of the new types of penicillin, is available on a doctor's prescription outside the hospital in quantities of 12 only. I have evidence that I can supply to the Minister of Health, to whom I hope to make a direct approach on this matter, that a patient has received a bottle of 500 of these capsules, which is 40 times the usual dosage scheduled. True, some people have to go on long-term penicillin treatment, thus needing to have large quantities at a reasonable price. They cannot be expected to pay \$2 for every 12 they receive, and I acknowledge that fact, but the trouble is that it is dangerous to have this quantity of tablets on hand in the house.

Another patient is on tolbutamide tablets, a hypoglycaemic substance used in the treatment of diabetes. This is a great break-through in the treatment of diabetes in older people. These tablets are available outside, on a doctor's prescription, under the pharmaceutical benefits scheme in quantities of 50. They are sold for \$3.77 for 50, the Government paying \$1.77 and the patient \$2.

I have evidence which states that a patient received five lots of 250 tablets, which is 25 times the normal dosage schedule outside a hospital. True, people who are on these tablets must take them regularly and over a long period. However, I suggest that 25 times the normal dosage schedule is excessive.

The hospitals are well aware of this problem and are trying to do something about it. However, a direction is needed from the Government or the Health Commission. Other questions must be taken into account as well. Country people who do not have access to a ready supply of these drugs must be given them in sufficient quantities to see them through to their next appointment.

**Mr. Venning:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. WILSON:** I am pleased that the member for Rocky River agrees with me on that matter. The other result of the survey to which I have referred is that people usually forget to take 10 per cent of the quantity of drugs that they are given, when given them in quantity. In other words, if a person is given six months supply of a drug, which could be 40 or 50 times the quantity taken outside the hospital, statistics show that at least 10 per cent of the drugs are not taken. So, wastage is involved.

This is an important matter, because we have not only the danger of excess drugs being held at home in patients' medicine cabinets but also a waste of public money, and we all know that we do not have enough money for our hospitals as it is. I repeat that it is essential that the Government institute an inquiry immediately. The hospitals will co-operate, as they are well aware of the situation. I will have much pleasure in referring this matter to the Minister of Health.

**Mr. SLATER (Gilles):** In the time that has been allocated to me, I shall draw the attention of the House to a matter which, although it is of a somewhat parochial nature, has nevertheless general application in the metropolitan area. I refer to the provision of pedestrian-

activated traffic lights on Main North-East Road. I have been particularly concerned about the traffic lights adjacent to Windsor Grove, Klemzig, and Queensborough Avenue, Hillcrest. We have had zebra-type flashing lights at this location for some time.

Having raised the matter in the House previously by way of a question of the Minister of Transport, I was told that the matter would be considered. The report I received stated that pedestrian-activated lights were planned for conversion during 1977-78, subject to the availability of resources at that time. Until now, the pedestrian-activated lights have not been installed, and this has caused much concern to local people. The member for Florey raised this question before I did so. He, too, was upset by an accident involving a school student that occurred at this location. When that honourable member represented the part of Hillcrest that is now in my district, he drew the matter to the Minister's attention before I did.

On December 1 last year I asked whether the zebra-type flashing lights could be replaced by pedestrian-activated lights, and the Minister indicated that they could be available in 1977-78. This evening I ask that some priority be given to installing the pedestrian-activated lights at this location. The present system is not only a pedestrian hazard; several chain collisions have been caused when pedestrians try to cross the road and the leading vehicle stops suddenly. It is important that this matter be considered seriously, and I ask the Minister to do so.

The North-East Road is, I understand, the second busiest road in the metropolitan area, South Road having the heaviest traffic flow. However, North-East Road is especially busy, particularly at certain times of the day. For a distance of about six to seven kilometres from the Mullers Road and North-East Road intersection to the intersection of Blacks Road and Sudholz Road, only two sets of lights are installed; one to which I have already referred, and the other a set of school lights opposite the Gilles Plains Primary School that work only at the time when children are leaving and entering the school. I have asked that these lights also be converted to pedestrian-activated lights, and the Minister's reply indicated that they would be converted possibly in 1977-78, subject to the availability of resources at that time. I am looking forward to 1977-78 as being a good year for pedestrian lights on North-East Road.

Another difficulty has been drawn to my attention by constituents living in Hillcrest who wish to attend the Windsor Hotel situated on the other side of the North-East Road. They have difficulty in crossing the road to go to the hotel, and probably greater difficulty in retracing their steps across the road in order to go home. I know that it depends on the individual, but this area needs to be considered for the installation of traffic lights.

The NEAPTR study, which has been operating for some time, indicates clearly the need to improve traffic flow to the north-eastern suburbs of the metropolitan area. This study deals mainly with traffic flow and other matters relating to transport, but I understand that it has not considered the need for pedestrians to have access from one side of the road to the other. As many shopping centres are located on the northern side of the road, persons living on its southern side have difficulty in safely crossing the road.

I realise that a balance must be maintained in regard to pedestrian lights to ensure adequate traffic flow. We cannot have such lights every 200 yards, but it is important that pedestrians be able to negotiate any road. I think that this year about 40 pedestrians have been killed on metropolitan roads, so it is important to ensure that pedestrians, particularly elderly ones who have difficulty

in negotiating major roads because of age or infirmity, are assisted to cross the traffic flow.

A press statement by the Minister of Transport shows that this difficulty will be accentuated on North-East Road, because we will have an exclusive peak period traffic lane on that road. The road will be widened in a section, and this will affect the opportunity for pedestrians to cross with some degree of safety. I ask the Minister, before the road is widened for emergency vehicles, motor bikes, and push bikes, to give priority to the installation of lights. I do not think that pedestrians will be too concerned about push bikes, but I think they will be concerned about the traffic that will be caused by the extra traffic lane.

I think the ultimate solution for pedestrians is not the provision of traffic lights: we should be thinking of providing under-passes or over-passes in the metropolitan

area. It is important that pedestrians be able to cross in safety. Under-passes are used extensively overseas.

**Mr. Mathwin:** How can elderly people use them?

**Mr. SLATER:** They can negotiate them if the under-passes are constructed correctly. Those facilities could be constructed at many places in the metropolitan area. I think particularly of Main North Road, which services the abattoir workers who park their vehicles on the eastern side of the road.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.13 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 26, at 2 p.m.