

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, August 1, 1974

The SPEAKER (Hon. J. R. Ryan) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**BRIGHTON TO CHRISTIE DOWNS RAILWAY
DUPLICATION AND EXTENSION BILL**

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

PETITION: LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. NANKIVELL presented a petition from 415 rate-payers of the District Council of Pinnaroo, stating that they were dissatisfied with the first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, and praying that the House of Assembly would reject any legislation that would be introduced to implement any recommendations of the Commission concerning the District Council of Pinnaroo.

Petition received and read.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Notice of Motion, Government Business No. 3, to be called on forthwith and the Bill for an Act to make exceptional provision for the peace, order and good government of the State in cases of emergency to be taken through all stages without delay.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion for suspension. Is the motion seconded?

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Dr. EASTICK: The reason I have moved to suspend Standing Orders is the gravity of the South Australian industrial situation which has been created by industrial anarchy and which is producing in its wake growing community misery. One only needs to look at the front page of today's *News* to see the extent of the industrial tie-up which is crippling Adelaide and which all reports indicate will reach more critical proportions, and even crisis, early next week. On the front page of today's *News* we see the main heading "7 400 in South Australia will be laid off". The report goes on to state:

More than 7 400 South Australian workers are now out of work because of the transport workers' strike. Kelvinator Australia Limited has laid off 700 workers at its Woodville North and Keswick plants. Building industry officials said today nearly 4 000 building subcontractors and their employees were without work because of the transport strike.

Another report, headed "Stoppage at Stanvac", states:

Union officials today said a prolonged stoppage at the refinery was inevitable.

Later the report states that a close-down at Port Stanvac almost certainly will result in a petrol shortage in South Australia. Beyond that, the pile-up of rubbish in the city is the worst on record. The Premier already has indicated that the Bill that he intends to introduce this afternoon, which is the subject of my motion for the suspension of Standing Orders, represents a plan to meet crisis situations. I claim that today we are at a crisis point.

For this reason, I believe that the Bill should be brought forward without delay, and for our part my members are willing to forgo Question Time, if necessary, to have the matter brought on for immediate scrutiny. We understand that the Premier will be asking, through the Bill, for a clearance to take whatever action he considers necessary at

any time to deal with industrial disruption or any other crisis. Certainly, if ever there has been a situation of industrial disruption that has required immediate action, it exists today and has existed for a few weeks.

The Opposition wants to know what sort of action the Government contemplates and therefore offers its full support to the Premier to explain the detail of the Bill to the House now. I suggest that, until we have the detail of the Bill, it will be futile pursuing a line of questioning of the Premier on the Government's initiatives, or lack of initiatives, designed to bring about industrial sanity, instead of—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has sought the suspension of Standing Orders for a certain reason and 10 minutes is allowed him to explain that reason. That time cannot be used to debate the matter to be discussed: it is purely time to explain the reason for the suspension.

Dr. EASTICK: I am making the point that we need to know the detail of this Bill now so that the emergency situation, which is a fact of life in South Australia now, can be scrutinized at the earliest possible time, and in this situation I include, for example, the shock announcement at 3.30 or 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon that 3 000 Engineering and Water Supply Department workers were to be stood down. We could ask questions regarding the picketing of the Highways Department.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is now starting to debate certain subject matter of which the House is not aware. He is seeking the suspension of Standing Orders so that a certain debate may take place, but the subject matter of that debate, whatever it may be, is not subject to the reason for seeking the suspension of Standing Orders. The honourable Leader.

Dr. EASTICK: With all due regard to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I point out that what I am saying to the House is that we could be seeking the type of information that might be contained in the Bill by asking a series of questions, the like of which I was indicating to the House. I was going on to make the point that there is now picketing of the Highways Department at Northfield which is preventing people from undertaking work. It is all very well for the Minister of Transport to try to get your eye so that you might act on his guidance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader.

Dr. EASTICK: There is a grave concern in the community and here is an opportunity for the Government and for the Premier, if he is fair dinkum about the measure he will bring before the House, to allow us to scrutinize it now. We are willing to forgo Question Time if need be so that the Bill can be introduced and so that we can study it and give it due attention. I am willing to stay here this evening, if it is such an emergency that it requires attention this evening, or to come back tomorrow or consider it next Tuesday. But, if there is a real emergency, I believe that the Premier and all of his colleagues will be willing to support the suspension of Standing Orders so as to allow them to introduce their own business forthwith.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I do not intend that the Leader of the Opposition should take the timing of Government business out of its hands.

Dr. Eastick: This is not Government business.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is.

Mr. Coumbe: It's to facilitate Government business.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader did not have any courtesy in suggesting to me before he moved the

motion that this was something about which he was wanting to co-operate with the Government. He is not always being co-operative.

Dr. Eastick: He is!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader was dinkum and not playing politics he could easily have communicated with me and said, "There's an emergency and we want to co-operate with you." However, he did not do that; he got up to play politics this afternoon by moving a motion that would bring on Government business at a time different from that scheduled by the Government. He is not going to do that. I oppose the motion.

The second matter is that the Leader suggests that the reason for giving notice of the Bill is some contemporary crisis regarding emergency supplies in South Australia. That is not true. The Bill has been prepared over a long period as a result of the experience of the Government in relation to two previous petrol crises. The Bill in no way bears relation to the present situation, because we are not in difficulty at present about emergency supplies. I know that the Leader has suggested that there is a grave crisis in public health, but that is not supported by the Public Health Department or the City Council. I know that he is trying to grab a headline where he can on this issue, but at present there are proceedings and negotiations in relation to the present industrial unrest, and we are not faced with a difficulty concerning emergency supplies. There is no reason to debate this measure before the normal course of its coming before the House next week; that is what the Government intends.

Dr. Eastick: Who's crying wolf now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not been crying wolf, but I do not know what the Leader has been doing because I have difficulty, as I usually do, in following his meaning.

Dr. Tonkin: This is expert footwork.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am happy that the honourable member should describe me as an expert at something. It is not his wont, so I appreciate it.

Mr. Mathwin: You certainly can't fix strikes.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I had not noticed that the initiative of Opposition members has done any more about it than when they were in Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We are dealing with a notice for the suspension of Standing Orders.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I see no reason at all for proceeding with this measure beyond the requirements of the normal time for debating it in the House. I gave notice yesterday of several measures in order to ensure that we had business on the Notice Paper to go on with when the Address in Reply debate ended. At that time I intend to proceed with those measures, particularly the one to which the Leader refers. If the Leader believes there is a panic at present, I can only say that he is trying to stir it up.

Dr. Eastick: Tell that to the wives and families of those employees who are on strike.

Mr. McAnaney: Don't you read the newspapers?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At this moment we are not in a situation of being able to provide the necessary emergency supplies in this State. That is the matter to which the measure refers: it does not specifically refer to industrial conscription, the prohibition of strikes, or the interference with peaceful pickets.

Mr. Mathwin: What would you call a peaceful picket?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is specific in that it is peaceful. I do not know what the Leader intends to do,

but yesterday he wanted to have the Lions Club and other organizations remove garbage, or something like that. I do not know what he will suggest next. The Leader is in charge of Opposition legislation that is to go before the House and I remain in charge of legislation I intend to introduce: he is not going to take my business out of my hands.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has moved for the suspension of Standing Orders. Those in favour of the motion say "Aye"; those against "No". There being a dissentient voice, the House will divide.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, and Tonkin.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Boundy, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Evans, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes—Messrs. Burdon, Corcoran, and Simmons.

Majority of 9 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Flagstaff Hill Primary School,

Hackham South Primary School.

Ordered that reports be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WATER RATING

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a Ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In view of the question raised yesterday by the honourable member for Davenport, I think it would be useful for honourable members and for the public generally to be aware of the procedure that is adopted by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in the processing of accounts. The due date for the payment of any quarterly bill is 20 days after the estimated date of receipt of the bill by the ratepayer. If a bill is unpaid or not fully paid and no agreement is reached between the ratepayer and the department, a final notice for payment would be transmitted to the ratepayer. The due date for the final notice is four weeks after the due date for the payment of the quarterly bill. If the final notice is ignored and the water supply is to be restricted, the date on which the supply of water would be restricted would be three weeks after the due date on the final notice. This time table applies generally in relation to the payment of all Engineering and Water Supply rates. For any council area different portions of the area will receive their rates in different weeks. In the case of Burnside ratepayers this would mean that the dates on which the water supply to any ratepayer will be restricted would vary between the middle of September and the end of September.

I would like to emphasize that the officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department have been requested to have available a report to the Government within the next two weeks. This should enable the Government to reach a decision as to whether any modification of the system is possible by the end of

this month. For any ratepayer who has paid his full rates, should a Government decision affect his payments an appropriate adjustment would be made in future accounts.

I am pleased that the honourable member for Davenport denies that he is encouraging ratepayers to flout the law. I take this to mean that he will pay his own account by the due date and will advise his constituents to do likewise.

QUESTIONS

CHRISTIE DOWNS RAILWAY

In reply to Mr. COUMBE (July 24).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In April, 1974, when this project, including the transport interchange terminal at Christie Downs, was submitted to the Australian Government for inclusion in its programme of financial aid for urban public transport, it was estimated to cost \$8 944 000. To June 30, 1974, about \$2 324 000 of capital expenditure has been incurred on earthworks and bridges of the project to the north of Beach Road, Christie Downs.

PETROL

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier acknowledge that both he and Cabinet were advised during the last petrol strike which involved members of the Storemen and Packers Union of a resolution passed by members of the Automobile Chamber of Commerce petrol resellers section that, if and when rationing was in force again, they would close their pumps immediately? This resolution, which was publicized at the time, appears in the records of the association and the decision was conveyed to the Premier and his Cabinet colleagues. Will the Premier say whether this information is correct?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am aware that many resolutions were passed by the Automobile Chamber of Commerce resellers section at that time, subsequent to which I had conversations with them as a result of which they altered their attitude on many subjects. If petrol resellers intend to close their pumps in the event of rationing, given that some of their requirements and demands have been met, I do not know what they think would be achieved by such action. Nor do I know what injustice to them, as alleged by the Leader, could exist under the system. If, for no purpose and to achieve nothing, resellers closed their pumps only to make the hardship to the public greater, I could only consider such action gravely irresponsible.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I direct my question to the Premier, who, I am glad to see, is in the House today. In view of the close relationship between the South Australian and Commonwealth Governments, will the Premier make representations to the Commonwealth Government to continue country petrol subsidies? It has been reported today that the Commonwealth Labor Caucus (by a vote of 45 to 42 at a hurriedly convened meeting last evening) decided to cut off the country petrol subsidy, an action that will save the Government \$28 000 000. It is reported that the big vote against the Cabinet indicated the concern of Labor members in rural districts, and the fact that the Caucus was not consulted over the abolition of the subsidy. This is a most serious matter: it will be serious for people living in the rural areas of South Australia as well as for those living in the rest of the Commonwealth. It appears that the decision, a humiliating victory for the Prime Minister, has been taken hurriedly and ill advisedly. I therefore ask the Premier this question in the interests of people living in South Australia and elsewhere in Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I regret that the honourable member finds it necessary to advert to my absences from the House and I assure him that no discourtesy is meant to him or to any other honourable member. It so happens that, for some months now, I have been suffering from a complaint that requires me to absent myself from the Chamber from time to time because I have difficulties with the end part of my digestive processes. Indeed, that is the reason for my being in hospital from time to time. It is for that reason that I leave the Chamber, not because of any involuntary reaction to the actions of the honourable member.

Regarding the matter the honourable member has raised, I assure him that it has already been raised previously, following on Premiers' Conferences, by me with the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Treasurer. However, I cannot conceive that I could obtain any further change in the Commonwealth Government's attitude as a result of such representations.

FOSTER ROAD LIGHTING

Mr. WELLS: Will the Minister of Local Government ask his officers to consider improving street lighting along Foster Road, which runs between North-East Road and Grand Junction Road? Recently the Highways Department has up-graded Foster Road and now it has an extremely good surface for traffic travelling from North-East Road on to Grand Junction Road and moving into the northern suburbs. Of course, Foster Road passes Hillcrest Hospital and, as the footpath facilities are of poor standard, much pedestrian traffic also uses the road. I travel on the road often and it is obvious at night time that a dangerous situation occurs because the street lighting is not sufficient to provide safety for pedestrians, particularly nurses and staff from Hillcrest Hospital.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I rather suspect that Foster Road is under the care and control of the council and, as such, it would be the council's responsibility rather than that of the Highways Department. I will ask officers of the department to check this and, if the council controls the road, we will refer the problem to it, asking it to confer with the Electricity Trust to try to overcome the difficulty to which the honourable member has referred.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

Mr. COUMBE: In view of the increasing number of industrial disputes in South Australia and the resultant lay-offs in employment, which regrettably are increasing in number day by day and which include stand-downs in some Government departments, will the Minister of Labour and Industry name for the House the strikes that are at present occurring in South Australia and will he give the reasons for them?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that the first part of the question may be permissible, but it is a matter for the Minister whether he replies to the second part, which refers to something that is outside his jurisdiction. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: At present there is one major problem, and that deals with the transport workers' dispute. As the honourable member knows, the transport workers' stoppage involves a Commonwealth issue and at present the matter is before Justice Gaudron, of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Court, who today is trying to arrange a conference. Of course, the claim by the South Australian drivers is based on the Commonwealth award, and that covers Government drivers. The application for an increase for the Government drivers was before a State

conciliation committee this morning and the Commissioner made an offer on the basis of an interim award of \$18 and a return to work. Naturally, the Commissioner would have expected that an appeal would be lodged, as there was a similar situation in Queensland, where a \$16 intern award increase was offered to drivers and they returned to work but appealed to the court for a further \$9.40. I also point out that in Queensland the situation was accepted by the transport drivers, I understand, because the Premier of that State threatened to declare a state of emergency. However, on considering what complications could have resulted from that, he withdrew that proposal and the drivers decided to return to work with the assurance that they would appeal for the additional \$9.40. I have appealed to the Australian Government Workers Union in South Australia today. After hearing of the offer from the commission, I made a similar offer to the Government drivers. However, they have rejected my appeal and at this stage I can only say that I am afraid that this issue must be resolved at the Commonwealth hearing that is being arranged by Justice Gaudron. So, until Her Honour can arrange the hearing, we will not get a decision across the nation.

Regarding the other disputes to which the honourable member has referred, I explained them in the House recently. One is the dispute involving Wallaroo-Mt. Lyell Fertilizers Limited and the chemical workers, which I understand has resulted from retrenchments as well as a wage claim. It has been going on for four weeks and I understand that it could end suddenly, but I am awaiting confirmation of that this afternoon. The other matter was a suggestion by members opposite or someone who would welcome a stoppage at the Port Stanvac refinery, but the Secretary of the Storemen and Packers Union has assured me that there will be no such stoppage. The steel dispute at Port Adelaide is entirely one between two unions on a demarcation matter, and I do not think I need give further information regarding that, because it is well known to the House. The Premier, who has had discussions with the parties involved, has explained the whole situation.

MODBURY WEST SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education obtain for me a report on the Education Department's plans to erect a new separate infants building at Modbury West Primary School? The accommodation position at this school has been raised with me frequently by members of the school council and at present about 730 students are housed in the original brick building and 10 transportable wooden classrooms. No additional facilities such as shelter sheds or toilets have been provided to cater for the additional children since the original brick building was erected.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will examine the matter for the honourable member and give her a reply as soon as possible.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Local Government say whether councils have been told, either in writing or by direct means of communication, such as by telephone, of the present position regarding grant and debit order funding? I have contacted six district clerks in my district and until yesterday none had received any communication originating from a departmental source. The only information that has filtered through has been as a result of clerks seeking such information from district engineers so that they can prepare budgets, assuming that the procedure followed in previous years would be adopted;

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Much stirring seems to be going on about the problem we now have regarding the allocation of grant moneys, in particular, and the programme of the Highways Department for the coming year. Councils that have felt so concerned on this matter have inquired themselves, rather than being involved in the matter that the honourable member has raised about being spoonfed by the Highways Department. Those councils have made submissions and, when those submissions have been genuine the councils have received assistance. At present, a considerable sum has already been allocated to local government to overcome the immediate problems that have been made known to the Highways Department.

Dr. Eastick: All local government bodies?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The difficulty we are facing now is that so many people who are so expert in the area of local government are so intent on criticizing the Government that they are losing sight of the real reason for and purpose of local government. I repeat that, where local government has a genuine problem and communicates it to the Highways Department, it will receive immediate assistance. Local councils have already received over \$100 000 worth of work.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What about the rest of the year?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is the kind of stupid remark one would expect from a stupid member.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We expect soon to be able to provide both the member for Gouger, and other members who may be interested, with the full details of this matter but, until the final sum that the Highways Department will have available for the current year is determined, it will not be possible to do so. That is the situation for those genuinely interested members, and I am sure that it will satisfy the queries the member for Gouger has had from the clerks in his district.

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the Government intends to proceed with the proposed changes to local government boundaries, despite the multitude of metropolitan and rural protests following the publication of the Royal Commission's first report? It is reported in this morning's *Advertiser* that councils are to hold talks, because some metropolitan councils are extremely concerned at the implications of this report. The member for Mallee has presented a petition from several hundred ratepayers in the Pinnaroo area, and this will be the forerunner of many more petitions that will be received during the next few weeks. I have many meetings to attend when I return to my district, and I am sure other members will also have to attend meetings. The implications of this report are causing much concern to me and to many other people in metropolitan and rural areas. The closing part of the article in this morning's *Advertiser* states:

The concern is at the conversion of local government—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now making a comment by way of a quotation. He sought leave to explain his question, and that is the condition under which leave is granted.

Mr. BOUNDY: Councils are concerned at the loss of adequate local representation.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: First, I can put the mind of the honourable member at ease. The Government will not give effect to the findings of the Royal Commission, as it does not have the authority to do so: Parliament alone can do that.

Mr. Millhouse: Come on! That's not a proper answer.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: You're trying to abdicate your responsibility.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That will be the position. I hope that soon, after Cabinet has been able to allocate me some time, the appropriate Bill will be introduced, and the member for Goyder (and any other member who is interested) will have adequate opportunity to express his views, the views of councils he may represent and, I hope, the views of all citizens of the State.

Mr. Millhouse: But will it be based on—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is interesting for me to be able to say that the first correspondence I received was from a council situated not far from the honourable member's district to the effect that it was somewhat disappointed that its identity was to fade into oblivion but that it accepted the inevitability of the situation and urged the Government to give effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission as quickly as possible. That was the first opinion communicated to me, but since then I have received differing views. No doubt, before the matter is finally disposed of, I will receive further views both for and against. It should be borne in mind that the Royal Commission was launched only after the views of all councils had been sought and 63 per cent of councils in South Australia had stated that they desired a review of the existing boundaries by a Royal Commission.

Mr. Mathwin: But that was—

Mr. Millhouse: Wouldn't you—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg and the member for Mitcham know by now the provisions of Standing Orders, and, if they persistently disregard Standing Orders, they know what the consequences will be.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: At that time I made clear that, if most councils desired a review of boundaries, we would appoint a Royal Commission and, if they did not desire it, we would be satisfied that we had done our best to solve their problems. The review was carried out by three of the most capable men in local government today. For one petition, by innuendo, to refer to the Commissioners as Fascists does not do much for the cause. I commend those members of that council who did not sign the petition. I believe that Judge Ward, Mr. Hockridge and Commissioner Pitt are beyond reproach and that they have brought down a very good report. The Royal Commission provided the first review of local government boundaries to have taken place in South Australia for 40 years. When the opportunity is presented, the recommendations of the Royal Commission will be placed before this House for debate. Parliament will decide the issues, and the member for Goyder will have adequate opportunity to express the views not only of councils in his area but also, I hope, of the people in his district. After all, local government is of the people and not just restricted to those people who are eligible to vote.

TRANSPORT SURVEY

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Transport ascertain the reasons for the Highways Department's motor traffic checkpoint near the intersection of Burbridge and Airport Roads yesterday and the large contingent of men on the site for what appeared to be a simple exercise that could have been conducted mechanically? Yesterday, when transporting Kangaroo Island passengers from West Beach to the city, I, together with other motorists, was diverted into a human funnel that led to the checkpoint. No fewer than eight officers were on the site, apart from a considerable quantity of the Highways Department's

identified equipment, and additional men were on the roadside adjacent to the checkpoint. The questions asked of the motorists and of me as the driver of my vehicle were as follows: how many passengers did you take to the airport; how many did you take away from the airport; and which way are you heading (or words to that effect)? As I have been told that a motor traffic movement survey of this type could be done mechanically, this has led to the expressed concern for what appeared to be a gross waste of time and taxpayers' money.

The other reason why I ask my question is that yesterday, after this incident occurred, I telephoned the Highways Department's Traffic Division to try to determine what was happening on the site and, after very courteous attention by officers in the department, I was finally told that the officer-in-charge of the exercise at the airport would phone me back later in the day and give me the information so that I would be aware of what was happening and could pass the information on to the inquirers. However, until we sat today I had not received the information and I therefore ask the Minister this question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not aware of the circumstances of the issue to which the honourable member refers, but I will certainly obtain the information. It appears from his description that it was nothing more than one of those simple trial checks taken from time to time to determine traffic volumes, flows, origins, and destinations of people. Unfortunately, contrary to the honourable member's view, mankind has not yet been able to devise a machine that will record the number of passengers in a car, whence they have come, or where they are going, although a machine will record that a vehicle has passed a certain point. Placed in strategic places, such machines can make certain calculations, but none of these machines is as good at getting information direct from the person. Such a survey is in keeping with the normal market surveys and the like that are continually taken for a multitude of reasons. As regards the issue of concern, I shall be pleased to get the information for the honourable member.

SWAN REACH SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Because of the importance of craft teaching at Swan Reach Area School and the continuing difficulties experienced by students at that school in attending for instruction at Cambrai Area School, will the Minister of Education consider the problems and needs at Swan Reach to ascertain whether a craft centre can be provided at the Swan Reach school?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will consider this matter, but I point out that we have an urgent need for craft accommodation at many schools in the State, and that part of the building programme is lagging in our overall planning. I believe the problems at Swan Reach have arisen because of the high river—

Mr. Nankivell: They have 36 kilometres to travel.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I would have thought that 36 km of travel would be relatively insignificant compared to the problems of a high river. This last year has been an unusual period (and we are not over it yet), because recent rains in Victoria will mean a further peak coming down the river. Although this is not expected to be as great as the present peak, it may cause further problems at Swan Reach. It will not be possible in the immediate future to construct a craft centre at Swan Reach; also, if we decided to make the centre available some time next year, by then there might not be high river levels. Despite this aspect of the problem, I will ascertain what can be done.

SCHOOL EQUIPMENT

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Education say when grants for most of the school library books and equipment will be available this year? What is departmental policy on ground maintenance grants? When will this money be available to school councils?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In reply to the last part of the question, I will get precise details, but there has been no change in normal arrangements for the payment of ground maintenance grants. The provision of library books and equipment through grant money will be as a result of the Australian Schools Commission funding, and, after checking the situation that applies, I will let the honourable member know the result as soon as possible.

JOINT SITTING

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Premier act to protect the interests of this State by offering to co-operate with other State Premiers in a High Court challenge to the proposed joint sitting of Commonwealth Parliament, on the grounds that the States' rights are in jeopardy? It has been reported that Victoria and Queensland are actively promoting such a challenge, and further reports indicate that other States are expected to be involved, including at least one Labor State. Does this mean that the Premier has now decided to back up his recent protestations of concern at the adverse effect of the Commonwealth Government's activities on South Australia and to do something positive about the situation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This State will not co-operate with any challenge in the High Court to the joint sittings of the Commonwealth House of Parliament. The legislation to be brought before the joint sitting comprises measures for which the Commonwealth Government has the clearest mandate, and I believe it to be the duty of every Senator, including Senators from this State of whatever political background, to attend the joint sitting and vote for the measures.

BASHAM BEACH

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Development and Mines say what is the position regarding the subdivision and development of land in the area commonly known as Basham Beach?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I assume that the honourable member is referring to that portion of land on the south coast immediately to the east of Port Elliot. If that is the case, officers of the department administered by the Minister of Environment and Conservation would be better able to get the information. However, I will certainly take up the matter with them and with my own department and get a detailed report.

TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education review the current rate of travelling allowances, with special reference to students who travel from Paracombe, Inglewood, and Houghton to Birdwood High School? Will the Minister also consider providing a departmental bus to travel to Birdwood High School? I recently received correspondence, as I believe has the member for Tea Tree Gully, from a parent body associated with the Birdwood High School setting out the scale of charges levied by a private bus operator who provides a bus service for students travelling to Birdwood High School from the areas mentioned. Although I sent that letter a few weeks ago to the Minister with a request for action, as yet I have not received a reply. This morning a parent of a child attending Birdwood High School saw me about this matter and

said he was experiencing hardship as a result of the fares being charged. I believe the fare currently charged by the private contractor is \$2.80 a week and that it will rise next term to \$3.60. Hardship is created for parents because the travelling allowance is recoverable only at the end of each term. My constituent has only one child at this school at present. That child could attend Banksia Park High School, but the bus would leave at 7.30 a.m. and would not get the student home until late, and the child would have a long walk home. Although the child is zoned to attend Birdwood High School, a choice is available. It was put to me that next year if another child from the same family were to attend Birdwood High School the father would have to pay \$7 a week, a sum that he could not afford on a workman's wage. Remember that he cannot recoup the fare until the end of the term. Currently he has \$18 due to him. A mistake was made in his case and he received only \$9; he believes he should have received \$18, and I suspect that it should have been \$21, as a neighbour received this. Nevertheless, he is out of pocket. Some students travelling to Birdwood High School are serviced by free departmental buses. The case I have mentioned is, I believe, a genuine one. I hope the Minister will bring down a satisfactory reply within a reasonable time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The answer to that part of the question that dealt with a general review of travelling allowances is "Yes; they will be reviewed". In fact, they are already under review. Regarding the specific problem to which the member referred, I believe the bus service is run by Mr. Weeks and is licensed by the Transport Control Board.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He doesn't make anything out of it either.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not an Education Department contracted bus service but a private bus service run under a licence issued by the Transport Control Board. Other complaints have been received, as the honourable members for Kavel and Tea Tree Gully would appreciate. A detailed investigation is being carried out in respect of this matter, but it has not been dealt with completely. When it is, I shall see that members are informed of the outcome. An announcement as to travelling allowances may be made within the next few weeks.

VEHICLE RATINGS

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Transport indicate whether a committee has been appointed to ascertain the G.V.W. and G.C.W. ratings provided in the amendment to the Road Traffic Act, 1973? Will the Minister also consider setting up similar committees in regional areas? A committee was to be set up to give ratings where modifications had been made to vehicles with lazy axles or where additions or subtractions had been made to production-built vehicles. So that people in the industry may plan for the future, the committee should operate as soon as possible. Most vehicles would be used by farmers for local deliveries to silos and similar local purposes and, if only one committee were established, vehicles would have to be brought to Adelaide to obtain ratings.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A committee has been established, so that answers the first part of the question. Regarding the second part, I should like to discuss the matter with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to determine the practicability of the suggestion. I do not completely favour the idea at this stage. Equally, I am not of the opinion that it would be necessary for people to bring vehicles to Adelaide to establish the G.V.W. In fact, I

understand it is being done locally without the establishment of regional committees. The matter having been raised, it ought to be clarified and I will bring down a considered reply when it is available.

WOOMERA VILLAGE

Mr. GUNN: Has the Premier made representations to the Commonwealth Government to ensure the continued employment of 5 000 residents at Woomera village in my district? If he has not, will he do so immediately? A report in this morning's newspaper states that the Commonwealth Government is considering the future operations of this important decentralized industrial centre in my district. Reports in newspapers in other States suggest that the Commonwealth Government is considering putting this operation into mothballs or closing it down.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: An approach has already been made to the Commonwealth Minister for Manufacturing Industry in relation to science-based industry and the maintenance of technology in South Australia, in all areas of defence-based industry.

HALLETT COVE

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the Government plans to purchase any more land in the Hallett Cove area near the amphitheatre, which is reported to be over 600 000 000 years old? I understand that the Government said it would purchase 56.66 hectares, and apparently it has already purchased 47.75 ha. Recently, the newspaper reported (and I have since been to the area to inspect this) that the area next to the amphitheatre had been completely bulldozed by the organization working there; of course, it looks rather shocking. In addition, it has been reported that this organization will build a groyne near the area. Does the Government intend to buy more land to protect the amphitheatre at Hallett Cove, as this must be protected at all costs?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: At the time when the Government purchased land at Hallett Cove, several reports were made to Parliament. I remind the honourable member that, at that time, when a development plan for building in the area was submitted, consideration was given as to which sections should be protected. A committee was appointed that considered the views of science teachers who, with students, visited the area regularly and of geologists who identified the area of importance as being 20.23 ha. Following the committee's recommendation, the Government decided that, in addition to purchasing the 20.23 ha, it would provide a buffer zone of 274.3 metres, so that the total purchase of land involved was 56.66 ha, this area being reserved from development. The honourable member will recall that the purchase price was about \$400 000. At that time, some people said that, although the land purchased by the Government would protect the amphitheatre, not enough land had been purchased to preserve the remoteness of the area for people who visited it, and that the Government should have purchased more land. However, it was felt that sufficient land had been purchased to protect the amphitheatre and the site of geological interest.

Recently, complaints have been made about bulldozing that is taking place outside the buffer zone and not within the area purchased. Water running across the disturbed soil and on to the beach is said to have discoloured the beach, and it could affect the sea water. Officers of the Fisheries Department have investigated the matter to ensure that no damage is done to the sea-bed. Subsequently, we discussed the matter with the developer, who agreed

to provide channels to ensure that water did not rush down on to the beach. In addition, the developer has said he will undertake more planting over the total area to provide extra cover and to prevent any clay run-off.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 31. Page 217.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): Before the adjournment last evening, I was referring to the Dental Department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. When the member for Bragg sat down last evening, the clock in the Chamber showed that he had 41 minutes left in which to make his speech, but now the clock shows that he has only 38 minutes remaining.

The SPEAKER: I have been informed that the official record shows that the time now appearing on the clock is correct.

Dr. TONKIN: In replying to a question on March 20, 1974, in the Upper House, the Minister of Health said:

The whole of the Dental Department is being investigated. The full report will not be available until the end of 1974 but it is the intention of the consultant, where appropriate, to make progressive recommendations for the improvement of services during the progress of his investigation. It is intended that the remainder of this year shall be an on-going period of change in regard to the organization of the Dental Department.

Be that as it may, what is now happening at the Dental Department? Is any progress being made at all? Can we believe what the Minister has said? I hope that these questions will be answered soon. Patients (not staff members) who have become singularly well informed about the position at this hospital have ascertained that of the 120 chairs in the hospital never more than 50 per cent are in use. I am told this in a letter I have received from a patient. The letter also states that the cost for every man, woman, and child who enters the hospital is \$13 to start with. That cost does not compare favourably with the cost in other States; for instance, the cost in New South Wales is \$6 a head. This patient sums up the situation in her letter. Having been advised to have full extraction, she states:

If your dentist had said to me, "Look, we have far more cases than we can cope with and we think it more important to save the teeth of young people than people 69 years old, and if you want to save your teeth any longer I'm afraid you will have to pay for the luxury privately," I would have respected his honesty. What I do most strongly resent is that from now on, even though I am entitled to free dental treatment, I must go to a private dentist if I need an inspection, filling, cleaning, etc. I would add that I shall never put the Dental Hospital to the expense of supplying me with full dentures while the existing waiting period of months and months without teeth exists. Old age is not synonymous with loss of dignity and regard for personal appearance. I continue to take an active part in public life in a variety of ways, and if it takes the last dollar I possess I would neither put myself in *purdah* nor appear looking undignified and sounding incomprehensible.

She concludes by saying that she has no criticism whatever of the dental treatment she has received; she says that she has received nothing but politeness and helpfulness from the staff and nurses. As I agree with her last remarks, I cannot understand why the present situation has been allowed to continue. It is deplorable that it has been allowed to go on for so long. It is also deplorable that

the Government appears to have acted or, rather, reacted to the questions only when publicity has been given periodically. I sincerely hope no action is taken against the person (Dr. Brian Penhall) who brought this latest situation to the attention of the public and whose paper to a group of dentists was reported in the press, especially bearing in mind that this Government supposedly advocates open government.

Unfortunately I can still remember the episodes involving the late Dr. Kevin Anderson when he was speaking about amoebic meningitis. He spoke out honestly and the truth may have embarrassed the Government occasionally, but he did what he thought was the right thing for the people of South Australia. He was asked to see the board on a number of occasions. I sincerely hope that that will not happen in this case. It seems to me that only by continued reference to the current situation of the Dental Department will the Government be stimulated to take any satisfactory action to rectify and improve it.

Inevitably, the attention of members of the House and the community is drawn to the current inflationary situation. The events of the last few weeks have done nothing to reassure members of the public. We have seen various Commonwealth Ministers expounding their own theories on how inflation should be controlled, although they differ with Dr. Cairns. Mr. Whitlam is notable for his silence. Dr. Cairns is even more of an enigma, because he has diagnosed the complaint satisfactorily but his suggested measures to be taken will have a deleterious effect on the inflationary situation. It is becoming more and more obvious that marked divisions exist within the Labor movement, both within the trade unions and the Labor Party sections. This has been shown quite clearly by recent events within the Commonwealth Labor Party Caucus—

Mr. Chapman: And in this State.

Dr. TONKIN: I will come to that later; remind me if I forget. There is no question about it (and I can well believe that members opposite will want to walk out): Labor members have done a pretty good job of smoothing over the problems in their own movement but now we are going to see this being brought out into the open, whether they like it or not. No-one would want to inhibit debate in this House or in public on this matter more than would the militants (the new left wing) within the Labor Party. They cannot hope to have everything their own way if they persist in taking such irresponsible and militant actions. It is going to become public, and the sooner the people of South Australia know what is going on, the better. The Labor Party and the Labor movement are facing a crisis greater than they have ever faced before, and that includes the conscription crisis when Billy Hughes was kicked out, as well as the crisis they faced during the depression. Once again we have seen an upsurge in militant activity. I refer again to the almost comic activities of the Commonwealth Labor Caucus not only in differing with its leaders as to whether or not to accept a pay rise but also as regards the latest report that appears in the *Advertiser* this morning, stating that the Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) "narrowly survived a fiery revolt in the Labor Caucus last night". I wonder how long he is going to survive in the Labor Caucus.

Mr. Coumbe: He is lurching from crisis to crisis.

Dr. TONKIN: Mr. Whitlam's major problem is that he has been a front man. A useful man to the Labor Party, he has been able to keep one foot in each camp: one militant foot and one moderate foot. The front he has put on has been useful in appealing to the electorate,

but now the Party is in power again his usefulness is gradually waning and we see the upsurge in activity of the militants such as Dr. Cairns, taking over and already displacing Mr. Barnard, a moderate and former Deputy Prime Minister. I predict before 18 months is over Dr. Cairns will be Prime Minister of this country. Heaven help us!

What a stupid situation it is, with the Labor Caucus voting to take one action and the Prime Minister in the House giving an answer to a question in which he says that the Government will take the opposite action, then calling another meeting of Caucus to try to justify his actions, and then winning in that matter by a majority of only three (the voting was reported as being 45 to 42). It seems to me that the Attorney-General would have signed the necessary papers, anyway, regardless of what Caucus said. Mr. Whitlam, Dr. Cairns, Mr. Cameron, and Mr. Hayden spoke strongly against the motion, I think with various motives.

Mr. Coumbe: Weren't they jeered and heckled the other day?

Dr. TONKIN: Yes. We have heard much about the problems of the right wing. The left has managed to smooth over its problems, but once again the traditional divisions that have existed for many years, since the Labor movement first arose, are being exposed again, and it takes a crisis to bring out into the open again these differences in attitude and opinion held by the opposite extremes within the Labor movement. We on this side of the House have often been accused of being anti-union. That statement has been refuted more than once during this debate and I refute it again: we are not anti-union. I believe that unions have rendered invaluable service to the people of Australia, not just the working people of Australia: they have given a very useful service to the community over many years and I believe that the community as a whole has benefited from the actions of unions (not all actions of unions, but generally speaking they have been a good thing).

The major problem arises when the militant section of the Labor movement, an extreme group at one end of the spectrum, tries to take over the trade unions and succeeds, and this is made easier for them in two main circumstances: when there is a national crisis, as there is now (and many of these people are not above exacerbating a national crisis to serve their own ends), when a Labor Party is in Government; and when the militant groups begin to take over the running of the Labor Caucus and, therefore, the Labor Party, the situation becoming compounded and growing still worse. I think it worth while looking at a brief history of the trade union movement, especially in relation to the Labor Party and Labor movement as a whole. I hope members opposite will forgive me for telling them what they should know, but I think this should be on record. Trade unions are comparatively new in our society. They were born in England about 150 years ago and were brought to Australia by emigrating workers. In the 1830's and 1840's small trade societies were set up mostly in Sydney.

Mr. Wright: Whose benefit is this for—your own side?

Dr. TONKIN: I think many people in the community should know a little more about the truth of the trade union movement. Organized unions first appeared in about 1850, and they grew in South Australia because of the development of responsible government and manhood suffrage. We in Australia had many advantages

that were not acknowledged in the United Kingdom in those days. These things gave the working man a potential political influence that workers did not have in Britain at that time. There has also been a generally expanding economy with a shortage of labour. Certainly there have been periods of unemployment, but there have generally been long periods where the situation has been one more or less of full employment. There were many reasons for the formation of trade unions, such as to provide holiday, sickness and unemployment benefits and to undertake various welfare functions; but the primary reason was to negotiate terms of employment, that is, to seek to determine, with the employer, the wages, hours and conditions under which the members of each union worked. Union development advanced steadily, with some setbacks, until the First World War, when Australia was the most highly unionized country in the world. During this period, the trade union movement became associated with a political Party, namely, the Australian Labor Party, which had been formed in Sydney in 1891. This Party virtually became the political wing of the trade union movement. In the depression years, two extremes polarized.

Mr. Payne: The haves and the have-nots!

Dr. TONKIN: I am speaking about members of the Labor Party. At one end there were revolutionaries who regarded trade unions as instruments of the class struggle and considered that unions should be less concerned about improving the conditions of workers and more concerned about overthrowing the system. At the other end of the spectrum we had those who considered that unions should, by legislation and arbitration involvement alone, be steadily preserving and extending the advantages that already had been won. These moderates were the people who believed that, by following the legitimate courses of action open to them, they would best serve the cause of the worker.

I consider that the majority of union members adopt an attitude somewhere between the two extremes. Since 1950 the division between the left wing and the remainder of the trade union movement has become more marked and certainly more obvious. The moderates and the militants are split further apart. Obviously there is a wide difference in ideology and tactics, and compromise has been necessary. It has not been accepted happily, but it has had the effect of patching up any possible split in the Labor Party.

These traditional divisions and differences within the Labor movement have become more overt in times of crisis. This was made quite clear by the reaction in 1916, when conscription was introduced, and it was made more apparent during the great depression between 1929 and 1932. The gap between the trade unions and the political leaders of the Labor Party widens when Labor Governments are in office, because these Governments are, because of their legislative responsibility, reluctant to accept unilateral instructions from unions and they must keep electoral prospects in mind.

The Labor Governments deal with pragmatic details of implementing policies that are not recognized by union officials, and they even have to recognize the rights and feelings of a considerable minority. This is something militant members of the Labor movement do not recognize. There have been many fair-minded Labor politicians and good Labor politicians, and there have been some pragmatists.

Mr. Wright: And some moderates, too. You must say that.

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Adelaide has made the point for me. By and large, they were the people who lived up to their responsibilities to everyone in Australia, and it has been the small minority that has wanted to overthrow the system. In 1916, Billy Hughes was expelled from the Labor Party on the conscription issue and many other people resigned from the Party or were expelled. Thus, the Parliamentary Labor Party was left without most of its old-established leaders and, significantly, the Parliamentary leaders who remained faithful to the Labor Party were firmly under the control of the extra-Parliamentary group, because that group was in turn firmly in the hands of the trade union movement.

With the loss of the responsible moderates, the whole Labor movement turned clearly to the left, and many years of militant unionism resulted. Unions found that they were unable to cushion the effects on the workers of the depression during that major crisis and were unwilling to introduce unemployment and wage reductions. The union movement, and therefore the Labor movement, lost membership and the militants once again took advantage of a crisis situation and became more active.

I have no doubt that history is repeating itself and that we in this country face a major crisis. Inflation is at an all-time high and people are threatened with unemployment. Indeed, they are not only threatened: we see today that unemployment is coming about. The left wing of the Labor Party is well in the ascendancy, and that is what we have come to expect, from our historical study.

The difficulty is compounded by the fact that a Labor Government is in office in the Commonwealth Parliament. Having won Government by smooth words and moderate policies, the representatives of the Labor Party have now been taken over and the Government can no longer compromise. The militant wing is ready to take over. The divisions within the Labor movement are becoming much more evident and the militant extremes in the left wing are calling the tune. As I have said, I think that the Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) has outlived his usefulness and that Dr. Cairns, as we have seen by his activities and in press reports, will soon emerge as Parliamentary Leader of the Labor Party. I consider that there is still a good proportion of moderates in the Parliamentary Labor Party in Canberra and many in the trade union movement.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Mr. Barnard got into trouble, didn't he?

Dr. TONKIN: He did. It is good to see that Clyde Cameron is at least talking sense. The moderates to whom I have referred have put their faith in Government legislative measures that are designed to benefit the working man and improve his welfare. They have also put faith in the arbitration system to achieve improvements in wages and conditions, but now those at the other end of the spectrum, the militants, are taking over. The big question that the average rank-and-file member of the Labor Party and of the trade unions must decide soon (if he has not done so already) is where he wants to go, how he wants to go there, and what effect this will have on the way and quality of life for him and his family.

The left-wing militants of the Labor movement, either in the trade unions or in an A.L.P. Government, have no hesitation in exploiting the current crisis situation to achieve the ultimate end of total destruction of the present system, nor have they any conscience about that matter. They will actively encourage this crisis situation. The present wage explosion, supported by continuous and widespread union demands to keep up with the cost of living and supported in many cases by strike action, is only part of the militants'

plan. Many rank-and-file union members naturally are forced by economic pressures to support such action in their own interests, but I consider that they are being grossly and appallingly manipulated by the militants, who are in the ascendancy in both the Parliamentary Labor Party and the trade unions.

The recent mini Budget shows that clearly. The Treasurer has announced measures that all informed observers maintain can only increase inflationary pressures in the present context. A reduction in taxation would provide the working man with extra money to allow for increasing prices, without compounding the situation by increasing production costs of the goods that he wants, but the present continuous wage demands are increasing production costs. I consider that the Commonwealth Government has taken this action because the militant left wing of the Labor movement, both in the trade unions and in the A.L.P., sees this as a tremendous opportunity to achieve the radical overthrow of our present financial system. That is what left-wing members are working for. They, too, have learned their history; so, who better than they should know? They will not care whom they hurt, and that involves the bulk of the trade union movement as well as most of the people of this country. These are the people who hold middle-of-the-road reasonable views. These people, I think, will soon see where they are being led and, I believe, they should and will act to prevent the total destruction of our society. This is not what they want to happen, anyway, any more than anyone else in Australia. I hope that these moderate views will prevail. I believe that this problem may have to be tackled from within the unions themselves. I believe that unionists may have to express more clearly their disapproval of the actions of the militants by dealing with them through the ballot box and by other democratic means.

The problem can be tackled by Labor Party membership also. I think pressure must be exerted on the Labor Caucus to control the disastrous actions of the Parliamentary left wing and to insist on realistic, determined, and genuine efforts to control inflation, which efforts we have not seen hitherto. There are divisions within the Labor Caucus, both federally and on the local scene. I believe that many members of the Labor movement have grave doubts and misgivings about the course that has been set for them. I believe that, if there are divisions in the Commonwealth Labor Party, they exist also on the local scene, and the Premier may find himself in much the same situation as the Prime Minister. It is difficult to work out who is a moderate militant and who is a militant moderate. I predict that, just as Dr. Cairns will be running the country within 18 months time, there may be a change of emphasis within the Parliamentary Party in this House, too.

Dr. Duncan Ironmonger (Acting Director of the Institute of Applied Economics and Social Research at the University of Melbourne) gave an interesting address a week ago. He talked about the Commonwealth Cabinet and its view of the economic situation. He was talking about the policy that should be adopted to control inflation. His was a worthwhile talk, and it was a reasonable one. He pointed out that only a few of the extremely large wage rises of the last five months have already been incorporated into retail prices; thus, we can expect some price rises between mid-May and mid-August to be published in October; and between mid-August and mid-November they will probably be in excess of the last ones published. In other words, the effect of these large wage rises is being spread over a long period but, nevertheless, they will be felt severely,

He said that the Deputy Prime Minister (Dr. Cairns) had correctly diagnosed the current inflationary problem as one of domestic cost-push inflation, that is, a problem of excess in wages and salaries leading to excessive demand. He said that increased costs caused by wages could not be absorbed in reduced profits but must be passed on in higher prices. It is a myth that a 20 per cent rise in wage costs could be met from business profits.

Mr. Payne: What about increased productivity?

Dr. TONKIN: Give us time. After allowing for plant depreciation and replacement and paying taxes, a company could afford wage increases of between 5 and 10 per cent, provided that it paid a similar return to its shareholders. No company can stay in operation in these circumstances. Output prices must therefore be increased. The general result of a 20 per cent increase in wages is a 20 per cent increase in prices, modified only by the extent to which increased productivity may offset the advantages during the adjustment period and modified by the extent to which commodities on oversea markets go up and down at the same time.

The variation that could be expected from these combined effects is about 4 per cent in a good year, and nothing in a bad year; thus, a general wage rise of 20 per cent could be expected to lead to a price rise of between 16 per cent and 20 per cent, the margin depending on productivity and trade gain. Some unions and wage and salary-earners, Dr. Ironmonger pointed out, at the expense of the rest of us, if they can, induce their employers to give excessive wage gains, and this results in a larger than usual increase in output prices. The Commonwealth Government must act to contain these illegitimate wage demands. Wage increases will add to inflationary pressures unless productivity is maintained. I agree with the member for Mitchell, as I presume that that is what he was talking about. In other words, although people are entitled to a fair wage, they must be willing to make an effective contribution to the economy by doing a fair day's work. This is a responsibility that every member of the community must accept.

Australia is a great country; it is a pioneering country that has been built up by people who have not been afraid to do a fair day's work if they have to. They had the incentive of having to live and stay alive and survive all the natural hazards by eating and drinking and by bringing up their families. With the growth of welfare services it seems to me that people today, with their better security (which they deserve), have lost their identity and incentive. They cannot identify with their general responsibilities to the community. In some cases, there seems to be a total lack of incentive to work at all and a reluctance to play a meaningful part in the maintenance of the economy by contributing their fair share. I support worker participation and job enrichment programmes, all these things that are supposed to help the worker (and I think they do), just as I support moves into unfair trade practices. As long as such things help the worker, he must realize that he depends on the viability of industry just as much as industry depends on his viability: one is fully dependent on the other.

I know of two examples of small firms, one of which went out of business because of continuing wage demands. The company decided that the real estate worth of the land was more valuable than the fuss and bother of keeping the company going. I know of another firm that put the situation fairly to its employees on a productivity and incentive basis. The firm has now expanded to an

extent where the company is thriving and the workers are thriving, too. Obviously, incentive arrangements must benefit company and worker alike in a fair and proper way.

I do not believe in worker exploitation. Mr. Cameron (and this is where I think he was making a little sense) said he recognized the need for tying wage increases to productivity. However, I cannot for the life of me understand the attitude of the State Secretary of the Miscellaneous Workers Union (Mr. Cavanagh) in reacting to Uniroyal's announcement that the company was to introduce an incentive scheme. Perhaps the scheme was a gimmick; perhaps there were better ways of doing it (I think there probably were). He said, "This is one of the most scurrilous and despicable campaigns we have come across to increase production." For the life of me I cannot understand why people are scared stiff of productivity. It is the militants who are scared of productivity because it does not suit what they have in mind for the people of Australia. I commend the leader in the *Advertiser* of June 6, this year, which states:

The reaction of the State Secretary is ludicrous and depressing.

Obviously, the Labor moderates who represent most members of the Labor Party will have to do something. The militants do not want any resolution of the present crisis situation, because they are taking advantage of it. I have heard it said, in justification of militant activities, that if all people worked for the State they would have every incentive to work as hard as possible. However, let us consider that Government utility, the Postmaster-General's Department, in which services have deteriorated in the previous two or three years: we now have one delivery a day instead of two, with no Saturday morning delivery and with mail delays. I could continue my recital but these aspects indicate the attitude of people who do not do their fair share and who go slow until overtime is necessary, and of postmen who take their time to finish their rounds. These are a few examples of what has happened: it may not affect the general worker, but these things do occur.

The average man needs money to meet the continuing increases in the cost of living. I believe this should be given to him by tax relief with a more equitable restructuring of the taxation system. Whether or not honest action will be taken to control inflation depends on who is in charge of the economy. By that I do not mean which Party, but which faction of the Labor movement. No doubt that movement has its problems, but the future of Australia is far too important to be put at risk by the action, or deliberate lack of action, of militant members of the Labor movement. It is up to the moderate majority to take control of the Labor movement, because I believe the militants, who are interested only in ideological upheaval, are making a desperate effort to take over the whole Labor movement (which is in turmoil), and are working to take over all of Australia. It is appalling to me that the future of our country can be put at risk by the activities of a fanatic, militant minority, and that other members of the Labor movement let them get away with it. If honesty, common sense, and a genuine unselfish concern for the people of Australia prevail, all will be well: if they do not, I believe democracy in this country will be destroyed.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): With other members I record my regret at the death of His Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester, and express my appreciation of his service in the high office of Governor-General of Australia during the difficult post-war years. Also, with other members I

extend condolences to the relatives of the late Edgar Rowland Dawes. I did not know the gentleman, but I believe he served the community sincerely and effectively. I also extend my sympathy to the wife and relatives of the late Ernest Clifford Allan Edwards, who was the member for Eyre. I knew Mr. Edwards and learned to appreciate his sincere, quiet, and straightforward manner.

The member for Kavel said yesterday that he considered the present situation of local government so important that he would refer to it before saying anything else. I, too, consider that this situation is one of paramount importance, because local government is in a critical situation today. Perhaps I am more acquainted with this situation in country areas, but the situation is most unsettled for two major reasons: first, many councils and corporations are concerned at the implications of the report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas. No doubt some councils will accept and appreciate to the full the Commission's recommendations, but others will be dissatisfied with them. The Minister of Local Government has already conceded that he has received adverse reaction, and he has a different view of the situation now than he had earlier. In the area I represent some councils are pleased but others are not. Page 5 of the Governor's Speech states, at paragraph 10:

The report of the Royal Commission into the boundaries of local government areas in this State will be presented to Parliament and, to the extent that legislation will be required to give effect to the report of the Commission, an appropriate Bill will be laid before you.

I understand from what the Minister said today that the only avenue by which local government and the community will be able to express opinions will be through their members of Parliament when the Bill is debated. The Commission's report states that many councils are not viable. It seems more important for a council to be viable than to have high receipts from rate revenue. Page 14 of the report states:

Moreover, paragraph 6 directs the Commission to consider any other matter which is proper to be taken into account. A number of factors were referred to by witnesses. These have included:

- (a) Economic viability.
- (b) Efficiency of each council.
- (c) Views of ratepayers.
- (d) Competence of staff.
- (e) Effect of use of resources.
- (f) Effective representation.

Many of these are far more relevant factors in determining whether a council should continue to exist than the issue whether a council should have a minimum rate revenue of \$500 000. The most relevant issue would seem to be whether a council is efficient and providing a proper service.

One council in my district has a credit balance, and its plant and equipment is of a standard equal to or higher than the plant of many other councils, but it is to go out of existence.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Which council is that?

Mr. RUSSACK: The Bute council. I believe there is room for adjustment in other areas, too, but this council is concerned with the findings of the Royal Commission on this matter. Employees are also very much concerned, but certain assurances have been given to them. However, will they be honoured in every respect? Only time will tell as far as day staff and outside employees are concerned. This problem of staff assurances was discussed at a conference held this week on Yorke Peninsula. Local government is unsettled because of this report; many councils do not accept the recommendations of the Royal Commission, and some are alarmed about finance.

This afternoon I asked the Minister of Local Government a question and, at the end of his reply, he made a statement to the effect that he was sure his reply would satisfy the member for Gouger and other members concerned about this matter. I am not satisfied, and I am sure that other members are not satisfied either. In fact, I would go as far as to say that the Minister is not at all happy with the financial situation at present. I asked the Minister whether his department had been in touch with councils because, for years, the accepted procedure was that during the first week of July councils were notified of allocations for roadworks. With this money and debit order work, councils could budget for the roadworks they could expect to carry out during the financial year. However, councils have not been contacted this year: it seems they have been disregarded.

The decent thing for the Minister to do, as there has been a change in procedure, would be to notify them about what is happening, but neither the Highways Department nor the Government has given any indication of what is happening. Had the councils been contacted and told that funds would not be available, they could make other financial arrangements. In replying to a question on this subject on July 25 the Minister said:

Until now the Government has told councils, whenever we have had the opportunity, that they need to plan their programmes to sustain them from their own resources. In other words, they should not expect assistance merely because they have received it in previous years. Unfortunately, I cannot give a full reply to the member's question other than to repeat that local government must stand on its own two feet.

Had councils been told that, they would have made other arrangements for finance. Most councils endeavour to stand on their own two feet, anyway. As the State Government relies on the Government in Canberra, it has no idea of how much it will receive for use by councils. Yesterday, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked what money might be received by way of council grants from the Commonwealth Government. The Minister, when replying, said:

That sum is identical to the sum allocated under the old Commonwealth Aid Roads Act for 1973-74. In other words, under the proposed legislation we have been allocated the same sum for this financial year.

The Deputy Leader interjected:

No increase for inflation?

The Minister replied:

No, nor has any allowance been made for the normal increases caused by expansion of activities.

He then went on to say that some of the money that would normally be reserved for this purpose had been reserved for urban public transport. With an expected inflationary trend of about 20 per cent for the year, surely that factor should have been considered. The Minister talked about \$31 000 000 being made available but, because of inflation, I believe the value will be much lower and councils will therefore be at a disadvantage. In His Excellency's Speech and in the report of the Royal Commission there is an association of ideas. The Commissioner of Highways (and I have every respect for him and consider he is a most able officer) is quoted as saying at page 30 of the Commission's report (and I believe I am not misinterpreting what he said):

So there is a nation-wide trend to distribute funds in accordance with needs and these needs have got to be established on some kind of basis and, as a general observation, we believe that the needs in South Australia at the moment are more towards upgrading the main road system than the minor local government road system. We cite the

Eyre Highway, the Stuart Highway, and many other main roads as roads which are of State and national significance and which require large amounts of spending to bring them up to acceptable standards.

The Commissioner refers specifically to two highways. Then reference is made to main roads other than district roads. Paragraph 9 of His Excellency's Speech states:

A greater priority for national highways and a somewhat reduced rate of spending on roads in the Adelaide metropolitan area are the predominating features of the Highways Department's programme of work in the immediate future. In keeping with this trend, work on three major national road links will be accelerated. These are the Eyre Highway, the South-Eastern Freeway, and possibly the Stuart Highway.

The Commissioner refers specifically to two of these roads. In view of that, I take it that his reference to needs in South Australia being more towards upgrading the main road system than the minor local government road system is also established. Councils definitely believe that money collected in petrol tax and motor registration fees should be used on district roads, so that councils can maintain those roads used by the motorists, anyway. The Minister has said that councils must stand on their own two feet. Towards the end of his Speech, His Excellency states:

However, if my Government is to continue to provide social and other services to standards which the people of this State expect and to which they are properly entitled, it will be necessary for it to take action to increase existing revenues and explore new avenues of income if the Revenue Account deficit is to be contained to manageable proportions.

Local government is following that example. Later, I will have more to say about the possibility of exploring new avenues of income. Councils have tried to stand on their own two feet. Each year, they try to raise more revenue. In the last 24 hours, I have contacted all the councils in my area, and have found that they have all had to increase their rates. Some have had to do this immediately, before knowing what they will receive by way of grants and debit order work.

I will cite the case of a council that the Royal Commission recommends should be retained and expanded. Its overdrafts are extended to the limit. During the last two years, its rate revenue has increased by 45 per cent, while its wages bill has increased by 57 per cent. In 1972-73, its rate revenue was \$62 000, whereas in 1973-74 it was \$80 000. The council has of necessity increased the rate for this year (it will be gazetted), and its rate revenue for 1974-75 will be \$102 000. As outside staff, it employs nine men whose weekly wage bill, on July 1, 1972, was \$594. The weekly wage bill for the same nine men on July 1, 1974, was \$945. In an endeavour to stand on its own two feet, the council will not replace one of these employees who will retire on September 6. The financial situation of the council has caused this reduction in the number of employees.

At present, three employees are entitled to long service leave. So that money from a special account can be used, by mutual arrangement three of these employees will take long service leave, one for five weeks, one for nine weeks, and one for 13 weeks. This will reduce the work force from nine to five men, but this has been dictated by circumstances. If no money has become available by next week, the council will approach the Minister and, having heard what the Minister has said about councils in difficulty, I am confident that he will do something to help this council. I certainly hope that he will listen to the appeal of the council and provide assistance. The

Chairman of the council has told me that, if no financial assistance is forthcoming by next week, the council will have to stand down some of the five men in the work force.

Although a council can increase its rates, there is a difficulty involved. As members know, by law metropolitan rates need not be paid (and no interest will be charged) up to November 30. In country areas, the relevant date is February 28 in the following year. Certain ratepayers may find themselves in reduced financial circumstances. Of course, good community people pay their rates straight away. However, no council can expect to receive the bulk of its rate income as soon as it sends out the notices, even though the Act provides that payment shall be made within 21 days.

Mr. Coumbe: It can be six months later.

Mr. RUSSACK: Yes, there is usually a rush on February 27 or 28 in the following year. The case to which I have referred is not a solitary case. I bring it to the attention of the Minister to show that councils are trying to do something about the situation so that they can stand on their own two feet. I reiterate that, had they been notified that they need not expect to receive money in the way that they had normally received it over the previous years, they would have done more to meet the situation.

Mr. Nankivell: In those circumstances, how can they compile their budget?

Mr. RUSSACK: They cannot. A clerk of another council has told me that the council really has to make a stab in the dark; it must bring in a temporary budget that can be adjusted when the council knows what moneys it will receive.

Mr. Coumbe: They can't fix their rate.

Mr. RUSSACK: In two cases, councils fixed the rate. As a matter of necessity, one council fixed the rate without knowing what it would receive. Another council is calling a special meeting on Monday. With the detail at his disposal, to the best of his ability the clerk will suggest to the council what its rate should be. Therefore, councils face difficulties in this respect. Regarding the escalation of wages and costs in any business, I refer to the following article in yesterday's *Advertiser* concerning the South Australian Meat Corporation, which is a Government instrumentality:

The average wage was about \$6 500. The cost of all leave, workmen's compensation—

and I emphasize that, because last week the member for Playford said that insurance companies were not interpreting the legislation correctly and that in many cases the cost of workmen's compensation insurance could be lower than it is—

and pay-roll tax boosted the employment cost to about \$10 000 a man.

So the figure rose from \$6 500 to \$10 000. That gives us an idea of what local government is facing, on the same basis: it can raise its rate revenue by 20 per cent, 30 per cent, or 35 per cent, but it is not keeping pace with the cost of wages in the work force. Therefore, I cannot emphasize too greatly today's financial crisis in local government, and particularly in district council areas. I appeal to the Minister to indicate to councils as soon as possible what they can expect by way of grants and debit orders, and in this way, and in this way only, can the crisis be relieved to any degree.

I commend and congratulate all councillors who contribute voluntary time in the interests of local government and their community. Local government, as we know it in Australia, was first instituted in South Australia in about

1840. To those people who still work voluntarily for local government and to all officers of local government I tender my commendations and congratulations. I referred just now to revenue. The Governor's Speech suggests that increases should be made in revenue received.

A vital matter I wish to mention now is land tax, which of course results from a valuation. At the outset, let me say I do not at all criticize the Valuer-General or his staff. They have an Act of Parliament within the confines of which they must make their valuations. The Land Tax Division can arrive at land tax figures only according to the Act, but the rate for land tax is statutory, and it is only by amending the Act in Parliament that the rate can be altered. Having obtained details of several examples, I think the time has arrived when that rate should be amended. I understand that, since 1971, when the Valuation of Land Act was amended, it has been the policy of the Valuer-General to value one-fifth of the State each year, that area becoming due again for valuation in at least five years time. The Act gives the Valuer-General the authority to value land at least once every five years.

It so happens that a portion of my electoral district has been valued (or, shall I say, the landowners have received notices of valuation) in the last month or so. Although some areas in that district were valued only in 1970 and 1971, they have again received a valuation in 1974. The most alarming thing about it in many cases is that increases have ranged from 250 per cent to, in some areas, over 300 per cent. I have been approached by individual landowners. I am now speaking about rural land, agricultural land, or broad acres, where the unimproved value has risen drastically. Let me read a portion of a letter that I received from a branch of the Agricultural Bureau of South Australia. It is as follows:

At a recent meeting . . . the main topic of discussion was the recent unimproved land valuations, which the primary producers in our area had received from the State Valuation Department. The meeting became animated and the discussion somewhat heated, with all members voicing their disapproval. We feel that the very steep increases ranging from 270 per cent to 300 per cent are most unrealistic and unjustified. This increase in valuations coming at a time when farmers' incomes are being eroded by steep increases in costs (beyond our control) and falling prices for their commodities (namely, meat and wool) is a bitter pill to swallow.

The letter was signed by the President of the branch and there were 46 other signatories. I thought it would not be correct of me to mention this matter without giving an example. So I contacted the department and asked it whether it would let me know the amount of land tax that would be due on two examples. It was thought by the owners that, if the valuation increased by 300 per cent, so the tax would increase by 300 per cent, but on investigation I find that that is not so. (The landowner only wishes it was so!) The people concerned still have time to appeal, and I am sure they will appeal but, if the appeal is dismissed, I will tell the House what the landowner will pay. I may explain here that during the year 1970-71 there was a rural depression and, because of that, there was a special amendment to the Act, which meant that the new valuations reverted to the previous valuations.

The first property I mention was valued at \$22 660 for one lot and \$770 for another lot but, for the purpose of taxation, those properties are aggregated. That was the 1965 assessment. If that assessment is maintained, the tax will be \$48.35. However, with the new assessment, the valuation has increased from \$22 660 to \$73 370. The lot that was valued at \$770 has increased to \$2 490, and the new tax applicable to that assessment will be \$502.04—

only more than 10 times as much! The valuation is up by 300 per cent but the tax is up by 1 000 per cent. I do not uphold any outrageous rates of profit in commerce but, when there has been criticism of high mark-ups in commerce (up to 300 per cent, with which I do not agree), what about 1 000 per cent for land tax?

Mr. Dean Brown: The Government has a double standard.

Mr. RUSSACK: Definitely. How can anyone accept that double standard? Another property, about 32 kilometres from the first property to which I have referred and comprising 333 hectares, was valued at \$21 400 in 1970, whereas the new assessment is \$61 610. On the old valuation, the land tax on that property was \$41.04, whereas the new tax will be \$319.32—an increase of about 800 per cent. I suggest that this is not a fair go for people whose commodities are decreasing in value.

There are only two ways in which this position can be corrected. First, the landholder can appeal but, if his appeal is rejected, he must pay the tax. We have heard recent discussions about water rates and the need to pay them. The second thing that can be done is for the Government, because of the high valuation, to reduce the rate, and this would be the only reasonable thing to do. It is my bounden duty, as a representative of these reasonable people, to bring this matter before the House and the Government so that something may be done.

I understand that these valuations are used also for water rating, although the steep increases applying to land tax would not apply for water rating. On the first property I mentioned, the old water rate was \$405.61 but, if the new valuation is upheld, the water rate will be \$486.73. Further, councils may adopt these valuations. A council that has the unimproved value system of rating adopts the unimproved value, but the Valuation Department also will give councils an annual value figure. Therefore, land tax and water and council rates can have a bearing on the valuation of properties.

I repeat that the Valuer-General has valued these properties according to his system and in terms of the Act, and the Land Tax Department has applied the rate according to the Statute. The second way in which to reduce the amount paid is by amending the Act and lowering the rate, and this would be reasonable. When a new valuation is made, a council prepares its budget and the rate is struck accordingly. I hope that the Government and the Minister responsible will take notice of what I have said and, on behalf of the people who are being hit in this way, do something to relieve the situation.

Under the Act, if there is a depression in the rural sector the Valuer-General has power to order a general valuation throughout the State, and I suggest strongly that a careful eye be kept on primary industry so that, if such a depression occurs, another valuation, commensurate with the situation in the industry, will be made. I should also like to refer to another matter that is mentioned in paragraph 11 of the Governor's Speech, as follows:

My Government has supported the operation of domiciliary care services in both the metropolitan and country areas and new projects in this field, at present under consideration, include Port Augusta, Millicent, Victor Harbor, Mannum and the Barossa towns.

I am particularly interested in this aspect of service to the community, and I commend the many people who work voluntarily in this field. It is intended to extend these services to other country areas and parts of the metropolitan area. The domiciliary care service based on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was one of the pilot schemes and it has been a good example to other services

that have been established. I was also pleased about the scheme established by the Hospitals Department for the Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta area about three years ago. A domiciliary co-ordinating committee for the district meets periodically and, when reports were given at the most recent meeting, the improvements that had been made in domiciliary care in the area were noticeable.

I am sure that the need for such services is great in other areas. In the area that I have mentioned, the service includes Meals on Wheels, home care or home cleaning, chiropody, a linen service, and a district nursing service. All these services are taken to the home: a patient does not go to a centre. Last Monday I had the privilege of attending, at the Strathmont Centre, a seminar attended by people from all parts of the State who are interested in this type of work, and it is encouraging to find what is being done and what progress is being made in this aspect of domiciliary service. There are many elderly citizens in country towns, and some of the larger towns would have a bigger percentage of aged people for whom these services would be necessary.

I also commend the work of the Royal District and Bush Nursing Society. I know that this Government contributes money to that organization: in the year ended June, 1973, it contributed \$148 000, or 39 per cent of the society's income. The Commonwealth Government contributed \$124 086 (32 per cent) while the branches contributed 23 per cent. It can therefore be seen that the local community works hard toward the upkeep of these services. The number of visits made has increased from 11 500 in 1961 to 230 000 in 1973. The number of patients attended to has increased from 10 000 in 1961 to 200 000 in 1973. I therefore commend all those connected with domiciliary care services, and I am pleased to see that an expansion of these services is being considered.

The Community Welfare Act provides for consultative councils to be established throughout the State. The usual practice is for an explanation of the purposes of a consultative council to be given at a public meeting. A steering committee is formed which is responsible for submitting to the Minister of Community Welfare the names of at least eight and not more than 12 people who would be suitable as members of the consultative council. In one case with which I am familiar, much time was spent in choosing nominees. Although members of the steering committee are very familiar with local affairs, it is the Minister and he alone who has the right to accept or reject the names submitted. Section 27 (1) of the Community Welfare Act provides:

A consultative council shall consist of not less than eight nor more than 12 persons appointed by the Minister.

I wonder how the Minister acquires knowledge of local people and local affairs that is superior to the knowledge possessed by members of the steering committee. I hope that he does not make his selection on a political basis. Section 26 of the Act provides:

The functions of a consultative council shall be:

- (a) to inquire into any matters affecting the welfare of the local community and to report to the Minister upon any matters that justify, in the opinion of the council, his consideration;
- (b) to give advice and guidance in the rationalization and co-ordination of services designed to promote the welfare of the local community so as to achieve the most effective utilization of those services;
- (c) to report upon any matter affecting the welfare of the local community referred to the consultative council for consideration and report by the Minister or the Director-General.

If the consultative council carries out its work diligently and conscientiously (as will the council with which I am concerned) it will be of great assistance to domiciliary services in its area.

Great emphasis has been placed on educational facilities, particularly in the metropolitan area. I have been privileged to visit some of the schools recently established, where the facilities are excellent. While I am pleased that those schools have facilities of high standard, I hope the Minister will set about establishing facilities of higher standard in country schools, too. Of course, I realize that money and time are involved. I know, too, that growing communities need special consideration. However, it must be realized that in 20 years time some schools in suburbs that we now call new will have redundant facilities because the present young generation will have grown up. The same type of thing has happened in the country. However, there are still many children in country areas. Why should they not have the same educational opportunities as have children in the metropolitan area?

I am grateful for the quick response given recently by an Education Department officer to an urgent request. Of course, Education Department officers are limited by the money and equipment available. I thank a regional officer of the department for what he did recently to expedite improvements in education facilities at a country school. At Kadina the Minister of Education recently made a statement about a proposed new building for the Kadina Memorial High School. I know that work is being done in Moonta and that work will be done in Wallaroo. There is an almost completed school at Snowtown and work is being done at Brinkworth Primary School. These projects are all appreciated. I quote from a press report:

I would like to take the opportunity today of giving you a brief run-down of the present school-building programme and where the proposed new building for Kadina High School fits into it. You will be aware of the very steep increases which have occurred recently in building costs. These rises in themselves have created considerable problems in the scheduling of new school buildings.

They have been exaggerated by the worsening of the tendering climate through the combination of a tight materials and labour situation with continued high demand for building work. In spite of the very considerable increases in funds which have occurred in provision of State and Federal funds for school buildings in South Australia the net effect of these market conditions has been to reduce somewhat the impact of the school-building programme particularly as it affects replacement of existing buildings.

All I can say is that there is some indication that the very tight building situation which we have experienced over the last 12 months now appears likely to relax a little in the forthcoming few months.

My appeal to the Minister is that, as soon as such a situation arises and it is possible for and expedient to the department, the new building will be built at Kadina.

I should have liked to refer in detail to other matters affecting my district, such as restricted water supplies in summer in the areas of Moonta, Moonta Mines, Wallaroo, Tickera and outlying areas. People in these areas who have communicated with the department have been told that a computer analysis is currently being undertaken. I suggest that, immediately the conclusions become available and all the necessary detail has been produced, something be done to help improve the water services in these areas. Port Hughes, Moonta Bay, North Beach Wallaroo and other areas along the coast as far as Tickera are being developed to encourage tourists. More people are purchasing houses in these areas, but the water situation leaves much to be desired.

In other areas, such as Tarlee and Riverton, additional worker housing is needed. Certain applications have been made, and I ask that, in the interests of employment (I know of two instances in Riverton and several in the Tarlee area), due attention be paid to this request. I support the motion.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I support the motion and, in doing so, congratulate the mover and seconder on the speeches they made last week. I, too, join with other speakers in expressing condolences to the families of deceased members. Mentioning the mover and seconder prompts me to say that, in the four years I have been a member, this Address in Reply debate has followed the trend of such debates of other years: there have been many good speeches and many bad speeches and, as usual, all the good ones have been made by Government members and all the bad ones by Opposition members, although I will comment on some remarks of substance made by Opposition members.

I was intrigued by the contribution made by the member for Eyre. He was critical of the media in this State and believed that the *Advertiser* was definitely an anti-Liberal Party publication. That comment struck me as being somewhat strange. Although I was prompted by a member of the press, it struck me that another super star of the same magnitude (Frank Sinatra) also had problems with the media. The media is just possibly a hazard that people of the importance of the member for Eyre and Frank Sinatra must learn to live with.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're not comparing the member for Eyre with Frank Sinatra?

Mr. KENEALLY: I do not think the member for Eyre can sing but, apart from that, I think they have much in common.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He can certainly squeal, though.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes. One interesting feature of speeches made by Opposition members is the differences of opinion on their benches over the result in the recent Goyder by-election. The member for Victoria said that the result might have been because of the sex appeal of Liberal Movement members, and we had criticisms from Liberal Party members that the L.M. members were acrobats. I can well imagine the member for Mitcham (the Lieutenant-Colonel) shinning up the trees in Goyder and pulling down the posters of the L.C.L. candidate. Although we cannot be sure that it was the member for Mitcham, as soon as summer comes and he dons his shorts we will see whether he has scars on his legs that might indicate such activities.

In a slightly more serious vein, but still discussing a point that is not really valid, I will comment on the contribution made by the member for Bragg, who recently must have read a history of the trade union movement in Australia—indeed, also in England. He bored the House with the details. Having just absorbed this knowledge, he felt compelled to tell the House just how the trade union movement was bom. He also commented in his speech and used the name of an expert whose name evades me. (He used various experts: little of his speech was his own.)

He said that, in an inflationary situation in which wages might increase at the rate of 20 per cent, it was not reasonable to expect that industry could absorb such an increase by a reduction in profits. This might well be so if profits and wages increased at the same ratio. However, when profits increase by, say, 40 per cent and the wage content is increased by 20 per cent, the situation

is vastly different. I also believe that, in such an instance, the comments of the member for Bragg have no validity.

When people have trouble in retaining the purchasing power of their wages, I prefer to see restraint exercised at the profiteering end. I would much prefer to see restraint exercised on the return in dividends than on the wage the wage-earner collects, because the wage-earner depends on his income each week to exist. Much of the money invested in dividends and shares is not generally required for the basic necessities of life. Few people on limited incomes depend entirely on returns from shares for their existence and, if restraint is to be exercised, it should be exercised at the profiteering end rather than at the wages end. This is my view, and I have not yet heard any arguments that would lead me to change my mind on this matter.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Would you have voted for the pay rise for Commonwealth members?

Mr. KENEALLY: That is an argument for the members of the Commonwealth Parliament to determine: it is not for me to comment on it. We in this Parliament have already made a decision on our salaries, so I cannot see how the interjection is relevant. The honourable member is able to express his views on this subject as well as I am. I am sorry that the member for Gouger has left the Chamber, because towards the end of his speech he referred to a subject in which all country members are interested, the education of country children. He has suggested that the Education Department has not been playing its part in providing an education for country children. In my own district (and members can speak of their own districts only) that argument does not apply. Indeed, educationally Stuart District is catered for as well as is any other district in South Australia, and much of the progress that has taken place has occurred during the term of office of the present Labor Government and under the leadership of the Minister of Education. Only one school in my district was built more than eight or nine years ago.

Mr. Evans: Half your luck!

Mr. KENEALLY: As the member for Fisher says, half my luck. True, certain schools in this State are dilapidated, but surely it is beyond the Government's ability to upgrade all schools quickly. The department is doing the best it can, and it has certainly done its best in my district. I do not think the member for Gouger was being critical when he spoke: I think he was trying to illustrate a situation that obtains in his district. However, I defend the department and the Minister by saying that they are doing an extremely good job.

As I usually do in this debate, I intend to concentrate on two or three subjects that apply to my district. Members would realize from the short period that I have been a member of this Parliament that I always explain to the House (and therefore to those who wish to read *Hansard*) the true position that obtains at Port Augusta in relation to its Aboriginal community. I feel compelled to do this each year in order to correct the information that is widely spread throughout the State regarding this matter. I do not deny that Port Augusta has certain trouble spots and that some Aborigines there act in an anti-social manner. Of course, it is these people who get the headlines and in whom those who do not live in Port Augusta are interested. The media do not seem to want to publicize, and the public does not appear keen to understand, that in Port Augusta most Aborigines are good citizens. However, they may not be coping in some cases as well as the more fortunate white people of the town, because the latter have

certain advantages and society allows them to cope better than do the Aborigines. In the main, however, these people are doing well. Although some people in the town have a deep bias or racist feeling about Aborigines, the efforts the Aborigines are making on their own behalf are gradually winning the support of the Port Augusta people.

In this respect, I refer to the Aboriginal Social Club. It would certainly be worth while for members to go to Port Augusta to see what is happening at this club, which is run by the Aboriginal population and which employs Aborigines. The club runs its own kindergarten for the Aboriginal children in the area, and it provides lunch for the Aboriginal children who, in many cases, attend school without having had adequate food in the morning. As members would realize, it is difficult for any children to progress at school, or indeed anywhere else, if they are poorly fed. The club also provides social advice, and helps Aborigines obtain the employment they require.

As a result of the establishment of this club, the number of calls made on my time and that of the Commonwealth member for Grey (Mr. Wallis) has reduced dramatically. This club is therefore fulfilling a function that was previously fulfilled by members of Parliament, the Social Welfare Department, and other welfare agencies in Port Augusta. The club has received help from the State Government and the Commonwealth Government and, although it is thankful for this help without which it would not have been able to progress, the club intends to develop to a degree that will render it unnecessary for it to receive further Government assistance. I believe this will happen soon.

One of the interesting aspects as a result of the establishment of this club is that many of its patrons are contributing to the town's development and have developed a community responsibility. For many years we have been asking Aborigines to take on this sort of responsibility and to show the public generally that they can do so. Aborigines are now serving on technical college and high school councils in Port Augusta and on the consultative council. Other Aborigines who are also developing a great interest in what the community is doing want to contribute in their own way. The social club has started a housing society at Port Augusta and hopes to be able to purchase houses for their folk. It has a maintenance gang and will employ an Aboriginal carpenter and electrician, and it will have a builder: each tradesman to be employed will take an Aboriginal lad as an apprentice. That is a welcome development in Port Augusta, where the State and Commonwealth Governments still seem reluctant to employ Aboriginal male or female children in any position that could give them status in the community. These people can obtain work in the lowest paid positions, which offer nothing to them and indicate to the children who remain at school that, despite the educational standard they reach, a worthwhile job will not be available to them.

If we are to discriminate in favour of Aborigines (and I believe we should in some cases, although I do not believe in the handout system), we should employ these young people, whether they are required or not, as apprentices and in clerical positions. Girls should be employed in status positions in which they can dress well and be proud and happy, rather than being given any old job and made to compete in a most unfair way with other children in Port Augusta. I assure members that, if an Aboriginal boy or girl seeks a position with eight or nine other applicants, the chances of the Aboriginal child obtaining the job are most remote.

I understand that the social club is now negotiating to purchase one of the more profitable industries in Port Augusta. I wish it well. It employs its own solicitor and accounting firm, and wants to operate the organization on a sound, economic basis. I have no doubt that, having regard to the quality of the people operating this club, that is what it will do. If any members hear criticism of Aborigines and what they are doing at Port Augusta, they should visit our city and see how most of these people are able to cope.

I now turn to the subject of leisure, in which I am greatly interested. About two years ago I raised the subject here, and was greeted with raucous laughter and derision from Opposition members who thought that that subject was probably the most disastrous thing with which a member could concern himself. They considered that Governments had no part to play in this matter, and that it was up to the individual. However, people inside and outside Australia and many Governments in Australia do not share that view, because Recreation and Sport Departments have been established by the Commonwealth Government and by some State Governments. A great Australian, Mr. Whitlam, in his 1972 policy speech stated:

There is no greater social problem facing Australia than the good use of leisure.

Dwight Retty (Executive Director of the National Recreation Association in America) defined leisure as follows:

That growing amount of discretionary time available to people during which we have free choice as to what we will do with ourselves, with our families, and with our communities.

Dr. Willy (Director of Physical Education, University of Melbourne, and Vice-President of the International Federation of Physical Education) in his definition of leisure stated:

Leisure is seen to be a period of time during which an individual is, within limits, free to choose what he may do. Recreation is essentially the enjoyment of freely chosen wholesome activity which affords satisfaction in the doing and provides for the restoration of the zest for life which may be impaired through toil.

Mr. D. Gabor, in his book *Inventing the Future*, stated:

Our civilization faces three great dangers. The first is destruction by nuclear war; the second is being crippled by over-population and the third is the age of leisure.

He went on to say that, whilst there are measures available and known to combat the first two, only the age of leisure will find man psychologically unprepared. As I should like to speak at length on this subject, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment..

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.19 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 6, at 2 p.m.