

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 11, 1974

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

PETITIONS: SPEED LIMIT

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON presented a petition signed by 35 persons, stating that because of conversion to metrics the speed limit of 30 kilometres an hour past school omnibuses and schools was too high and presented an increased threat to the safety of schoolchildren, and praying that the House of Assembly would support legislation to amend the Road Traffic Act to reduce the speed limit to 25 km/h.

Mr. Langley, for Mr. DUNCAN, presented a similar petition signed by 26 persons.

Mr. Millhouse, for Mr. BOUNDY, presented a similar petition signed by 26 persons.

Petitions received.

PETITION: WATER RATES

Mr. BECKER presented a petition signed by 176 residents of the city of Glenelg and the city of Henley and Grange who expressed concern at the present inequitable system of estimating and charging water and sewerage rates, particularly in the present period of high inflation. This practice had resulted in water and sewerage rates being increased, in many instances, by more than 100 per cent, which was an unfair, discriminatory and grossly excessive impost on them and which would cause hardship to many residents on fixed incomes. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would take action to correct the present inequitable and discriminatory situation.

Petition received.

PETITION: COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Mr. DEAN BROWN presented a petition signed by 208 persons 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 not bring about any change or alteration of boundaries.

Petition received.

PETITION: SODOMY

Mr. WELLS presented a petition signed by 88 persons objecting to the introduction of legislation to legalise sodomy between consenting adults until such time as Parliament had a clear mandate from the people by way of a referendum (to be held at the next periodic South Australian election) to pass such legislation.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MONARTO

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: During the past few days the Leader of the Opposition, outside the House, has made allegations of corruption against officers within the Government service in relation to land deals at Monarto and has claimed that those deals depressed the values of properties later purchased by the Government. It has even been suggested in the press, and perhaps by implication by the Leader of the Opposition, that the Government promoted these land deals for the purpose of depressing artificially the price that it would be required to pay for land at Monarto. Despite a full Ministerial statement made by me yesterday, the Leader has not complied with repeated

invitations to withdraw the allegations, nor has he produced any evidence to substantiate these serious charges. In these circumstances, the Government considers that it is necessary, for the reputation of public administration in this State, that the allegations be the subject of a full public inquiry. A Royal Commission will be appointed without delay to inquire into the allegations that have been made. This will provide the Leader of the Opposition with the opportunity of producing any evidence that he has to substantiate the charges that he has made. It will enable the whole matter to be fully ventilated. An announcement about the identity of the Royal Commissioner and the terms of reference will be made as soon as possible.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Dr. EASTICK: I welcome the announcement that the Minister of Environment and Conservation has made to this House. He will realise that it has precluded me from bringing to the attention of this House during today's sitting the information that I have gleaned and put together as a result of allegations that have been made to me and inquiries that I have undertaken. However, I undertake that, at the appropriate time before the Royal Commission all of that detail will be made known.

QUESTIONS

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

MESSAGE PARLOURS

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (July 25).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There has been an upsurge in recent months in the number of massage parlours operating in the metropolitan area, and continued surveillance has been given by members of the Vice Squad to premises of this nature. However, although it is apparent that most of these establishments are a front for prostitution, there is no evidence to support the claim that criminal elements have taken over their operation. Any movement in this direction would have made itself evident in the course of routine police observations of the activities of these organisations.

ADVERTISING

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (August 21).

The Hon. L. J. KING: It has been recognised by Commonwealth and State Ministers of Health at their conference that, if there is to be any restraint on or control of the advertising of cigarettes, it must apply to all forms of advertising. Although radio and television advertising is a matter for the Australian Government, advertising in the other media is a matter for the States. At the recent conference of Health Ministers it was agreed that the States should require the health hazard warning, which appears on all radio and television advertising, to appear also in all other advertisements for cigarettes. This will require an amendment to the Labelling of Cigarettes Act. The advertising of alcoholic beverages has been considered by the Alcohol (Standing) Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council in its deliberations on the measures necessary to prevent the abuse of alcohol.

The report of this committee will be considered by the National Health and Medical Research Council, and its recommendations on the whole matter of the abuse of alcohol are likely to be referred to Commonwealth and State Health Ministers. The Food and Drugs Act gives power to prescribe the form of advertisements relating to

food and drugs, including alcoholic beverages, but there would obviously be need for complementary Commonwealth legislation to cover radio and television. It is considered that the Australian Radio and Television Act does not deal with advertising of other than drugs. It is hoped, therefore, that, as in the case of cigarettes, the matter of positive action to control the advertising of alcoholic beverages will be considered at a Health Ministers' conference in due course.

TRAVELLERS AID HOSTEL

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Community Welfare say whether he is aware of today's report of the threatened closure of the Travellers Aid Society hostel at North Adelaide? This hostel, which is in my district but which serves the whole State, provides an invaluable shelter for the indigent and also for mothers who come to the city with sick children requiring treatment at the adjacent Children's Hospital. Owing to an order issued by the Labour and Industry Department on award rates to be paid to pensioner domestics and a cleaner, the hostel may no longer be able to function and provide cheap shelter or, as in some cases, shelter at no cost to the lodgers. I add for the Minister's information that the hostel works closely with the Police Department and the Community Welfare Department in providing shelter of this type. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether he will seriously consider making funds available to this society in addition to those provided in the Budget, in which no increase at all on last year's allocation has been provided, in an effort to prevent the society from being forced to close.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will look into the matter, as I know little about it apart from what I read in this morning's newspaper. However, I understand from the Minister of Labour and Industry that the organisation concerned has not applied, as it is entitled to do, for exemption from compliance with award rates and conditions. My colleague tells me that, if such an application were made, it would be considered. Of course, he cannot say more than that until he sees the application and any grounds that may be put forward in support of it. This body receives State funds. I think that this morning's report suggests that it also receives Commonwealth funds, although I have not had an opportunity to check that. The whole matter will be examined to see whether there should be an exemption from compliance with the normal conditions of employment and, if that is not a proper approach to be made, I will certainly look at the possibility of providing further financial assistance. The work of this organisation is much appreciated by my department and, I know, by other Government departments. There is no doubt that it performs useful and valuable service to the community; no-one would wish to see it closed. On the other hand, the question whether the people who work there should be paid the proper award rates is another matter, being within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour and Industry.

MURRAY RIVER FLOODING

Mr. OLSON: Will the Minister of Works obtain an interim report about the estimated levels that will be reached in the Murray River, as a result of floodwaters entering its upper reaches, at Lake Alexandrina and as it passes through major towns in South Australia? Numerous constituents have requested from me information about this matter, as they wish to protect fully their property holdings by taking precautions without delay, should the level of the river be deemed to warrant such precautions.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to obtain the information for the honourable member. As he will know, predictions of this type are subject to alteration, depending on climatic conditions in the upper reaches of the Murrumbidgee River. It is from this area that a problem could arise for us in late October or early November. In addition to obtaining details of the present position, in the event of alterations as a result of future developments I undertake to bring down up-to-date information for the honourable member and other honourable members who may be interested in it.

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister say what assistance the Government will provide to avoid or reduce the likelihood of damage resulting from flooding of the river? Moreover, will the Minister provide for newspapers and radio stations precise statements of the position each week, as recent conflicting reports have left people in the area in doubt about the actual position? Several difficult situations are developing along the Murray River, particularly at Waikerie. The Premier will recall that, last February, I introduced a deputation headed by the Chairman of Waikerie Cellars, seeking assistance to shift the winery to high land. However, the Premier was unable to give an undertaking that assistance would be given, because of the Government's then commitment to the Redcliff and Monarto projects. However, the Government's commitment to the Redcliff project has since been considerably reduced. In view of the situation that now arises, whereby Waikerie Cellars will be flooded, it will be impossible for the cellars to process the vintage in that area. I once again ask that the Government seriously consider relieving the plight of this winery and of the growers, especially those in the Waikerie area.

As the winery will almost certainly be flooded, the crusher pit and many of the storage tanks will be full of water, and this will be necessary to stop them from floating out of the ground; already, the pit and the tanks are below water level and seepage is already being pumped out of the area. Even if the floodwaters could be held back from the winery at high river level by high banks, the winery could not be used immediately, because the crusher pit and the vats, as a result of hydraulic pressure, would be forced up out of the ground. Will the Minister ascertain what assistance can be given to the winery, as it will be necessary to shift it within the next two months?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to comply with the honourable member's request with regard to conveying information through the press. I asked one of the daily newspapers to publish the listed levels, but I do not know whether that has been done. I will negotiate to see whether this can be done at regular intervals, particularly if there is a change in prediction. Regarding financial assistance, I have announced on the Government's behalf that we will make financial assistance available to local government where application is made to the Government for what it considers to be essential works to protect property, etc. This will be done, and officers have already been in touch with local councils concerned late last week and early this week. I have discussed this matter with all councils along the length of the Murray River in South Australia.

As to how much assistance will be given, I cannot tell the honourable member now, because all applications have not yet been finalised. However, I assure him that we are anxious to assist, wherever possible and as quickly as possible. Regarding the winery, I am under the impression that it would have to be shifted anyway, irrespective of floods. On that basis, therefore, I do not

think that the Government would be willing to assist financially, because the need for relocation is not the result of the flood. I understand that to be the position. I will check this matter and let the honourable member know whether the Government is willing to assist in this case.

INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Treasurer, as the Minister responsible for the State Government Insurance Commission, say whether a managerial and/or actuarial estimate has been made of the future annual deficits or profits expected by the State Government Insurance Commission? If such an estimate has been made, can he say for how many more years we can expect the commission to incur a deficit? In the financial year just ended, the State Government Insurance Commission incurred a deficit of \$2 900 000, and in the previous year a deficit of \$848 000. In discussing this matter with executives of private insurance companies, I am assured that during the first few years of operation any new insurance business operates at a low profit level, or possibly even at a deficit. I ask the Premier this question so that the State can have some estimate of likely future deficits. The State Government acts as a guarantor for any sums owing by the commission. I think, therefore, that the House and the State should have some idea of what deficits may occur during the next 10 or 15 years.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is extremely difficult to make forecasts of the kind the honourable member suggests, because of constant changes in the insurance climate and business. In the last 12 months alone, the State Government Insurance Commission has acquired about 64 per cent of the compulsory third party motor vehicle insurance in South Australia.

Dr. Eastick: How many others provide it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Only one other company provides it at present, all the other private companies having found it unprofitable and withdrawn from the field.

Mr. Millhouse: What did you expect to happen?

Mr. Goldsworthy: We told you it would get the rubbish.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The State Government Insurance Commission has more than rubbish in its insurance portfolio. I notice that certain questions were asked in this House and, although the honourable member may not have been here at the time they were asked, I assure him that they relate to other business of the State Government Insurance Commission and to protests that the commission is getting into profitable fields.

Mr. Millhouse: That shows you are embarrassed by the interjection.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham will be embarrassed in a moment. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that the honourable member does not believe in Governments or communities being involved in business ventures.

Members interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In fact, most people in South Australia have shown their support for the State Government Insurance Commission, as well as their desire for its business and a desire to obtain the assistance of the commission, as its portfolio area is changing rapidly and markedly and as, in addition, announcements have been made by the Commonwealth Government as to prospective no-fault insurance programmes. It is very difficult, then,

to say exactly what will be the future situation of the commission in the fields in which it is already involved, because at this stage we simply do not know what will be the Commonwealth involvement in the area, nor do we know exactly how far the Commonwealth Government's insurance proposals will trench on household insurance, which is a very profitable area of State Government Insurance Commission work. As against the possibility of this, the State banking operations have undertaken assistance by specifying the State Government Insurance Commission as the insurer in the relevant mortgage activities and this has been done in the same way as the Commonwealth Bank is operating with the insurance interests to insure in its mortgage cases. But, given the fact that there is a constantly changing scene, any actuarial studies of the next 10 or 15 years are likely to be vague indeed. However, I am in constant consultation with the Chairman and the General Manager of the State Government Insurance Commission as regards these future situations, and we have the best advice anywhere in Australia and, in this area, the most competent people involved in any insurance area in Australia. No-one could suggest that either the Chairman or General Manager of the commission was other than at the top of his field.

SCHOOL TRANSPORT

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Transport report to the House regarding the private bus service which transports children from the Tea Tree Gully area to Birdwood High School, and which operates under licence from the Transport Control Board? The Minister will be aware that, on July 16, I presented a petition to the House on this subject and followed it up by asking him a question on August 13, when he said that the matter was still being pursued.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Negotiations have proceeded to the point where the owner of the bus service has agreed to continue the service until the end of this year, at which time the matter will be reviewed. Therefore, the immediate position has been resolved, but what will happen in 1975 remains to be seen. It could well be that the children concerned may be transferred to nearer schools.

FLINT COMMITTEE

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Transport say what are the terms of reference of the Flint committee to report to him on road maintenance charges in this State? The committee brought down a report regarding transport in this State and one of the committee's duties was to report to the Minister on road maintenance charges.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not have the actual terms of reference before me, but I assume that the honourable member is simply looking for some guide as to the type of matter involved in the terms of reference. In general terms, the committee was to investigate whether there was an equitable means available for the purpose of raising funds to replace existing road maintenance contributions. The economics of our road programme are such that obviously we just could not reduce the sum available for that purpose by about \$3 250 000 (I believe that is the figure) this year without its having serious repercussions. Many suggestions have been made in the past to solve this problem but none of them has appeared to be suitable. However, in the light of other circumstances, it now seems that another avenue of approaching the matter could provide a suitable answer. The committee, which is progressing well, has sought guidance from the Government in relation to the report it may eventually bring down. I hope it will not be too long before the committee can give an indication of its recommendations.

LIBERAL PARTY ADVERTISING

Mr. DUNCAN: Has the Leader of the Opposition read a report in today's *News* concerning his Party's plagiarism of the advertising ideas of a South Australian advertising agency and the use his Party has made of those ideas in the advertising campaign run for the Liberal Party by a multi-national advertising agency? Is this action of his Party in stealing the ideas of the local agency and using them for the benefit of a multi-national organisation indicative of his Party's attitude to local industry? According to the report—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member for Elizabeth that certain requirements exist for asking questions and that the main principle is that the question must relate to a matter that concerns this House or the State. I presume that the honourable member's question, as I heard it, relates to a private matter that appears in a newspaper and does not concern this House or the State.

Mr. DUNCAN: Mr. Speaker,—

The SPEAKER: Is this a point of order?

Mr. DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: At this stage I rule the question out as being not admissible.

Mr. DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order. The basis of the question is whether, in fact, the Opposition in this State is trying to further the interests of a multi-national corporation, against the interests of a local State organisation.

Mr. McAnaney: That's not a point of order.

Mr. DUNCAN: Because of what I have said, I submit that it brings this question well within the ambit of its being a matter of much importance to this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order and I refer the honourable member to Standing Order 123, which provides:

At the time of giving notices of motion, questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs; and to other members, relating to any Bill, motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the House, in which such members may be concerned.

SEX OFFENCES

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say whether the Government will appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the current increase in the number of crimes of sexual violence and into all aspects of prostitution and the operation of massage parlours in this State? Much concern has been expressed in the community about these matters. The Premier, in a reply he has given me today, states that there has been an upsurge in recent months in the number of massage parlours operating in the metropolitan area. In reply to a question I asked the Attorney-General on August 22, the Attorney stated that a departmental inquiry would be appointed to inquire into the increased incidence of crimes of rape. Since then much concern has been expressed in reports in the *Sunday Mail* and other publications, and many opinions have been expressed that it is important that as much information as possible be obtained. I welcome the departmental inquiry, but I consider that it should be widened in compass to a full Royal Commission.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At first blush, as it were, I do not think a Royal Commission is necessary. However, I will discuss the matter with my colleague and give the honourable member a reply.

HOUSING TRUST RENTS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Development and Mines, as Minister in charge of housing, give details of the scheme proposed by the Housing Trust to overcome anomalies regarding unduly low rents in some trust rentals, and will the Minister say why the scheme was rejected? On page 319 of the most recent Auditor-General's Report, the Auditor-General states:

The rentals of many houses are still unduly low—some only \$7.50 per week even for full income families. Certain rentals are increased on re-allotment following vacancies. During the year these vacancy rents were also increased and are substantially higher than the rents being paid by other older tenants for similar accommodation. A scheme proposed by the trust to overcome such anomalies and the unduly low rents has not been approved by the Government.

The Auditor-General also points out that, in the trust's rental field, last year there was a deficit of \$2 201 000, or a deficit increase of \$695 000 in one year. I have previously raised with the Minister the matter of whether people on large incomes are renting trust houses at extremely low rentals. I now ask the Minister whether, in view of his Government's stated policy of open government, he will explain the scheme that the Government has rejected.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will check the matter. The honourable member would be aware that soon after I became Minister in charge of housing an alteration was made to rents. It was made in three stages. There was an increase of, I think, 50c a week in rents between \$10 and \$12 a week; an increase of \$1 was made for people on a slightly lower figure; and I think there was an increase of \$1.50 for people on a rent of \$7.50 a week or less. That alteration was made pursuant to a clause in the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, to which this Government is a signatory. That agreement requires that the Housing Trust and Housing Commissions obtaining this money at an interest rate of 4 per cent should from time to time upgrade rents so that the anomalous situation to which the honourable member has referred will be eliminated progressively. That was done at that time and, doubtless, we will be considering making further alterations as time goes on. As to any other specific matters that may have been quoted by the trust, I will get what information I can for the honourable member, but that information has not been put to me.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I had better ask my question of the Premier, although I suppose it could go to the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the Minister of Transport?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. He was not here a short time ago.

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say whether the Government is satisfied that the Commonwealth Government's regional employment and development plan is adequate to keep down unemployment in South Australia? There has been much criticism of the Commonwealth Government's plans in this field and the plans are described in a report in this morning's newspaper as band-aid relief. There has been much comment about the difference of opinion between the man who is, I believe, President of the Australian Labor Party (Mr. Hawke) and the Deputy Prime Minister (Dr. Cairns) about the way to tackle the grave problem of unemployment. We know that at least we in South Australia are probably more susceptible to a high level of unemployment than are other States.

Mr. Langley: They'd all be unemployed if you had your wish.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Unley always comes in when I am making a point, and that is one of the barometers in this place. I know that, if I make a point, the member for Unley will come in.

Mr. Jennings: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is necessary for the Commonwealth Government and State Governments to co-operate and be, shall I say, *ad idem*—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I understand that members of the House have indicated that leave to the member for Mitcham to continue his explanation has been withdrawn.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't you like it?

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members to show more decorum in Question Time. At times it is not possible to hear above the noise of voices in the House. I understand that "Question!" has been called and, in accordance with Standing Orders, leave to the honourable member has therefore been withdrawn.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At this stage, I cannot give any assurance about the unemployment situation in South Australia if the unemployment position generally were to worsen. I can only say that the State Government is preparing plans to provide unemployment relief work in the case of rural and metropolitan unemployment.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think you should approach the Commonwealth Government?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have been told by the Commonwealth Government that, in the case of unemployment relief works being sought by the State, support from the Commonwealth Government will be available for that work. If there were to be a down-turn specifically in the building industry, to the extent that there was unemployment in that industry, this State would be provided with moneys for welfare housing to take up the whole of the slack in the industry. We have had from the Commonwealth Government relief for the unemployed in South Australia that was denied to us consistently by the previous Commonwealth Liberal Government. As soon as the Commonwealth Labor Government got into power, one of its first acts was to give South Australia \$7 000 000 for unemployment relief work for metropolitan unemployed people. A request for such assistance made by me and the Premier and the Treasurer of Queensland had been completely denied by the previous Commonwealth Liberal Government.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not what I asked you at all.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member wants to know whether I am satisfied with the Commonwealth Government's proposals. All I can say is that I am preparing for the Commonwealth Government proposals in relation to unemployment and, on our previous experience of this Commonwealth Government (unlike its predecessor), I expect that I will get assistance.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say what are the specific terms of reference of the inquiry to be conducted into the Auditor-General's allegations about the State's accounts? Who will conduct the inquiry, and when is a report expected to be presented? A report on page 2 of this afternoon's newspaper states that there will be a probe into this matter. Although the report includes statements

by the Minister of Works and the Premier, no clear indication is given of what authority the Public Service Board will have in the matter. Moreover, nothing is said about the extent of its terms of inquiry, the authority to which it will report, or when it will report. One can only draw the inference from the Auditor-General's Report (which was tabled yesterday) that the requirements that have been spelt out by the Auditor-General over the years have not been complied with, for he draws attention to the fact that some areas of concern have been areas of concern for several years.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader refers to two matters, the first relating to the Public Buildings Department. On that matter, the Public Service Board is acting within the terms of the Public Service Act, being empowered to make an inquiry into a certain department; and it is doing so.

Dr. Eastick: Did it do so last year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Before the Auditor-General's Report was published, the board had already set up this inquiry. Regarding the accounts of departments in forward budgeting (and that is the main gravamen of the Auditor-General's complaint), the Treasury, after last year's report, decided that it would take direct action in the matter to remedy the budgeting practices of departments, and obtain the appointment of a special officer who would be able to investigate the forward budgeting of departments in accordance with the matters raised in the previous Auditor-General's Report. That officer has been appointed. Part of the problem in several Government departments is that we do not have the kind of accounting staff in those departments who can make the kind of forward budgeting analyses that the Auditor-General considers is necessary. Several departments complain that they simply do not have the staff necessary to get out the figures required. I am trying to limit the number of public servants in South Australia.

Dr. Eastick: That's a new approach.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not new. If members opposite at one moment want a vast increase in the number of accountants in the Public Service and at the same time require us to reduce the Public Service, they are being normally inconsistent. A special Treasury officer has already been appointed in relation to this work, so that analyses may be undertaken by the Treasury itself in those departments where the department says it does not have the staff to get out the required figures. In addition, a new system of budgeting in South Australia has been instituted since early this year. That new system requires several accounting measures to be provided for the Treasury during each year so that constantly, throughout the year, accounting must be made to the Treasury as to forward budgeting and as to the way the department is running within the accounts it has previously provided. At this stage, already this year, accounts are required of departments by the Treasury as to the degree to which they are running within their forward budgeting.

Mr. Coumbe: On Loan and Revenue?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. This new system (and it was the principal matter that required my return to South Australia in May this year, because the major decisions arising out of these new budgeting processes had to be taken then) is continuing. It is not the case at all that the Auditor-General's Report has been ignored. The necessary action in the matter has been taken by the Treasury and is continuing to be taken.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say when the Public Service Board set up the inquiry into the Public Buildings Department and whether the board had prior knowledge of the contents of the Auditor-General's Report in respect of criticism of the department so that the inquiry could be got off the ground as quickly as possible? The Premier will be aware that no member received the Auditor-General's Report until yesterday.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: From memory, it was about six weeks ago. Neither the board nor I had prior knowledge of the Auditor-General's Report.

GREENHILL ROAD

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Transport say what work the Highways Department contemplates to beautify the section of Greenhill Road between Glen Osmond Road and Anzac Highway? On many occasions, people make statements in the press about these matters without having any knowledge of what the Highways Department intends to do. I have always found the department approachable and co-operative. I point out that the top section of this road has been beautified, although little comment has been made about this. It seems that the comments made are all one way.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I happen to have in my hand copies of letters from people to whom the honourable member has referred. They are obviously ill advised.

Mr. Coumbe: But they—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Perhaps even the member for Torrens is ill advised. A water reticulation scheme has been installed along the median strip of Greenhill Road in an endeavour to aid beautification. In the process of this work it is intended that several existing claret ash trees shall be removed and replaced with elm trees. To show that the people who have been complaining are ill informed and not concerned directly in this matter, I point out that, before the work started, a booklet entitled *The inside story, the trees of Greenhill Road* was distributed to all the people concerned. The booklet shows both in printing and pictures exactly what was being done.

Dr. Tonkin: It's in my district.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know whether the honourable member for Bragg lives near Greenhill Road.

Mr. Coumbe: Part of his district is in this area.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Bragg is interested in this matter, I should have thought he would raise it. I will give him this pamphlet I have, which shows that—

The SPEAKER: The Minister cannot display material. The honourable Minister of Transport.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not displaying it: I am merely holding it in my hands so that I can read it. The booklet shows that the number of trees to be planted on medians in 1974 is 53 and on footpaths 16. It also shows that the number of trees to be removed is 45 in 1974 and 71 in 1975. This is clearly set out in the pamphlet. I do not know why people race in and make all kinds of stupid noises when, in fact, the Highways Department is actively engaged in beautifying the median strip. If these do-gooders want dead trees to remain, let them stand up and say so but, if they want nice trees that will beautify the area and a green lawn strip along the median, they should praise the department for the grand job it is doing.

SECONDHAND VEHICLES

Mr. DUNCAN: I address my question to the Attorney-General. It concerns the operation of the Secondhand Motor Vehicles Act, 1971, and in particular the methods being used by some dealers to avoid their obligations under the Act. Is the Attorney-General satisfied with the administration and working of the warranty provisions of the Act? Has the Government any plans to introduce amendments to the Act to strengthen the provisions concerning warranties and to ban the sale of unroadworthy cars?

An 18-year-old man recently sought my assistance following his purchase of a secondhand 1960 model Humber Snipe from Clive Bambury Motors, of 250 Brighton Road, Somerton Park, for \$499. At that price the warranty provisions of the Act do not apply. Notwithstanding this, however, the dealer offered a written warranty to pay 50 per cent of the cost of repairs for 12 months and agreed as part of the transaction to get the brakes on the vehicle fixed. It was three weeks before the car was delivered and, at that time, he found that the brakes were in such a dangerous condition that he had to have them immediately repaired. The repairer found that the rear brakes were completely inoperative and that the whole system was in an extremely dangerous condition. They were repaired at a cost of \$70.

Following up this complaint I contacted Clive Bambury Motors and was told that they had had the brakes repaired prior to delivery by a firm in Somerton Park. On contacting that firm I was told that Mr. Bambury had brought the car in without any brakes at all and had given instructions that the repairers were to "get a pedal", which, I understand in motor trade jargon, means that the repairers were to make the necessary adjustments to bring the brake pedal off the floor. That repairer stated that, in his opinion, the car was not safe to drive when it left his premises following the adjustments to "get a pedal".

This dealer is known unfavourably by the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs and by the Royal Automobile Association. In this case an unroadworthy and dangerous car was sold and delivered to an 18-year-old person at a price specifically intended to avoid the warranty provisions of the Act. It is not an isolated incident but it does, I believe, illustrate a growing attempt to subvert the provisions of the Act and underlines the need for a tightening of it.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The matter contained in the honourable member's explanation relates primarily to the danger to members of the public that arises from the sale of unroadworthy vehicles. This matter was not intended to be dealt with by the Secondhand Motor Vehicles Act, which is concerned with the protection of the buyer against the cost of remedying defects and the loss resulting from such defects. The question of unroadworthiness more properly falls within the province of my colleague the Minister of Transport. Nevertheless, this matter will occupy the Government's attention because there is an obvious risk to the public in having unsafe cars placed on the market. This matter will be examined. It was considered at the time of the preparation of the Secondhand Motor Vehicles Bill, but it was thought at that time that it was inappropriate in that Act to try to deal with unroadworthiness because, if the price was less than \$500, it was a matter for the purchaser and the vendor to decide whether they were willing to enter into a transaction, leaving it to the purchaser to make the vehicle roadworthy at his own expense if he so wished. Nevertheless, I believe there is room for legislation to prohibit the sale of an unroadworthy

vehicle unless the purchaser is warned that the vehicle is not fit to be driven at that time without work being done on it.

Regarding the general provisions of the warranty in the Act, there are problems in its administration but, on the whole, my advice from the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs is that it is working well. The problems centre around a matter of which I think every member was well aware at the time the Bill was debated, namely, the difficult dealer who tries to evade his obligations under the Act. Members will recall that initially I indicated that I believed that the purchaser's right should be to have the defect remedied and to claim the cost of remedying the defect against the dealer.

The dealers made strong representations that this would be damaging to their business, would make secondhand deals difficult, and would increase the prices of secondhand motor vehicles. I acceded to some of the arguments put forward by incorporating in the Bill a provision that the dealer would have the first opportunity of remedying the defects. True, some dealers procrastinate: they do not remedy the defects as quickly as they should, and the customer is left to go to the Commissioner to have the defects remedied. That is an unsatisfactory state of affairs. The Commissioner is keeping his eye on the matter and will recommend any necessary amendments to the Act if the situation does not improve. There may be grounds also for a further tightening of the licence provisions and the machinery for cancellation of licences.

I assure the honourable member that the operation of this Act is under constant review and that I confer from time to time with the Commissioner and his officers on its operation. I think it is necessary to give legislation of this kind, which is far-reaching and new in its concepts, a reasonable time to settle down before amendments are attempted. I also assure the honourable member that, as soon as we believe that we can solve the problems that have arisen in the administration of the legislation, an amending Bill will be introduced.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT FINANCES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I move:

That in the opinion of this House Highways Department finances should be treated on the same basis as other Government departments, including the South Australian Railways; that is, be subject to normal annual appropriation by Parliament and Treasury budgetary control.

The subject matter of this motion is one of the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee. Members are aware that this committee was set up under the terms of the Public Accounts Committee Act, 1972, and part of its duties are set out in section 13 of that Act, which provides:

- (a) to examine the accounts of the receipts and expenditure of the State and each statement and report transmitted to the Houses of Parliament by the Auditor-General, pursuant to the Audit Act, 1921-1966, as amended;
- (b) to report to the House of Assembly, with such comments as it thinks fit, any items or matters in those accounts, statements and reports, or any circumstances connected with them, to which the committee is of the opinion that the attention of the House should be directed;
- (c) to report to the House of Assembly any alteration which the committee thinks desirable in the form of the public accounts or in the method of keeping them, or in the mode of receipt, control, issue or payment of public moneys;

The third report of the committee was, in my opinion, a fairly major report. I do not know how many members have considered this report, but I assure them that much effort and inquiry went into compiling it. As the subject matter of this motion is the first of the recommendations made as a result of an inquiry by the committee, I shall provide some background material, much of which is included in the report but some of which may not be familiar to members. The Public Accounts Committee, as a result of a scrutiny of the 1973 Auditor-General's report, decided to investigate two projects undertaken by the Highways Department: the construction of Kingston and Port Augusta bridges.

The Auditor-General's Report at page 105 referred to the escalating costs of constructing these projects. The Auditor-General is concerned with the efficiency of departmental control to ensure that Parliament's control of public money is maintained. However, it is unusual that the only projects of the Highways Department on which there would seem to be major cost increases are those to which the Auditor-General has drawn attention. In no way do I cast any reflections on the capacity or efficiency of the Auditor-General: he is one of the most important and influential public servants that we have in this State, and an officer of the highest calibre, but much of the activity of the Highways Department, by the way in which it operates, is not closely scrutinised by the Auditor-General. A former member of this House, who was recently elected to the Canberra Parliament, Senator Hall, saw fit to support the Government on some amendments to roads legislation that was being considered by the Commonwealth Government. In his speech, among other things, he said:

The planning of roads in metropolitan Adelaide is, in fact, in a shambles.

He was speaking to an amendment moved by Senator Durack that was trying to cut away some of the tentacles of the Commonwealth Government, which was seeking absolute control of spending, in this State, road funds that had been raised here. Later, Senator Hall said:

I have a great deal of sympathy for Senator Durack in not wanting to have discipline placed on the expenditure of funds by the State Government in his part of Australia. But for other reasons I find myself to be almost at the opposite end. I am wondering whether the Whitlam Labor Government could be any worse than the Dunstan Labor Government. I suspect, with full charity tonight, that it could not be as bad in respect to road planning. Therefore, I am inclined not to support this amendment for the reason that South Australia does need some discipline in its road expenditures.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What did he do next day when the vote was taken?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is hardly relevant to my point.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It meant that what he said is complete hypocrisy, because he voted the other way.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not supporting him.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What are you quoting it for?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is a view a Senator from this State has in regard to road planning in this State.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: If you want to criticise the Highways Department, go ahead.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We would come to a different conclusion as a result of an investigation of the affairs of the Highways Department in connection with those two projects. We would not think that the answer lay in giving greater control to the Commonwealth Government. Perhaps I cannot speak for all members of the committee, but I can speak for Opposition members of that committee, who would not see the correct solution as giving greater control

of the Highways Department to the Commonwealth Government in Canberra. The report of the Public Accounts Committee indicates that expenditure by the Highways Department is not properly controlled, and the reason the Auditor-General has highlighted escalating costs of two projects in the last five years is that few projects are referred to the Public Works Committee, so that the Auditor-General has no basis on which to refer to excessive costs. The Auditor-General reported this situation to Parliament in 1969, when he said:

In my opinion insufficient attention is being given to economy consistent with the necessity in the standard sought by departments, and in the planning and design, particularly where projects do not come within the scrutiny of the Public Works Standing Committee.

The Highways Department is required to submit projects to the Public Works Committee only when it seeks Loan funds. It was suggested to the Public Accounts Committee that there would be two reasons for the department's submitting a project to the Public Works Committee: first, there may be a need or the department may wish to have access to Loan funds for the project; and, secondly, the department may wish to use the Public Works Committee as a sounding board in its inquiries as to the reaction of the public to its proposals. I cannot help concluding that in these circumstances the department is using the Public Works Committee for purposes for which it was not established. It seems to me that the use of the Public Works Committee to sound out public opinion is hardly a compelling reason to submit a project for its scrutiny.

In looking at these two projects the Public Accounts Committee investigated the construction of the Kingston and Port Augusta bridges. From those investigations it would appear that the submissions to the Public Works Committee left much to be desired. What were the findings of the Public Accounts Committee in these matters? The cost of the Kingston bridge to January, 1974, was about \$3 600 000, compared to the estimate approved by the Public Works Committee in May, 1967, of \$2 400 000. An increased cost of \$1 200 000 may not appear significant because of current inflationary rates but, fortunately, the Public Accounts Committee looked further than that. A request from the committee brought the following reply (dated November 30, 1973) from the Commissioner of Highways:

The department does not maintain a formalised system of estimating departmental and council work. However, if comparable information to that given to the Parliamentary Public Works Standing Committee is desired an attempt will be made to reconstruct actual costs in consultation with the officers that supervise the work.

To the committee, that seemed to be a fairly important admission by the Commissioner of Highways: that, in fact, the department does not maintain a formalised system of estimating departmental and council work. Costs were reconstructed by the Highways Department to enable a comparison to be made, and that reconstruction is included in table 1, which I draw to the attention of the House as follows:

(a) The by-pass road to Renmark has still to be constructed and presumably the cost will not now be charged against this project.

(b) Apart from the cost of sand fill in the embankment where the Highways Department made a major error in estimating, the cost of contract work was about 64 per cent above the estimate approved by the Public Works Standing Committee.

(c) In contract work done largely by councils on the approach roads and associated works, it was 126 per cent above the estimate approved by the Public Works Standing Committee.

(d) The cost of land and compensation was only \$12 000 compared with the estimate of \$58 000 approved by Public Works Standing Committee.

That indicates there were gross inaccuracies in the estimates put to the Public Works Committee by the department, those estimates having been submitted possibly for the purpose of qualifying for Loan funds or for testing public opinion. To January, 1974, the cost of the Port Augusta bridge was \$2 700 000 compared to the estimate of \$1 600 000 approved by the Public Works Committee in June, 1967. The overall cost exceeded the estimate by 68 per cent, which is greater than the 57 per cent increase for the Kingston bridge. Closer scrutiny of the individual items in table 2 of the report provides interesting and revealing information, as follows:

(a) The cost of earthworks exceeded the estimate approved by Public Works Standing Committee by 290 per cent.

(b) The cost of the Great Western bridge exceeded the estimate approved by Public Works Standing Committee by 61 per cent.

(c) The cost of roadworks exceeded the estimate approved by Public Works Standing Committee by 416 per cent.

(d) The cost of relocating the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline exceeded the estimate approved by Public Works Standing Committee by 403 per cent.

Reasons for the astronomical increases were produced by the Commissioner of Highways and are contained in the Public Accounts Committee report. As almost \$2 000 000 of the \$2 700 000 spent on the project was paid to the contractor, it is reasonable to assume that poor estimating and not excessive expenditure during construction was the prime cause of increased costs. Is poor estimating more excusable than inefficiency in construction? I suggest that poor estimating could cause major wasteful public expenditure. For example, several alternative sites were evaluated for both the Port Augusta and Kingston bridges, and the estimated costs for each location were a major influence in the final choice. Misleading estimates may have meant that the most uneconomic site was chosen.

Apart from the choice of site, design decisions are influenced by estimates of cost and, once again, if the estimates are misleading the most economic designs will not eventuate. I believe it is easy to see that poor estimating can cause major wasteful public expenditure and that it must certainly frustrate my colleagues on the Public Works Committee who also try to make sure that the State gets value for the money spent on major projects. I am not suggesting that the Minister of Transport is trying in any way to cover up the activities of the Highways Department. However, he must certainly be aware of the limitations of information released by the department.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're just saying it is grossly inefficient.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I was convinced before I commenced my remarks that the Minister would suggest that I was reflecting on his senior officers.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Aren't you doing just that?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: All I am saying is that the legislative basis on which the department operates is not satisfactory. I now turn to the schedule of proposed work for the year ended June 30, 1974 (I assume that each member of the House has received a copy of that schedule), and to a note from the Minister's office which states:

It is pointed out that, because of the many factors which can influence the commencement of any particular project or job, it is sometimes necessary to redirect resources. This may be particularly so, bearing in mind the financial resources of the State. Therefore, this schedule should not be accepted too literally as being the fixed and unalterable determination of the department's works proposal for the financial year ending June 30, 1974.

I cannot see the relevance of the sentence relating to available financial resources of the State because known highways funds were predictable for the financial year ended

June 30, 1974. I do not doubt the department's need to have to redirect its resources because of its inability to plan. This is evident at page 12 of the Public Accounts Committee report, which shows that the Port Augusta bridge was planned to be started during the 1966-67 financial year and completed during 1968-69; however, the bridge was started three years later than planned, because of the inability of the Highways Department to complete design and effect land acquisition.

Tn the meantime, heavy transport was being diverted from the old bridge via Yorkey Crossing, on which thousands of dollars had to be spent (I think more than \$100 000) to take the diverted traffic. Similarly, it is shown on page 12 of the Public Accounts Committee report that the Kingston bridge was planned to be started during the 1968-69 financial year and completed in 1969-70. The construction of the bridge was delayed for two years, and then it was only completed in time for the official opening in February by spending several thousand dollars in additional overtime, working at weekends, and hiring more expensive plant and equipment.

Why should not the Highways Department come under proper Parliamentary scrutiny that other Government departments come under? The Commissioner of Highways has not disputed the criticisms contained in the Public Accounts Committee report, so how can he avoid similar criticisms in future? Unfortunately, this will be just too easy, because the Commissioner knows that a Crown law opinion indicated that the Highways Department had no statutory requirement to refer its works to the Public Works Committee unless the appropriation of funds was necessary. Unlike other State Government departments, the Highways Department does not finance its capital works from Loan moneys, but State funds are appropriated automatically to the department under the provisions of the Highways Act.

Other Government departments are subject to the influences of Treasury, whose function it is to ensure that departments have adequate financial control. Unfortunately, the Highways Department is outside Treasury influence, although it is evident it is needed. What would be the effect of making the Highways Department subject to annual appropriation by Parliament and Treasury budgetary control? It would provide a cure for the ills. Perhaps that is not the only cure, but it is abundantly clear that Parliament desires more budgetary control and scrutiny of the operations of the Highways Department.

Other compelling arguments may lead members of this House and the Government to follow a different course of action, but I do not believe that anyone can deny the indisputable fact that greater scrutiny by this House is needed of the operations of the department. What I have suggested is certainly one way in which that control can be achieved. Revenue from State taxes on vehicles would be paid into State revenue but still could be identified and compared to expenditure to justify the level of vehicle taxes.

The Highways Department works could be financed from Loan funds, including Australian Government grants. All Loan funds at present include grants from the Australian Government, as can be seen from a perusal of the funds that go into the Loan programme. It is significant that interest on Loan money qualifies as expenditure for the State's quota required by the Australian Government in relation to grants.

I am not necessarily suggesting that the State reduce its spending on roads, but it would have more flexibility to meet its quota, and that may avoid rash spending in any year to make up the quota, possibly caused by delays

to some major projects. For national roads, which are to be wholly financed from Australian Government funds, it may be appropriate for the Treasurer to adopt a procedure similar to that adopted for tertiary education, and he has explained this procedure on page 3 of his report on the 1974-75 Loan Estimates.

Highways Department operating expenses, in these circumstances, would be provided annually in the State Revenue Budget. I am well aware of the objections to what has been proposed. Of course, one objection is that all revenue raised from the operations of the Motor Registration Division should be earmarked for road purposes, and I do not contest that. The people expect that money raised in this way should be spent on roadworks. I think that the Australian Government's requirements regarding matching grants would help to ensure this. If the Government saw fit, as it has in recent legislative proposals, to raise further revenue to keep up with the current road programme, I would endorse that course of action. However, the benefits to be achieved by bringing the Highways Department under closer Parliamentary scrutiny are indisputable. It is highly desirable that Highways Department projects that involve a cost of more than \$300 000 be submitted to the Public Works Committee, although not for the purposes that have been explained to the Public Accounts Committee.

I cannot see any reason why the projects to which I have referred (the Port Augusta bridge and the Kingston bridge) should be exempt from consideration by the committee, merely by decision of the Commissioner of Highways. The Auditor-General's Report, which we received yesterday, in dealing with financial management of the Highways Department (and this impinges directly on the matter of the reference regarding the Public Accounts Committee), states:

Financial control is exercised broadly through submitting to the Minister for approval annually a schedule of proposed works which becomes the basis for budgetary control over departmental activities and expenditures. Because detailed estimates for the various stages of road construction are not prepared, the practice of relating measurement to costs to date does not provide effective control of expenditure, and the system operates to control the rate of spending rather than to assist in the control of performance. Large construction jobs done by day labour are costed but this is of doubtful value because the estimated costs are not set out under the same headings as the recorded costs. Jobs undertaken by local government authorities are not costed.

In other words, the Auditor-General has asked for information, and he explains what he wants to know. He states:

In order to ascertain its practice in estimating and recording costs of projects which extend over a number of years, the department was requested to supply details showing the original and revised estimates, the cost to date and degree of completion relating to the following road construction projects: Shepherds Hill Road, Brighton Road, Marion Road, Glen Osmond-Payneham Main Road 85, Meningie-Narrung district road, and Lochiel-Burra Main Road 46. To date the department has not supplied the information requested.

It must be clear to the House that the Highways Department lives in a world of its own and is not subject to the scrutiny of this House as all other departments are, nor is it subject to budgetary control. The price to be paid for what has been suggested may be too high, and there may be intensive lobbying from the motoring public to ensure and be assured that all money received from State motor taxes is spent on highways and other road projects.

It would not be difficult to ensure this, but the Minister might wish to comment on that aspect. Doubtless, that seems to be the price that may have to be paid. What

I have suggested would give the Treasurer flexibility and put the department in line with all other Government departments. This is the recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee, and there are compelling reasons for making changes in the operations of the department.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): At a later stage I should like to speak on several matters that the honourable member has raised. However, at this stage I want to make some comments, because I am sure, in view of what the honourable member has put forward, that much pressure would be brought to bear on me, as Minister, on the Government, and on all members of the Opposition. I think I ought to clarify the position immediately to prevent that situation from occurring. The Government is not willing to accept the motion, for the sound reason that, as the honourable member has stated, if this proposal became Government policy, it would not apply only to the present Government. It would be there for all time and would be an open invitation to a Government, under financial pressures, to start spending some road tax money in other areas. It is not the policy of the Government that this should happen, and all the assurances in the world would not be a safeguard.

We cannot guarantee what a future Government may do. There is no way in which any Government could give that assurance, and for that reason a separate Highways Fund was established so that the little cotton-picking fingers of members of Parliament could not get at the fund and use it for purposes other than those for which it was established.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's not a very—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member has admitted that it would be extremely unwise to spend the money in other areas. That is why the concept of having a separate fund was born. I make that position plain so that there will be no misunderstandings. This Government will not have anything to do with the system which this motion proposes and which would enable people in future Governments to spend money that has been raised by registration fees, ton-mile tax, licence fees, and ancillary fees such as learners' permit fees. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted: debate adjourned.

PRICES JUSTIFICATION TRIBUNAL

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the inadequacy of the machinery established under the Prices Act is becoming manifestly apparent and this House resolve that it be replaced by a prices justification tribunal.

For a long time members of the various political Parties have had differing views about the ramifications of a Prices Act system. Indeed, during the term of office of the present Commonwealth Government, which commenced on December 2, 1972, the introduction of a Prices Justification Tribunal in the Commonwealth sphere was widely criticised by members of the Party of whose South Australian Division I am proud to be a member, but the activities of the Prices Justification Tribunal have shown that there is a distinct advantage to the whole community, and particularly to those who appear before it, a result being achieved within a definite period. A written report on the case by the tribunal gives a guideline not only to the organisation concerned but also to other organisations that may wish to appear before the tribunal later. The fact that a report is brought down within a definite period means that the problem that obtains in South Australia under the Prices Act is solved.

In South Australia, applications under our Act can be put off for an indeterminate period. I am told that in some cases the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch has considered cases for periods from nine months to 14 months. Assuming that a decision is given in favour of the applicant, by the time it is given, in the circumstances of spiralling inflation, the increase granted is already out of date, with the organisation concerned being called on to meet massive cost increases. It has been generally accepted that the increases that can be justified before the Prices Justification Tribunal must relate directly to costs incurred as a result of wage increases that are not over-award payments given by one organisation in an attempt to attract employees from another organisation, or increases given irresponsibly by an organisation of employers in an attempt to create disharmony in an industry. In the case of the dispute involving the Transport Workers Union, under what is called a major award employees were granted a sum above what the union expected. Subsequently, employees considered under a minor award had their wages held back at what was recognised as a justifiable figure. The end result was a major confrontation that caused untold damage to industry throughout Australia.

It is also extremely important to consider that a Government has room for manipulation with regard to the time at which it publicly announces the result of an application before the branch. We had an example of this in South Australia before the May 18 Commonwealth election. As reported in the *Advertiser* of June 5, 1974, I believe that the activities of the State Government in the prices field at that time were anything but fair; they were directly designed to obtain political capital for the Commonwealth Labor Party. At page 125 of *Hansard* of July 30, 1974, appears the following Question on Notice I asked the Premier:

What was the date of each application for a price increase for the beer, petrol, and bread increases announced on May 23, 1974?

The Premier's reply is as follows:

Applications for price increases on beer, petrol and bread were received by the Commissioner, as follows:

Retail liquor prices including beer (subject to prices justification but not price control)—April 17, 1974.

Petrol—

Industry application for wholesale price increase—February 7, 1974.

Resellers' application for increased margins—February 13, 1974.

Bread—(bread application subsequently amended on January 30 and March 26, 1974)—January 24, 1974.

My next question, which is of considerable importance, is as follows:

On what date did the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs report on each of these increases?

In reply, the Premier said that the report on liquor prices was made on April 26, 1974, on an application lodged on April 17, 1974, certainly not a long delay. Regarding the petrol industry application, there was an interim report to the Minister on April 29 and a final report on May 9. As the application in this respect was first put to the branch on February 7, 1974, there was a considerable delay in considering it. The resellers' application was made on February 13, 1974, with a report being made to the Minister on March 20, with a further report as required by the Government on May 1.

In other words, the Government had sought additional information, thus holding up consideration of the application. Regarding bread, the original application made on January 24 was amended on January 30 and March 26,

the report being made by the Commissioner on April 16, 1974. Then I asked on what date and to which Minister each report was presented. We found that the liquor prices report was presented to the Minister in charge of prices and consumer affairs on May 2. The petrol report was presented to the same Minister on May 10. The report on resellers' margins was presented to that same Minister on March 25. The further report on the resellers' margins was presented to that Minister on May 3, and the bread report was presented to him on April 18.

So, we find that, as these increases were not notified to the public until May 23 (five days after the Commonwealth election), clearly the Government had withheld the information that was in its hands and prevented these increases being made known to the public and to the industries that had made the applications: that is blatant political manoeuvring. There are other aspects of this matter, particularly the formation and conduct of a prices justification tribunal, that I want to present to the House, but I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PETROL SUBSIDY

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That this House, especially in the interests of those living in remote areas of the State, request the Government as a matter of urgency to make strong representations to the Commonwealth Government to reinstate the schemes formulated under the Commonwealth States Grants (Petroleum Products) Act, 1965-1973, and call on all South Australian Senators to support the motion to this effect to be moved in the Senate by Senator Steele Hall.

The genesis of my motion is the sudden and arbitrary withdrawal by the Commonwealth Government, after an open quarrel in the Commonwealth Australian Labor Party Caucus, of the petrol subsidy that has existed for many years in the remoter areas of Australia, including South Australia. Members will recall the publicity this matter achieved at the end of July. What happened was that a subsidy on petrol in country areas had been granted to keep the price of petrol everywhere throughout Australia within 5c a gallon (4.55 l) of the price in Australian capital cities. The estimated cost of the subsidy this year to the Commonwealth Government is about \$28 000 000.

The Coombs report recommended the abandonment of the subsidy, and the Commonwealth Government, by a narrow majority of its Parliamentary Caucus, decided in favour of this abandonment. This has meant that the price of petrol has since skyrocketed in many parts of South Australia and of the rest of Australia, although I am speaking only of South Australia. This is a real hardship on people living in country areas. Last week I had the pleasure (and I am sorry that the member for Alexandra is not awake to hear me say this) of spending a week on Kangaroo Island. I took my car over on the *Troubridge*, and it was a pleasant and convenient holiday. However, I found that the price of petrol I bought at Kelly Hill Caves, at the western end of the island, was, I think, 72c a gallon (premium grade), compared to about 56c in Adelaide. This was, to me, a bit of a slug, but it meant nothing to me compared to what it means to people who live on the island and have to pay these prices all the time.

This is simply one small example of what has happened. Of course, it is an open secret that the removal of the subsidy almost led to the downfall of the Whillam Government in Canberra. The *Advertiser* of August 1 contains a report, on page 1, under the heading "P.M. Survives Caucus Revolt on Fuel Subsidy", which states:

The Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) narrowly survived a fiery revolt in the Labor Caucus last night. In a heated debate at a special Caucus meeting Mr. Whitlam said the future of the Labor Government was at stake.

These are not my words but those of the Parliamentary Leader of the Labor Party in the Commonwealth Parliament. The report continues:

Ministers were heckled during the debate and some Labor M.P.'s walked out of the meeting. The issue which brought about the meeting was the Government's decision to abolish the petroleum products prices subsidy scheme. After a 90-minute meeting, Caucus voted 45 to 42 in favour of abolishing the scheme from midnight last night. Mr. Whitlam made a passionate speech calling on the Caucus to support the Cabinet decision to abolish the subsidy. He said the Ministry and the Caucus would disintegrate if the decision was overruled.

What had happened was that the Cabinet had made a decision, which was challenged in Caucus and almost upset. If it had not been for Mr. Whitlam's tactics, that is what would have happened.

Mr. Langley: When do you hold your Caucus meetings?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We have the barometer again. When the member for Unley interjects, I know that I have scored a point, and I appreciate his interjection. Let the honourable member listen to a little more of what happens in Canberra among his Commonwealth colleagues.

Mr. Wells: Why wasn't the motion moved by a country Liberal member?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Florey asks why the motion was not moved by a country member of the so-called Liberal Party. They say they are all Liberals, but their actions and attitudes belie them. It was left to me, as one of the Liberal Movement members in this House, to champion country interests in South Australia, and I am happy to do it. I am also happy to ask this House to support my Commonwealth colleague Senator Hall, who has put a motion on the Senate Notice Paper. Perhaps now is the appropriate time to move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Orders of the Day, Other Business, to be postponed and taken into consideration after Notices of Motion, Other Business, are disposed of.

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?

Mr. BOUNDY: Yes.

The SPEAKER: As I hear no dissentient voice, the motion for suspension is agreed to. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Motion carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I shall now go on with the newspaper report about the open quarrel in the Commonwealth Labor Caucus. I draw attention to this matter not just to discomfort members opposite (nothing could be further from my mind than that) but to show that there is, even on their side of politics, a very large minority of members who favoured this scheme. I hope that even the pressure that we from South Australia can put on them will be enough to turn the tables; that is why I am referring to this matter at some length. The report in the *Advertiser* of August 1 is as follows:

The subsidy maintained the wholesale prices of petroleum products in areas outside the capital cities to within 5c a gallon of capital city prices. Mr. Whitlam told State Premiers on June 7 that the Coombs report had suggested the subsidy be abolished. The Government had first planned to adopt the suggestion in this year's Budget but had then decided to abolish the subsidy "without further delay".

This shows the arbitrary nature of decisions made by the Commonwealth Government, despite what is said in apology for it so often by members opposite, particularly the Premier; I know that he finds it hard sometimes. The article continues:

Mr. Whitlam said the scheme would have cost the Government \$28 000 000 in 1974-75. The row first erupted yesterday morning when a scheduled meeting of Caucus decided to defer the abolition. Later, Mr. Whitlam said in the House of Representatives that the Government would not reintroduce the subsidy. He angered some Labor M.P.'s during Question Time when he told Mr. Lusher (C.P., N.S.W.) he did not believe the petrol subsidy scheme was worth-while.

Well, 42 out of the total number in his Caucus believed it was worth-while. The article continues:

During the afternoon Mr. Whitlam called to his office the Deputy Prime Minister (Dr. Cairns), the Treasurer (Mr. Crean) and the Ministers for Labour (Mr. Cameron) and Services and Property (Mr. Daly). He told them another Caucus meeting should be held during the dinner adjournment of Parliament. Labor M.P.'s who had earlier sought extension of the subsidy were angry when told of the special meeting. At the meeting Mr. Fitzpatrick (N.S.W.) moved that the subsidy be continued until the Party's resources committee had considered it and brought back recommendations to the Caucus next week. The motion was seconded by Mr. Keogh (Qld.) and supporters included Mr. Collard (W.A.), Mr. Luchetti (N.S.W.), Senator Gietzelt (N.S.W.) and the Minister for Northern Development (Dr. Patterson).

So, even the Commonwealth Cabinet was divided on this matter.

Mr. Langley: Were you in the Caucus room?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is encouraging me more and more. Does he challenge the accuracy of this report?

Mr. Langley: Certainly.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Then, I invite the honourable member to say in due course in what respects he challenges the accuracy of this report.

Mr. Langley: How do you know it is correct?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member, being the Government Whip, should show some spirit and say in what respects he challenges the accuracy of the report.

Mr. Langley: I don't believe all press reports.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I see. Perhaps he would be more interested in seeing in *Hansard* what actually happened on the floor of the House of Representatives. Let me quote from the article, and then let the honourable member consult *Hansard* and see whether it is accurate.

Mr. Langley: Do you think that *Hansard* reports what happens in Caucus?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Surely the honourable member is not serious. The article continues:

Mr. Whitlam, Dr. Cairns, Mr. Cameron and the Minister for Social Security (Mr. Hayden) spoke strongly against the motion. Dr. Cairns said Ministers should not go against a Cabinet decision. Mr. Cameron and Mr. Hayden were heckled by some M.P.'s. The Minister for Tourism and Recreation (Mr. Stewart) moved the gag to end the debate.

The Labor Party is good at doing that, apparently even at its own meetings. The article continues:

After the vote was taken, Mr. Berinson (W.A.) moved that a special Caucus meeting be held next week to discuss the relationship between the Caucus and the Ministry.

We do not need to go into that. The unhappy divisions in the Commonwealth Labor Party are well known, so we need not rub it in for this purpose. The article continues:

At the first Caucus meeting—the one in the middle of the day—

the Attorney-General (Senator Murphy) presented the Cabinet decision to abolish the subsidy and moved that it be received but not adopted.

It is well known that Senator Murphy and the Prime Minister are at daggers drawn, and this is simply one more indication of that. The article continues:

This angered Mr. Whitlam and his supporters. Mr. Fitzpatrick then moved that the subsidy be continued until the resources committee had prepared recommendations. He said removal of the subsidy would hit people in isolated areas such as shearers, farmers, graziers and miners.

And he is quite right in saying that. The article continues:

A motion by Dr. Cairns that the Cabinet's decision be adopted was met with a chorus of disapproval and was ruled out of order. A motion by Mr. Innes (Vic.) that the issue be deferred to Wednesday's Caucus meeting was overwhelmingly agreed to on the voices. After last night's meeting Senator Murphy signed the order abolishing the subsidy.

That is enough from the article. There is another report in the *Advertiser* of the following day. I shall quote from the article for the benefit of the member for Unley. I would not have quoted from it if the honourable member had not challenged the accuracy of what I said.

Mr. Langley: How do you know the reports are accurate?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have already invited the honourable member to say in what respects he challenges the accuracy of the article.

Mr. Langley: You are accepting what's in the paper.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am in the habit of accepting the bulk of what is in the paper but, of course, I look to see whether it is refuted in a subsequent issue. If it is not refuted in any way, it is a fair assumption that at least in outline it is accurate. I challenge the member for Unley to deny that what I have said is accurate. Let us refer to Question Time in the House of Representatives on the following day; this is public, and the honourable member can check it in *Hansard*. The article in the *Advertiser* is as follows:

Tempers flared during Question Time in the House of Representatives yesterday as Opposition members attacked the Government over the decision to end the subsidy on petrol in rural areas. The Speaker (Mr. Cope) repeatedly called for order.

He might even have been in this place. Here is a significant piece for the member for Unley:

Mr. Whitlam sharply corrected the Minister for Transport (Mr. Jones) over the date that the decision to withdraw the subsidy had been made. Mr. Snedden had asked if any inquiry had been made into the impact of removing the subsidy. Mr. Jones said no inquiry had been conducted and, in fact, the decision to terminate the subsidy had been taken only on Wednesday night. Mr. Whitlam then interjected: "It was made on the seventh of June."

That is nearly two months earlier. The article continues:

The Deputy Leader of the Country Party (Mr. Sinclair) called out: "That is what he thinks of his Ministers." Uproar broke out, and Mr. Cope again called for order.

That is the sorry state of affairs within the Labor Party over this matter. As I have said before, I am quoting all these things not simply to highlight the very deep divisions within the Commonwealth Labor Party but to show that this is an issue of concern to Australia and one on which there is much dissension. I believe we should do our best to have this decision reversed, and there is a strong minority already in the Government Party in Canberra who believe that as well. What happened? In the Senate, Senator Hall, the representative of the Liberal Movement in the Commonwealth Parliament, immediately moved as follows:

That the Senate recognises the importance of maintaining transport Jinks in the interior of Australia and the impact that petroleum prices have on this network. In view of

the vital contribution citizens living in the interior make to this country, the Senator requests that the Government reinstate the schemes formulated under the States Grants (Petroleum Products) Act, 1965-1973.

Again, it is significant that it was the Liberal Movement representative in the Senate who took the lead in this matter in the interests of people living in the country areas of Australia, just as I have done in this place. I should like to see this House support that motion by supporting my motion. However, that is not the end of this story.

Mr. Langley: In other words, they should be subsidised.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I believe that they should be.

Mr. Langley: Why?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is obviously opposed to giving some relief to people in outback areas of Australia. It is good to get that in *Hansard*, and it will be interesting to see whether his colleagues support his attitude. I do not believe that the Government really does in its heart of hearts: probably, in its typical fashion it will put Party above the interests of the community and vote against this motion. Let us see what attitude the Premier displayed on this matter when I asked him a question on August 1. The question I asked, as reported on page 230 of *Hansard*, was as follows—

Mr. Langley: You want to be subsidised by everyone.

Mr. McAnaney: Who isn't subsidised in Adelaide?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McAnaney: I don't know!

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Are you directing that to me, Sir?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, to the interjectors.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Sir. My question was as follows:

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?

In the course of his reply, which dealt mainly with his piles but which references I will omit, the Premier said:

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.

If the Premier does not think he can do it by his representation, I hope that this House will have more effect. However, it is obvious from the tone of the Premier's reply, and its brevity, that he (whatever the member for Unley, his Whip, may think) favours retaining the subsidy. I hope (but it is probably a vain hope, because the Government Party normally puts Party above community interests) that the Government will live up to the implication of the Premier's reply and support this motion, because I believe it is only fair and just that people in the remoter areas of this State should have the benefit of some remission in the price of fuel. That is what the scheme allowed them in the past and what most people want them to have now and in future, and it is right and proper that it should be allowed to them. I believe we should pass this motion, because I believe it would encourage and support Senator Hall, and drum up support for him in the Senate; it would help the people of this country to get what has been a proper and just subsidy, in contrast to many others; and it would put pressure on the Commonwealth Government at a time

when I gauge that not much extra pressure would be required to have the subsidy restored. For these reasons, I have moved the motion.

The Hon. L. J. KING secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the periodical payments made to participating clubs pursuant to paragraph (e) of subsection (1) of section 31p of the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936, as amended, be made at quarterly intervals in lieu of annually as heretofore.

In moving this motion, I realise that the provision to which I have referred in the Lottery and Gaming Act authorises the Totalizator Agency Board to make periodical payments to participating clubs in accordance with that section. The board can make periodical payments to clubs now, but this has not been done. About September 20, following the end of each financial year, the board makes a distribution to the participating clubs. For the year ended June 30, 1973, the distribution was \$1 426 734; of this, \$933 566 was allocated to horse-racing; trotting received \$309 822; and greyhound-racing received \$173 396. There were further distributions to the participating clubs for establishment costs, administration, club subsidies, and part of the Government grant, based on turnover, and so much for stake money. I am concerned not about that aspect but about the principle behind the establishment of the Totalizator Agency Board and what it was designed to do. I refer to the excellent report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Racing Industry, which at page 275, under the heading "Frequency of distributions", states:

The committee received a number of submissions favouring quarterly rather than annual distributions of T.A.B. profits. It was apparent that some clubs felt that earlier distributions would significantly improve their cash-flow positions. The T.A.B., on the other hand, contended that the worsening of its own cash-flow position would adversely affect the amounts available for distribution and that the racing industry as a whole would suffer from any change. The committee makes no recommendation on this matter. It believes that the advantages and disadvantages of more frequent distributions will change with variations in the cash positions of the clubs and the T.A.B. The best course will be for the T.A.B. to review the matter from time to time and discuss its findings with the controlling bodies. While I said it was an excellent report on the racing industry, the document really is only the history of what has happened and what is happening within the racing industry, speaking of horse-racing, trotting, and greyhound-racing. When the Western Australian Government established its T.A.B., it immediately started making monthly payments to the racing clubs in that State. Western Australian racing has forged ahead, yet in South Australia it was 15 months after the commencement of the board before any distribution was made to the participating clubs. That is the whole problem.

The T.A.B., as I see it, in this State has been able to build up substantial assets and certain investments, and it suffered a shocking loss from the data-bet system. However, the participating clubs really have not benefited from the distribution of all of the moneys. If South Australian clubs had been fortunate enough to receive monthly payments, as was the case in Western Australia, they would have had a greater cash flow and would have had also the opportunity to use that money for the benefit of the industry. It has been suggested that racing needs an injection of funds from the Government, but throughout this report there is reference to certain aspects of racing

administration. It is up to the racing clubs to prove that they are operating as efficiently as they can and that they desperately need this assistance.

One would have thought the racing clubs would jump at the opportunity to have the board make quarterly payments, increasing their cash-flow basis. In the current financial year they would thus receive the benefit of the distributions from the previous financial year, together with moneys accruing in the present year. I cannot accept that additional income to the racing clubs from distributions by the board will be severely affected by taxation. The racing clubs pay income tax at company rates. At present, that rate is 47½ per cent, and if the Commonwealth Government runs true to form I should not be surprised if it is increased to 50 per cent. I believe there are avenues available for racing clubs to use that money and not necessarily involve themselves in income tax. The taxpayer, after all, is the person who supports the T.A.B., because tax is already taken by the State Government out of the money invested, and, of course, the Commonwealth Government wants its slice. The report for the financial year ended June 30, 1973, showed that in that year the total turnover of the board was about \$48 000 000, of which \$40 000 000 was paid to investors as dividends, the Government revenue was \$3 000 000, and distribution to racing clubs was \$1 400 000. The State Government did very well out of racing through the turnover of the T.A.B.

Several participating clubs are operating on a grant, and I think the position could be improved if quarterly payments were available. If they were, the clubs could immediately undertake certain improvements, provide certain amenities, and embark on advertising or other programmes to attract people to the racecourses. They could have a short-term trial of increasing stake money to improve the standard of some of their races. It is up to the racing clubs to attract people to the courses if that is what they want, and it is up to the clubs to use the means of the T.A.B.

I do not see the role of the board as one of an organisation that should be building up reserves and investments. It is established as an agency to handle off-course betting, and I believe its profits, after expenses, should be paid to the participating clubs. However, we have not seen that happen. I will not go into the matter of the loss suffered over the data-bet system. Racing must help itself. The board must help racing, and the best way at this stage would be through quarterly payments. The argument has been raised in the report that quarterly payments would affect the cash flow system of the T.A.B., but one wonders how this would happen and why it should happen. That money belongs to the participating clubs, and not to the board to be used at its whim. If the board has undertaken further commitments that will affect the industry, I believe it has taken advantage of the provisions of the Act. The section provides that there may be periodical payments, and that has been interpreted as meaning once a year. I commend this motion to the House. To assist racing without seriously affecting the Revenue Account, I urge the House to support the motion.

The Hon. L. J. KING secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNION MILITANCY

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That this House express its congratulation to the Commonwealth member for Hindmarsh (Hon. C. R. Cameron, M.H.R.), Commonwealth Minister for Labor

and Immigration, in condemning some trade union officials for their militancy, regret that the State Government has not done likewise and call on it, as a matter of urgency, to follow Mr. Cameron's lead.

One of the greatest weaknesses of Labor Governments, whether State or Commonwealth, is that they are always prisoners of the trade union movement because they are the political wing of the movement. However much the Party may try to put a veneer of middle-class liberalism on itself, ultimately, the power in the Labor Party rests with the trade unions. We all know of the scandalous situation within the Australian Labor Party in this State and, for all I know, in other places, too, where the card vote is used to ensure that, when the chips are down, trade union numbers always prevail. That means that in a time of industrial unrest a Labor Government is less well equipped than any other Government to stand up to the unions and to get a bit of sense out of them.

This situation has been evident time and time again in Australia, and it has never been more clearly demonstrated than in the last few years in this State and at the Commonwealth level, in particular, since December, 1972, when a Labor Government came into office in Canberra. Let us now look at some of the results that have followed in the last few years. The "A.G.C. perspective" issued by Australian Guarantee Corporation Limited (I suppose one would call it a newsletter) for July 31, 1974, headed "Strikes and absenteeism soaring to a record", states:

Australia is at present staggering under the worst industrial unrest since 1929, and by the end of 1974 statisticians will have to dig even further back into their records to find comparisons. In fact their search may take them back into the 19th century. In the first four months of 1974 3.4 million working days were lost because of strikes, costing workers—

those who are on strike—

about \$63 000 000 in wages. In recent times, the full 1971 year recorded just over 3 000 000 days lost and then it's back to the years 1917, 1919, 1920 and 1929 to find similar strike records. It is plain that 1974, therefore, will chalk up more than 6 000 000 days lost before 1975 is rung in.

Of course, those figures can be checked by reference to Australian Bureau of Statistics records. Its report dated July 19, 1974, in a table headed "Industrial disputes: States working days lost", refers to the working days lost because of industrial disputes in South Australia and for the whole of Australia. In 1969 in South Australia 129 000 working days were lost, and in 1970, 93 100 working days were lost. I pause here because the Premier has, on many occasions, with great self-satisfaction, pointed to the drop in working days lost since the present Government came to office. He is now hoist with his own petard. In 1971 the figure went up to 111 200; in 1972 it went down to 60 900; and in 1973 it more than doubled, and went to 130 600. For the first four months of 1974 (and I suggest that honourable members listen carefully to these figures) the number of working days lost had already exceeded the total for 1973. The table shows the number of working days lost as 153 700. The comparable figure for 1973 was 38 200. That is what happened in South Australia: it mirrors what happened throughout the whole of Australia during that time. In 1973 the working days lost for the whole of Australia were 2 634 700, and already in 1974, from January to April, 3 419 200 working days were lost. That is the situation which we have in Australia and, alone of all the leaders of the Labor Party, Mr. Cameron has been willing to come out and condemn what is going on. Therefore, I believe that he deserves for his courageous action, being

a member of the Labor Party, the support of every member here for what he said, and I hope he will get it when this motion is put to the vote.

The honourable member for Unley is not here, and I am sorry, because he would probably even deny the accuracy of the *Advertiser* report to which I now refer. Nevertheless, although that does not make me tremble, I refer to the front page *Advertiser* report of Saturday, August 17. I am glad the Minister of Labor and Industry is here, because I am most interested to see which way he is going to jump on this motion. Under the heading "Throw out extremist union chiefs: Cameron" and under a Brisbane date line, the report is as follows:

Rank-and-file unionists should throw over-militant officials out of office, the Federal Minister for Labour (Mr. Cameron) said yesterday. He said the rank-and-file was "sick and tired of having to go out on strike at the drop of a hat".

The figures I just quoted show that that is exactly what is happening. The report continues:

"In effect, a day off work meant the worker was being fined at least \$20." Mr. Cameron was speaking at a press conference at the Brisbane Airport after having addressed the Queensland Trades and Labor Council. He supported criticism—

he was not the only one to make it—

of many trade unions by the Queensland Trades and Labor Council President (Mr. J. Egerton), who said in a letter to Queensland union leaders that the trade union movement was at its lowest ebb.

I must say that, having had one verbal passage of arms with a trade union secretary today, Mr. Jack Nyland, I am inclined to agree with that from my own experience. The report continued:

When he returned to Canberra Mr. Cameron issued a statement attacking "near-anarchy" and "bloody-mindedness" among trade unions. He said the actions of some union officials would be to blame, if unemployment reached unacceptable levels. The attitude of a small section of the trade union movement was slowly but surely pricing thousands of Australian workers out of employment. I deliberately asked the Premier today about the Commonwealth Government's plans on unemployment. What answer did I get? The usual flow of words but not one atom of substance in his reply.

Mr. Wright: You may not be able to understand him.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I can understand him when he has something to say, and I also understand when he has nothing to say, and that was the situation this afternoon. The report continues:

In the strongest anti-union statement by a Minister since the Labor Government came to power Mr. Cameron agreed with Mr. Egerton that the trade union movement was at its lowest ebb.

I emphasise to all honourable members that Mr. Cameron is a South Australian, and is one of the leading members of the Labor Party. The report continues:

"There is little doubt that anarchy has prevailed in a number of cases," he said. Observers in Canberra believe the statements by Mr. Cameron and Mr. Egerton reflect the attitude of the Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam). Mr. Cameron's statement blasted the "selfishness" of some unionists.

"They seem to see nothing wrong with forcing more than 4 000 000 of their fellow workers to pay more than they should for some given commodity or service," he said. They did this so "some minute section of the work force should get wage rises that go above their fair share and well beyond price movements." Employers and some unions were acting jointly to try to get the Federal Government to lift the guidelines imposed on the Prices Justification Tribunal.

Then the report goes on. It is ironic that in the next column there is another report of a statement by a trade

union leader in South Australia, the son of a Commonwealth Minister, one of Mr. Cameron's colleagues and a colleague of honourable members opposite. Under the headline "Government will fall, says union man", the report is as follows:

A South Australian union secretary predicted last night that the Federal Government would be out of office by May. He is Mr. B. F. J. Cavanagh, of the 9 500-strong Miscellaneous Workers Union.

If the Government is out of office by May, Mr. Barry Cavanagh will have played his part, and I refer to the tactics he and his union have adopted recently in helping to send that Government out of office. There we have the son of a Commonwealth Minister prophesying the fall of the Commonwealth Government within the next 12 months. As I have said, I consider that Mr. Cameron has been courageous. Many times in this place I have besought the present Government, the Premier, and other Ministers to come out strongly and admit what is going on among trade unions, particularly among the leaders of trade unions, with their disruptive tactics. I have never got a strong statement from members opposite, and I suppose it is a vain hope that I ever will. The reason is that that Party is utterly dependent, when the chips are down, on trade union support. It dare not stand up to or antagonise its base. Therefore, we get to the situation that I have mentioned, namely, that a Labor Government must, of necessity, be weak towards trade unionists.

Mr. McAnaney: It's weak everywhere.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the member for Heysen likes to add that, that is for him to say: I am referring only to trade unions. When we, for once, get a Labor man in a senior Ministerial position, particularly when he is a South Australian, saying what he has said, I believe there is an obligation on this House to back him up, and I am sure that members on this side, irrespective of Party, will support my motion. Likewise, I hope that honourable members opposite will support their own Commonwealth colleague.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr. EVANS (Fisher) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961, as amended. Read a first time.

Mr. EVANS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to make it compulsory for motor vehicles, other than those exempted by the Road Traffic Board under the Act, to have a litter bag fitted.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Where's the Bill?

Mr. EVANS: There are no forward copies of the Bill. I have two copies, one for the Clerk and one for me, and the Minister of Transport would understand that often copies of private members' Bills are not available readily. I apologise for the inconvenience, but the Bill is short. It is not complicated, and the Minister will be given my copy immediately I finish my speech. I am sure that he will have the debate adjourned, as is the normal practice, and he will have a week in which he and his departmental officers can see the contents of the measure.

Doubtless, litter is part of the pollution problem: we all accept that. The main cause is the action of individuals in our society, and individuals should be responsible people and not litter the roads and the streets. Making a litter bag available in motor vehicles would give the individual the

opportunity to place the litter there and dispose of it in litter bins or in his own garbage can, instead of disposing of it in streets or parks or on highways.

Most people who tend to litter will not do so on their own property. They object strongly if someone else litters in front of their property, but they will litter willy-nilly in other places in the community, because they know that that does not affect them directly. The Bill gives these people the opportunity to learn to discipline their actions regarding litter.

I, as well as Kesab and other organisations concerned about litter, am convinced that the litter in such places as roads and parks comes mainly from motor vehicles, and it can be expected that, once members of a family develop a habit of placing their litter in a receptacle, their whole attitude to litter will change. That is part of the intention in placing an obligation on a person to have a litter bag fitted in his motor vehicle. The proposal has the support of many people who take an interest in protecting their environment.

Kesab has proved that promotion in the public sector regarding preserving our environment can be successful. At the Hahndorf Schutzenfest, Jitter bins are placed in the area and people are encouraged to use them, and the most recent Schutzenfest was the cleanest on record. The same can be said of the recent Royal Show. Compliments have been paid to the authorities and the people who worked to keep the showgrounds clean on the tidiness of the grounds this year. Visitors from other States also paid compliments on the cleanliness of the area.

These are examples of cleanliness being achieved in the community, and litter bags will be part of that promotion. In the United States of America the Chrysler motor company has accepted the responsibility of installing a litter receptacle in motor vehicles, as standard equipment. Not all States in the United States compel people to have a litter receptacle in vehicles, but at least one motor vehicle manufacturer has accepted the responsibility of making the receptacle standard equipment. In 1972, Kesab sent a letter to all motor vehicle manufacturers in Australia, and I shall read some of the correspondence. A letter from Kesab states:

I ask you to make a valuable contribution towards the fight against litter by installing permanent litter containers in your vehicle as soon as it can be conveniently engineered.

A follow-up letter from Kesab went to the manufacturers in March of this year and it seems, from the replies received by that organisation, that the manufacturers have at least shown an interest and, I believe, are carrying out research to see whether there is a method by which litter receptacles can easily and permanently be fitted into motor vehicles. I believe there is and, if this Bill is accepted by the House and becomes an Act, automatically every new vehicle that goes on the market after the Act comes into operation will have fitted within it a litter receptacle; and this is the first step towards getting the people to accept their responsibilities.

I turn now briefly to the Bill as there is nothing else I wish to say as general comment. Clause 1 is the short title of the Bill, which seeks to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961, as amended. Clause 2 provides:

This Act shall come into operation on the first day of February, 1975.

I have attempted to pick a size of container that will be readily available as the minimum size for a litter receptacle and, for that reason, I believe the operative commencing date of February 1, 1975, is not unreasonable. I have chosen the first day of February as being the first acceptable

first day of the month after the Christmas break. Clause 3 amends the principal Act by inserting new section 138c, which gives the Road Traffic Board the power to exempt any vehicle, or any class of vehicle, from the provisions of the Act. There will be some areas where it will be necessary to offer an exemption at first, and later we can reconsider the position and perhaps remove the exemption. Perhaps some passenger buses or even other commercial vehicles may be exempt to start with; there may be some problems there but, in the long term, I hope that the owners of all commercial and passenger vehicles will be obliged to have litter receptacles fitted in their vehicles.

New section 138d provides a definition of "adequate litter receptacle". I have chosen a receptacle having a capacity of not less than 1½ litres. As I stated earlier, I think there is no complication with that size of container. There is also a definition of "exempt vehicle", which means:

A vehicle or a vehicle of a class for the time being the subject of a notice published pursuant to section 138c of this Act.

In other words, the community is advised that people can apply to the Road Traffic Board for an exemption, where necessary. New subsection (2) of section 138d provides:

A person shall not drive a vehicle—

in other words, the responsibility shall be upon the driver—

not being an exempt vehicle, unless that vehicle is equipped with an adequate litter receptacle. Penalty: Fifty dollars.

I know that this type of law is difficult to police, as is the seat belt legislation. However, this does not infringe the rights of the individual. The driver is obliged to make sure that he has in his vehicle a receptacle capable of holding at least 1½ litres of litter. It need not be a permanent fixture: it can be a temporary fixture in the vehicle. If we are litter conscious and if we, as a Parliament, are concerned about the environment in which we live (as I am sure the Government is), we should accept this proposition unanimously. It is important that we show society that we are concerned about the litter problem and pollution and that we expect the people to accept the same responsibilities as we are prepared to accept. I ask all members to support this move to make it obligatory for owners to have litter bags fitted to their vehicles.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO secured the adjournment of the debate.

STANDING ORDERS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Standing Orders Committee should be asked to prepare amendments to the Standing Orders of this House to provide for a 30 minutes grievance debate to take place on the motion "That this House do now adjourn".

This is not an uncommon procedure for a House to adopt. It is commonly called an adjournment debate, and the procedure is already practised in the House of Commons, the House of Representatives in Canberra, the State Parliament Houses of Assembly in both New South Wales and Victoria, as well as in many other Parliaments throughout the world. As I have said, it is a common procedure, which gives the Opposition members, and in particular the back-benchers on both sides, the opportunity to stand up and air their grievances on any matter, particularly on important public issues that may arise from day to day. Before proceeding with this motion, we should examine what opportunities Opposition members have, at this point of time, for airing their grievances.

First, we have the grievance debates on the introduction of the Appropriation and Supply Bills. From a careful

assessment of how often such Bills are introduced, I suspect it is three or four times a year (I have counted three times, so let me say "three times") that we have the chance for a grievance debate. That comes under Standing Order 288. Secondly, Opposition members can move to suspend Standing Orders so as to allow a debate on a matter, but of course we have heard in this place many times recently how the Premier will not allow Opposition members to do that: he has the numbers and uses them effectively to gag the Opposition. So that method of airing grievances is out.

The third method is in the Address in Reply debate. That debate takes place normally once a year, at the beginning of each Parliamentary session. That means we have a chance to air our grievances in one speech a year. Finally, we have private members' time, the time we have this afternoon. This is a common practice that is with us during the earlier part of each session, but there are normally only 10 sitting weeks in which private members' time is allowed. If that is the case, it means there are many other sitting weeks in which Opposition members do not have a chance to bring forward private business or matters of grievance. Furthermore, we can see at present how private members' time has become completely bogged down because there are so many issues on which we do not get to a vote, and invariably we lose much time, as we did last week, to some other matter.

Mr. Millhouse: It was an important matter, despite what some of your colleagues thought.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It was an important matter. I point out that invariably the situation is that there is no opportunity for members to air their grievances as they expect to air them. To summarise, we have about three grievance debates a year; we have a chance to air grievances during the one Address in Reply debate a session; and we have about six weeks effectively in which private members' time is available. They are the only opportunities Opposition members have to air grievances. For about the last 15 weeks of a session, Opposition members may have virtually no time at all for these debates.

It could be said that Question Time offers an opportunity for members to raise matters of grievance, but I am sure that you, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker, will support the Speaker in carrying out Standing Orders, which provide that a member may ask a question, state the facts in explanation, and then sit down. Moreover, only last session, the Government restricted Question Time, cutting the time provided almost in half. The Government has also restricted by 15 minutes the time allotted to each member to speak in a debate on a motion. Therefore, the time allotted to private members (and this applies particularly to Opposition back-benchers) is certainly not great, and in this time they must air issues of public importance and grievance. I believe that a debate of 30 minutes in which grievances can be aired should be provided at the end of the sitting each day. When a Minister moved the adjournment of the House, we would immediately move into a 30-minute grievance debate. The explanation of the Standing Orders of the Commonwealth House of Representatives states:

Standing Order 81 provides that, on the motion for the adjournment of the House to terminate the sitting moved by a Minister, matters irrelevant to the motion may be debated. The adjournment debate is thus an opportunity which members value highly to bring before the House an almost unlimited range of matters. The general rules

of debate, other than relevancy, apply, and a member should not attempt to revive earlier debates of the session unless the allusion is relevant to a new aspect or matter which the member is raising. This restriction does not prevent reference to previous adjournment debates. No amendment may be moved to the motion for the adjournment.

That indicates the type of procedure adopted in Canberra. Referring to the daily adjournment motion, *An Encyclopedia of Parliament* clearly sets out the procedure, and this system could be adopted well by our Standing Orders Committee. In summarising his attitude to the adjournment debate in *Back-benchers in Parliament* (edited by Leonard and Herman), Valentine Herman states:

Adjournment debates play an important part in the Parliamentary process. Like questions they are one of the few devices the back-bencher can use in the face of increased front bench control over the content and time table of the House, and increased Government involvement in the lives of the people; in both these areas adjournment debates function as a counter-balancing mechanism, returning an element of control to the back-benchers.

I am sure all members would agree that the front bench in this House is demanding much greater control. Furthermore, as the Government is involving itself more and more in the private lives of the citizens of South Australia, it is important that our Parliament should adopt this procedure. I suggest that perhaps the Standing Orders Committee should decide to limit each speaker in the adjournment debate to 10 minutes, with alternate speakers from each side. However, I realise it is up to the Standing Orders Committee to decide the details of such a debate. This debate would be an excellent opportunity for the silent voting machine of Government back-benchers to air grievances for once.

Mr. Millhouse: You don't really think it would happen on the record we've seen?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On alternate sitting days there would be an opportunity for three Government back-benchers to air their grievances. Perhaps they do not have grievances because they do not venture out into their districts, but one would hope they would speak in this debate, representing the views of their electors. I am sure members on this side would have many matters of grievance to bring forward. Therefore, it is important at this time that members have a chance on more occasions than are available at present to air their grievances. However, in no way do I suggest that this adjournment debate should replace (and I emphasise that word) other grievance debates now available. This debate should add to the opportunities members have to grieve, and not replace existing opportunities. I think that events of the last few weeks have clearly indicated that Opposition members have a tremendous number of issues to bring forward. The Government has invariably tried to gag debate on these matters, but it is in the interests of the public that we be allowed to bring such issues forward. In this way, we will have much more efficient government. I am sure there would be a greater threat to the Government, because we could air the vital issues that so many people bring to Opposition members. Opposition members do not have an opportunity to air their grievances.

Mr. Evans: Neither do Government back-benchers.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I think they have the opportunity but do not use it. I have already said that at present there are only three grievance debates a year, as well as the Address in Reply debate in which grievances can be raised. I have suggested an adjournment debate of 30 minutes with a time limit of 10 minutes for each speaker. It is up to the Standing Orders Committee to work out

other procedures. This debate should take place each sitting day when the motion is moved to adjourn the House. In this way the people of South Australia would benefit, and certainly the procedures of the House would benefit. We would start to move towards much more open government, through the opportunity being available for franker and more open debate on public issues. I move my motion, hoping that the House will support it.

The Hon. L. J. KING secured the adjournment of the debate.

HEALTH SERVICES

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government stands condemned for its lack of concern for the urgent health needs of this State as demonstrated by its failure to implement the major recommendations detailed in the report of the Bright Committee of Inquiry into Health Services in South Australia, released in January, 1973.

I am appalled that the Government should be so committed to an ideological course of action that it is unwilling to consider the forward health planning needs of this State. It is so concerned about letting the Commonwealth Government take over full responsibility for health services, and it so fully expects the Commonwealth Government to do so in all States—

Mr. Millhouse: It's their policy.

Dr. TONKIN: It is indeed. It is content to sit back and take no notice whatsoever of one of the finest reports on health matters that has been prepared in this country.

Mr. Millhouse: You don't expect them to put the interests of the community before those of the Party, do you?

Dr. TONKIN: As far as I can recall from my relatively short time in this House, I have never seen the Australian Labor Party put the interests of the people above its own interests. Never have I seen a Government member cross the floor and vote against the wishes and dictates of his Caucus. That is exactly what we are talking about now: it is what the Opposition is saying regarding this health committee report. When I first entered this House, I was told that perhaps someone would speak up for the health professions at first hand.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Who told you that?

Dr. TONKIN: One of the first things I did in this House was to move a private member's motion on August 19, 1970 that, in the opinion of this House, a Select Committee should be appointed to inquire into all aspects of nursing in this State. There was at that stage a tremendous crisis in nursing, the like of which had not been seen before in this State or, indeed, in this country.

Mr. Duncan: Which was resolved by the Canberra nurses' strike!

Dr. TONKIN: I do not think it was solved by that strike at all because, the nurses tell me, that matter has not yet been resolved. Certainly, conditions and rates of pay have improved tremendously, as they should have done. Indeed, such improvement was long overdue. However, the conditions under which they are still working and training are far from satisfactory. I will now deal with the wider sphere of general health, as the nursing aspect was taken out of that context and placed by the Government into the general context of health. I should like also to refer to what happened between the time I gave notice of my moving the motion and the time I was able to move it. After I gave notice of my intention to move the motion, the Chief Secretary announced the proposed setting up of two committees related in some way to nursing. On August 19, 1970 (page 824 of *Hansard*), I said:

On August 11 it was reported in the press that a committee was being convened to receive and examine representations from medical and nursing staff, as well as from staff associations in kindred organisations, with the prime object of improving methods of communication within the administrative structure of Government hospitals.

That refers to the inquiry into communications within hospitals. I am sure all members will remember that committee. I continued:

It was reported further on August 14 that there was a proposal to set up later this year a committee of inquiry into health services generally; this committee could well take from 12 to 18 months to complete its deliberations; and it was therefore intended as a completely separate committee from the working committee on communication aspects.

Later, I continued:

Regarding the type of inquiry, the Minister is reported as saying that the Government was of the view that any reorganisation of nursing roles could not take place in isolation from associated developments in the medical, dental and paramedical fields, and for these reasons the Government considered that the nature and scope of the inquiry into total health services was such that the inquiry should be undertaken by the type of committee outlined rather than by the appointment of a Select Committee of Parliament. Generally, I welcome the announcement of these two moves; in principle, I think that they are a good thing. I think the move regarding administration within the hospital itself could well clear up some of the petty misunderstandings which exist at present and which make for ill-feeling and a lack of hospital spirit. I highly commend the Government—

and in my early days in this House I was perhaps a little naive—

for its decision to set up a general inquiry into health services, because I think that this can do nothing but good, and I hope that it will advance the health of the South Australian people over the next 20 years, as it is planned to do. Certainly, there is a need for forward planning, and I agree that sometimes in the past there has not been sufficient forward planning. In principle, then, I support the setting up of both these committees. However, I will reserve final judgment until the constitution of the general committee is announced.

Those statements were made in 1970 when, after I had given notice of a move to set up a Select Committee to inquire into all aspects of nursing, the Minister was galvanised into action and immediately announced the establishment of a committee to examine hospital communications, including nursing, and was further galvanised into announcing the appointment of what has become known as the Bright Committee of Inquiry into Health Services in South Australia.

To refresh members' memories, the recommendations of the committee inquiring into hospital communications were announced to this House without any details of the evidence that had been taken or of the discussions held, and without any reasons being given. The bare recommendations were given to this House in the form of a report, and this action led to much dissatisfaction. The Government said initially that it would proceed with the recommendations, but that it could not give details of the committee's proceedings as this would be unfair to those who had given evidence to the committee and who might otherwise have been embarrassed.

It was said that some pointed, critical remarks had been made about certain people involved in hospital administration and that the people who had made those remarks to the committee would not have done so had they thought their remarks would be published. As a result, the Government was willing to act on the committee's recommendations without giving reasons therefor. In response to many questions and repeated probing, the Premier finally said that I could see the record of the committee's proceedings so long as I regarded them as privileged and made

no further comment on them. However, that was far from satisfactory. Finally, after further protests from the nursing and medical professions, it was stated that the Government would no longer proceed with the recommendations of the first committee into hospital communications but would wait until the Bright committee had reported.

This has become a familiar theme. Ever since the Bright committee was set up, the Opposition has been told, in reply to all sorts of questions regarding health and hospital policy, that it must wait until the Bright committee has reported. The Opposition looked forward with tremendous anticipation to the release of that report. That committee finally reported on January 31, 1973, which is over 18 months ago. I believe that the Government was well justified in stating that we should wait for the report, because I believe it lived up to the expectations that the Government had of it and there was every reason to suppose that it would do so. It is an excellent report, and one would expect it to be excellent. One has only to consider the members of that committee. The Hon. Mr. Justice Bright is a distinguished judge, a prominent South Australian citizen, and a man who has done as much for this State as has anyone of whom I can think. Professor Ray Brown from Flinders University; Dr. Cummins; Dr. David Game; Miss Hardy, a person prominent in nursing education; Professor Hetzel, an Adelaide graduate; Mr. Joel, and Mr. Owens. The research officer was Dr. Neville Hicks; the research assistants are listed in the front pages of the report; and the secretary was Mr. Henry James. An outstanding committee, it cost much money to set up and service, but it was worth every cent. At least it would have been worth every cent had the Government showed any sign of doing something about the contents of its report. Here we have a first-class report provided by a first-class committee that reported in January 1973, but there it is and there it stays, and it has been gathering dust ever since.

Mr. Becker: They don't know what to do with it!

Dr. TONKIN: I would know and Opposition members would know what to do with it: we would act on it, because it contains some tremendously valuable suggestions. It has some vital recommendations, but the most important of these has still not been considered. I cannot say whether it has been examined by Cabinet, because Cabinet will not tell us. Perhaps the Minister of Works will consider this subject, but I do not know. Obviously, the Attorney-General will look at it, but perhaps someone will tell us whether Cabinet has done more than look at this red-covered book and said, "Very nice, that will keep everyone quiet for a while." Perhaps members of Cabinet have looked at it and said that they did not want it.

I suspect that they have looked at it, but that it does not suit their purpose to implement the recommendations. Minor matters have been considered from the earlier committee's report on the inquiry into hospital communications, and I favour the matters that have helped nurses in hospitals in particular. However, fundamental factors have not been implemented, and I believe that they have been ignored wilfully. The Government does not want to set up a central health authority that would co-ordinate health services in this State because it cheerfully, happily, and confidently expects the Commonwealth Government to take over health services in this State at the first opportunity. The terms of reference of the Bright committee, which are well worth reading, were as follows:

The committee is required to examine and report on health services within the State and to make recommendations on the administrative structures required to ensure an optimum standard of public and private health services to meet the future needs of the community—

—that was one item members opposite did not like: an optimum standard of public and private health services—The committee will have regard to a total health concept and will, in particular, make recommendations on requirements regarding:

(a) Prevention, diagnosis, treatment and rehabilitation including:

- (i) Public health services involving the preservation and conservation of the health of the community, including epidemiology; the control of communicable and other diseases; environmental and occupational factors influencing health and welfare; maternal and child health services (including school health services); public diagnostic procedures and health education programmes (including family planning).
- (ii) Hospital services; mental health services; services for alcoholism and drug addiction; nursing homes; services for the chronic sick, handicapped, and aged; and domiciliary supportive services.
- (iii) The development of community health and welfare services and centres, including the role of medical specialists and general medical practitioners in private practice; and their links with services provided by public hospitals and Government departments.
- (iv) Health and welfare services in remote areas.
- (v) The participation and involvement of voluntary agencies in health, hospital and welfare services.

(b) The education and function and numbers of health personnel in all categories with particular emphasis on possible changes in role in the future.

(c) The organisation and co-ordination of public, private and community health, hospital and welfare services at central and regional levels.

(d) The examination of future demands for hospital and nursing home services, including Government, subsidised, community and private.

(e) The future organisation and role of medical, dental, nursing and other allied health professions and services.

(f) The transport of patients to services and services to patients.

The findings, which I shall later try to summarise, admirably covered all those points, going into detail where necessary and into first principles where called for. This is a model document, and one well worth waiting for. It was a firm blueprint for action with which this State could have leapt forward into the next 20 years, providing the health services that the State deserved. As I said, we have seen no action whatever. It is now September, 1974, and we are back where we started. We are not in the position we were in when the Bright committee released its report; we are back even before 1970, when the inquiry was announced, because there is no point whatever in having an inquiry, and in spending money on it, if it is not to be acted on.

Mr. McAnaney: It just goes with all the other hundreds of reports.

Dr. TONKIN: It goes with all the other reports now gathering dust, hundreds of reports prepared by dozens of committees set up by this Government. I doubt whether the Government intended to act on more than a small proportion of them. At least we have the consolation that this report was released to the public. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

WATER LICENCE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That, in the opinion of this House, the recommendations to the Engineering and Water Supply Department contained in the two reports of the Ombudsman laid on the table of the House on July 23, 1974, and relating to the issue of a water licence and the provision of an indirect water service, respectively, should have been approved.

(Continued from August 14. Page 474.)

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The motion moved by the member for Mitcham deals with two reports made by the Ombudsman concerning the Engineering and Water Supply Department. While opposing the motion, I agree with the honourable member's contention that it is a historic motion. The charges laid are of a serious nature; and, like him, I believe Parliament should not take the matter lightly. I am most concerned that such charges have been made and can assure the honourable member that he was correct in suggesting that there may be reasons, not appearing in the reports, which completely justify what has been done.

Prior to the reports being made I had a long and frank discussion with the Ombudsman on both matters, and it appears that his concern is not with Government policy but with a belief that in both cases the department operated in such a manner as to prevent my exercising Ministerial discretion in each matter. This view is very evident in both of his reports. First, on page 9 of his report on the Kennedy matter, he states his conclusion as follows:

Ministerial and Cabinet decisions are outside the scope of my jurisdiction and, in my view, most properly so, and this report should not be construed to suggest that I am questioning the decisions at that level. However, my investigation has been directed at the departmental action taken in this case and I remain of the opinion that the department was at fault in ignoring considerations of hardship to the substantial financial detriment of my complainant. I hasten to assure Parliament that I believe the department acted in good faith albeit in my view wrongly.

The Ombudsman also says on page 5 of his report on the Smith matter that the department's policy not to grant an indirect water service in this area operated in this case to exclude any consideration of the exercise of the statutory discretion of the Minister to grant an indirect water supply.

I pointed out to the Ombudsman, as I will to the House, that in both instances the department properly followed confirmed Government policy and considered such matters relevant to my discretion as were proper. In view of this discussion I am disappointed that the reports were made and am concerned that public confidence in the department may be affected. However, the reports have been made, and I will now deal with each matter in turn.

For the purpose of background I will begin with a brief explanation of the policy on water pollution control in the metropolitan watersheds. This policy, first approved in March, 1970, by the Liberal Government, was subsequently adopted by the present Government. It has been widely publicised since April, 1970, and pamphlets outlining it are freely available to anyone. The policy statement emphasises that in our society Governments do not impose restrictions for the sake of restrictions.

Mr. McAnaney: That's a joke.

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: No Government imposes restrictions for the sake of restrictions. Surely the honourable member agrees with that. He is not being fair and reasonable, and he knows it. Controls within the catchment areas of the metropolitan reservoirs are vital to the economic survival of Adelaide. The watersheds policy was introduced at a time when nullification and pollution of watersheds were becoming evident and as a holding measure to slow down this trend while further research was undertaken and necessary measures planned. The metropolitan watersheds are extremely vulnerable to pollution: there is no escaping this conclusion. They are inhabited and comprise some of the most attractive, fertile and productive

land in the State. They are also uncomfortably close to the metropolitan area and extremely accessible, which makes them attractive for commuter living. Also, unfortunately, they are large in relation to their yield, which gives them a higher than normal pollution potential.

In view of the potential danger, the comprehensive policy was put into effect to regulate animal and human activity within the watersheds. A long-term study of the water supplies was instituted so that trends in water quality impairment could be assessed. While at that stage (and this still applies) the precise limits of desirable habitation were uncertain, it was clear that human habitation on the watersheds should be actively restricted and that urban-type development should be confined to specific areas so that sewage could be collected and treated where necessary. This involves negotiations with councils to limit the expansion of existing watershed township areas. There is no point in limiting one area to find development shifting to other watershed areas. Much work has taken place which will culminate in the Outer Metropolitan Planning Area Development Plan and the Metropolitan Development Plan, Supplementary Development Plan No. 5, Mount Lofty Range. The first is likely to be authorised soon and the second is expected to be authorised next year. This is a major step towards planning control in the watersheds, but before it can be effective further detailed steps are necessary.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Will appeals be allowed?

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: We will deal with them when they are lodged.

Mr. Goldsworthy: There is no appeal now?

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: Under the plan, no doubt there will be appeal facilities. The honourable member knows that there have been appeals to the planning authority. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has not been victorious in all of them, as he is aware. The Government's policy for the watersheds is that, with the exception of township areas where the department raises no objection to subdivision and resubdivision, water mains will not be extended or indirect services granted. This is part of the overall holding policy to give a breathing space while final policies can be determined. It is still too early to prepare a final policy, as technical studies have not been in operation long enough to disclose a full trend. However, they do prove that nutrient enrichment levels are invariably above those associated in overseas situations with excessive biological growth. This brings me to report No. 1, that concerning Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith obtained a copy of the policy statement from the E. and W.S. Department before purchasing his property.

This is shown in a letter, dated October 9, 1973, reproduced by the Ombudsman, but is more fully dealt with in a subsequent letter to him, dated January 31, 1974. Mr. Smith wrote to the department on the May 1, 1972, saying, "Your department was kind enough to send me information describing water pollution problems and the department's policy of control." He also said in the letter that he was negotiating to buy a block of land in the Houghton district. Notwithstanding that he was advised of the non-availability of water prior to purchase, he proceeded with the purchase and erected his house. Now he has complained to the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman's statement in the copy of the letter reproduced on page 7 of his report refers to his discussion with me on the matter. While I do not take serious objection to his reporting of the discussion, it would be fair to say that my actual remarks were along the lines that the case had been considered on its merits and discretion had been exercised properly in line with the general policy. That is, the whole

point of the policy was to ensure that the discretion would be exercised not to grant an indirect water supply in such a case. I told the Ombudsman there was nothing in Mr. Smith's case to justify exercising the discretion any other way, particularly as Mr. Smith had been aware of the policy prior to purchase and building. I added that if I made an exception in such circumstances there would be no grounds on which to refuse any other applicant within a watershed area.

There have been instances where my discretion has been exercised differently. For example, all people who had applied for an indirect service or main extension prior to the introduction of the policy were granted indirect services. In instances where houses which had a supply of water lost the supply through resubdivision, indirect services were granted. That clearly shows that the department acted strictly in accordance with policy. The member for Fisher said that he knew many people who were planning to approach the Ombudsman on the very same matter. This indicates the need for a policy to hold the situation until we can determine a proper plan to control the matter and until the technical reports that I need are completed.

I now turn to the Kennedy matter. In July, 1969, an annual water licence was issued to two persons who it was later ascertained acted as managers of a property on behalf of a trust administered by an executor company. This licence authorised the diversion of water from Pike River to section 290, hundred of Paringa, for the irrigation of a maximum of about 17 hectares for the year ended June 30, 1970. It was subsequently renewed on application for the year ended June 30, 1971, for the same area. The property was offered for sale by auction but the reserve price was not reached. It was then sold on May 10, 1971, to a Mr. B. T. Kennedy acting for the Clovercrest Cattle Company, in which he holds an interest. Mr. Kennedy applied for the transfer of the licence and, following an inspection, the licence, in accordance with Government policy, was issued for the then current irrigated area of about 8 ha.

The sale of the property was made through a local agent. The matter was fully investigated by an investigating officer from the Attorney-General's Department and his report, together with all departmental documents, was made available to the Ombudsman. Members have the background, and it is now my intention to place in correct perspective the principal observations made by the Ombudsman. A starting point is this statement made on page 5 of the Ombudsman's report:

There is no doubt that substantial hardship has been suffered by Mr. Kennedy as the purchase was based on the assumption that a water licence to the full amount of acreage held by the previous owners would be issued to him.

True, Mr. Kennedy may well have paid more than the property was worth. If such a sale occurred now, it would appear he would have recourse under the Land and Business Agents Act, introduced by this Government, to guard against such occurrences. It may well be that he still has such recourse, but I am not aware whether he has considered this. As the matter stands, Mr. Kennedy has chosen to complain about the department, even though it is in no way responsible for his predicament. The department acted quite properly in the matter. It informed the trustee company and the agent of the transfer policy and would have informed Mr. Kennedy had he inquired.

Mr. McAnaney: That was prior to the sale.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. It could not have done more, as it did not know of Mr. Kennedy's existence in the matter until he had bought the property. Mr. Kennedy chose to rely upon representations of the agent and an employee of the trustee company. Copies of documents now in the possession of the department show that both had been advised of the policy applicable to transfers. The vendor's employee admits that Mr. Kennedy was advised by both of them that the transfer would be a mere formality. I am sure members agree that Mr. Kennedy would have been prudent to make this a condition of sale. This House should be made aware that the agent wrote a letter to the trustee company on April 12, 1971, which said a licence may be curtailed or cancelled if the full area is not irrigated, and this is now being enforced. Without the licence the block would be virtually worthless. The trustee company then wrote two letters to the agent. The first said:

The Engineering and Water Supply Department have informed us that they are aware of the position as regards the water licence on this property and if we sell the purchaser will have to reapply. At present the licence is for 41 acres.

The second referred to a proposed document containing the conditions of sale which the agent had submitted and instructed him as follows:

Delete reference to existing water licence for 41 acres as this licence is not transferable; however, mention of same can be made in your address prior to offering.

The agent later stated to the investigating officer:

When I auctioned the property and witnessed the contract of sale after the property had been withdrawn I did not know that the Engineering and Water Supply Department policy at that time was to issue a new water licence only for the acreage actually under irrigation at the time of property transfer.

He changed his mind when he was shown a copy of the letter he had written. All of this information and more was supplied to the Ombudsman. It should now be quite clear to all members that Mr. Kennedy did not suffer hardship as a result of the department's actions. The Ombudsman then raises the issue that, if Mr. Kennedy had paid a lower price for the property, the result would have been to transfer hardship to the vendor. This, in fact, did not occur and the only complainant in the matter is Mr. Kennedy. As I have said, the vendor was a trustee company. The company held the land in trust for a Mr. X whom the Ombudsman describes as mentally disadvantaged.

At this stage the correctness of the Ombudsman's statements resolves into just what factors should be taken into account in effecting transfers. This, of course, is a matter of Government policy. The Ombudsman refers to this on pages 2 and 3 of his report and specifically to two decisions which were made on December 9, 1968, and on May 29, 1969. The first was to the effect that I should consider the type and extent of planting when transfers of water diversion licences were proposed. The second said this could lead to hardship and gave me discretion to vary this procedure where I "think it proper". The Ombudsman makes this astonishing statement on page 3:

On October 20, 1970, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief issued an internal departmental administrative instruction wherein he directed officers that recommendations to the Minister should suggest that the discretion of the Minister be used to refuse transfer of water licences where there was no evidence of development of existing licences.

He told me such an instruction appeared incompatible with the Cabinet decision of May 29, 1969, but the Director saw no inconsistency. He also expressed this view in his report. The statement is astonishing,

because the Ombudsman's report is completely incorrect. The actual item was an internal instruction approved by the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, which read as follows:

I propose to instruct the Engineer for Irrigation and Drainage to cover future applications for reissue of licences with a report listing all the relevant details on actual plantings, date of issue of licence, and any other information which may assist in determining whether a reduction in the area of actual planting would cause hardship. The recommendation to the honourable Minister would suggest an acreage for the new licence which would be determined after taking account of all factors.

This is so different from the Ombudsman's statement that it is a matter for concern. As the departmental statement in no way conflicted with Cabinet policy it was not surprising that the Director and Engineer-in-Chief saw no inconsistency or that he was puzzled to find, like I was, that the Ombudsman did. While dealing with this, it is perhaps only fair to say that a misconception regarding the same point also occurred in the case of the investigating officer. On pages 7 and 8 of the Ombudsman's report he stated in a letter to the Premier:

I respectfully draw your attention to the fact that a previous independent investigation had been made by an investigating officer of the Attorney-General's office and he made the same recommendation which suffered a similar fate.

He continues:

Frankly I am staggered by such departmental intransigence.

At that stage he had already had copies of documents supplied to him, wherein the Crown Solicitor, to whom the report was addressed, had reviewed it and said that certain conclusions were erroneously made and that the recommendation was unwarranted. His attention was also drawn to this fact in my office, but he makes no mention of this in his report. This of course is important, for it is the reason both recommendations were, as he says, declined.

The principal reason the recommendation is in error is that the investigating officer also misquoted and misunderstood the internal instruction as being "Mr. Beaney approved a new policy that the reissue of licences to new owners of properties be considered on the basis of planted areas only and not on the full amount shown in the cancelled licence". He further stated that this new policy rescinded the Cabinet decision of May 29, 1969, which is of course incorrect. The essential part of all this, having disposed of the allegation against the department, is that I have the discretion to transfer the full extent of licences where I think this proper to avoid hardship. How then should hardship be considered?

The Ombudsman appears to have construed this very widely—indeed to the point where it occurs when anyone suffers a financial loss. Government policy on this is, as I have personally explained to the Ombudsman, that hardship for the purpose of affecting the transferable area of a water diversion licence is not established simply because a financial loss will be suffered. Financial loss is likely to occur in all instances where licensed areas are not developed and consequently reduced. If financial loss was accepted as the sole criterion all applications would have to be granted, licences would become a water right, and the very basis of the effective use of water resources would cease to exist. If I accepted one such case for special treatment I would in effect lose my discretion, as I would have no basis on which to refuse any other transfer. Hardship can only be considered where some unforeseen event occurs during ownership which suddenly changes the *status quo* and warrants special consideration.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't think you understand the meaning of the word "discretion". It is the ability to make a decision and—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has made his speech on this matter, and has the right to reply, when he can then tell the House in his wisdom what he thinks discretion is. However, I think I understand better than the honourable member does what discretion means, how it is to be applied, and when it is to be applied in this matter.

Mr. Millhouse: We will see about that.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has invited me to give this information to the House—

Mr. Millhouse: And I have been listening with attention.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I said, hardship can only be considered where some unforeseen event occurs during ownership which suddenly changes the *status quo* and warrants special consideration. It is neither practicable nor desirable to attempt to adjudicate on the wisdom of a particular investment made in property, the effectiveness of the employment of resources, or of management policy and practices. I said at the beginning that I had a long and frank discussion with the Ombudsman and that it appeared that his concern was not with Government policy but with the department's alleged actions, which he seemed to believe were depriving me of the opportunity of exercising discretion. I again state that, as shown, the department has properly followed confirmed Government policy. Indeed, had it done as requested by the Ombudsman, the effect would have been that I would have lost my discretionary power in both instances and in all other similar cases.

I was satisfied, following the discussions that I had with the Ombudsman, that I had clearly shown to him that the best way of destroying any policy was to breach it oneself. Clearly, I have demonstrated here today that both policies (the policy applying in the metropolitan watershed area, and the policy applying to River water licences) would have been breached had either of these applications been granted. The policies are well known: certainly, the policy in question is well known to people along the River. We have written to land agents and, in fact, I have had certain land agents reported to the Land Agents Board because, in certain cases, they have given false information about situations similar to this. I have pointed out that Mr. Kennedy may even have redress under recent amending legislation passed by this House. Further, I have clearly demonstrated that certain information, which was vital to the decisions made and which was conveyed to the Ombudsman, in some cases had been misunderstood or misconstrued, and in other cases it had not been reported to this House, and that I consider to be most serious.

Mr. BOUNDY secured the adjournment of the debate.

WRONGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 14. Page 474.)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I support this Bill. As the member for Mitcham pointed out in his explanation, it is a long time since the amounts which at present stand on the Statute Book as being capable of being awarded by way of solatium were fixed, and they were fixed, I think, under a Bill that was introduced by the present Premier as a private member in 1958. The amounts which the honourable member is suggesting in his

Bill, are, I think, about three times the existing amounts, and are a reasonable reflection of the changed value of currency since the previous amounts were fixed. I think that, if anything, I would take the view that even now the amounts may be under-stated to a certain extent, but I suppose that the increase is a substantial one to be made at one time, and the matter can be considered again, possibly next year, when we find out what happens in relation to the value of money generally.

It is important that from time to time Parliament review amounts of this kind. Many amounts in measures on the Statute Book are subject to regular review, but there is a tendency to overlook amounts that do not involve Government directly but merely create private rights. It is significant in this regard that the increases in 1958 and on this occasion are the result of a private member's Bill. Perhaps that points to the need for a more regular, periodic and systematic review of amounts of this kind on the Statute Book, and I intend to give attention to this matter.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

[Sitting suspended from 5.57 to 7.30 p.m.]

METROPOLITAN TAXI-CAB ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATE LOTTERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MOTOR FUEL DISTRIBUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 28. Page 744.)

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I support this Bill, which basically seeks to achieve two main objects, the first being to extend from October 1, 1974, to January 1, 1975, the period on the expiration of which the regulatory provisions of the principal Act come into operation, thus giving the board and applicants an opportunity to have licences and permits in order, as the Act requires, by January 1, 1975. However, I point out that, while this additional period has been provided by this Bill, it is important that applicants have their applications lodged by September 30. Just because this additional provision has been inserted by the Bill, applicants should not delay making their applications, as it is important that the applications be lodged by September 30.

The second main object of the Bill is to protect the interests of persons who could be disadvantaged by certain provisions in the Act as it now stands. The new provision will enable a lessee to apply for a licence or a permit if the owner does not make the application. As the Minister points out in the second reading explanation, it had been suggested to the Government that some owners of premises could refuse to apply for a licence for a lessee, thus putting the lessee in an impossible position.

The effect of this Bill will be to give the board more flexibility and more discretionary power. That is as I see it. To all intents and purposes, the Bill will amend the principal Act by giving the same consideration to the prescribed lessee (included in this Bill in the definition clause) as is given to the owner. There are two main provisions of the Bill. The first is in clause 4, which amends section 27 of the principal Act, and which extends the expiry date to January 1, 1975.

The second main provision is in clause 5, which amends section 29 of the principal Act in relation to the grant of a licence in respect of certain existing premises. This is the key protective clause for the prescribed lessee; it will enable prescribed lessees to be given the same consideration by the board as is given to the owners of premises. So, if the owner does not apply for a licence or permit on behalf of the prescribed lessee, the prescribed lessee can go directly to the board, make his application, and so remove any likelihood of blackmail by the owner standing over the lessee and demanding an increase in the percentage or interest paid for the use of the premises. The remaining clauses are virtually consequential on clause 5 and carry through the principle that the prescribed lessee be given exactly the same consideration as is given the owner of the premises.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I, too, support the Bill, and support fully the comments of the member for Chaffey. I think he has clearly pointed out that the purpose of the Bill is two-fold. The provisions are purely administrative matters correcting the Bill as originally presented to this House. It is fair to point out that the original Bill was discussed between 2 a.m. and about 3.30 a.m. one morning in this House, and on that occasion the Opposition pointed out to the Government that it was not a suitable time at which to debate the Bill. The very fact that we have another Bill on this subject presented to us this evening for consideration suggests it is about time the Government realised that we cannot pass good legislation in the early hours of the morning. I hope this is a good lesson for the Government for the future.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I do not object to the Bill but there is an area of its operation, which I should like to point out to the Minister, that concerns me somewhat: that, where a person seeks to have a licence as opposed to a permit, the department is saying that the principal part of his business must be petrol reselling. Some small storekeepers who supply petrol as part of their business and sell groceries and other things as another part of their business rely on petrol sales. I fear that, if we have these separate forms (a permit and a licence), it may be easy in the future for the big power movements, the petrol companies, to say to the Government, "These people do not sell much petrol; let us wipe them out. Let us do away with permits and have all licences. These people should rely on selling groceries for their livelihood." I air that fear now because that may occur in the future. There is no reason why that should happen, except that we may be benefiting the small person by enabling him to obtain a permit for \$10.

The intention of the original legislation was to give the small operator a cheaper way of selling petrol by allowing him to get a permit for \$10 instead of paying \$50 for a licence. It is that is the basis of the matter, I accept it, but, if these small people are to be told in the future, "Sorry, Jack; you can sell groceries and hardware but no petrol", I am afraid of it. The Government has asked the petrol companies to reduce outlets for selling petrol by 10 per cent, and the big combines have asked the Government to reduce the number of outlets even further. In the 10 per cent reduction that was made, the biggest percentage reduction was in the area of the small operator. If the petrol companies have their way, the little man will be kicked out even more in the future.

Although I support the Bill, I am airing my concern. It should be the duty of this Parliament to ensure that the small operator is protected, because on his ability to earn a living lies the real basis of our democracy. The

little man should be not be tied up in a monopolistic enterprise where he can be manipulated. I admire the small operator and want to see him protected. I support the Bill and ask the Government to consider the concern I have shown. If a person wishes to take out a licence, petrol selling should be looked at by the department as being not the principal part of his business but an important part of his business. At present, the board interprets the position as I have outlined.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I thank members for enabling the speedy passage of this Bill. I am pleased to have heard the member for Fisher at last support small businesses. The members of the board are responsible people who I am sure will look after the interest of small business men, and that is the intention of the Government. As the member for Chaffey has said, the passing of this measure will not in any way affect the requirement in this Act that owners of premises that have continuously operated as motor fuel outlets from December, 1972, will still have to apply for a permit or a licence not later than the last day of this month. Any potential applicant who believes that he qualifies for a licence or permit in respect of existing premises must ensure that his application is in the hands of the Motor Fuel Licensing Board before September 30. If a person does not apply by this time, he could be subject to a public hearing, the result of which may not necessarily be successful from his point of view. I suggest that anyone who believes he qualifies for a licence or a permit should immediately apply to the board.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved:

That the adjourned debate on the second reading of this Bill be now proceeded with.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): First, I wish to refer to the fishing industry which is vital to the State and support for which is being completely denied by the Government. The value of the produce of this industry to South Australia is greater than \$14 000 000. The Government has failed to promote actively the interests of fisheries in this State, since it has not filled certain offices in the Fisheries Department. The former Director of Fisheries has been promoted sideways to the position of Director of Fisheries Research. So quickly was that transfer accomplished that the position of Director of Fisheries was left completely vacant; indeed, in the interim, until Executive Council saw fit to appoint as Acting Director of Fisheries the person that it had made Director of Fisheries Research, no activities could proceed in the Fisheries Department.

Although this matter goes back some time, there has still been no appointment to the vital position of Director of Fisheries. At the same time as he is responsible for research, the Director of Fisheries Research has been called on to fulfil the role of Acting Director of Fisheries. It is untenable that at a time when this industry requires Government support and assistance in research the Director of Fisheries Research is not able to perform his duties on a full-time basis. If it is not possible to make an appointment to the position of Director of Fisheries from all the applications that have been received, surely it is reasonable that the Government should appoint as Director the person who has satisfactorily performed the duties for a long time and who has filled this role previously. Then another person could be sought for the position of Director of

Fisheries Research. For a long time there has been a cry for a suitable vessel to be fitted out to undertake fishing research. There has also been a call for adequate breakwater facilities in the South-East. Indeed, when this project was promoted to the people of South Australia, and particularly to those in the South-East, before the March, 1973, election, we were told that it was not a feasible proposition.

Mr. Coumbe: It couldn't be done!

Dr. EASTICK: That is so. We were told that this was an area that would not receive Government support in any circumstances for 15 or 20 years, if then. It is surprising to note that that project has now been referred to the Public Works Standing Committee. In other words, once more the Government has done a complete about face regarding this matter, which is of such vital importance to the people of Port MacDonnell. Three weeks ago I had the opportunity of discussing with the Board of Directors of the Australian Bight Fishing Industry at Port Lincoln the problem they face regarding the prawn industry, the annual turnover of which has increased to about \$3 000 000.

Mr. Chapman: Does the Fisheries Department in South Australia know that there is a prawn fishing industry?

Dr. EASTICK: One could certainly question that at times, as there have been many different approaches regarding the subject. Indeed, there has been a refusal to help people who know that they can catch prawns in large numbers in Commonwealth waters. These people are prevented from selling those prawns on the South Australian market, merely because the South Australian Government will not try to determine responsibilities regarding Commonwealth and State waters. However, that is another matter. I should like briefly to refer to the situation obtaining at Port Lincoln. This industry, whose product is highly regarded not only here but also overseas, is indeed a vital one. However, like so many other industries in Australia, it is suffering because of the alterations in tariff policies and the Commonwealth Government's failure to provide adequate protection where it is needed.

In this respect I am asking not for financial protection but for the Government to ensure that products permitted to come into Australia to compete with our own products are of a value and quality that will allow a reasonable price structure to be maintained. At present, there is no control on the quality of prawns allowed into Australia from South Korea and other areas to the north; there is no clear indication of their water content. Indeed, the quality, and therefore the value, of the product that has been permitted to enter Australia is destroying the local industry, which employs many people. Indeed, about 60 people are employed regularly on a casual basis at the Port Lincoln works of the Australian Bight Fishing Industry; most of the women come from Housing Trust and other areas of Port Lincoln.

This decentralised industry is under attack because of the introduction from overseas of low-quality goods. This is preventing the Australian industry from functioning as it has proved it would be capable of functioning but for the cost value situation, which is at present causing concern. The same industry is also vitally concerned in relation to ecological studies in the Redcliff area in the upper Gulf region and the problems that it foresees regarding the nursery grounds of the prawn industry. The Opposition will accept, only when it sees it, that the provision to be written into the Red Cliff indenture Bill could conceivably cover these points.

It is interesting to note the speed with which the Government backs off from the crunch date in relation to the Redcliff project. It is almost like a serial for one to see so many decisions being made that have created a climate conducive to tying up the ecological problems associated with the indenture Bill. Despite this, one sees from yesterday's press that such words cannot be reduced into a meaningful legal interpretation that is satisfactory to the Crown Law office. Undoubtedly we will hear more about that later.

The last matter with which I wish to deal relates to the activities that have taken place for some time regarding Williamstown school. On August 10, 1971, I asked the Minister of Education when it was intended that an under-pass from the Williamstown school to the school oval on the opposite side of the Lyndoch to Chain of Ponds Main Road No. 96 would be constructed. I explained that the road from Lyndoch to Chain of Ponds traversed the original grant of land made available to the school and, in effect, dissected the schoolgrounds. I also said that, because of the terrain in this area (there being a hill close to the gateway from the schoolyard) speeding traffic came over the brow of the hill and on to the school crossing before drivers realised that the crossing existed. The member for Tea Tree Gully (formerly the member for Barossa) made representations to the former Ministers of Education, Mr. Coumbe and Mrs. Steele. It was understood that an inquiry was being undertaken to try to solve the problem and that an under-pass would be constructed as a result of amendments to the Local Government Act, the costs to be shared between the Government and the local council. On March 25, 1971, the Acting Assistant Superintendent of Primary Education wrote to the Secretary of the primary school committee, as follows:

The Public Buildings Department has been contacted concerning the progress of this project. Advice has been received that the architect and consultants have agreed on their recommendations, and these are being considered by a senior officer. The findings will be reported to the Education Department shortly, and I will advise you of them.

On May 4, 1971, the same officer wrote to the secretary of the school committee, as follows:

This is to confirm information given to you by telephone on May 3 concerning the construction of an under-pass at the Williamstown Primary School. The Public Buildings Department advises that funds for this project will be available this week. This will enable tenders to be called and work to proceed. The department is unable to give any indication of the date of tender call or the date of completion at this stage.

On July 7, 1971, I wrote to the Director, Public Buildings Department, as follows:

I would appreciate advice on the date on which tenders were called and/or closed in relation to an under-pass on the Lyndoch-Chain of Ponds Main Road No. 96 adjacent to the Williamstown school. Information relative to the schedule for commencement and completion would also be appreciated.

The Secretary of the department replied, on August 3, 1971, as follows:

The matter of providing safe access to the oval for children attending the school has been given consideration by this department at the request of the Education Department. A firm of consultant engineers commissioned by this department has investigated the various proposals put forward to overcome the problem, and a report has been forwarded to the Director-General of Education on the feasibility of various schemes, and favouring, for reasons of cost, the construction of an under-pass. I am not in a position, therefore, at this stage to give an authoritative answer to your question. However, the matter of providing safe access for children of the school is under active

consideration, and as soon as a decision has been reached as to the best means of achieving this, appropriate action will be taken.

I point out now, as I did on an earlier occasion, the variations in the replies received from within the same department. The Minister, in reply to the question, was able to answer with some knowledge of the matter because I had, prior to asking my question, informed his office of my intention to do so. The Minister replied:

A request for the provision of an under-pass near the Williamstown school has been in existence since 1967. Hitherto, the responsibility for bearing the cost of the construction has rested with the District Council of Barossa. That council has been unable to carry out the work because of the lack of funds, but, under a new Government policy on finance relating to, amongst other things, school crossings and pedestrian over-passes and under-passes announced last Friday by the Minister of Roads and Transport, the Government will now pay two-thirds of the cost of construction with the remaining one-third being paid by the local council. I understand that the estimate for the under-pass at Williamstown is \$6 500 and that negotiations will now take place with the District Council of Barossa in the light of the new policy.

It took some time before the necessary legislation passed through the House! Initially, its passage was delayed in another place because of the ridiculous attitude adopted by the present Minister of Local Government in bringing forward a Bill that tied up many useful amendments to the Local Government Act, including this one, with an attitude in relation to franchise. Because of that delay, the chance to implement this programme was held over but, as soon as the legislation passed through the House, I made a further application to the Minister. I also wrote to the district council, which has had standing in its loan account for about two years its proportion of the money required to construct this vital under-pass.

It was recognised and stated by the authorities that the danger of the site required that an under-pass be constructed. The information made available subsequently was that the Highways Department refused to construct the under-pass, because it believed that entry to it was restricted by the narrow verge adjacent to the roadway, the school and the oval. So, on April 5, 1974, I wrote to the Minister of Education, and today I received a reply from him. I had telephoned the Minister's office in the interim. The Minister's reply states:

I refer to your letter of April 5, concerning the provision of an under-pass from the grounds of the Williamstown Primary School to an oval on the opposite side of main road 96.

I had suggested that the Education Department might make available a small area of land on both sides of the road to vest in the Highways Department so that there would be an adequate entry to the under-pass. The Minister's letter continues:

The matter was referred to the Public Buildings Department, which arranged for an inspection of the site by the Survey Branch. This inspection confirmed that the existing means of crossing the road between the schoolgrounds and the sports grounds presents a danger to the schoolchildren. This was known back in 1967, when the applications were first made by the member for Tea Tree Gully (then the member for Barossa). The Minister's letter continues:

The officers making the report considered that an under-pass is unwarranted—notwithstanding that it was the department's own authority that said that it was necessary for an under-pass to be constructed at this site, yet now says that an under-pass is unwarranted—but that barrier and/or flashing school crossing lights should be installed as an alternative which would alleviate the

danger of children running down a steep path from the classrooms straight on to the road, and would also give warning to motorists.

How one would adequately give warning to the motorists when they must come over a rise immediately before the crossing and therefore could easily miss seeing the crossing ahead, I do not know. The Minister's letter continues:

Provision of barriers and/or flashing school crossing lights should be initiated in the first instance by an approach from the school council to the District Council of Barossa. So it is right back into the district council's hands to provide this facility! The Minister's letter continues:

The Education Department has no direct control over the type of crossing erected on any road, though it is represented on the Road Safety Council and maintains close liaison with the Road Traffic Board. The type of crossing erected on any roadway in South Australia is controlled by the Road Traffic Board. The report also recommended that the existing education programme on road safety at the school be stepped up to ensure safer crossing by the students. This programme would include the training of reliable students to monitor the crossing and the stationing of a teacher on duty there at the beginning and end of the lunch period and any other necessary time. The report will now be sent to the Regional Director, Central Region, for his attention and appropriate action.

It is high time the Minister of Education and those who support him in the various departments examined this docket completely and put into effect the provisions that they agreed in 1967 were essential for the benefit of the schoolchildren at Williamstown. I sincerely hope that within the next week the Minister or some other authority will accept the responsibility that successive Ministers have agreed to since 1967.

Mr. Coumbe: That goes back to Mr. Loveday's time.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes. We want to see this necessary under-pass constructed without further delay.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I wish to raise a matter that concerns the average young couple who want to buy their own home. Earlier today I asked the Minister in charge of housing a question relating to page 319 of the Auditor-General's Report. The Minister said that he had no knowledge of a scheme submitted to the Government by the Housing Trust to help overcome some problems related to the unduly low rents of the Housing Trust. On August 27 (at *Hansard*, page 683) the Minister said:

I try to keep as much information as I can in the House so that I can have it readily available for members. Surely, if there is one thing a Minister should have (if not in writing at least stored in his mind) it is the detail of a scheme submitted to the Government with the intention of saving more than \$2 000 000 a year, yet the Minister denied any knowledge of it in the House today. The Auditor-General's Report was laid on the table of this House yesterday, and it may have been in the hands of Government members before that, although I cannot be sure of that. In the report there are not many pages dealing with the Housing Trust. How long would it take for the Minister to read those pages? To help him, I point out that the section to which I am referring is printed in bold type. I shall quote the section so that people can judge whether the Minister should have known of the submission. The section in the Auditor-General's Report is as follows:

Overall the table reveals a further decline in the operating results of rental properties by \$483 000 to a deficit of \$1 813 000 in 1973-74. The overall deficit on rental dwellings was \$2 201 000 (up \$695 000). A factor contributing to this large and increasing deficit has been the failure during the recent years to relate rentals more closely to operating costs. A general rent increase was approved by the Government effective from March 30, 1974, with increases ranging from 50c to \$1.50 per week but not applying to certain pensioner tenants.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I told you about that. I am responsible for that.

Mr. EVANS: Yes; the Minister told us that rentals had increased by between the price of one bottle of beer and that of three bottles of beer. The section in the Auditor-General's Report continues:

The rentals of many houses are still unduly low—some only \$7.50 per week even for "full income" families. Certain rentals are increased on re-allotment, following vacancies. During the year these "vacancy rents" were also increased and are substantially higher than the rents being paid by other "older" tenants for similar accommodation. A scheme proposed by the trust to overcome such anomalies and the unduly low rents has not been approved by the Government.

That scheme was put to the Government this year. The Minister responsible, or his predecessor at least, took it to a Cabinet meeting. So, at least someone in the Government knows that a scheme was submitted to save this State \$2 000 000, but the Minister says "No".

The Hon. J. D. Hopgood: If it was not his responsibility he wouldn't know, would he?

Mr. EVANS: I hope he would know. I would hope that the Minister would not take over the responsibilities of a department without looking back at major recommendations. Any Minister who suggests that recommendation for saving \$2 000 000 is not a major recommendation is not fit to hold office. If the Minister is as keen on Royal Commissions as is his colleague, I ask him to investigate the Housing Trust rental system. A letter I have received says:

I was pleased to see a report of your criticism of Housing Trust rented homes and the low rents paid in many cases.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You could raise this matter when the lines are being debated.

Mr. EVANS: This is a grievance against a Minister who has admitted that he lacked the opportunity to accept the responsibility for an area of major concern to the State.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: What you mean is that I am not omniscient.

Mr. EVANS: The letter also says:

Unfortunately the public is fickle and memory fades quickly in the ever changing hurly burly.

The writer asks the following:

Did you know that during the past year the trust has purchased over 500 houses from private sellers in the cheaper range, mostly about and below \$15 000, renovated them and let them also?

I do not believe that the writer of the letter is accurate in connection with the figure of \$15 000. The Minister has told me recently that up to \$24 000 or \$25 000 has been paid for that type of house. The letter continues:

Did you know that about half of the houses rented out by the trust are let at around \$8 or less per week? That tenants in Housing Trust homes have them painted inside and outside every four years without cost to the tenants? That many of these homes have been occupied by tenants for several years and that rents have only been increased by about 75c weekly over that time, although most of the tenants would now be drawing more than double the wages they drew when they first took over the house? Remember, tenants do not pay any rates, taxes or house insurance.

The letter concludes:

Do you think it is fair that the State (that means you) should carry the burden? It is hard to rent privately below \$25. Surely the schoolteachers, bank clerks and other well paid young people, and some not so young, are getting unjustified benefits at the expense of the taxpayer. They form some of the tenants but there are plenty of others in the trades and professions equally well off who should have to pay a fair thing. We are promised all sorts of increased taxes. What about some justice for all?

Another person sent a letter to me regarding a report in the *Sunday Mail*. That letter states:

I have noted Miss Coventry's article regarding the lady with truck driver husband with \$54 take-home pay, saying she was lucky to have a trust house at \$7.50 a week. How lucky she is because really her husband's take-home pay is \$68, plus a tax gain of approximately \$3, which equals \$71 a week. We "own" our own house, valued at \$10 000, which would be the sale value of the average trust home.

This was back in 1972. The letter continues:

We pay \$7 a week interest on a \$4 000 mortgage (we have never been able to save to reduce this mortgage) and have \$6 000 of our own money invested in the house, which would equal a further \$10.50 interest.

That relates to the interest rate in those times, not at present. The letter continues:

Add to this rates, taxes, insurances—\$2 a week, plus painting and repairs to maintain our asset, about \$2 a week (try doing it for less). Add this up and we find our rent is \$21.50 a week. Therefore this lady is \$14 a week better off than we are! The only way we have managed for the past 20 years is that I've had to work long hours of overtime which at the age of 49 has ruined my health.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's only young.

Mr. EVANS: She may be young, but she sees the injustice of the present system of rentals. I am not attacking areas in which there is an urgent need to help people in low-income groups. It is the purpose and function of the Housing Trust to help them, but the trust is not operating in that field in the way its original charter intended. I received a letter in June, 1973, from a welfare officer, a social worker, and that letter states:

I wish to support strongly your recent statement, reported in the press, regarding a means test for tenants of State-supplied rental housing. I am a social worker involved in work with low-income families in the Port Adelaide area ... I wish to emphasise the following two means of increasing the supply of low-rental state housing:

(1) As has been suggested, regular means testing of all tenants of State housing, taking into account any significant long-term increases in income or changes in family composition.

(2) Increased State interest in, and expenditure on buying, renovating and maintaining already existing housing, rather than a single concentration on building new homes. I am aware of the work being done in this area within the State Government's urban renewal scheme, but stress that a far greater effort is needed to meet the demand. I hope that you will continue to pressure for more realistic means of meeting the ever-increasing demand for low-rental State supplied housing.

That welfare officer makes the same point. She knows the injustice that exists in the Housing Trust sector. Another welfare worker wrote to me, stating:

Thank you very much for your public statement about the need for a means test for people in low-rental homes. I am aware the problem is complex and involves changing the South Australian Housing Trust Act.

I do not think that that is so. The letter continues:

But it is tremendous to see that the housing committee is looking into this.

That was a reference to the Liberal Party housing committee. The letter continues:

I believe that a continuous means test applies to some Victorian Housing Trust tenants and that after their income reaches a certain amount they are asked to leave. Could this possibly be looked at in relation to South Australia? I have urged other social workers as well who were glad to see your statement to express their support for your stand.

I have never advocated that these people should be put out of their houses, and I hope to express my view on that matter later. I have other letters and do not wish to read them all, but I wish to refer to one in particular.

Dated August 11, 1974, it states:

You are to be commended on your remarks regarding the Housing Commission and peppercorn rents. I feel that you would be doing the right thing if the matter was brought up for debate in the House. I myself, have talked to people living in a trust home.

That person states that he believes that the advantage goes towards the low-income groups and he goes on to give examples of which he has knowledge. He states:

A divorcee of three years, her three sons now married, lives in a three-bedroom unit. She has applied for a smaller unit at least two years ago, no result. Next door, the family there have an estimated weekly income of \$450 with the husband, wife and three sons all working. Another case of a man who runs his own business and employs staff. He has enjoyed the low rents and no maintenance bills for over 35 years. My own sister, aged 73, her husband, deceased September, 1972, her two sons, now married and in their own homes, applied for a smaller unit. After two years a spokesman for the commission informed her they had a unit suitable, "but she'd have to move in by Monday". This was on the Friday. Her lads could not be contacted before late Saturday and early Sunday respectively. Both were willing to help during the week as my sister could not afford professional men, being on the pension. She went to the commission and was told the unit would go to some other person more keen to move.

I have raised this matter many times. I have no doubt that the submission that the Housing Trust made to the Government to alter the system was along the lines of having a means test, and the submission was rejected.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: There's a means test now.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister knows that the means test operates only in the initial stages. For the Minister's benefit, let us consider what other people are doing. I will leave the rental section, because the same system regarding interest on loans or rentals on houses for the low-income groups is being started. Recently the Minister in charge of housing in this State stated that the money from the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement to be made available at low interest to certain sections of the community would be made available at 4½ per cent interest. The Minister also stated:

This is 4½ per cent interest money which has been raised by the Australian Government at, I suppose, somewhere near the long-term bond rate, namely, 9½ per cent. Let us think about that. The remainder of the community is paying the extra 5½ per cent on that money so that it can be offered to a low-income group. I have no objection to that, but men of 20 years, 21 years, or of whatever age, are in the low-income group at one stage and in a business-like or professional way promote themselves to a position where they can be even members of Parliament or Cabinet Ministers, yet they have money at the low interest rate of 4½ per cent for the rest of the term. The system is ridiculous, and the same thing is being done in the Commonwealth sphere.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What about war service loans?

Mr. EVANS: I respect persons who made a commitment to save this country. Some of them have nerve problems and other problems. Few persons who served in war came back without some disadvantage.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They didn't have to go away.

Mr. EVANS: Thank God they did.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I said that they didn't have to.

Mr. EVANS: I know that. I do not attack that system, because there is only a limited number in it. If the system to be set up involved a means test, I would not object, and I do not believe that returned servicemen would object, either. This scheme is being established in 1974, and I refer

to the big disadvantages that will apply to one section of the community and the great advantages that will accrue to another section under this scheme. Nevertheless, that is the Commonwealth Government's approach at this stage, and our State Minister is backing the Commonwealth Government by saying that he supports it. I do not. Indeed, I believe that that system is dangerous and gives one citizen a distinct advantage over his fellow citizen, regardless of what his future prospects and prosperity may be. In a recent reply to me about Housing Trust rentals, the Minister in charge of housing said:

On the management side, the trust is aware that some people with quite high family incomes stay on in its houses. However, the trust makes the following comments:

If a family is paying the rent it agreed to pay and in other ways is fulfilling its tenancy obligations, it is well nigh impossible and is probably undesirable to use coercion for that family to move. In fact, the trust does discuss the possibility of moving with many of its tenants and offers alternative suggestions according to circumstances.

I support that. I never said that these people should be kicked out. I seek only that they pay the normal rent applying generally in the community for that style of home for a person on the average income or above. If the people concerned cannot do that, or if they do not wish to buy the house, I would offer to sell it to them on a low deposit and at a reasonable interest rate. If they will not accept one of those alternatives, they should try to find themselves other accommodation, or such accommodation should be found for them. There is nothing unfair about that. The Minister further said:

If rents increase with income, it would equally be necessary for them to decrease with the income;

I agree with that, as long as the decrease is not below the average income rate. I seek only that the normal rental applying in the community be paid by people receiving the average income or higher income. If a person received double the average income and then his income fell, he should still pay the normal rental prevailing within the community for the type of housing he has obtained. The Minister continued:

Frequently families go through a period of relatively low income, then, while the children are working, have a relatively high family income which again drops when the children leave home. Frequent measuring of family income on a means test basis can be difficult.

It is not difficult when we let them in. Indeed, it is easy. We just ask people to state their income and they are in, and that is it, but periodic means tests are still necessary. Further, there is no way that society can continue supporting the system we have at present, where some people earning over \$30 000 annually are renting trust houses at a rental of less than \$12 a week. Society cannot support that situation, nor can it support a Minister who denies any knowledge of a scheme brought up by the responsible body to solve that problem and save the State \$2 200 000.

I now refer to the increasing costs of housing, an area in which the Minister recently has challenged me. On August 27 (at page 682 of *Hansard*), in reply to a Dorothy Dixier question from one of his colleagues the Minister said:

I know that he has stated previously in relation to the trust in particular and housing in general that housing costs over a specific period increased by 40 per cent, and I have an itemised list from the trust that shows that for the first half of this year, or one month less than the period to which the honourable member has referred, the cost increased by exactly 25.4 per cent,

First, I have never referred to a six-month period or a seven-month period as suggested. Indeed, I referred to a

period from April 29, 1973, to April 23, 1974, and the figures I quoted were the figures used by the building industry for indexing and for giving an idea to builders on the amounts they should charge. The increases comprised award increases of \$3 435 on an average 14-square home which, at the beginning of that period, was worth \$15 400. Increases in the cost of materials were \$1 288. So, award increases in respect of wages comprised about 300 per cent of the increase in the cost of the material. Increases resulting from Government legislation amounted to \$1 076. So, the Government has applied an increase of over \$1 000 on the cost of an average home, yet the Government says it is trying to protect the consumer! I refer now to the record of this Government, as it is referred to in a press report of October 18, 1973, as follows:

Mr. Dunstan said yesterday he was deeply concerned at the continued rise in South Australian building costs. In July this year, costs rose by 2.8 per cent. Only Brisbane, which had a rise of 2.9 per cent, was higher. The national average increase for July was 1.8 per cent.

In 1973, the increase was running at 8.4 per cent more for the 12 months ended July. The Premier then wanted an inquiry into building costs, but what is the situation today? I refer to an *Advertiser* report of September 6, as follows:

The increase in cost of materials for the 12 months to the end of June for Adelaide was also the highest of all cities of 24.9 per cent.

The Minister says there is no problem, and the Premier, who sits pat and holds an inquiry in every other field, is not willing to inquire into the housing industry. The South Australian record is its worst since 1947. The production of trust homes had never dropped below 1 700 until 1972-73, when only 1 618 homes were built. In 1973-74, according to the Auditor-General, the number has dropped to 1 339. That is the worst figure on record, yet the price we are paying for these houses is the highest on record.

I believe that the cost of housing in South Australia has increased by 40 per cent over 12 months. Be that from April to April, June to June, July to July, or August to August, members will find that to be an accurate figure. At one time South Australia enjoyed the best housing at the lowest cost of any State. However, in the last two years, the costs of housing in South Australia have been either the highest or second highest in Australia. What sort of record is this for a Government that proclaims its concern about housing. In 1962, when speaking on this subject (at page 1244 of *Hansard*), Frank Walsh said:

If legislation is passed to enable people to own their own houses, they will become better citizens through having an interest in them. It is another stake in the country. I believe in house ownership and, if we can give people an opportunity to own their own houses, let us do it.

What would he think of those who followed him, that man who worked for the worker, fought for the worker, and believed in the cause of the average citizen? The Government sits pat; what does it do? It sees the position drift until we now have the worst housing record of any State in Australia, and have had for the last two years. We have a Minister who says he does not even know what is going on in his department! What the Deputy Premier said when I started my speech was that I could say all this on the first line, but there is a real grievance in the housing situation in this State, and the Government and the Minister stand condemned for their lack of interest and concern in trying to solve the problem for the average person who desires to own his own house as a stake in our community.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): These occasions when one can raise a matter of some grievance do not come very frequently in each session of Parliament. When they do, they are treated seriously and the opportunity is taken advantage of by most members. I recall in the past speaking on various matters, one being the Nurses War Memorial Centre. When I spoke last in a similar debate, there was some difficulty in deciding on a suitable site, the Government having acquired the land originally proposed to be used as the site for the Nurses War Memorial Centre; but the Government shilly-shallied about it. Following a grievance debate like this, a firm decision was made, and we now find that the centre is almost ready to be opened, occupied, and fully operational on Dequetteville Terrace. It has become traditional for me on these occasions to speak about the conditions in various hospitals in this State, and I intend to do that now.

Mrs. Byrne: I suppose you are going to talk about Glenside.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, and I hope the member for Tea Tree Gully does not end up in either Glenside or Hillcrest. I cannot for the life of me see why she should. I say that because I am in a charitable frame of mind this evening.

Mr. Payne: Tell us what your mob did about conditions at Glenside.

Dr. TONKIN: Obviously, the member for Mitchell does not recall what I have said in the past, because I have been careful to point out that the mental hospitals in this State have been the Cinderellas—

Mr. Payne: You haven't put the blame on either side, so far.

Dr. TONKIN: —whether a Liberal or a Labor Government has been in power.

Mr. Payne: You finally got around to it.

Dr. TONKIN: I do wish the honourable member would stop interjecting. Anyway, he is not worth worrying about.

Mr. McAnaney: Didn't a Labor Government knock back Commonwealth money between 1965 and 1968?

Dr. TONKIN: Because they made such a mess of their budgeting, saying that they could not find the matching funds. I have previously spoken at some length on the conditions that patients have to suffer at both Glenside and Hillcrest Hospitals, and again I make the point that conditions at Glenside are no better than they were when I spoke on this matter two years ago. Once again, the staff and the staff association, led by Mr. Fehlandt are having to make public the conditions that exist at Glenside, the shocking conditions of which I am fully aware. It is a hospital that I know very well: it is in the heart of my electoral district, and I have served there as a honorary medical officer. I have visited it on many occasions and know that it is nothing of which this State can be proud.

It is an appalling institution, and I must say I was pleased to receive from the Minister of Works a statement, in answer to a question I asked during the Loan Estimates debate, that money is to be spent on upgrading the electrical reticulation system, on the Cleland House renovations, and on finalising the building of the out-patients department. In particular, I am pleased to learn that provision is being made for the expenditure of \$280 000 "to enable the commencement of work on the new psychiatric sub-acute wards for which tenders have been called. Work on site is programmed to start in November, 1974, and it is anticipated that the project will be completed by March, 1976."

I am pleased to hear that, but it still does not help the plight of those people in Glenside in the old blocks, people who sit and sleep in cramped conditions, who share male and female outdoor toilets and have no privacy, who live in the most degrading situation. All I can say is that it is nothing of which either Party can be proud. I wish something could be done right now before the estimated completion time of March, 1976, to improve those conditions. I will continue to support the staff of Glenside, who feel impelled to bring these conditions to public notice and attention. All honour to them for doing so, because they certainly cannot be proud of the conditions under which they have to care for patients.

There has been some rivalry because the dividing line is the Torrens River: the area north of the Torrens is served by Hillcrest Hospital, whereas the area to the south of the Torrens is served by Glenside Hospital. Hillcrest Hospital, being of a rather more modern standard than Glenside Hospital (after all, it is only about 80 years old, I think, from memory) is not much better. The conditions there (again, conditions with which I am well acquainted) are little better than those at Glenside. I must say they are better, but there has been some rivalry between the staffs of each institution, because both staffs feel equally impelled to bring these rather primitive conditions to the attention of the public. I have supported, too, the staff of Hillcrest Hospital (medical, nursing, and lay) because they are not proud of the conditions under which they have to care for their patients, and I wish something could be done to alleviate their problems immediately.

Having spent this time in the past dealing with these appalling conditions in our mental hospitals, I now wish to come to my major point: what has happened to the new Northfield wards of the Royal Adelaide Hospital? No-one seems to know. I refer to a newspaper report dated February, 1973. Again, it was left to the staff of the Northfield wards to bring to the attention of the public the conditions existing in that part of the institution. The article states:

Buildings of the Northfield wards of the Royal Adelaide Hospital were seriously dilapidated, hospital staff claimed yesterday. They said floors were uneven, plaster and paint was flaking from walls and ceilings, and the electrical wiring was in danger of overload.

This report resulted from a meeting of about 150 sisters, nurses, and domestics employed at the hospital with representatives of the Public Service Association and of the Australian Government Workers Association. Later, the report states:

Staff thought that it was their duty to speak up for patients about conditions at the hospital.

Once again, all power to them! The following day (February 16) the then Minister of Health (Hon. A. J. Shard) said that a \$20 000 000 redevelopment of the Northfield wards of the Royal Adelaide Hospital was being planned. Hallelujah was the cry of the staff. The sum of \$20 000 000 would go some way towards making conditions as they should be. A newspaper report dated February 16, 1973, stated:

Plans for the \$5 000 000 first stage of the 10-year project were being made.

This lost its lustre a little when we realised that the project would be over 10 years, but that was reasonable. The report continued:

Mr. Shard was commenting on the action of 150 staff members at the hospital who protested on Monday about the "dilapidated condition of the wards" and called on Mr. Shard for "immediate action" . . . Mr. Shard said the first stage of the redevelopment would provide 200 nursing home beds together with day-hospital and domiciliary-care facilities.

These are all aims with which I fully agree, as these are all badly needed facilities in our community. On April 11, 1973, a further report in the *Advertiser* stated that the State would need substantial Commonwealth grants for redevelopment of the dilapidated Northfield wards. This was the opinion of the Public Service Association and the Australian Government Workers Association, representatives of which went in a deputation to the new Minister of Health (Hon. D. H. L. Banfield). Mr. Banfield said that he hoped redevelopment of the wards would begin in the following year. There certainly was a fuss about the matter. I must say the Minister of Health at the time was particularly sympathetic, as he has been in relation to most of the complaints about the position at Glenside and Hillcrest Hospitals. In explaining the Loan Estimates introduced on August 9, 1973, under the heading "Certain other projects" (which I am sure honourable members will recall), the Treasurer stated:

There are two other projects which the Government considers urgent. One is redevelopment of Glenside Hospital at an estimated total cost of \$4 000 000. The first stage of the scheme ...would require an expenditure of \$360 000. The other project is a major redevelopment of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, Northfield wards, in three stages, estimated to cost \$17 000 000 at current prices. The first stage would include erection of a 200-bed nursing home. These projects have not yet been referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and no provision has been made in the Loan Estimates for their financing.

I have commented recently on the ridiculous situation of a Budget that is not really a Budget and Loan Estimates that are not really Loan Estimates. On August 14, 1973, I said that the projects had not been referred to the Public Works Committee and no provision had been made for their financing. I pointed out that this seemed to be window dressing designed to damp down the concern expressed by the staff of the hospital, who had taken the trouble to have meetings, bring in union representatives, and meet the Minister at deputations. As a result of the concern expressed, the Government had to make a gesture, so it made a reference in the Loan Estimates to redevelopment of the Northfield wards, although it had no intention of proceeding with that project. Although I understand that the first stage of the work has now gone to the Public Works Committee, where are the 200 beds of the Northfield wards redevelopment? This was a fantasy of the Government.

Mr. Mathwin: Will it come to pass?

Dr. TONKIN: At present, it is showing no signs of coming to pass. According to my information, demolition of ward 4D, which contains about 50 geriatric beds in almost primitive conditions was to take place in February, 1974, being replaced by two 100-bed units for long-term geriatric patients. About 18 months ago, everyone said that this was wonderful. Earthworks were to commence in February, 1974, following demolition of the existing building; construction was to begin in June this year. However, there is absolutely no sign of anything happening. No reference is made anywhere in the Loan Estimates to a sum for this project. There are still more than 100 geriatric patients living in the same dilapidated, dangerous, and degrading situation.

I believe that the Commonwealth Government also deserves some censure for this, because it obviously calls the tune when it comes to placing priorities on works. It does not place much priority on caring for 100 or, potentially, 200 elderly geriatric patients who desperately need care. These people cannot afford to stay in nursing homes. Some people are being looked after in nursing homes at a loss to

the proprietors of those homes who do not have the heart to send them out into the community. Hospital beds are being taken up by geriatric patients, who should be looked after in geriatric beds, that should be used for acute hospital cases. With such vast sums being made available to this State as special grants for the construction of community health centres and the introduction of the Australian assistance plan, why is the Commonwealth Government so disinclined to look after the invalid elderly? It has money to spend elsewhere when it wants to.

If one looks at the location of community health centres, one can see that the Commonwealth has a fair eye on the electoral advantage to be gained. I believe this a fairly miserable state of affairs. Certain people in our community are being imposed on as a result of the cynical, totally political, and ideological attitude of the Australian Labor Party. This Government and the Commonwealth Government deserve censure for their failure to proceed with this work. A promise was made about this, and how more binding can a promise be than a promise made in the Loan Estimates that a project will be undertaken if at all possible?

Mrs. Byrne: Aren't you in favour of these works?

Dr. TONKIN: I can think of priorities along far more useful lines. I would like to see money now being spent on making Parliament House into a shambles perhaps spent instead on making life a little more civilised for people at the Glenside and Hillcrest Hospitals and at the Northfield wards of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. I would willingly go without some of the guff that is being put into this building if I thought those people could live a more civilised life and be looked after in a better manner as a result. The Government deserves to be censured. I hope it wakes up and does something positive about these appalling conditions while it still has a shred of conscience left.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I will be brief, having already participated in this debate. Initially, I draw attention to the Highways Department and particularly its operations on Brighton Road, the work on which has taken a long time but which is nearing completion in my district and will continue in that of the member for Hanson. Having visited the area many times and spoken to the foreman and other workmen on the site, I know that the gang working on Brighton Road has indeed been considerate to people living on Brighton Road and to those who have small businesses thereon. Road builders rely on many organisations, particularly the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the Postmaster-General's Department, and, whenever hold-ups have occurred, those organisations have done their best to help. Despite these hold-ups, the gang working on this road has done an excellent job. I only hope that if the Highways Department sees fit to undertake other work in my district, particularly on, say, Morphet Road, the same gang will be transferred to such work.

We have had problems with stobie poles. When the work was being done on Brighton Road, it would have been a marvellous opportunity for the Government to implement its policy of putting underground as many electricity supplies as possible. Unfortunately, however, when I asked the Minister if this would be possible, he said it would be too expensive. Nevertheless, one hopes that this scheme will be progressively implemented; I hoped that it would be tried in my district. I also asked the Government to provide a cycle track on that part of Brighton Road that had been widened, in order to cater for the many children

attending primary and senior schools on, or near Brighton Road. Although many children use this road, the Minister, in his wisdom, saw fit not to accede to my request.

When roads, particularly arterial roads, are widened, traffic problems are aggravated, because the traffic flows more quickly on wider roads. This, in turn, creates additional problems for young and old people who must traverse such roads, an aspect that should be considered by the Road Safety Council. Unfortunately, more importance is placed on traffic flow than it is on pedestrians. This is illustrated by the Highways Department's suggestions regarding the closure of many streets that connect with main highways because it considers this action will create a faster traffic flow.

More crossings with activated signals must be provided for pedestrians, particularly near shopping areas. Even if this causes a problem regarding what has become the sacred cow of traffic flow (as it appears to have become), the department must provide for pedestrians. The Highways Department is indeed creating additional problems by forcing more traffic on to these main highways because of the resultant traffic flow.

Motion carried.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 10. Page 855.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I should like to deal with the overall economic impact of the Budget, many other members having referred to taxation and specific items. Australia (particularly South Australia) is in a grave economic position. Unfortunately, we in this country are experiencing an unprecedented inflationary spiral. In the last quarter South Australia's inflation rate was equivalent to an annual rate of 16 per cent, which is unusual, particularly as it increased from the rate of 4 per cent a year only 18 months ago. The gravity of the unemployment situation is just starting to be felt, and the situation will worsen. Many a responsible economist has predicted high levels of unemployment in the next 18 months or 2 years. In this respect, it was interesting to see the figures for the most recent quarter. I refer specifically to the bulletin for July this year and to the summary for South Australian unemployed. The first point it makes is that, for July, the total registered number of unemployed increased by 1 658 to 9 641, or 1.74 per cent of the labour force; that excludes school leavers, because the Commonwealth Government now excludes them from all unemployment figures. The second point it makes about South Australian unemployed is that unfilled vacancies decreased by 884 to 4 015; so, there was an increase in the number of persons actually unemployed and a decrease in the number of positions available.

Mr. McAnaney: That's only chicken feed to what it will be.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will come to that shortly. The number of persons receiving unemployment benefits increased by 569 to 3 442. The final point made in the summary is that in non-metropolitan areas the number unemployed, excluding school leavers, increased by 334, compared to an increase of 283 in July, 1973, and a decrease of 404 in 1972. It is on that summary that I will dwell, and I will relate it to the figures for July, 1973. At that time, the number of job vacancies was increasing and the number of unemployed was decreasing. A year later we saw the number of unemployed increasing and the number of job vacancies decreasing. This relates not only to city areas but also to the country.

In other words, the present trend in Australia is toward rapidly increasing unemployment. The *Australian* of September 9 contains a report by Dr. Barry Hughes who, we would all agree, is probably one of the most noted economists in Australia now, particularly as regards the national economy. The report states:

Unemployment in Australia has exceeded its peak during the McMahon Government and is growing at an unprecedented rate. The key figure for economic analysis is the seasonally adjusted jobless rate, which since last year excluded unemployed school leavers.

The figures are on a new and much more favourable basis as far as the Labor Government is concerned. The article continues:

At the end of August, there were 110 891 people unemployed—1.8 per cent of the labour force. Calculated on the same basis, the peak 1972 rate under the previous Liberal Government was 1.77 per cent. It also came in August.

So, the percentage increase in unemployment in Australia now is far greater than the increase in the unemployment rate when the Liberals were in Government. The article continues:

The unemployment rate this year has risen 0.67 per cent in the past two months—the fastest rise over two months since collection of figures started in 1946.

That is significant: we now have the fastest increasing number of unemployed in Australia since the figures were first collected back in 1946. The article continues:

Only twice before has unemployment increased at anything like the present pace.

Dr. Hughes points out those two occasions: one in 1961, when the unemployment rate of increase over a two-month period was .48 per cent compared to .67 per cent now; and the other in 1952, at the end of the Korean war, when the rate was .56 per cent—still well below the present rate of increase of .67 per cent. The article continues:

The number of unfilled vacancies has slumped from nearly 80 000 in June to 48 186 today.

In other words, that is a drop of about 40 per cent. In his article Dr. Hughes says that, in effect, no longer can we turn economies on and off as though turning a water tap on and off. Having appreciated the fact that we have massive unemployment, we also have an incredible inflation rate. I would like to turn to a fundamental piece of economics, and I am sure that the Minister of Education probably taught these fundamental principles to his students at the University of Adelaide. In a period of increasing unemployment it is imperative that the Government increase the number of persons in its employ. The Government needs to create employment, whether in the Public Service sector or by injecting money into the economy, thus creating outside employment. The Treasurer would rightly say that the economy, under the Australian Constitution, is largely affected by the Commonwealth Government, and I entirely agree with him.

I make the point that the State Government can significantly affect South Australia's economic position. I appreciate the fact that it cannot have a dominant effect, but it can have a significant effect as a result of the policies it has adopted in recent years. However, it is those policies that have increased South Australia's inflation rate to the highest of any Australian State. The Government's policies in granting wage increases to its employees have encouraged higher wages than we would normally have. I do not deride that, but it shows that the State Government can affect the state of the local economy. A year ago the State Government adopted a policy that allowed for a rapid growth rate in the Public Service. However, the Treasurer said recently that the growth rate in the service

during the last year had been over 10 per cent. That is an incredible growth rate for a Public Service, the private sector normally growing at between 3.5 per cent and 4.5 per cent a year. That tends to throw the balance out of phase.

A year ago, during a period of low unemployment, the Treasurer adopted a policy of a rapid growth rate in the Public Service, obviously placing even greater demands on our overall economy and forcing the inflation rate even higher. Yet a year later, when we should be trying to stimulate employment, the Treasurer about a week ago announced that he would cut back the growth rate in the Public Service from over 10 per cent to 5 per cent for the current year. However, the Treasurer has failed to appreciate the most fundamental point in Keynesian economics (the very lesson the world learnt in the 1930's depression): to solve the unemployment problem it is up to the Government to stimulate the economy and create employment. Unfortunately the Treasurer is making a grave mistake, because no-one likes to see people unemployed. I did not experience the 1930's depression, but I have heard many people talk about it and I have seen the effects it has had on people's outlook on life. It has left many psychological scars on people, and that is most unfortunate.

I was disappointed to hear the Commonwealth Minister for Labor and Immigration (Mr. Clyde Cameron) say on television this evening that the present economic troubles could continue for the next 18 months to 24 months; he said that that was a short-term basis. I believe that a two-year period of such economic conditions would be disastrous for Australia. Some people have predicted that the unemployment figure will reach 150 000; that is the lowest figure. I believe that Dr. Barry Hughes predicted at a seminar recently an unemployment figure of at least 200 000; he said it could go as high as 250 000. A former Prime Minister has predicted that as many as 400 000 could be unemployed throughout Australia; that would place us in an economic depression equal to if not worse than the depression in the 1930's. No Government would like to see that situation.

The Labor Party has suggested that the Liberals believe that the economy can be controlled by creating unemployment; I disagree with that, and it has been shown that Liberal Governments disagree with that. If we are to control inflation and the economy we must alter the input of the Government and the growth of the Public Service sector in accordance with the state of the economy, and that is what the South Australian Government and the Australian Government have failed to do. For the last 18 months they have been injecting finance into the economy at a tremendous rate; then, when unemployment has increased they have suddenly tightened their finances.

I wish to refer now to the taxation increases that the South Australian public is facing. I shall take as my base the figures for 1970-71, when the Labor Government had returned to office, and I shall examine the increases in State taxation since then. In the 4½ years since then we have had a 258 per cent increase in State taxation revenue—an incredible increase. During the same period there has been only 49.8 per cent increase in the minimum wage. Clearly, the people on lower incomes and the pensioners are the worst off. What has the State Government done with the finance? Basically, the tremendous increase in revenue has been devoted largely to pipe dreams and grand schemes of the State Government.

Mr. Simmons: Such as protecting the environment!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The events of the last six months have shown that the State Government is not really concerned about the environment.

Mr. GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I draw your attention to the situation in the House. Is it proper that there is no Minister in the Chamber to reply on behalf of the Government?

The SPEAKER: I point out that it is not the Speaker's jurisdiction to demand that anyone should be in the House, and that the honourable member for Eyre has just come into the House himself.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I wish to compare the taxation and revenue collected by the State Government in 1969-70, the last year of a Liberal Government, with the corresponding figures estimated for 1974-75. In 1969-70 the total taxation for the State was \$56 400 000, and it is now \$208 900 000, an incredible increase. In 1969-70 the total revenue collected by way of fees and earnings of public undertakings was \$86 400 000, and in 1974-75 it is \$154 300 000. Finally, in 1969-70 the total receipts, including taxation, revenue from fees, and moneys from the Commonwealth Government, amounted to \$338 500 000, and in 1974-75 it is \$762 600 000.

That clearly shows that the people of South Australia are now having to pay for the grand schemes put forward by the Government. They are paying not from surplus finance but in terms of their standard of living and security within their homes. For this reason the people of Burnside have recently objected strongly to the sudden increases in water and sewerage rates. If they had not objected, some of them could have no longer stayed in their houses. Widows have been faced with increases in water and sewerage rates from \$38 to \$102 a quarter.

Dr. Eastick: They can't sell their houses either.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: They cannot sell their properties because there is no liquidity at present, and they would be selling at depleted prices. Those same houses were assessed for water and sewerage rates at the peak of the land boom in 1973-74.

I make a plea to the State Government to take far greater responsibility for managing the economy of the State. The Government should give its first thought to sound economic management, rather than throwing up scheme after scheme that the people of South Australia cannot afford. In particular, the Government should consider whether we should sacrifice a few grand schemes to ensure that some people are not unemployed.

On May 16, 1974, 115 economists published a letter supporting the return of the Commonwealth Labor Government. I imagine that now there are about 113 very embarrassed economists in Australia; evidently two of the economists still believe that they did the right thing. Those 115 economists said that they would rather have Labor Government's policies than the Liberal Party's policies, yet three or four months after the election we see that the Labor Government has adopted the Liberal Party's policies advanced before the election. For example, the Liberal Party advocated income tax reductions, and only last week the Prime Minister announced income tax reductions. The Labor Government has stolen the policies of the Liberal Party. I heard an interesting comment by a senior economist soon after Mr. Whitlam made his economic speech and announced his policy at the beginning of July. That economist, having heard Mr. Whitlam's speech, said that Mr. Whitlam had merely adopted Mr. Snedden's economic policies.

Mr. Keneally: Mr. Snedden hasn't got economic policies.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: To refresh the memories of the people, particularly members opposite, I will read a statement by 115 economists. It is as follows:

The rapid increase in prices has been an international phenomenon as well as a national one and we doubt that any Australian Government could have managed to isolate our economy from these international price movements. We believe that the general thrust of the Government's policy responses has been in the best interests of the nation as a whole. More importantly we seriously doubt that the previous Government would have had the wisdom or the courage to undertake them. It had certainly given no indication of moving in that direction while it was in power even though the need for such policies had become obvious.

Mr. Jennings: Why don't you table the statement?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is reported in the *Financial Review* of May 16, and I am sure that the honourable member can read it there. The Budget shows the unsatisfactory state of our present Commonwealth-State financial relations, on which I have spoken previously in this House. The Liberal Governments that have been in office in the Commonwealth Parliament in recent years did not adopt the correct policies and they should have ensured that more finance, without strings attached, was available to the States. However, the Liberal Party has seen the error of its ways.

Mr. Payne: The people saw the error of its ways, too.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Those policies have been worsened by the disastrous policies of the Labor Government. The amount of money made available to the States to carry out their programmes now is completely farcical. The Treasurer stated what he would like to do to the Prime Minister at a recent Premiers' Conference. He said that he would prefer to deal with Mr. Snedden rather than with Mr. Whitlam on economic matters. In Australia we should be granting more powers to the States to raise finance. A fixed percentage of income tax revenue collected by the Australian Government should be returned to the States, with no strings attached. Furthermore, there should be redistribution grants, which could be determined by a commission but which should not be determined on the same basis as the Canadian economic grants, although many people have advocated that basis.

The States must have the responsibility to raise finance, and the only satisfactory way to arrange this is by giving them a percentage of the income tax revenue collected by the Australian Government. I am proud to be a member of a Party that has promised to give a fixed percentage to the States. Mr. Snedden announced that before the recent Commonwealth election. That is the only scheme that will work, as it has done in the United States and West Germany, and in many federations. It is about time we had it in Australia.

Until we have that scheme, the States will be strangled through lack of finance, even though they will still have major responsibility for carrying out public works. For this reason I make a plea to the Australian people to take great care, when they next vote for the election of an Australian Government, about how finance will be allocated to the States. I support the second reading reluctantly, because the State Government has not protected the economy and the Australian Government is not looking after South Australia.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I wish to speak about the way in which the Government has presented this Budget to the people. It is clear to me that the Government and its army of publicity experts have fed to the press much publicity since the Budget was introduced last Thursday week. Following the introduction of the Budget, one newspaper report was headed, "No tax rises for South

Australia in tame Budget." At about the same time last year, a newspaper report by the same political reporter stated:

South Australians were blessed yesterday with a State Budget free of taxation increases.

However, many increases were made last year before the Budget was introduced, and I refer to increases in water rates, the electricity levy, hospital fees, and port charges. Again this year we have seen the ability of this Government, with its press representatives, to hoodwink the press into publishing reports of this kind and also to hoodwink the people. I am reminded of the following verse:

Kentish Sir Bing stood for his King,
And pressing a troupe unable to stoop,
To see the rogues flourish,
And honest men droop.

That applies to the present Government. When we were in office, we were persecuted about the receipts tax that we imposed but the present Government has been getting away with murder, pulling the wool over the eyes of the people by its publicity machine. If the Speaker carried out his duty to the letter, he would prohibit any debate now on the matters that came before Parliament before the Budget was introduced. I refer to increases made in respect of petrol, pay-roll tax, and liquor tax. Technically speaking, they should not be mentioned in this debate. This is all part of the shrewd scheme used by the Treasurer in connection with this Budget. The rural situation is well known, especially the way in which the economy is being run down.

I compliment the member for Gouger, who last night made a wonderful contribution to this debate. I point out that the honourable member, although representing to a degree a large rural area, is not himself a farmer, nor has he a farming background. Nevertheless, he forcefully presented the problems confronting rural industry. He referred to the problems involved in rural land tax and valuations which are of great concern to primary producers. Primary producers are getting sick of having the onus placed on them in having to prove that the valuation placed on a property by the department concerned is incorrect, especially as there is only a limited period in which a complaint can be lodged. This problem is continually facing primary producers, who are tired of having to put forward their case in this way.

Several means of increasing taxation and revenue to the Treasury have been referred to by members, but the one item that has not been referred to is that of rail freights, which were increased by 10 per cent in July. This increase affects grain and livestock movements throughout the State; indeed, in some areas the increase in grain freights is as high as 13 per cent, and the effects on primary producers will not be fully felt until they receive a reduced payment in the coming harvest.

It is most interesting to sit on this side and hear from time to time the concern expressed by members opposite. The member for Elizabeth today referred to motor vehicles, and he expressed concern about the consumer protection, with which I agree. I believe in consumer protection. However, what about protection for the people of South Australia? Under the cloak of this Budget and through the publicity afforded by the Premier's Department, we see the following headline: "No tax rises for South Australia in 'tame' Budget". What does the member for Elizabeth call that? Is that not hoodwinking the public? Should not the public receive some consumer protection in that regard?

It is a pity that the Government is not more consistent in its attitude to the problems facing the people of South Australia.

The primary producers of South Australia do not know where they can turn next. Thankfully, we are experiencing a bountiful year, that is one thing with which man cannot interfere. However, primary producers are experiencing problems in respect of stock movements. Indeed, any returns going to primary producers are being eroded. What has happened regarding the payment of 20c a bushel to the wheatgrower? What will happen to a producer's lambs, which are now becoming available for slaughter? How much more harm will this current spate of strikes cause primary producers, apart from their having to accept the current prices offered for their lambs? The price now being paid for lambs varies between \$6.50 and \$7. Yet primary producers received almost double that sum for lambs 25 years ago; they received about \$5 a head. Today they are forced into accepting a much lower price, and they can do nothing about that because of the continuing strikes occurring not only in South Australia but also throughout Australia.

The sooner this Government and the unions realise what they are doing, not only to the community generally but also to themselves, and the sooner they wake up, the better it will be. Many months ago I stated that, under the legislation of a Socialist Government such as this State Government, the people will eventually starve unless there is a change of Government, or a change in attitude by this Government, providing incentives to farmers to produce more. I refer to the situation now confronting primary producers. Soon they are to lose their superphosphate bounty (it will go at the end of the year), and primary producers go into the next year already expecting an increase in superphosphate costs. Mr. Speaker, I know that your colleagues opposite are not interested in commerce, business or profit. Indeed, they are the three dirty words as far as this Government is concerned.

If South Australia, and Australia as a whole, is to survive, especially in respect of our export balance of payments, incentives must be given to people who are willing to work and produce the commodities necessary to export to overseas countries, but it is obvious that this Government and its Commonwealth colleagues are not concerned with these matters. Some months ago when beef was being exported, a move was afoot to apply a levy of 2c a pound on export beef. However, overnight, by one means or another, we find that the price of beef has dropped dramatically and that many problems face the beef industry today. Indeed, I do not know how the industry will get out of its present situation.

Mr. Duncan: The problem is caused primarily by the cattlemen of the U.S.A. That has caused the drop in the price of beef.

Mr. VENNING: Not entirely. A major factor is the uncertainty and lack of confidence of growers. This is one of the greatest problems facing the industry today. Yesterday I visited the Gepps Cross abattoir, where I saw only one exporter buying lambs, and he was buying them at the price he wanted to pay. He faced little competition. Much of this lack of confidence results from strike action in our own abattoir which, despite having had many millions of dollars spent on improvements, has recently lain idle for long periods. Indeed, this is a sad state of affairs for South Australian primary producers, and the Government seems to be doing nothing about the problem. I deplore the attitude of the Government and the financial chaos and confusion into which the people of this

State are being plunged by a Socialist Government that is only a knife-edge from Communism, which is a dictatorship. As a consequence, I regretfully support the second reading.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): It was interesting to pick up the afternoon newspaper and see the leading article headed "Uncovering the errors". In the editorial, reference was made to the statement in the Auditor-General's Report that he was not happy with the budgeting systems used by certain Government departments, in the way of accountancy practices, and so on. I have thought for some time that we could save the taxpayers of South Australia much money if proper accounting methods were adopted, particularly in relation to budgeting and to the interference in the administration of our Government departments by some Ministers. It is interesting to note that the Ministers referred to are the Minister of Works, the Minister of Environment and Conservation, and the Minister of Lands, Ministers who, I consider, would not be able to hold similar positions in private enterprises, where they would be in command of the handling of millions of dollars of their employers' funds; yet they are in control of taxpayers' money to this extent. It has been borne out by the Auditor-General's Report that there have been so many deficiencies in so many areas. It is interesting to note also that one department that did not come under too much criticism in the press is the Highways Department, under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Transport. There is a glaring example of one item in that report where, at page 120 under the subheading "South Road Land", we read:

Previous reports have drawn attention to the improper use of Highways Department funds for the purchase of land in the triangle formed by Main South Road, Sturt Road and Marion Road. Agreement has not yet been reached on the use or control of land surplus to freeway requirements and no financial adjustment has yet been made.

We have to go back into the history of this matter, to almost 10 years ago, when this land was originally acquired under a previous Labor Government. I shall now read an extract from the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1967, on page 3 of which the Auditor-General said this:

Land on South Road, etc., acquired for hospital, education and road widening purposes. Over recent years the Government has acquired the major portion of the triangular area of land bounded by the Sturt, Marion and South Roads, and the remaining portion of the land has been acquired by the Flinders University. Of the portion purchased by the Government, approximately 50 acres on the western side of the Sturt River was purchased in 1965 for the Education Department as a site for a high school, primary school and playing fields for the Bedford Park Teachers College. The cost was \$500 194. The Highways and Local Government Department purchased two areas within the triangle: approximately 25 acres facing South Road compulsorily acquired during June, 1965, for \$254 236. This site included an area selected for the erection of the South-Western District Hospital and was to be exchanged with the Public Buildings Department for land purchased by that department in 1950 at Oaklands and previously earmarked as a site for the same hospital. The balance of the land was to be used for road widening; approximately 8 acres, 3 roods, 28 perches facing Sturt Road from the South Australian Housing Trust for \$36 200 in 1959, for the establishment of a depot.

The Railways Department Obtained a strip of land passing through the Education Department land and bordering the Highways and Local Government Department depot. In June, 1966, a report was obtained from the Mines Department indicating that the site selected for the major hospital was located directly over a major fault line which had recently been active. The line also passes through the southern section of the land purchased for the Education Department. The report indicated that

although "buildings can be constructed so as to minimise damage during earthquakes, it is considered that a major hospital should not be built on the site proposed or anywhere within the Sturt Road triangle". Subsequently a special committee reported to the Government, *inter alia*, "while the dangers inherent in locating multi-storey structures and the necessity to safeguard emergency communicating services make the Sturt Road triangle site unsuitable for hospital purposes, it should be possible to locate suitably designed school buildings on the site".

Negotiations have now been entered into with the Flinders University authorities for the exchange of certain areas in the Sturt Road triangle, purchased by the Highways Department as set out above, for land at present held by the university on the southern side of South Road (suitable for hospital purposes) and five acres owned by the university within the triangle which it is proposed to use for car parking sites. The exchange will involve a number of additional commitments to compensate the university and others for certain re-establishment costs and for the purchase of some additional blocks of land. It is envisaged that a subway could be built communicating the proposed hospital on the southern side of South Road with a car park within the Sturt triangle. The land within the university site which it is proposed to exchange is part of the land dedicated by the Government for university purposes a few years ago.

At this stage the proposals do not envisage any adjustment of the areas purchased for the Education Department for school purposes but, if the negotiations reach fruition, the balance of the area within the triangle will be mainly for sports fields and car parking areas. As mentioned earlier, the land selected for the erection of the hospital was purchased and financed from Highways Department funds. The intention was that the Highways Department would take over for freeway purposes the original hospital site at Oaklands, but there are indications that the Oaklands land, after acquisition of part of it for river improvements, is unlikely to be required for that purpose. Purchases of land for hospitals should be made from moneys directly appropriated by Parliament for that purpose. The method adopted to obtain that portion of the land which was to be for hospital purposes has, in my opinion, involved the improper use of the Highways Department funds, and financial adjustments should be made to correct the position.

That is the statement of the Auditor-General at June 30, 1967. It is interesting to note that the land within that triangle has remained untouched. There is one small area where the Highways Department has established a depot, but the Education Department has done nothing. The hospital, which is now the Flinders Medical Centre, is being built on the southern side of South Road. The land which was the major exchange at Oaklands is now the site of the Road Safety Centre, that being originally for freeway purposes. Some of that land had to be filled in for river bank improvements, and so on, but that is where the Road Safety Centre has been established. So this land was acquired in 1965 for \$500 194. In 1969, on page 74 of his report, the Auditor-General had this to say:

My reports for the last two years have drawn attention to the improper use of Highways Department funds for the purchase of land adjoining the South Road. Negotiations have been deferred pending clarification of the land required for future freeway purposes and the position of the South-Western Suburbs Hospital, and in consequence no financial adjustments have been made to remedy the incorrect charge against the Highways Fund.

The Auditor-General's Report for the year ended June 30, 1970, sets out at page 70 what is set out in the 1969 report. For the year ended June 30, 1971, at page 75 of his report the Auditor-General makes the same reference that he made in previous years and then adds:

It is disturbing to find that action has not been taken to remedy an improper use of funds which has been brought to the notice of the Government for the past four years.

For the year ended June 30, 1972, at page 74, under the heading "South Road Land" the Auditor-General's Report states:

Previous reports have drawn attention to the improper use of Highways Department funds for the purchase of land in the triangle formed by Main South Road, Sturt Road and Marion Road. A committee has been appointed to negotiate the disposal of this land, and agreement in principle has been reached regarding the area owned by the Highways Department which will be surplus to eventual freeway requirements. Financial adjustments will be made on completion of the land transfers.

For the year ended June 30, 1973, at page 104 the report states:

Previous reports have drawn attention to the improper use of Highways Department funds for the purchase of land in the triangle formed by Main South Road, Sturt Road and Marion Road. Agreement has not yet been reached on the use or control of land surplus to freeway requirements and no financial adjustment has yet been made.

At the beginning of my remarks, I referred to the reference by the Auditor-General in this year's report to the effect that nothing had been settled. On September 20, 1973, as reported at page 870 of *Hansard*, I asked the Minister of Transport the following question:

Can the Minister of Transport say whether there has been any improper use of Highways Department funds for the purchase of land in the triangle formed by South Road, Sturt Road and Marion Road and what is the proposed future use of this land?

I then referred to the 1973 Auditor-General's Report. In reply, the Minister said:

I will obtain a report.

The credibility of the Minister, the department, and the Government is at stake. For almost nine years since the land was purchased, it has been referred to in every Auditor-General's Report. The Minister has promised to obtain a report for me, but nothing has been done. How much importance can we attach to the statement in this afternoon's *News* that the Treasurer today promised an immediate investigation into budgeting mismanagement in certain Government departments, as highlighted in the Auditor-General's Report?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: There is a complication here. Part of the land that used to be vested in—

Mr. BECKER: The point I am trying to make is that the Auditor-General drew the attention of this Parliament to this matter not only this year but also last year. In this debate in the past two years, I have said that Government departments are not doing the right thing by the taxpayers of the State, yet only now the Treasurer has promised that something will be done. Throughout the Auditor-General's Report various Government departments have their attention drawn to certain accounting procedures. Although they say that something will be done about this, nothing has been done. There is a classic example in the case of the Highways Department—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why do you always shout?

Mr. BECKER: —misusing funds, and nothing has been done. It is all very well for the Minister to ask why I shout; I have to shout. I am trying to make a speech and the Minister is trying to interject; in doing so, he is completely out of order.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It is not for you to say that I am out of order. A part of that land went to Flinders and Sturt, and it will have to be paid for by the Australian Government, and that has complicated the process of making financial adjustments.

Mr. BECKER: I want to know why the Auditor-General has continued to comment on this matter and why the Minister of Transport will not answer a question I asked on September 20, 1973. I can keep asking questions, but I know jolly well I will not get an answer, because I

have been told that. When I ring certain departments to obtain information, I get thrown up to me that, under the Public Service Act, officers cannot give me any information. It is okay that they put a black ban on me.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But don't you—

Mr. BECKER: At least I get co-operation from the Minister's department. The point is that about two years ago I raised a matter in relation to rent being paid for accommodation for Government departments. It was after a series of questions to the Minister of Works that we finally established the correct amounts and had the authentic statement of the Auditor-General. In subsequent questions the Minister did not verify the statements made in the Auditor-General's Report. Why do we have an Auditor-General's Report if his recommendations will not be accepted by Government departments or Ministers? I do not blame heads of departments: I blame Ministers.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I believe that the mismanagement of Government funds in various departments is the result of sheer incompetency by various Ministers in control of those departments. If there is to be an investigation, the Treasurer should start with his Ministers, seeing whether they are capable of supervising the amount of expenditure they have under their control. This is highlighted by the weaknesses of some of the performances by various Ministers, as the Treasurer jolly well knows. The statement in the *News* is that an inquiry will be undertaken. It is the duty of this House and the taxpayers to insist on investigations into the Auditor-General's allegations. We want to know as soon as possible what remedies have been taken, and we want to be assured by the Auditor-General well before the time of his next report that these matters have been dealt with. I am frightened that the Auditor-General's statements will be treated as they have been in the past, and that the whole situation will be swept under the carpet, as in the case of the South Road land deal. All we see on that site is weeds, rubbish, vines, and so on.

Dr. Eastick: A cover-up in every respect.

Mr. BECKER: Of course it is; it is an utter disgrace.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You carry on about nothing.

Mr. BECKER: Not about nothing; \$500 000 is involved.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: There have been several changes in the proposed land usage.

Mr. BECKER: The Auditor-General has reported on this, and it is up to the Minister of Transport to provide information. I am still waiting patiently for a reply to my question. I know that this case is similar to the case of a question I asked in relation to the road toll; I will not get a reply to that question, either. Whenever my questions are too hard to answer, Ministers forget about them. If my questions are embarrassing to the Government, Ministers either call me a liar or forget all about the matter, hoping that I will forget, too. However, this matter will not be forgotten, as there has been a clear statement by the Auditor-General about the misuse of departmental money. We cannot allow this to continue.

The Railways Department receives a fair amount of criticism, previous speakers having already criticised it. It is disturbing to note that the average revenue for each passenger journey since 1969-70 has increased from 15c to only 19c, while the average loss for each passenger journey has increased from 34c in 1969-70 to 59c. Anyone could say simply that we are losing 40c a journey on suburban passenger lines. There are two things that can be done. The cost structure can be left as it is, and we can

accept that all taxpayers throughout the State must subsidise each passenger journey to the tune of 40c, or we can increase the fares. If fares are increased, many people will probably be driven off the trains and the loss ratio will be maintained. It is a pity that such huge losses are being made by the South Australian Railways. The question is: what can be done about it?

When one considers the sum that is to be provided to the Municipal Tramways Trust now that the Government has acquired certain private bus operations, which were unprofitable, and realises that the motorist must pay additional licence and registration fees, an extra levy on insurance, excise duties on petrol that go to the Commonwealth Government, and all the other charges associated with motoring, one sees that the motor car is certainly being put into the luxury category. Also, the motorist is to be charged twice as much as he is presently charged for parking in the Adelaide City Council area. It is therefore the motorist that is getting it in the neck. He is entitled to his independence, and the motor car is his only means of independent transport.

How much should the Government subsidise public transport, and how much should private motorists have to pay to enjoy the privilege of owning a motor car? When one considers that \$45 000 000 is to be provided for public transport this financial year, the mind boggles to think of what the sum will be next year if fares and freight rates are not increased now. I know that the Government realises it is unpopular to increase these charges, but one must be realistic. Because the Government is frightened to increase fares, it is, in effect, taxing the whole community.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How would you assess the increased cost of road usage if the number of passengers declined? Would you take it into account?

Mr. BECKER: I am making this speech, not the Minister of Education.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I am asking you a perfectly reasonable question.

Mr. BECKER: Question Time will be available again tomorrow afternoon.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I am only asking a question, and you don't want to answer it.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BECKER: I am concerned at the increased costs that the taxpayers of South Australia are being asked to meet.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The taxpayers will have to pay for the increased cost of roads.

Mr. BECKER: I realise that, but motorists are being penalised more than other sections, and private motorists will be taxed out of owning a motor vehicle. In future, a car will be a luxury. The Commonwealth Government has got itself into trouble, having received a report from the Australian Industries Development Commission regarding tariffs. All members know what effect this will have on South Australia's motor industry, and it will be a shame if the recommendations are put into effect. However, this is what happens when a State depends on only one or two industries. Because Sir Thomas Playford realised that South Australia could not rely on primary production alone, he encouraged, with great gusto, the development of industry in this State.

Another matter about which I am concerned is that, for the first time, the Savings Bank of South Australia will have to pay a Government tax. Indeed, half of its profits will now go into State revenue. The Savings Bank is the people's bank and it belongs to its depositors, who enjoy

the benefit of receiving a slightly higher rate of interest than that offered by the free enterprise banks. That is fair enough, as the bank belongs to its depositors. Although the bank has had its deposits guaranteed by the Government and has also had a monopoly in relation to school banking, the South Australian public has admired and respected it for what it has done for the State. It is now most unfair for the Government to take half of its profits.

Mr. Simmons: Sir Thomas Playford taxed a lot more than that. Between 1945 and 1953 he got \$11 000 000 from the bank. Haven't you heard of that?

Mr. BECKER: I realise that the bank's funds have been manipulated by Governments. I do not care which Governments have done this, but I do not think it is right; nor do I think it was right then. What Government members have been interjecting about is history; I am concerned about the present position. The Savings Bank made a profit of about \$1 600 000 last year and, if that rate of profit is maintained, it could contribute more than \$800 000 to Revenue Account this year. I still maintain that it is not right to take the bank's profits from it in this way. The bank is building up its reserves and, no matter what proportion the State Government takes from the bank's profits, the bank cannot use that money in its normal day-to-day operations.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you think the tax paid by the Bank of Adelaide is justified?

Mr. BECKER: It is a private enterprise bank and it accepts that it must pay company tax. It has its shareholders and, as long as they get their fair share, it is all right. That bank must be run as an efficient operation, just as the Savings Bank must. However, the latter has to give its depositors the benefit of a higher rate of interest on their deposits, and it charges a lower rate of interest on its housing loans. However, if \$800 000 or more is taken from its profits, certain members of the public will be denied the opportunity of borrowing money from the bank at the lower interest rate. Any Government, and particularly the present Government, that denies people the opportunity to borrow money from this bank for housing purposes at a lower rate of interest is not doing the right thing for the State's young people. I do not know how the Government will be able in future to stand up and tell the public that it cares about people. It does not care about people; if it did, it would not touch the profits of the Savings Bank. The Government is weakening that bank by taking its profits, just as it has done to the State Bank.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You did that.

Mr. BECKER: The Minister is in Government now, and the Government is taking the money and spending it. There is nothing to stop the Government from amending the Act and saying that no more money will be taken from the State Bank. These two banks have served the State well, but the State Bank has not expanded at the rate at which it should have expanded. Unfortunately, it is not giving the people of this State the real benefits that it should be giving, because its operations are being interfered with by the State Government. The whole text of the Auditor-General's Report reflects on the ability of the Government and its members to handle taxpayers' money in a responsible manner.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): Those people who read the *Advertiser* the day after the Treasurer introduced the Budget would have been completely misled by reading under the heading, "No new tax increases for South Australia in 'tame' Budget", the following:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) introduced a Budget free of taxation increases yesterday.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You had better stop there. Whoever wrote the speeches for you has given two of you the same speech.

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the Minister of Environment and Conservation agree with that statement? Does he suggest that it is correct?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Of course I do.

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the Minister suggest that the Budget is free of new tax increases?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He suggests you are being repetitive.

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the Minister say that that is a correct report about the Budget?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He didn't say that. All he said was that you were repeating the speech made by the member for Bragg.

Mr. MATHWIN: I was not present when he spoke. The ordinary people of the State have been completely misled by the report in the *Advertiser*. I am surprised that it was approved by the Editor; obviously, he did not read the documents associated with the Budget. The Treasurer, in his Financial Statement, said:

I move that this Bill be read a second time. In doing so I present the Government's Revenue Budget proposals for 1974-75 which forecast aggregate receipts of \$762 645 000, aggregate payments of \$774 645 000 and, accordingly, an estimated deficit of \$12 000 000.

As the Treasurer gave his explanation, he got down to the interesting section for those Government members who agreed with me, particularly those on the front bench, but more particularly the Minister of Environment and Conservation, who has said that he agrees with the statement in the *Advertiser*. The Treasurer's first slug will be an increase in motor vehicle registration and drivers' licence fees. The expected increase is \$7 133 000 and, if that is not an increase in taxation, I do not know what it is. Revenue from stamp duties is expected to increase from \$41 914 000 to \$49 700 000. Will the Government tell the people of this State that this does not mean an increase in taxation? These various increases in taxation will hit the ordinary people in the community. The Treasurer also announced an increase in the receipts from liquor licences, and this will hit the ordinary man and his family. If he dares to buy a new motor vehicle he will pay increased registration fees and stamp duty, and if he enjoys an occasional drink he will suffer still more.

Every club and organisation within the community, whether a sporting body or a group trying to raise finance, will suffer financially. Every person or organisation that convenes a dance or ball for which a liquor licence is necessary will have to pay more. The Government expects to increase the revenue from liquor licences from \$4 176 000 to \$4 900 000; part of the increase will come from growth in the value of turnover and part will result from an increase in the rate of tax from 6 per cent to 7 per cent. The Treasurer said that the latter (and obviously the Minister of Environment and Conservation does not agree that this means increased taxation) was expected to yield about \$300 000 for the remainder of this financial year and about \$750 000 in a full year. Surely this is an increase in taxation. Does the Minister, who is now in charge of the House, suggest that this is not increased taxation?

The ordinary family trying to buy a house or renting a house will have to pay for the next increase the Treasurer has imposed on the State, namely, an increase

in water and sewerage rates. People in the Glenelg area have now been given the honour of being third on the list of those who will pay increased water and sewerage rates. I should like to know what the Minister of Environment and Conservation said at the public meeting his constituents held at Henley Beach last week. Did he suggest to them that those taxes were not real taxation imposed by the Treasurer and his Government? Did he refer them to the heading in the *Advertiser* of August 30? Did he convince his constituents that increased water and sewerage rates were not increases in taxation? I should like to know how effective the Minister was at preaching to his constituents at the meeting and trying to convince them that these were not increases in taxation. I wonder whether, when the Minister was confronted by some of his irate constituents at Henley Beach recently, he quoted the following extract from the Treasurer's statement:

In accordance with normal practice, properties have been revalued and will be receiving new assessment notices this year.

The properties have certainly been revalued, and it is significant that the areas affected are held by Liberal members—the Davenport District, the Glenelg District and the Fisher District. One wonders how the authorities picked those districts out of a hat. Was it a mistake that the Minister's district was also picked out? His district is the only Government-held district that is affected at present. If the procedure continues and if his constituents continue to be as irate as they are now, his district will possibly be won by the Liberal Party at the next election. The Treasurer's statement continues:

The higher valuations will result in higher bills for water and sewerage rates.

That is a laugh. Many people in the Glenelg District, the Fisher District, the Davenport District, and the Henley Beach District know about that. They know that their rates have been increased by 100 per cent or 200 per cent, and by even 500 per cent in the Fisher District. The Treasurer said:

The higher valuations will result in higher bills for water and sewerage rates and will account for part of the increase of \$4 811 000 expected in the earnings of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. There has also been an increase in the price of water from 10c for 1 000 litres to 11c for 1 000 litres.

Here, of course, is the sorry story that the Government has hit everyone right down the line. One of my irate constituents lets 20 flats at a reasonable rental; his quarterly payment was previously just over \$305, but it is now \$690. I am amazed at the claim that this Budget is free of taxation increases. I would think that even the Minister of Labour and Industry would agree with me.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: No way in the world.

Mr. MATHWIN: This Budget is full of taxation increases aimed particularly at the ordinary person; for example, the increase in fees for drivers' licences and motor registration, increases in water and sewerage rates, and increases in liquor licence fees. In his statement the Treasurer also says:

As from September 1, 1974, and in accordance with the earlier announcement, hospital fees will be raised as follows:

| Type of accommodation | Present fee | New fee |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------|
| | \$ | \$ |
| Standard..... | 20 | 27 |
| Intermediate..... | 25 | 35 |
| Private..... | 30 | 45 |

So, here are increases levied on the sick and the infirm, the older people in the community who find it difficult

to look after themselves. They see their lifesavings disappearing, they find it impossible to get accommodation in any type of hospital, and who will help them? The Treasurer also says that extra funds will come from duty on substantially increased turnover with the Totalizator Agency Board and the Lotteries Commission, and from the proposed increase from \$2 to \$3 in the surcharge on third-party insurance policies. As a result, extra funds will be made available to the Hospitals Fund, but here again we are relying on the same type of people. The press secretaries, of whom there is an abundance, no doubt send reports to the local papers, and no doubt those reports try to draw red herrings across the trail. The Chairman of the Public Service Board, Mr. Inns, has stated that the Government should reduce the number of State Government departments; if that advice was followed there would be some expenditure cuts that would assist the ordinary person and obviate the need for taxation increases.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Would you apply that principle to local government boundaries as well?

Mr. MATHWIN: I would apply it if councils were not viable.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: It is the same principle.

Mr. MATHWIN: If the Minister can point to a small metropolitan council that is not viable, I will agree with his line of thinking on local government. If he can prove that the Brighton and Walkerville councils, which will be disintegrated, are not viable, I will think as he thinks.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: What about Government departments?

Mr. MATHWIN: I am willing to be advised by experts, and I assume that Mr. Inns is an expert.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Isn't Judge Ward?

Mr. MATHWIN: Judge Ward is no more an expert on Local Government boundaries than is the Minister. The Premier's Department will increase its spending from \$1 800 000 to \$2 200 000 this year, while spending by the Attorney-General's Department will increase from \$6 900 000 to \$8 500 000. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is a sore point, particularly with my colleagues and I who represent Davenport (which includes Burnside), Hanson, Fisher and Glenelg. Those districts are all Liberal areas. There has been mistiming by the Government, because somehow or other the Minister of Environment and Conservation has become involved, and I suppose it was not to be his turn until after the next election.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: It is an annual review, and there is no Government control over it.

Mr. MATHWIN: Spending by the Engineering and Water Supply Department will increase from \$22 700 000 to \$26 700 000, while spending by the Highways Department will increase from \$8 900 000 to \$11 900 000, and spending by the Railways Department will increase from \$55 600 000 to \$70 500 000. The Government has not taken notice of the advice that Mr. Inns has given it.

I refer now to the reliance of this Government on the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth Government wants to direct State Governments and councils about how to spend money that it gives them. Dr. Cairns has stated that many thousands of people will be out of work, and that the position will become worse before next Christmas. This was disputed by Mr. Hawke, the man who wears two hats and who cannot even run a haberdashery store in Melbourne. This leads one to wonder what is happening in the Commonwealth sphere and how much the Commonwealth Government will be able to

direct this Government on the spending of the millions of dollars that this Government expects to receive. The Prime Minister cannot control his wife, let alone his Cabinet.

Mr. Keneally: What a ridiculous speech!

Mr. MATHWIN: Those who released to the newspapers the press statement, on the day after the Treasurer had introduced the Budget, stating that the Budget was free of taxation increases, completely misled the people of South Australia, and I think that was done intentionally.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I wish to refer to the lack of proper budgetary provision to provide the facilities that the people in my district desire and need. I refer particularly to education and health services. Although I will be repeating statements that I have made previously, in Parliamentary matters the only way to get a message across is to keep giving it. I refer first to the lack of sewerage facilities in the Mitcham Hills area, particularly at Bellevue Heights, Eden Hills, Blackwood, Belair, Coromandel Valley, Hawthorndene, Glenalta, and Monalta.

Recently the Minister of Works and the Minister of Education did not like my implication that possibly some decisions about where sewerage work would be carried out were political decisions. I do not like to make that accusation, and I have not done so yet. However, the people in my district are saying it, and I will tell the House why they are doing that. Since the Loan Estimates debate [have received from the Minister of Works two letters, one of which proves my earlier belief.

In a letter dated August 26, the Minister states that the provision made for sewerage work in the Mitcham Hills area for 1974-75 is \$400 000. The provision made in 1972-73 was \$490 000, so the amount has been reduced by about 20 per cent. When we consider inflationary trends, we see that the amount of work that can be carried out has been reduced by about 40 per cent. Secondly, in a letter dated August 27, the Minister replied to my request for a list of the areas in the Adelaide metropolitan area that still needed sewerage facilities. That reply states:

I advise that there are only a few areas in the metropolitan area that are not yet sewered, the main ones being:

He refers to the Christies Beach, Morphett Vale, and Port Noarlunga area and states:

This area is at present being sewered and, apart from some of the more sparsely developed areas, is expected to be completed in about three years.

So the Minister of Development and Mines (Hon. D. J. Hopgood) has been given a guarantee that all his district will be sewered, except for a few sparsely populated fringe areas, by the end of 1978.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That's not soon enough.

Mr. EVANS: I appreciate the Minister's concern. The next area referred to in the letter concerns Tea Tree Gully, as follows:

There are two small pockets of unsewered areas which are expected to be completed in 1974-75.

So, the member for Tea Tree Gully has a guarantee from the Minister that all the unsewered areas in her district will be sewered by the end of 1975. Perhaps some of her constituents will think that that is not soon enough, as does the Minister of Development and Mines in respect of his own district. Reference is next made to Gawler, as follows:

The township is at present being sewered and is expected to be completed in 1979-80.

True, the District of Gawler is represented by the Leader of the Opposition, a Liberal member, and the finishing date applying to that area is two years later than the latest

finishing date applying to the district of the Minister of Development and Mines. In respect of the Athelstone area the Minister of Works states:

There are a few small pockets still unsewered in Athelstone, but those with reasonable development will be sewered in 1974-75 or 1975-76.

That area is represented by a Labor member, and he now has a guarantee that sewerage connections in that area will be finished by 1976. I do not suppose he and his constituents are completely satisfied with that time span, either, but at least there is a guarantee, and it is not too far in the future. In respect of Salisbury, the Minister states:

A few small unsewered areas in Salisbury will be sewered in 1974-75 or 1975-76.

Again, a happy situation for an A.L.P. member. I now refer to the Stirling, Aldgate, Bridgewater area, which comprises part of the District of Fisher. True, that is a Liberal seat, which I represent to the best of my ability and to the satisfaction, at least so it appears, of most of my constituents. In respect of that area the Minister stated:

A sewerage scheme for this area is proposed, and subject to Loan funds being available, is expected to be commenced in 1975-76.

In giving proper credit in respect of what has taken place, I point out that acquisition will start before the date stated for the treatment works, and the land is being bought. Perhaps it is an attempt to buy at a time when it is hoped that prices will be deflated, but we will see about that.

The Aldgate, Stirling, Bridgewater area is not in such a drastic situation in respect of health considerations except in one or two small pockets. True, concern has been expressed over the safety of some constituents in those pockets where heavy effluent pollution prevails. The fifth area referred to by the Minister includes Blackwood and Belair, the Mitcham Hills area, and the Minister states:

The first stage including the more densely populated areas—

the Minister must be joking—

is under construction and expected to be completed in 1975. This will be followed by the remainder of the Blackwood, Belair, Hawthorndene, Coromandel Valley areas. He has left out Eden Hills, a small pocket in the Bellevue Heights area, and I take it that in the Belair area he includes Monalta and Glenalta, where there is a small unsewered section. What the Minister is really saying is that there is no guaranteed finishing date for the Mitcham Hills area. For the people living there it is a matter of "wailing to see what comes along but, if you are willing to suffer an A.L.P. Government, we give you no guarantee when you will get sewerage, because we do not find that you have the representation in the right places, in Cabinet or elsewhere".

It can be argued that when Sir Thomas Playford was in power, he, at least, handled such matters fairly. He did not pay favour to the group in the Mitcham Hills area who might have voted for his member at that time. He judged things on their merits and on their priorities. Of course, priorities have now changed. The Mitcham Hills area is an area causing grave concern in respect of health problems and the general living environment resulting from a lack of proper sewerage facilities. The Minister was asked how many allotments in the metropolitan area remained unsewered, and he said:

To determine the actual number of unsewered allotments would entail a considerable amount of work, and would have little meaning as there are a number of old subdivisions where there is little or no development.

I would like him to tell me where they were. True, there is no development of sewerage facilities in some of those areas, and there is not likely to be any development for a long time at the present rate of progress. The Minister continued:

However, it is estimated that there is a total of approximately 14 000 houses that are not sewered. Approximately 3 000 of these are connected to common effluent schemes.

There are 11 000 houses which do not have any facility for the removal of sewerage. Of these 11 000 houses, 2 000 are in the Stirling area. This leaves 9 000 houses without sewerage facilities. How many of these houses or properties would be in the Mitcham Hills area? I calculate that there would be 5 000. By this process I realise there are about 7 000 unsewered houses in the District of Fisher out of a total 11 000 unsewered houses in the metropolitan area.

Fisher is the largest metropolitan electorate in area and has the most electors of any Liberal-held district, now numbering about 21 000. It is held by a Liberal member and the district is rapidly developing. Nevertheless, the Minister gives the people in this district no guarantee about sewerage facilities being completed, other than that there has been a reduction in the effective amount of work that can be carried out this year by 40 per cent.

I leave my constituents to judge for themselves the implications that can be obtained from the figures disclosed. Several petitions have recently been lodged about roads in the Mitcham Hills area. At least two petitions have been presented to this House, and one to the Minister, all having the same preamble, and another is to be presented tomorrow. In total, they contain nearly 1 000 signatures. The petition states:

The humble petition of the undersigned citizens of South Australia sheweth that:

- (1) The development of main roads connecting the Mitcham Hills area with Crafers will be detrimental to the quality of life in these areas.
- (2) The encouragement of heavy transport and other through traffic into residential areas is totally out of keeping with modern thinking.
- (3) There is an opportunity to take a more southerly route from Hackham to Callington, saving fuel and decreasing the burden on the South-Eastern Freeway.

Your petitioners therefore pray that your honourable House will bring to the notice of the Minister of Transport the stupidity of destroying the quality of life in the Mitcham Hills, Crafers, Stirling, and Upper Sturt area with the construction of major roads.

There have been public meetings in my district about this matter. I have received over 200 letters from people concerned about the proposal. I should like to read just two of them, one from a school teacher and one from the Minister of Transport, to show the frustration felt by people in the Mitcham Hills area because the Minister of Transport will not say exactly what the department intends to do; he will not give a direct answer. Yet he is a member of a Government that claims to believe in open government. It may believe in open government, but it does not practise open government. The letter is written by Mr. Webber, who has given me permission to mention his name. It is as follows:

Thank you for your letter of August 14, 1974, concerning road proposals for the Blackwood-Belair region.

I note your request that I direct further questions to the Highways Department. However, I would like to point out that (a) the central and only question asked in my correspondence of July 6, 1974, has not even been touched upon by yourself; and (b) the department has already declined to answer this question and stated that it was a Ministerial matter.

I have not personally at any stage questioned the integrity of your officers or the department but have forwarded a proposal to answer the doubts that I saw expressed at the meeting of July 5, 1974. I have no reason to question the integrity yet, for the obvious test to satisfy others has not yet been refused. I would like to point out, however, that the proclamation of innocence and protestation against questioned integrity are no assurance of the same. I enclose my question as forwarded at an earlier date and await your reply: "At this meeting the reasons for work on the roads in the Blackwood-Belair region have been based solely on the advantages for the local people. If, using as a base projection of population for this area, the present residents, knowing the advantages and disadvantages of the scheme, voted as an absolute majority against the whole or part of the scheme, would the department act in accordance with these wishes?" Yours sincerely, A. T. Webber.

Then follows a postscript:

Note: Upon re-reading my original letter I understand your basis for believing I was reflecting upon the department. This is through the phrase at the bottom of the page "we came away believing". The "we" was in error and arose as a late correction. The original intent was for it to read "many came away believing", and my intent has not at any stage differed from this.

The Minister replied:

I refer to your further letter of August 15, 1974, in which you reiterate the question of whether construction of an arterial road in the Blackwood-Belair region would proceed, should the majority of residents of the area vote against it. I find this question entirely hypothetical—

the Minister suddenly found another word—

as I think I made it quite clear in my letter to you of August 14, that at the present time there is no firm proposal to construct such a road in the area in question. It is not my practice to answer hypothetical questions; however, as a general statement it can be said that all public works which will be of benefit to the State as a whole must be considered from the broadest viewpoint, and not be confined to small sections of the community who may have a vested interest in maintaining the *status quo*. For example, several years ago when the Government took the decision to purchase the township of Chain of Ponds to minimise pollution of the watershed area, the interests of a wider group of our community took precedence over those of the townfolk. Decisions of this nature are of course not easy to make for, in the instance cited, people of the town were required to vacate their homes and move elsewhere. Nevertheless, I believe that the Government is required to make such decisions from time to time to ensure that the State is developed in the manner expected by the majority of South Australians. Decisions in respect to the construction of arterial roads are by no means easy, and are only made when the benefits to the State as a whole are expected to outweigh any disadvantages that may occur to a few. Needless to say, I can assure you that, in any major decisions of this nature, the views of the adjacent residents are always carefully appraised.

The writer of the letter scribbled on the back of the Minister's letter:

It becomes evident that I am not going to get a direct answer to my question for in my original letter it is stated that the Blackwood-Belair region roads were important for their effect on the Sheoak Road proposal, and hence one would assume that a reader (not having reason to do otherwise) would take these as separate references. This letter (overleaf) clearly does not separate them and one can assume either haste or deliberation. If these letters are of use to you, I give you leave to use them as you wish, for I do not intend to follow them up further myself, believing I will not get a direct answer.

That is the sort of approach I had from the Minister of Transport all the way through in this issue. The Highways Department will not say; it is evasive. It says it will widen the road in the township area to provide a better facility for the township, but it does not say whether or not it intends going further. I know in my own heart that that is its intention, but the Minister has not the courage to state it.

I now wish to refer to schools within my area, where the same thing applies. There was a meeting at Bellevue Heights over 18 months ago with people from the Education Department, who said there was a primary school proposed for that area; plans were under way. Rough plans were shown to the meeting, and it was stated that the school would be used as a school to help train students from Sturt College of Advanced Education. We are now told that that school has been backdated but, at the same time, a school at Flagstaff Hill, in the district of the Minister of Development and Mines, has been up-dated. What conclusions can we draw?

In the other field of education, I am pleased that the school for Coromandel Valley will continue to progress, as presently promised. Some people fear that even that school will be backdated. In respect of kindergartens, the committee at Bridgewater has worked hard, but it fears it will be told that this is a rich area. There are 200 potential students (if we can call kindergarten children potential students) waiting to enter kindergarten in the Stirling area. The group is set up in temporary premises, thanks to the sisters at the Mt. St. Katherine Convent making room and allowing the community to have a kindergarten there. Coromandel Valley has operated for years and is using a church building that is inadequate. When the money is granted, we all know where most of it will go. If previous practice is to be continued, very little of it will go to the Liberal areas. Members should think about that and remember it. If democracy is to work, it must work for the benefit of all, not only for the favoured few. In these respects, my district has been neglected. I say that, after waiting for some time for an attempt to be made to do something.

I have with me a copy of a letter sent by the Minister of Transport to one of my constituents after I had directed letters to him from several constituents about Ackland Hill Road. The Minister puts the blame for the condition of this road on the Meadows council, saying that it is its responsibility. In the case of Keenihan Road, Happy Valley, on the border of my district in the district of the Minister of Development and Mines, a grant has been guaranteed for roadwork to be completed. Ackland Hill Road in my district is used by the school bus, there having been one accident this year when it was lucky no-one was injured. There is no guarantee that that will be the case next time. When this accident occurred, neither the driver nor the bus was at fault. This road is nothing more than a corrugated strip of rubble. The Minister says that the Meadows council should be told to keep it in trafficable condition, but that is impossible in an area that has 102 cm rainfall a year. The Minister of Development and Mines can get the road in his district upgraded, yet it serves no more people than the road in my district serves.

Mr. Langley: What happened under Liberal Governments?

Mr. EVANS: The Mitcham Hills area was not considered for sewerage until the latter part of the term of the 1968-70 Liberal Government. The Playford Government left that area alone for years. The member for Unley can be assured that, if this Government had handled its priorities with as much political honesty as did the Playford Government, I would not be making the comments I am making this evening. In this Budget, the Treasurer claims there is little increase in taxation. The *Advertiser* states that, as it has no new tax increases, it is a tame Budget. I would hate to be in a cage with a lion as tame as this Budget, which contains slugs so that everyone

will pay more. The water rate assessment in the Stirling area has increased on average by 200 per cent, with the highest increase being 500 per cent. This service is supplied by the Government which gets the water for nothing but which still cannot sell it at a profit without slugging people.

There is a \$10 000 000 project for a community housing project at Para Hills. Who represents that area—a Liberal or Labor politician? The sum of \$500 000 will be spent on a swimming pool and complex in the Marion area in the district of the Minister of Transport. The sum of \$2 000 000 is to be spent at Noarlunga in the district of the Minister of Development and Mines. There is not one community swimming pool in my district, although approaches have been made to the Minister of Education and others in this regard. Although there are over 21 000 people in my district, practically all the community developments in the area have been provided only as a result of the community making a sacrifice.

Mr. Keneally: What about the Sturt College of Advanced Education?

Mr. EVANS: It has a swimming pool, although there have been problems there. That is on the fringe of my district, and it is not a community swimming pool. If we could have in my district the same sort of facility as is being provided in the district of the Minister of Transport, we would be happy. Government members should know that I have not made many attacks of a political nature. However, the stage has been reached where people in my district are making these allegations. In fairness to them, I am expressing the view they have that my district has been disadvantaged because the Government favours its own. Because of the tax slugs contained in it, I do not support the Bill with any real enthusiasm.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): In the Budget, additional taxes on the community amount to about 38 per cent. If a round figure of 20 per cent is taken as the rate of inflation and that sum is deducted from the increase in taxes, we could reasonably expect to enjoy additional services at the rate of 18 per cent. However, the Budget does not work out that way. I will cite one or two examples of cases in which the Government has imposed increases in non-productive areas at a time when production in primary and secondary industry is at a disastrously low level.

The fishing industry has been referred to during this debate by several members. It deserves the comment and time spent on it so far and much more as well. A miserable sum of \$527 000 is being appropriated to the Fisheries Department, which represents this vital part of Australia's primary production. The State fishing industry deserves a much better deal than it has had over several years. Fishermen and their associations have become organized in their own industry. They have searched for the natural resources in and around the State coastline and rivers, and they are not getting the service they deserve from the department. As a result of becoming licensed, they are restricted in the areas whence they can draw these natural resources.

I am disappointed in the Minister of Fisheries for his lack of attention towards this vital part of primary industry. Since becoming Minister, he has promised to look seriously at the areas to which I have referred. He has promised to set up authorities to investigate and research the prawn industry and the trawling industry. Although he chooses not to pay attention at the moment, the Minister must realise that the position is serious. Certain people in this State have borrowed large sums to equip themselves on the assumption that the department would at least give them

a reasonable go and allow them to farm the sea just as rural producers farm the land. I understand that 150 people have applied for B class licences. Unfortunately, these people have been fooled around for 12 months waiting for a report, presumably to be made by the Director of Fisheries, on whether or not their licences should be granted. All members know that South Australia has not at present got a Director of Fisheries but that we are enjoying the services of a former Director who has recently been appointed Director of Research but is serving as Director of Fisheries in an acting capacity.

I should like briefly to cite the sort of problem being experienced by these men, particularly those in the lobster fishing industry. It is difficult enough for one to obtain a permit to catch lobster. Those in South Australia who are fortunate enough to have a permit are faced with a double standard regarding the size of lobster that they are permitted to catch. Although the Commonwealth-State boundary line can be defined, there are two size limits, one for State waters, and another for Commonwealth waters. I see little point in any Government be it State or Commonwealth passing laws if there is no practical way of policing them. The example that has been set in this regard is typical of the disorganised department dealing with the fishing industry in the State.

The Commonwealth Government is aware of this State's lobster size limit, but apparently it is a case of the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing. The Acting Director of Fisheries and his Minister in this State do not appear to have the co-operation of their Commonwealth colleagues that they should have. We therefore have the ridiculous situation of the South Australian-based fisherman who puts to sea and who must catch a certain size crayfish when he is only 8 km from shore but who, when only about 1½ km farther out, must catch larger crayfish. I do not know how such a fisherman can be expected to keep his catch separate or, indeed, how the department will police this legislation. Perhaps this is another basis on which to enlarge the great Public Service that supports the Australian Labor Party in this State.

I turn now to other productive industries, be they primary or secondary. It is obvious that the Government is neglecting production and output in industry at the expense of other artificial fields. I have said previously that \$527 000 is allocated to the fishing industry. However, one finds that the Art Gallery, believe it or not, is to receive \$387 000 for expenditure in that direction. No-one denies the South Australian public the right to enjoy art, culture and other areas of artificial entertainment.

Mr. Millhouse: What do you mean by "artificial"?

Mr. Payne: Don't ask him, Robin; he's in real trouble.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am not in real trouble, as such areas are artificial and non-productive. It is important that priorities be shifted. This Government has drifted into giving priority to non-productive fields at the expense of areas that need assistance so desperately. It is about time that Government members realised how important it is to keep the wheels of industry turning and to keep the production of food, for example, and the output of other valuable exports at the highest possible level.

Mr. Max Brown: What about the Sydney Opera House?

Mr. CHAPMAN: That is a great place for those who can afford it. I do not deny that establishments such as our Festival Theatre have a place in society, but let us not place too much emphasis in this direction at the expense of essential services.

Mr. Langley: They should get a subsidy, I suppose?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Does the honourable member need a subsidy?

Mr. Langley: No, I can run a business without a subsidy. Can you?

Mr. CHAPMAN: The member for Unley talks about subsidies. However, the artificial fields to which I have referred are highly subsidized, and do Government members deny that they, too, need assistance? If they do, it is not unreasonable to deny a subsidy for the formation or assistance of other productive industries. While concentrating on the productive aspect, let us examine the erosion of incentive for those who are trying to produce from productive land. In 1973, the outer metropolitan area development plan, which contained considerable land acquisition proposals, was produced. A large area of my district was intended to be acquired for parks and other artificial and non-productive purposes. Again, no-one denies that a certain area should be laid aside, but is it not fair that those who currently occupy that land should be given an opportunity to plan their lives?

There is an area on the south coast of Fleurieu Peninsula, for example, and many thousands of hectares of land in that area is proposed to be acquired by the Government if and when it finds the money to carry out its programme. However, in the meantime the occupiers of that land cannot go on building further structural improvements for the future of their families, because at any time at the whim of the Government or the appropriate authority there may be a move to buy the land.

Mr. Duncan: Of course, that's not the story you were giving us a moment ago. These aren't uncleared and undeveloped lands.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The honourable member should study the outer metropolitan plan and see the area to which I am referring. A vast area proposed to be acquired is already developed, running stock, and producing grain.

Mr. Duncan: Some of the land ought to be taken over by the Government as areas of natural land and conservation parks.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I have said several times that it is reasonable that certain lands be acquired by the Government and protected from indiscriminate development. The authority that prepared the document referred to Rundle Street and Pitt Street type farmers who had been developing this land for the sake of having an interest in rural production for the sake of taxation avoidance, but those days have gone. The department need have no fears now about indiscriminate development of country that is likely to erode as a result of cultivation, because the inducement to city business men to develop in the country has gone. Can we now expect that the Environment and Conservation Department will take another look at the proposed vast acquisition of rural lands? I raised this matter with the Minister of Environment and Conservation some months ago.

I do not believe that his department at that stage had even considered the matter in the light of Mr. Crean's erosion of primary producer incentive to develop and produce more in the rural areas. If it had, the Minister has chosen so far not to report on it as I requested at that time. I do not believe there is anything like the urgency to acquire such vast areas of land, as was proposed prior to the August Budget speech last year. The whole concept of land acquisition for conservation purposes should be reconsidered in South Australia.

Mr. Duncan: In 1918, when the first acquisition of land on Kangaroo Island for national parks was undertaken, people like you hotly opposed it. and now that is the only part of the island—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot make a second reading speech. The honourable member for Alexandra.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The honourable member is vocal about an area of which I have had some experience. Probably he was referring to the large fauna and flora reserve near Cape Borda. Without going into detail as to whether or not the area should be as large as it is or even enlarged, I remind him that my family owned that land at one time and a large part of it was given to the Government for the purposes for which it is used today. The honourable member may have been referring to the Seal Bay area, where another island farmer released his ownership so that the land could become a reserve.

Mr. Duncan: I wasn't referring to the Seal Bay area.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The honourable member should do his homework before referring to the territory adjacent to my back door.

Mr. Keneally: You didn't refer to Flinders Chase.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Flinders Chase is a large fauna and flora reserve near Cape Borda, for the honourable member's information. He, too, ought to do his homework before interjecting about areas near my back door.

Mr. Duncan: Flinders Chase doesn't include Seal Bay and the other areas to which you have referred.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Flinders Chase is adjacent to the Cape Borda reserve.

Mr. Duncan: But it doesn't include Seal Bay.

Mr. CHAPMAN: No; it is 50 km away.

Mr. Duncan: I was referring to Flinders Chase.

Mr. CHAPMAN: So was I. There is another area where the Kangaroo Island Lands Committee approved of the land being proclaimed as a reserve, that is, on the north coast of the island, near Western River. I could also refer to another large area proposed to be held by the Lands Department for other than rural productive purposes (or at least for other than farming purposes): namely, the multi-thousand hectare area adjacent to the Gosse community where, I understand, the department is considering, among other things, proclaiming this area as a forestry reserve. That is, of course, if the member for Mitcham does not influence his colleagues in the Department of the Army to take it over as a military training centre. If the Army does take over this land, we on the island hope that it will be more careful and will clean up properly before it leaves the site.

Certain problems followed the Army's visit to the island last year, but I am certain that that state of affairs will not happen again. Ordinarily, I would not have referred to this matter; I am only returning a mention I received from the member for Mitcham today. I thought it appropriate to be fair and to mention him.

Mr. Becker: Was he in charge of that camp?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am not sure whether he was in charge, but he was in the area. We are pleased to have his officers and men in the area, but if the honourable member was in charge of the area he must be made totally responsible for not cleaning it up properly before leaving.

Mr. Max Brown: Have you seen Jimmy Dunford lately?

Mr. McAnaney: Not since—

Mr. CHAPMAN: I do not believe that he has been back to the island since the incident to which the member for Heysen refers; but, if he has, he must have gone in and out quietly because his presence was not noticed. Of course, he, along with everyone else, is welcome to

go to Kangaroo Island at any time. That beautiful island is one of the greatest tourist areas in South Australia. Unlike some parts of South Australia, on Kangaroo Island the tourist promoters and the primary producers live together harmoniously. Of course, there are also scenic delights on the south coast of Fleurieu Peninsula. Whilst members opposite do not know much about national parks and proclaimed reserves in the district, one hopes that they know more about the tourist areas to which I have referred. They would be welcome to visit Victor Harbor and Kangaroo Island.

Mr. Arnold: We don't want to see those districts polluted.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Whilst we cordially invite Australian and international tourists, we hope that they will respect the unpolluted nature of the districts to which I have referred.

Mr. Keneally: I think you're doing all right without any help.

Mr. CHAPMAN: It is all very well for the member for Stuart to make rude comments, but I am proud to be able to refer to Fleurieu Peninsula and Kangaroo Island, two valuable and productive parts of South Australia. I am also proud to have the responsibility of ensuring that they are not destroyed by centralist bureaucrats who do not appreciate the value of production. There are many attractions in those areas that can be exploited without a great deal of expenditure. It is only in Adelaide and other densely populated places that the arts are an expensive exercise. Natural beauty does not involve great expense. One could criticise the Budget because the Government has made many mistakes in it. However, I have welcomed the opportunity to promote South Australia generally and my district in particular.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (3)—Messrs. Boundy, McAnaney, and Millhouse (teller).

Noes (36)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Broomhill, Dean Brown, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Chapman, Corcoran (teller), Coumbe, Crimes, Duncan, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Groth, Gunn, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, Mathwin, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Russack, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Venning, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Majority of 33 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): We have just witnessed a coalition between the two numerically strongest Parties in this House that is becoming all too common, and my reason for moving that the debate be adjourned was well known to all members. It was so that I would get an opportunity tomorrow to move the motion of which I gave notice today. All members know that, by forcing the debate to go on now, they can block me from moving that motion by denying me a suspension of Standing Orders. I have no doubt that that is why members on the L.C.L. side of the House voted with the Government, as is their wont so often. I think that is a disgraceful action. It is typical of the fact that the L.C.L. is willing to be the junior partner to the Government when it suits it, and it suits it if it thinks it will do something to disparage the efforts of the Liberal Movement to provide some real opposition in this place.

Mr. Venning: Do you—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Rocky River had better be careful about what he says. I notice that the

member for Kavel is quiet. Probably he received the news this evening that was not as welcome as other news has been.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Your turn is coming. Someone will soon be breathing down your neck.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member can match the calibre of our candidate for the District of Kavel, I will congratulate him.

Mr. McANANEY: I rise on a point of order. I know that latitude is given in the Budget debate, but I can see no reference in the Budget to the tripe that the member for Mitcham is talking.

The SPEAKER: I admit that, in a Budget debate, much latitude is given and honourable members usually are given the opportunity to speak on practically any matter. However, I ask honourable members to refrain from introducing personalities that have no relation to the Budget.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I certainly accept what you have said. The personality that I have mentioned will have a considerable effect on the Budget after the next election: he will be able to debate it. Yesterday I raised, on the motion to resume this debate, the matter of trade unions and particularly the way the affairs of the Transport Workers Union were conducted. I referred to notes that had been taken by a man who was not a member of the union but who turned up at a meeting about eight or nine days ago and then went home and made the notes. They showed the most deliberately and scandalously lax conduct of the affairs of the union.

I consider that that course of action is taken to allow a small number of people in the union to manipulate its affairs. I will not repeat what I said yesterday: I am sure that to do so would be transgressing Standing Orders. However, the evidence that I got today fortified what I had said yesterday. At lunchtime today I had the opportunity to discuss this matter with Mr. Jack Nyland, Secretary of the Transport Workers Union, and the only defence that Mr. Nyland could put up to what I had said in the House yesterday and what I repeated in shortened form on the television programme was that the man who went to the meeting was my spy and must have been drunk.

Mr. Payne Was he?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I do not believe that he was drunk, and he certainly was not my spy. I heard about the incident only last Monday morning.

Mr. Wright: He may not have been a spy, but his ethics weren't too good in sneaking into a meeting. He must have been a sneak thief.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope that *Hansard* is hearing all these things.

Mr. Wright: So do I.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Adelaide is saying the sort of thing that Mr. Nyland said on the programme today. The problem that Mr. Nyland and, apparently, the member for Adelaide have is that they have no way of refuting what I reported to the House yesterday. The only thing that they can do to try to defend the situation is to hurl abuse at me, and I got that today. One thing hurled at me was that I was a broken-down politician who was chasing the cheers. They were the only things that Mr. Nyland, who plays a central part in the Transport Workers Union, was able to say in answer to the report which I gave in the House and which was published in the newspaper and repeated on television.

The fact that Mr. Nyland was not able to give an answer other than the absurdities that I have mentioned (and I gave him the invitation) fortified what I had said.

I had no doubt yesterday (and I have no doubt today) that what I said was an accurate statement on the affairs of the union. I gave to the House an example of the sort of thing that goes on in the Transport Workers Union and, I believe, also in other unions. Because of the deliberate tactics of trade union officials, it is possible for anyone, member or non-member, financial or unfinancial, to go to union meetings and take part in making decisions that affect the whole community. If that sort of thing is to occur, the community has a right to take an active interest in the affairs of unions.

[Midnight]

That is the point that I make from the report that I gave yesterday. If there is to be this scandalous laxity, which can lead so easily to manipulation and which I believe has led to manipulation, the community is entitled to see something done about it, and that means interfering with the rights (so treasured by members opposite and so fiercely defended) of no interference at all in union affairs so that the unions can do what they like. That is the point and, if members opposite have nothing to fear in this matter, they have nothing to fear from an inquiry into the affairs of unions. That is all I proposed yesterday, and that is all I am asking now. That is what I put to Mr. Nyland today, but he could give no answer to that, except to say that it was the union's affair how meetings were run, and he was not going to have anyone inquiring into what happened in his union. That will not be accepted by 99.9 per cent of the people of this State as a reasonable attitude.

I have dwelt only on the way in which meetings are run and manipulated. As I said yesterday, there are other aspects of union affairs which also call for inquiry. Those are the things that have been referred to in this place by the former member for Goyder (Senator Hall) last year in respect of unions' accounts. There is also the other aspect that has been raised repeatedly by members on both sides of this House, year after year, about the way in which votes are taken in unions and whether there should be some degree of secrecy in certain circumstances. All these matters call for inquiry and report. Yesterday I referred to the Royal Commission which the Government hastened to establish in respect of a school-girl. If we can have a Royal Commission on that matter, surely it would not be too much trouble to have a Royal Commission inquire into the affairs of trade unions, which play such a prominent part in all our lives.

Today, we have heard of yet another Royal Commission, although I do not believe it has yet been established. I do not believe (and I say this for the benefit of the Leader of the Opposition) that we are barred from discussing the matter to be investigated, although that is what the Leader said immediately he rose. I believe he made a mistake. The Government is to establish—

The Hon. L. J. King: He may not be anxious to say anything at all.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think the Attorney-General is right for once. I believe the Leader took refuge in that little ploy. Nevertheless, it will all come out when the Commission takes evidence. The Government does not hesitate to establish Royal Commissions when it suits it, and there is no reason why we should not have a Royal Commission into trade unions. They are now so significant a force in the community that the community is entitled to be satisfied that they are being properly conducted and run, or we will have what we have had in the last few months from the Transport Workers

Union. No member opposite can deny the scandalous situation of that union's disrupting the economy of this State over a demarcation dispute in which the overwhelming majority of us (and I believe a majority of the union's own members) did not believe it had any justification at all.

That has been said not by me for the first time, but by Ministers on the front bench and by Labor back-benchers. That is the situation. The contingent notice that I gave today was pursuant to Standing Order No. 300, which is in a new form, and the relevant part is as follows:

To the question "That this Bill be now read a second time,"—

and that is the question we are now debating—

the only amendments which may be moved shall be—

. . . (iii) An amendment relating to public affairs—

and if this does not relate to public affairs, I do not know what does—

where the Bill is an Appropriation Bill—

as this is—

for the ordinary annual services of the Government;

This is a new procedure, which has not, so far as I know, been adopted before but it does give members (and this is what the member for Davenport referred to this afternoon) an added opportunity to raise and get a decision in this place on a matter concerning public affairs. I did not have an opportunity after I spoke in the grievance debate yesterday until today to give notice of that motion. Under the Standing Orders a notice is good only for a subsequent day, and this debate has, I believe, been deliberately kept going until this stage, so that it is necessary for me to get that notice in to move a suspension of Standing Orders. By denying me a suspension of Standing Orders, which we will test in a minute, Government members will avoid having to take a vote on the motion itself and will so avoid having to vote directly against an inquiry into trade union affairs.

I have no doubt that this is the reason why I am being obliged, against my will as I made clear in the division when only one L.C.L. member saw fit to support me, to go on with this debate tonight. It is simply to avoid the embarrassment which is being caused to members opposite by the matters to which I referred yesterday. L.C.L. members were silly enough to support the Government in that by voting against me on the adjournment. I am not going to waste the time of the House, or my own time, by going into matters concerning the Budget. I am afraid that almost the whole, if not the whole, of the debate on the first line, as we call it, has been so far, to the best of my observation, a complete waste of time. The motion I intend to move will test members on both sides. Let all members remember that, by voting against the suspension of Standing Orders, they are stifling the motion that I desire to move later. I will now give that motion so that there will later be no misunderstanding about it. The amendment I want to move is that the motion "That this Bill be now read a second time" be amended as follows:

By leaving out all the words after "that" and inserting "this House is of opinion that the Bill should not be proceeded with until a Royal Commission is set up to inquire into the affairs of trade unions in this State".

That is the motion I want to move, and it is the motion on which I want a vote. However, unless there is a suspension of Standing Orders, I will not get a vote on that motion, and members opposite will be spared, they hope, some degree of embarrassment (embarrassment that would come from refusing an inquiry which is so obviously

justified and which, I believe, is wanted by many people throughout the community because of their disquiet with the way in which trade unions are running their own affairs and thereby running our lives). To move that motion I must first move for a suspension of Standing Orders. I hope there are enough members here to see that I get to that stage. Therefore, I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move an amendment without notice.

There is little more that I need say in explanation of that motion. I have already given as good an explanation as I can. I remind members on this side of the House that, if they do not support this motion, they are showing that they would not support an inquiry into the affairs of trade unions in this State. I remind members on the other side of the House that if they refuse the suspension—

The SPEAKER: Order! I seek information from the honourable member as to whether he has moved for the suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I have moved for the suspension of Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there not being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the Houses, the motion for suspension cannot be accepted. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Right! In that case I am defeated in this way, and I am defeated just as certainly by members of the Liberal and Country League being out of the Chamber as I am by being refused a vote on my motion. I hope the public will take note of this. I cannot go on with this motion for the suspension of Standing Orders because there is not present in the Chamber an absolute majority of all members of the Houses. I can see in front of me only eight members of the L.C.L. If members of the L.C.L. came into this place, there would be present (because there are a number of Government members present) a sufficient number of members for me to move for the suspension of Standing Orders. I will speak on for a few minutes and will give members of the L.C.L. an opportunity to come into this House so that I may move for the suspension of Standing Orders. If they do not come in, I will interpret it (and will say as much) as a deliberate attempt (and it will be a successful attempt) to prevent me moving this motion. That is the position, and it will be just as obvious an action in support of the Government as a vote against it would be. Now, we shall see.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has moved for the suspension of Standing Orders. The suspension was not permitted. A discussion on the suspension is not now permitted in the debate. The honourable member got the call, after my not accepting the suspension motion, to continue his remarks in the debate on the Bill. The only discussion open to the member for Mitcham at this stage is on the Appropriation Bill; reference to a decision of this House cannot be made by the member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With great deference, there has been no decision of the House at all. The only thing that has happened is that I have not been able to move for suspension because not enough members have been present.

Mr. Chapman: You must accept the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Alexandra is bellicose tonight. He has been sleeping for most of the day. In a repetitious speech, he made a slighting reference to me, and now he comes out with this. I do not know

the reason for this; whether it has any connection with the announcement that was made tonight I do not know, but I will not waste my own time or even the time of other members by going on. It is obvious now, in the five minutes that has elapsed since I attempted to move for the suspension of Standing Orders, that L.C.L. members are deliberately torpedoing this move of mine by staying out of the House, because there are still only eight of them here and—

Mr. McAnaney: That's 50 per cent, but you are here for only 5 per cent of the time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Heysen had better get his facts right.

Dr. Tonkin: Why were you not here to answer the call at about 9 o'clock?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Bragg has asked me a question. I was not here, in the hope that this debate would be adjourned until tomorrow so that I would not be in the predicament in which I am now.

Dr. Tonkin: It happened while you were away.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, it was not while I was away. The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Tell the truth.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister is a great one: it was he who, earlier in the evening, absolutely refused me any co-operation or information at all. He said he had no responsibility in the matter. He would not tell me whether or not the debate was to go on all night. I was not here earlier in the evening so that I would not be called on to speak early in the debate, in the hope that this debate would be adjourned until tomorrow and I would not need a suspension of Standing Orders. I am not prepared to argue further with the member for Bragg about it. I have given him the explanation, which he knows is accurate. I ask the member for Heysen to leave my microphone alone. If he will play the fool and try to distract my attention, I shall have to take a point of order on him. However, it is useless my going on.

Members interjecting:

Mr. McAnaney: That is the first good point you have made.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is amazing how in this House I can feel the animosity of members of the L.C.L. towards me from time to time, and on a matter on which I have heard the member for Alexandra and other members of the L.C.L. talk at greater length than on anything else; yet, when we have the opportunity to take some action, they prefer to support the Government rather than me. That shows what is so patently obvious, that they hate and fear the Liberal Movement more than they hate and fear the Government.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Dr. EASTICK: I rise to make a personal explanation about the gutsless statement we have heard in the last few minutes from the member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take a point of order. The Leader is apparently referring to me and has used a term to which I object—"gutsless". I ask for that word to be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham has objected to a certain word used by the Leader of the Opposition. I ask the Leader whether he will withdraw the word to which the honourable member objects.

Dr. EASTICK: I am quite happy to alter it to "gutless".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot accept that as a withdrawal; that is simply making grammatical what was before ungrammatical.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is objecting to the use of a word, and I ask the Leader of the Opposition whether he will withdraw that word.

Dr. EASTICK: I believe that, as members of this House rise to make contributions to debates, they have a responsibility to accept the comments they make. I accept the comment that I have made and I now seek the opportunity to proceed with the other statement I have to make.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has objected to the use of a certain word and has requested, through the Chair, the withdrawal of that word. I ask the Leader of the Opposition whether he will withdraw the word objected to.

Dr. EASTICK: So that I shall not be denied the opportunity of putting the record straight, I withdraw the word "gutless" or "gutsless", whichever the honourable member prefers used against him, and will refer now to the lack of courage shown by the member for Mitcham in the statement he made in this House earlier. The statement made by the honourable member about members of the Party I am proud to lead lacks an understanding of the facts. I have been in verbal contact this week with the member for Flinders, who I am certain would wish me to include him in my personal explanation. He is in a hospital bed in Port Lincoln undergoing medical tests. The member for Victoria is confined to bed on medical advice. The member for Frome has gone to his home this evening, because he is ailing. The member for Rocky River was released from the services of the House by me about 10 minutes ago so that he could take his wife home, she having returned to the House after an earlier engagement. As the member for Mitcham will appreciate, the member for Murray is overseas on a tour that has the sanction of the House. The member for Mallee is also overseas representing the Parliaments of Australia as a regional representative of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I believe that this evening the member for Mitcham has shown us just how puerile he can be by his attack on the proceedings of this House. You, Sir, definitely gave him the call earlier this evening, as second in line in this debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on another point of order, Mr. Speaker. As I understand it, the Leader has leave to make a personal explanation. It seems (and I say this with great respect to you, because it is a matter for your judgment) that no personal explanation is being given; the Leader is simply using this opportunity to make an attack on me. I suggest that that is beyond the bounds of a personal explanation, and I ask you either to confine him to that or shut him up.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader sought leave of the House to make a personal explanation, leave being unanimously granted. From the tone of the remarks of the honourable Leader, I take it that the personal explanation is designed to refute the statement made by the honourable member for Mitcham about the attendance in the House of honourable members belonging to the Party that the Leader of the Opposition leads. I will not uphold the point of order of the honourable member for Mitcham regarding the explanation of the honourable Leader to which I have referred, but I must ask the honourable Leader to refrain from referring to the call given to the honourable member for Mitcham earlier in the debate, as that is not a matter of personal explanation. However, the honourable

Leader, in his personal explanation, can refute the remarks made by the honourable member for Mitcham about his Party.

Dr. EASTICK: With due respect, Sir, I believe you will see that the explanation I am giving is importantly tied to that issue. You will accept that, as Leader, I am responsible for giving the opportunity to members of my Party to vacate the House. I must know their whereabouts. I am also aware that members on this side were invited by the member for Mitcham this evening to continue to grieve so that this debate could continue and he could be in a position to make this sort of puerile attempt to get himself the cheap publicity he seeks. The usual Christian charity we have received from the member for Mitcham this evening is something that does him no credit. As this personal explanation covers all aspects of the matter, I refer also to the ridiculous statements made by the Attorney-General by way of interjection. The Attorney-General in his interjection and the member for Mitcham in the debate spoke about my capacity or otherwise to speak about the Monarto issue.

The Hon. L. J. King: As to your intention.

The SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with Standing Order 137, a personal explanation by any honourable member is limited to a maximum period of five minutes. In accordance with Standing Orders, the honourable Leader's time has expired.

Mr. COUMBE: I should like to move that an extension of five minutes be granted to the Leader.

The SPEAKER: The Leader can move that leave be granted to enable him to continue his remarks.

Dr. EASTICK: I seek leave to continue my remarks.
Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: Again, I point out to the honourable Leader that his personal explanation must be confined to remarks made in the House this evening. He may not introduce extraneous matters that have no relationship to the statement made by the honourable member for Mitcham and to the honourable Leader's refutation of that statement.

Dr. EASTICK: The remarks to which I refer were made in the last 15 minutes of the debate by the member for Mitcham in the course of his speech, and by the Attorney-General in an interjection. I believe that it is the right of any member to determine the course of action he will take in respect of an issue before the House. I made a considered judgment this afternoon about the way in which I would conduct myself in relation to a statement made by the Minister of Environment and Conservation. It does neither the Attorney-General nor the member for Mitcham any credit to have reflected on me in the way they chose to do some 15 minutes ago. In conclusion, I wish to say that the removal of the member for Mitcham from this House to the Army this evening has got him into a fix from which he has been unable to extricate himself.

The SPEAKER: Order! The latter remarks of the honourable Leader cannot be accepted as a personal explanation; I rule them out of order.

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

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I appreciate the courtesy of members on both sides in allowing me to make a personal explanation which will be short and which will be confined to the matter that was first raised in his explanation by the Leader: the question of numbers in the House. At the time I attempted to suspend Standing Orders you, Sir, made a count and, to the best of my recollection, there were

20 members in the House, excluding you. As I understand it, an absolute majority was required, and that is 24 members. At that time, there were eight members of the L.C.L. present.

Mr. Chapman: Of the Liberal Party.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the country member for Alexandra prefers that it be called the Liberal Party, let it be. There were eight members of his Party present. There are now 11 members present, and I notice that the Leader in his explanation gave no reason for the absence of the members for Hanson and Davenport. If those members and the members who have since returned to the Chamber had been here, I would have had sufficient numbers to suspend Standing Orders.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If honourable members interject when the Speaker is seeking the opinion of the House on whether leave should be granted to an honourable member to enable him to make a personal explanation, I will have to take it as an objection to the granting of such leave.

Leave granted.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Mitcham has reflected on the Opposition, of which I am a member.

Mr. Millhouse: Of the L.C.L.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am a member of the Liberal Party Opposition in this Chamber. The member for Mitcham complained that only eight Opposition members were in the Chamber when he sought leave to have Standing Orders suspended. I point out to the honourable member and other honourable members that the member for Mitcham did not have the courtesy to tell the Opposition what he intended to do or at what time he intended to do it. Since I have been a member of this House, there have often been far fewer than 22 members present in this Chamber at this time of the night. It seems that the member for Mitcham expects us to be clairvoyant and to wait on his every word, in case he seeks to suspend Standing Orders in, say, seven or eight hours. The reason for his seeking to do so is completely ridiculous. He did not even have the courtesy to tell the Opposition what he intended to do. What he has said is sheer humbug.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. EVANS: As Whip of the Liberal Party, and of the Country Party when its member is here (unfortunately he is ill this week), I wish to refer to the way in which the debate was kept going tonight. You, Mr. Speaker, will know that I increased the number of speakers on the list in addition to those who intended initially to speak. I kept the debate going, as did the member for Glenelg, until the member for Mitcham returned to the Chamber. Indeed, we deliberately spoke out our time so that the member for Mitcham could return and, immediately he returned, I took off the list the member for Chaffey, who did not then speak in the debate. That was done out of courtesy to the member for Mitcham, with the Government's knowing what the Opposition was doing: giving the member for Mitcham an opportunity to return to the Chamber and participate in the debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind honourable members that a personal explanation is, as the words indicate, an

explanation by a member of something pertaining to himself: it is not a means whereby an honourable member can debate an issue. I repeat that a personal explanation can be made by an honourable member only about something affecting him. If honourable members are going to debate the issue, I, as Speaker, will have to refuse leave.

Mr. EVANS: I explained it in this way, Mr. Speaker, because it was a reflection on me, as Whip. I went out of my way to offer an opportunity to a member of this House, while he was absent from the Chamber on other business, to return and participate in the debate. However, I received nothing but criticism for my actions.

Mr. Millhouse: But the member for Alexandra had not started speaking when I came back.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: He was not even on his feet when I returned.

The SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with Standing Orders, leave to make a personal explanation can be granted only by a unanimous decision of honourable members. If honourable members continually interject during the making of a personal explanation, I can only interpret that as a refusal of leave.

Mr. EVANS: I have received from the member for Mitcham a letter in which he refers to his colleague, the member for Goyder, and in which he says that at any time they wish to take the type of action they have taken tonight they will have the courtesy to inform me, as Whip, accordingly, and that they hope I will do the same. However, that did not happen tonight. Had it happened, the circumstances might have been different. I take what happened

tonight as a reflection on me. I gave the member for Mitcham every opportunity to return to the Chamber to speak, but instead of gratitude I received nothing but abuse.

Mr. Millhouse: You blokes still have a lot of explaining to do.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. McANANEY: I should like to explain why I voted for the motion for the adjournment of the debate at 11.45 p.m. I did so because of my conscientious objection to staying here after midnight when that is caused by the inability of the Government to organise its activities so that it can get through the business of the House without late sittings. I am pleased to be able to sit alongside the member for Goyder—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Heysen has gone beyond all realms of making a personal explanation.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Schedule.

Legislative Council, \$113 000—passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.40 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 12, at 2 p.m.