

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, September 17, 1974

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

PETITIONS: SODOMY

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY presented a petition signed by 168 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 referendum (to be held at the next periodic South Australian election) to pass such legislation.

Mr. CRIMES presented a similar petition signed by 75 persons.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: SPEED LIMIT

Mr. MILLHOUSE presented a petition signed by 44 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. GOLDSWORTHY presented a similar petition signed by 51 persons.

Mr. McANANEY presented a similar petition signed by 26 persons.

Mr. BECKER presented a similar petition signed by 76 persons.

Petitions received.

PETITION: COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Mr. ARNOLD presented a petition signed by 588 persons slating 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.

QUESTIONS

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

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (August 27).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Shown below are the latest cost estimates related to the Redcliff petro-chemical project. Cost escalation factors of about 10 per cent a year have been built into these figures. The estimates are:

	Approx. cost in \$m.
Consortium expenditure: (Caustic soda/chlorine cell plant, ethylene plant, ethylene dichloride plant, polythene plant, fractionator, alkylation plant, etc.)	600.00
Infra-structure to be provided with Common- wealth and State finance:	
Power station.....	65.40
Hydrocarbon liquids line.....	42.40
Gas spur.....	16.20
Marine facilities.....	9.40
Water supply to site.....	9.50
920 houses for Redcliff employees average cost of \$16 000 per house.....	14.72
Total	\$157.62

The State's share of this cost would amount to nearly \$45 000 000, which sum includes \$14 720 000 for the provision of 920 houses. Discussions with the Commonwealth for special funds under the housing agreement are currently taking place. Apart from minor works and housing, all the infrastructure provided with State or Commonwealth funds will be repaid in full by the consortium over an agreed period of time.

SUPERANNUATION

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (September 2).

In reply to Mr. COUMBE (September 2).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the debate on the Superannuation Act Amendment Bill, two questions were asked of me and the answers are as follows:

1. The Leader may have been misinformed regarding the pension payable to a widow in Western Australia. According to information received from Western Australia, a widow receives 62-86 per cent of the husband's pension.

2. The ninth valuation report by the Public Actuary as at June 30, 1970, showed a surplus in the fund of \$5 733 470 and a deficit in the pensions supplementation account of \$745 029. The net surplus was therefore about \$5 000 000. Although this surplus will have increased since that date, no assessment of its magnitude can be made until the completion of a valuation as at June 30, 1973. It is expected that any surplus will be greatly reduced when the valuation as at June 30, 1974, has been completed.

3. It is considered that \$2 000 000 of the surplus in the fund was attributable to present pensioners. On that basis it was calculated that a flat increase of 3 per cent on all pensions would be an extra liability of about \$2 000 000 on the fund. The Government decided to subsidise this increase in the ratio of 2:1 making a total percentage increase on all pensions which commenced before January 1, 1973, of 9 per cent. The remaining surplus in the fund was considered to be applicable to present contributors.

4. If after the completion of the 1973 and 1974 valuations a surplus is revealed, the report of the Public Actuary will include a recommendation as to its distribution or otherwise.

5. A further increase of 15.27 per cent will be paid in October, 1974, in respect of all pensions which commenced prior to September 30, 1973. This increase is based on the variation in the consumer price index for the year ended June 30, 1974, and all of this increase will be paid by the Government. Pensions commencing between October 1, 1973, and June 30, 1974, will receive a portion of the increase.

6. Pensioners who retired 10 years ago would now be receiving \$151.67 for each \$100 of original pension. After payment of the 15.27 per cent increase in October, 1974, the new rate will be \$174.83 for each \$100 of original pension. Pensioners who retired 15 years ago are now receiving \$173.74 for each \$100 of original pension. After the October increase they will be receiving \$200.27 for each \$100 of original pension.

GOVERNMENT OFFICE ACCOMMODATION

In reply to Mr. BECKER (September 10).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: (a) The Community Welfare Department occupied one floor of the five leased for it in the G.R.E. Building on September 9, 1974. The remaining floors will be occupied in stages as completed by the builder over the next 15 weeks, when it is planned to complete the project.

(b) Rental for the five floors occupied by the department amounts to \$183 500 a year. Rental payments commenced

on September 1, 1973, consequently expenditure so far is \$183 500, as rental is paid on a monthly basis.

(c) Initial planning by consultant architects engaged for this project indicated that a total time of nine months would be required to complete the work, and difficulties have been experienced in obtaining supplies of materials, including furniture, due to the present supply climate.

SAVINGS SCHEMES

In reply to Mr. DUNCAN (August 27).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The erosion of the savings of pensioners and of other people relying on small fixed incomes from investment is undoubtedly a serious social problem in times of inflation. It is not practicable, however, for a bank, whether Government or private, to guarantee the continued purchasing power of such savings out of its own invested resources, which are in any case similarly subject to erosion in real value by inflation. Any index-linked guarantee of fixed purchasing power of savings within selected areas would involve difficult administrative problems and, if undertaken, would necessarily require support out of public funds by the Australian Government as part of an overall national financial programme. A more practicable alternative might be to arrange, as an adjunct to a national superannuation scheme, that appropriate persons on retirement, invalidity or becoming widowed may be able to purchase by lump-sum payment out of savings an income for the remainder of their lives that will be adjustable with living costs. This would, of necessity, require subsidy and underwriting by the Australian Government out of public funds. If the State Bank and the Savings Bank could assist in the implementation of such a scheme, I am sure that they would be willing to do so.

NORTHERN RAILWAY LINES

In reply to Mr. VENNING (August 29).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: 1. Standardisation—Adelaide to Crystal Brook: Agreement has been reached between the Australian and South Australian Governments, planning and design is well advanced, and it is expected that physical work will commence in the near future.

2. Gladstone-Wilmington and Peterborough-Quorn: In the foreseeable future these lines will continue to be operated as isolated narrow gauge lines.

3. Wallaroo-Gladstone: That portion between Wallaroo and Snowtown will be converted to dual gauge line over which both standard and broad gauge rolling stock will move. The section between Snowtown and Gladstone will continue to operate as a broad gauge line.

CHRISTIE DOWNS RAILWAY

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (August 15).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Work involving about 30 per cent of the total cost of the Port Stanvac to Christie Downs railway is being carried out by the Engineering and Waler Supply Department, whose available equipment and manpower was diverted to this work. The work is being done on an actual cost basis and not for a tendered price. Public tenders were not called.

VICTOR HARBOR RAILWAY

In reply to Mr. McANANEY (August 15).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The railway line from Mt. Barker junction, where it branches from the main Adelaide-Melbourne line to Victor Harbor, is about 82 km long. The average annual cost of maintaining the track is about \$130 000. This includes provision for necessary re-sleepering and re-railing, and the amount spent in any one year can vary considerably.

CONCRETE TESTS

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (August 15).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Concrete tests are carried out on contract work on bridge construction in accordance with recommended practices laid down in Australian Standard Association codes. In general these tests are carried out at the test house at Islington, and the results are recorded and retained in the relevant files. In some instances where ready mixed concrete is used, test cylinders cast by the suppliers of the concrete are tested in their registered laboratories. These test results are accepted in lieu of tests on cylinders prepared at the work site.

ROLLING STOCK

In reply to Mr. CUMBE (August 15).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Negotiations are proceeding with the Australian Government that, it is hoped, will enable the railways to construct rolling stock at the Islington workshops, provided it can be done expeditiously and within project estimates.

UPPER MURRAY DEVELOPMENT

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (August 8).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: A preliminary draft copy of the Upper Murray Planning Area Development Plan was forwarded for comment and consultation to the relevant councils and Government authorities on June 26, 1974. To date no councils have replied to the preliminary draft, although several other authorities have submitted their comments. It is also intended to send to the councils and other authorities a supplementary draft based on the findings of the Murray River Study for the River Valley. This supplement is expected to be with councils and Government departments in October, 1974. Following consultation, amendments are certain to be required to be incorporated into the plan. A revised draft copy will then be placed on public display for a period of not less than two months while objections are heard. This should occur early in 1975. At this stage, it is expected that the development plan for the Upper Murray Planning Area will be finally authorised during the latter half of 1975.

STERILISATION FACILITY

In reply to Mr. SIMMONS (August 21).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: At present four organisations operate cobalt-60 isotope sterilisation plants, namely, the Australian Atomic Energy Commission in Sydney; Johnson and Johnson Proprietary Limited in Sydney; Tasman Vaccine Laboratories Limited in Melbourne; and Westminster Carpets in Melbourne.

According to studies by the Development Division there is surplus capacity in this area. At present gamma ray sterilisation is about five times as expensive as conventional ethylene dioxide techniques, and consequently local manufacturers of medical equipment only use gamma ray sterilisation when the cost is not a serious problem. The medical field represents the major demand for gamma ray sterilisation at this stage, although Westminster Carpets process a significant amount of goat hair for use in the production of carpets. There is the prospect of gamma ray sterilisation being used for human foods, but the cost has limited the growth in this market.

The establishment of a gamma ray sterilisation facility at Monarto would be very expensive. The plant requires massive concrete walls to protect personnel, a stainless steel pool for the storage of cobalt rods, and a conveyor system to transport the material through the plant, together with

extensive instrumentation. According to information provided by the Atomic Energy Commission, this would cost at least \$500 000, and a high volume plant could easily cost twice that amount.

At this stage, with the availability of four plants in other States, and the low volume in South Australia, it would not be economically feasible to establish a gamma ray sterilisation plant, although this may become more attractive in the future. Monarto would be a logical place to establish such a facility, because it would be readily accessible to both the Adelaide based medical equipment manufacturers and the research sections of the Agriculture Department.

The Australian Atomic Energy Commission has developed a pool of expertise in gamma ray sterilisation and other areas involving the use of nuclear techniques. The commission is always willing to provide information to individuals interested in nuclear techniques, and the names of suitable contacts can be provided by the Development Division.

HOUSING TRUST

In reply to Mr. EVANS (August 27).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Since the introduction of the Special Rental Housing Scheme in February, 1973, the trust has contracted to purchase 479 existing houses in the city and metropolitan areas at a value of \$5 764 751. These houses, after upgrading and renovation, are let to families urgently requiring rental accommodation. I should also mention that, in the same period, the trust, on behalf of the Community Welfare Department, has contracted to purchase 148 existing houses, which have been allocated under the Aboriginal Funded Housing Scheme. The expenditure on these houses amounts to \$1 875 413. I would point out that the city of Adelaide Development Committee has, in fact, control over demolition in the city.

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What is the address, price, and agent (or agents name) for each property the South Australian Housing Trust has purchased from June 30, 1970, to July 1 1974?
2. What commission was paid to each agent in each negotiation?
3. Does the Housing Trust deal direct with vendors or their agents and, if not, why not?
4. How many landbrokers does the South Australian Housing Trust employ?
5. Which properties were offered direct to the Housing Trust, then referred to an agent, and who were these agents?
6. What was the cost of renovating each of the established homes acquired for the period June 30, 1972, to July 1, 1974, and what is the rental being received for each of these homes?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As this is part of the normal day-to-day operations of the Housing Trust separate lists are not maintained giving all the enormous amount of detail that is required for this question. The compiling of such a list would involve the unnecessary use of time and money, but the following general comments can be made:

1. The trust, since its inception, has operated in the real estate field through a particular agency now called Ronald R. Sutton and Associates. The trust has found this cheaper and more efficient than building up a staff of its own to operate in the metropolitan area and all larger country centres, especially in view of the reply to Question 2. Moreover, the trust's needs for land fluctuates, and the trust cannot put on and put off officers as land purchases move up and down. The new policy of buying houses is a case in point of such a fluctuation. With the

knowledge and support of the trust, this agency in turn uses many other agents for particular business. The trust does not keep a record of such sub-agents, since it has no direct financial relations with them.

2. The trust pays half Chamber of Commerce rates to its agent.

3. Although the trust deals with one agent and through him obtains a wide service with the real estate profession, it retains the right to deal directly, and not infrequently does so.

4. The trust employs three landbrokers, but these are mainly used in the conveyancing section of the trust.

5. The trust does not keep a record of inquiries of land offered when the matter is then referred to an agent.

6. Since this is part of the day-to-day operations of the trust, it is not considered practicable to provide this detailed information on the 450 houses so far purchased. However, the honourable member can be assured that the trust still finds it cheaper in city and near-city areas to buy and renovate rather than build new.

ABORIGINAL HEALTH SERVICES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What action is the Government taking to enable the Aboriginal Health Branch of the Health Department to continue to provide its services to the Pitjantjatjara Aborigines who have left the Amata settlement for Cave Hill and elsewhere?

2. Have mobile facilities been provided for the clinic sisters to meet the present situation, and, if not, when is it expected they will be provided?

3. Is responsibility for Aboriginal health services to be completely that of the Commonwealth Government, and, if so, from what date?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Staff of the Public Health Department are located on each of the Aboriginal reserves in the North-West of the State to provide clinical nursing and public health education services designed to improve the general health and hygiene of the Aboriginal people and the sanitation of the area. These services are available to all Aboriginal people on the reserves if sought by them, and are not restricted to those living adjacent to the clinics established at the main settlements.

2. Transport is available on each reserve for sisters to visit outlying settlements if this service is sought.

3. The South Australian Public Health Department is responsible for the provision of health services to the Aboriginal people in South Australia, for which purpose funds are provided by the Commonwealth Government. By arrangement, the Northern Territory Aerial Medical Service provides medical treatment by visits to reserves, and hospital treatment where necessary is generally provided at the Alice Springs Hospital. There is no proposal by the South Australian Government to alter these arrangements at this stage.

URANIUM

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What known resources of uranium ore are there in South Australia, where are significant deposits situated, and what is the estimated extent of such deposits?

2. Is it intended to develop, or are there being developed, any of these deposits, and, if so, where, and by whom?

3. Are any of these deposits on land under the control of Aboriginal councils, and, if so, which deposits and under which councils?

4. What actions are being, or will be, taken to respect the rights of Aboriginal councils in mining development proposals?

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

1. South Australian uranium reserves have been established in two principal areas, namely, Mt. Painter where reserves in four separate deposits total 7 803 000 kg U₃O₈, and at Paraburra (Beverley deposit) where drilling has proven reserves totalling 15 876 000 kg U₃O₈. Exploration has indicated uranium mineralisation at several other localities, including Crocker's Well and on the Lake Frome Plains, the most significant of these being located in the Yamba area. Reserves, however, remain to be determined.

2. None of the deposits is being developed and there are no proposals for mining. Development will be dependent on the securing of markets and of approvals from the Commonwealth Government to export. It is likely that the Beverley ore will be the first to be mined by Oilmin N.L., Petromin N.L., Transoil N.L., and Western Nuclear Limited.

3. No.

4. Consultations are in progress between officers of the Mines Department and Community Welfare Department, and all those communities that are involved with the North-West Aboriginal reserve and environs to ensure their understanding and acceptance and to ensure that sacred sites are preserved in conformity with the Woodward report and with the declared policy on exploration in Aboriginal reserves, as enunciated by the Government on April 29, 1974.

PRICES AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS BRANCH

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Will the operation of the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch be modified or changed by the proclamation of the Commonwealth Trade Practices Act, 1974, and, if so, in what way will it be affected?

2. Will an office of the Trade Practices Commission be established in South Australia, and, if so, will officers from the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch be seconded to the commission?

3. What terms of reference will be applied to determine which office, Commonwealth or State, should examine specific complaints, and by whom will such terms of reference be prepared and agreed?

4. Is it intended to define specific guidelines for co-operation between the Commonwealth and State departments, and, if so, when?

5. Is it intended to hand over to the Commonwealth the functions of the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch and, if so, when?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. It is not considered that the operation of the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch will be modified or changed materially by the proclamation of the Commonwealth Trade Practices Act, 1974. However, the implications of the new legislation are being studied.

2. There has been an office of the Trade Practices Commission in Adelaide for several years. It is understood that there will be some increase in staff. It is not intended that officers from the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch will be seconded to the commission.

3. The Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch will continue to administer the various State consumer protection Acts and investigate complaints received under these Acts. The more important of the State Acts such as the Consumer Credit Act, Consumer Transactions Act, and Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act, go well beyond the scope of the Commonwealth legislation. Further, as regards the con-

sumer protection part of the Trade Practices Act, section 75 states that it is not intended to exclude or limit the concurrent operation of any law of a State or Territory.

4. There has always been co-operation between the office of the Trade Practices Commission and the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch. It is expected that this co-operation will be further developed with regard to the handling of complaints and other matters. Government consumer protection authorities in the other States will also be examining their relationships with the Trade Practices Commission.

5. It is not intended to hand over to the Trade Practices Commission any functions of the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch.

SUPPORTING FATHERS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many fathers bringing up children alone are presently receiving assistance from the Community Welfare Department, and what form or forms does the assistance take?

2. What other community services are available to these supporting fathers in the community, and what additional services is it intended to make available for both supporting mothers and supporting fathers?

3. Will a special committee be set up under the terms of the Community Welfare Act to examine the problems faced by supporting fathers, and to recommend ways in which help can be given, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Four fathers bringing up children alone are being paid special financial assistance for limited periods, because of their special circumstances. Other fathers in this category are being assisted with counselling, arrangements for home help, and care of children, in an attempt to meet reasonable requests for help.

2. Parents without partners and social work agencies as listed in the Directory of Social Resources, 1974, available from the South Australian Council of Social Service. No new services are proposed by the State Government at this stage.

3. The Australian Government is considering this matter, and any new actions by the State should await its decisions.

UNLEY TRAFFIC

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Is there no prospect of the Unley intersection conversion plan going ahead now that the Commonwealth Government has refused to provide money for the project?

2. What actions have been taken to acquaint the Commonwealth Government of the dangerous and hazardous conditions pertaining along Duthy Street, and the high accident rate applying there?

3. Can funds be made available from the State's General Revenue for completion of the project?

4. Why has the Commonwealth Government placed such a low priority on a project which is regarded by the State Government as having a high priority?

5. What other instances are there of the Commonwealth Government's policies conflicting with and over-riding the State's road safety programme?

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

1. A Bill now before the Senate may enable projects of this type to be funded during the three-year period of the next Road Grants Act. Whether or not this project will qualify for inclusion in the programme of expenditure under the Act will be determined when details of the Act and the administrative policies are known.

2. Full details of the conditions and accident rate in Duthy Street and other streets in the area were included in the report submitted previously to the Australian Government.

3. Funds are not available from any other source to enable this project to proceed.

4. The priority of the project will be evaluated in relation to other competing projects when programmes are being prepared for consideration by the Australian Government under the new Act.

5. State and Australian Government policies on road safety do not conflict. Individual projects are being evaluated, and programmes are being prepared to achieve the maximum cost effectiveness of expenditure on these minor traffic engineering and road safety measures.

CYCLISTS' TRAFFIC RULES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Will the Minister call for a report on the relative safety factors of introducing a "long" right hand turn for cyclists, as opposed to the "short" right hand turn which requires cyclists to move across traffic to reach the centre of the road?

2. Will legislation be introduced to provide for "long" right hand turns by cyclists, if such a report shows this to be a safer procedure?

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

1. The relative merits of "long" and "short" right hand turns for cyclists have already been studied by an advisory committee of the Australian Transport Advisory Council. The conclusion was that the present situation does not call for any amendment to the laws relating to turning cyclists.

2. The position will be kept under review, and, if changed circumstances indicate that some change of law may be desirable, the matter will be referred to the Australian Transport Advisory Council for consideration of change on a national basis.

BICYCLES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to introduce a registration scheme for bicycles, either as a means of raising additional revenue or for any other purpose?

2. Is it considered the increase in the number of bicycles now on the road is related to the increases in registration fees and stamp duties in respect of motor vehicles?

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

1. No.

2. No.

FOOD DATING SYSTEM

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Has the Government approved the introduction of a uniform dating system for packaged perishable goods, as recommended by the South Australian Food and Drugs Advisory Committee, and, if not, why not?

2. If a system has been approved, when is it intended such a scheme will be introduced?

3. What actions are being taken to notify and advise manufacturers of the likely implications of the scheme?

4. What assistance will be given to those firms experiencing difficulty in the initial stages?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. This matter has not yet been submitted to the Government for consideration. The Minister of Health announced on July 31, 1974, that the South Australian Food and Drugs Advisory Committee was seeking public comment on draft regulations for the date marking of all short-life perishable foods. The text of the proposed regulation was released

at the same time. The committee has requested that any comments on the draft should be received by September 30, 1974. When these comments have been received and reviewed, the committee will submit a recommendation to the Government.

2. Not applicable, as no system has as yet been approved.

3. The draft proposals have, on two occasions, been circulated to both manufacturers' and consumers' organisations for comment.

4. In proposals of this nature it is usual for adequate time to be allowed for manufacturers to make suitable arrangements between the gazettal and the introduction of any proposals. Officers of the Public Health Department, who are concerned with the labelling of food stuffs, are available to any firm experiencing difficulties in the matter.

WATER RATES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Is the Minister aware that some people are considering selling their properties because of the financial hardship caused by increases in water rates based on property valuation?

2. Is he also aware that, because of a general shortage of funds and high interest rates, those people forced to sell their properties cannot obtain the level of valuation recently placed on properties by the Valuer-General's Department?

3. Will the Government act to make good the deficit between the official valuation and the actual sum received at sale in each such case where the sale has been forced by financial hardship caused by the increase in water rates?

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

1. Whenever there are rapid price rises, a person on a fixed income inevitably feels increased costs more than those people whose incomes increase in proportion to the price rises. In situations where these rises continue the stage is eventually reached when an individual may have to decide whether he can really afford to own his own house in that particular area. This is a fact of life and is not a situation caused by the increase in water rates in isolation, as claimed by the honourable member.

2. Information cannot, of course, be obtained of the number of people who are trying to sell their houses at present and are unable to obtain a price for them equivalent to the valuation made by the Valuation Department. However, for the months of June, July, and August the sale prices of residences have been compared to their valuations for the districts that received the greatest increases in the latest general valuation. The results were as follows:

	Sale price greater than valuation	Sale price less than valuation
Stirling.....	24	1
Burnside.....	41	1
Glenelg.....	60	
Henley and Grange.....	58	—

In the case of the property at Stirling the margin was not great, and the Valuer-General considered that the purchaser made a very good buy. In the case of Burnside the property in question was a home unit, and recent sales of adjacent units were considerably above this case. This information shows the honourable member's statement is not correct.

3. No.

ADELAIDE TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. When did the department acquire the area of Queen Street immediately adjacent to the Adelaide Technical High School?

2. For what consideration did the Burnside council agree to the transfer?

3. When is it intended to use the acquired area for building—

- (a) physical education facilities;
- (b) drama and assembly hall facilities; and
- (c) other facilities?

4. Will the local community, either through the council or in other ways, be invited or expected to contribute towards the cost of constructing the proposed facilities?

5. Will these facilities be available for use by local sporting, recreational, and cultural groups, and, if so, on what basis?

6. Will any part of the present Webb Reserve be acquired by the department for use in these projects?

7. Does the Government intend to acquire the land in Conyngham Street, Glenside, now used for Adelaide Technical High School sporting activities, for use by the Mines Department, or for any other purpose?

8. If so, for what purpose will it be used and what alternative arrangements will be made for the school's sporting activities?

9. What use is presently made of the Webb Oval reserve by the school, and on what basis is that use granted?

10. Does the Government intend that the greater part of the school's sporting and recreational activities will be transferred to Webb Oval, or is it planned to provide an alternative site for the school's activities?

11. If Webb Oval is to be used in this way, what will be the effect on local sporting and other bodies now using the oval?

12. Is there any proposal to acquire the Webb Oval reserve from the Burnside council, and to use it exclusively for the school?

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

1. The area of Queen Street referred to by the honourable member has not yet been acquired by the Education Department. Action has been taken to close the street, and the necessary documentation has been prepared in order to submit the proposal to the Public Buildings Department for the preparation of a road-closing plan.

2. The Burnside council agreed to the transfer for no consideration other than that the Education Department accept responsibilities for the costs involved.

3. Physical education, drama and music facilities will be provided at the school, probably during the latter part of 1975. Sketch plans for the multi-purpose building plus estimates have been prepared by the Public Buildings Department. These plans are still subject to agreement and, even if agreement is reached in the immediate future, it is unlikely that the building could be commenced during this financial year. Commencement is dependent on the availability of funds.

4. The Burnside council will contribute towards the cost of the complex.

5. The facilities will be available for use by local sporting, recreational, and cultural groups. This is in accordance with current policy. The arrangements for the use of the complex will be determined by the school and the Burnside corporation, who will act in a managerial role.

6. No part of the present Webb reserve will be acquired by the department for use in these projects. The building will be sited on the Queen Street property, but will not encroach in any way on to Webb Oval.

7. This matter is still under consideration.

8. *Vide* No. 7.

9. The Webb Oval reserve has been made available to the school for day use on week days.

10. It is expected that the greater part of the school's sporting and recreational activities will take place on the Webb Oval, and it is not planned to provide an alternative site.

11. The use of Webb Oval under these circumstances will in no way affect the use of the oval by local sporting or other bodies. Community involvement of the facilities is encouraged.

12. If the oval is acquired from the Burnside council, exclusive use by the school would not occur. Very little change in the existing use of the oval by the school would be expected. It is probable that the school would have the right to use the oval on Saturday mornings, in addition to the present arrangements of day use during school hours.

RECREATION FACILITIES

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Has the State Planning Authority been involved in a survey of recreational facilities and, if so, what is the brief for the survey, who is carrying it out and what is the cost involved?

2. If a survey is being made what results have been obtained thus far?

3. What additional work is involved and when is it expected to be completed?

4. As a result of details obtained, is it intended to expand the survey and, if so, in what way?

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

1. Yes, to determine what and how many recreational facilities are needed in metropolitan Adelaide and where they should be provided. The study is being carried out by the staff of the State Planning Office Division of the Environment and Conservation Department with assistance from casually employed interviewers. The cost to August 31, 1974, was \$34 000, and it is expected that a further \$21 000 will be required to complete the study. The Australian Government has provided a grant of \$20 000 towards this work.

2. Work is proceeding on a report on the first phase of the study.

3. All field surveys will be completed by December, 1974. Processing and analysis of the data will be completed as soon as possible after that date.

4. No.

IMPORTS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Has there been any evidence in this State of either clothes or shoes imported from overseas having identification labels removed and replaced by a local label and, if so, what are the details?

2. Is such action viewed as illegal?

3. Has such action resulted in profiteering and, if so, by whom?

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

1. The Textile Products Description Act provides that garments imported from overseas must be labelled showing the fibre content of the material of which the garments are made. The Footwear Regulation Act provides that footwear imported from overseas must be branded or labelled showing the country of origin. There has been no indication to the Department of Labour and Industry that labels on clothing and footwear imported from overseas have been removed and replaced by local labels.

2. No offence is committed by the local retailer if he replaces the labels with labels of his own, provided the labels carry correct information.

3. There has been no evidence of profiteering notified to the Department of Labour and Industry.

DECENTRALISATION SUBSIDIES

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

J. Is the Premier aware that the Australian Government is taxing as normal operating income State Government decentralisation subsidies or considerations?

2. How many companies in South Australia are receiving such consideration, and which are they?

3. What actual assistance (financial or otherwise) was provided to each of these companies in the last three financial years?

4. Have any of the companies advised the Government of their concern for the tax imposition which has been charged against them?

5. Has the Government made any representations to the Australian Government relative to approaches from decentralised industries in this State?

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

1. State Government decentralisation subsidies (or other financial assistance that directly adds to the normal operating income of a firm) are treated in the same manner for taxation purposes as income from any other source. As the honourable member has stated, this taxation policy is a matter for Australian Government consideration. I might add however, that the only decentralisation incentives in this State that would be immediately reflected in normal operating income and, therefore, taxed, are subsidies or grants. Nevertheless, such measures retain their incentive value to the firm, because, after all, it is operating in an environment where all income is subject to taxation. Furthermore, the incentive value to a firm of other decentralisation measures, such as provision of industrial land, factory buildings, and loans, is not taxed because it is not directly reflected in normal operating income.

2. Given the nature of decentralisation incentives in South Australia, which mainly fall into the latter category, this and the following questions are not strictly relevant. However, in answer specifically to the points raised, no companies have received from the South Australian Government any decentralisation subsidies or considerations that would normally be subject to Australian Government taxation.

3. Not applicable.

4. Not applicable.

5. No. However, the South Australian Government is aware of the situation in other States and sympathises with their representations to the Australian Government.

GOVERNMENT TRANSACTIONS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Has the Government had any business transactions with Mr. L. J. DeYoung, formerly of 28 Goldsworthy Road, Ethelton and, if so, what has been the nature of the transactions?

2. Have these transactions been satisfactorily concluded, and, if not, why not?

3. Has any Minister appeared on television in relation to the transactions?

4. Has any television station or employee of a television station been threatened in any way if they make film of any interview with a Minister on the subject available to Mr. DeYoung or any other person?

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

1. Yes. The Commissioner of Highways acquired the property at 28 Goldsworthy Road, Ethelton, owned by L. J. and J. M. DeYoung for road purposes associated with the Jervois bridge project. The Crown Solicitor acted for the Highways Department in connection with acquisition of real estate from this person. The Sheriff was also involved in

that he was directed to execute a warrant requiring Mr. L. J. DeYoung to deliver up possession of the land. The warrant was never executed, as the Sheriff was instructed to withhold execution the day after receiving instructions. The sum of \$31.44 payable for water and sewerage rates on Mr. L. J. DeYoung's home at Kurrajong Avenue, Dry Creek, for the period July 1, to August 31, 1974, is overdue. Normal follow-up procedure has been carried out, and a notice threatening, *inter alia*, restriction of the supply for non-payment was issued on September 5, 1974. The property at 28 Goldsworthy Road, Ethelton, is no longer subject to water and sewerage rates. The water service to this property was removed in March, 1972, on an order from the Highways Department. The only dealings the Electricity Trust of South Australia has had with Mr. DeYoung has been as a normal consumer of electricity at 28 Goldsworthy Road, Ethelton. Supply at this address was discontinued on request in February, 1972, and the final electricity account was paid satisfactorily.

2. The matter is to be resolved by the courts, but it is understood that settlement is being delayed by a disagreement between the registered owners.

3. No Minister of the present Cabinet has any recollection of doing so.

4. Nothing is known of this matter.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What were the total receipts to the Government from Wardang Island for 1972-73 and 1973-74?

2. What is the intended use for the site known as Colebrook, situated on Shepherds Hill Road, Eden Hills?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Operations at Wardang Island are operations of the Aboriginal Lands Trust, and there are no receipts to the Government.

2. The property will be transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust, which is considering possible uses of the site.

PUBLIC TRUSTEE

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What is the address, price, purchasers name, and method of sale (auction, tender, or private negotiation) for each property sold on behalf of clients by the Public Trustee from June 30, 1970, to July 1, 1974?

2. What was the name of the agent employed in each transaction?

3. What was the total commission paid to each agent for that period?

4. What was the name of the purchaser of each property?

The Hon. L. J. KING: During the period between July 1, 1970, and June 30, 1974, the Public Trustee sold, as executor administrator or trustee of deceased estates or manager of the estates of mental patients or protected persons, a total of 1 691 items of real estate for a total sum of \$16 849 637. The method of sale was either by auction, private negotiation, or, in a few cases, by tender. To extract the information sought, it would be necessary for an examination to be made of each of the 1 691 files. It is not practicable to do this, because of the enormous amount of work that would be involved.

FOSTER CHILDREN

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. Are welfare officers of the Community Welfare Department dissatisfied with the role that the Foster Parents Association of S.A. plays in helping foster parents?

2. How many foster parents have been advised to have their foster child take guidance at the Child Guidance

Clinic or the Adelaide Children's Hospital Psychiatric Department?

3. How many foster children are at the moment undergoing treatment or counselling at the Child Guidance Clinic or the Adelaide Children's Hospital Psychiatric Department?

4. Is it the opinion of the Community Welfare Department that foster children create more problems for their foster parents than do children under the care of their natural parents?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Welfare officers of the department aim to co-operate with the Foster Parents Association of South Australia in its role of helping foster parents. The limited support the association receives from foster parents restricts its effectiveness.

2. Statistics are not available.

3. Statistics are not available.

4. The special circumstances of fostering and the previous deprivation some of the children have experienced create problems in some instances. It is not possible to generalise.

FLINDERS RANGE MINING

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. Does the Government accept as policy the recommendation of the authorised Flinders Range Planning Area Development Plan, that in land designated as class A, geological exploration be conducted by the Mines Department in consultation with the State Planning Authority?

2. If this is Government policy, why is the Government intending to grant exploration licences at Arkaroola and Moolawatana, both of which include class A land, to North Flinders Mines Limited?

3. Is it intended to grant mineral leases in class A area as defined in the Flinders Range Planning Area Development Plan only if the mineral deposit is of paramount significance and its exploitation is in the State or national interest and, if so, how will the decisions regarding "paramount significance", "State interest", and "national interest" be made?

4. If mineral leases are to be granted—

(a) has North Flinders Mines Limited been made aware of these special provisions relating to granting of mineral leases in class A areas;

(b) has any understanding been entered into with North Flinders Mines Limited as to what would constitute a "mineral deposit of paramount significance whose exploitation is in the State or national interest"; and

(c) what are the details of the understanding?

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

1. Yes, for all new exploration.

2. Exploration licences were granted to North Flinders Mines Limited on August 26, 1974, in accordance with the provisions of the Mining Act, 1971-1973, and the Flinders Range Planning Area Authorised Development Plan (1973). The North Flinders Range has a long history of mineral exploration. This particular region has attracted more attention in this regard than most, and the area is studded with mining relics dating back to 1860. Its mineral potential is recognised in the Flinders Range Authorised Development Plan, section 9, Proposals for Rural Land, class A, sixth paragraph. North Flinders Mines Limited has been continuously engaged in mineral exploration over these same grounds in Special Mining Leases Nos. 291, 294, 295, 296, 297, 558, 575, 703, 704 and 705 since 1969, and

thus existing use has been maintained and recognised. The area covered has been progressively reduced and that covered by the exploration licences granted on August 26, 1974, is over an area of 1 387 square km while the area previously covered was 2 059 square km. The licence contains provisions preventing the construction of new tracks, the upgrading of existing tracks, and the use of declared equipment without consent.

3. It is intended that mineral leases will be granted in class A areas if the mineral deposits are of paramount significance and exploitation is in the State or national interest. Conditions under which mining is or will be allowed in class A areas are determined in consultation between the Mines Department and Environment and Conservation Department. Unequivocal definitions of terms "paramount significance", "State interest", and "national interest" cannot be given, but the Government will reach decisions on the advice of its officers, including those of the Environment and Conservation Department.

4. (a) Yes.

(b) No, see 3.

(c) See 4 (b).

SOLAR ENERGY

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What progress, if any, is being made in the use of solar energy by State Government departments?

2. What assistance is being given by the Government to private companies and individuals in the development of solar energy plants?

3. Why is the "J" rate charge for electric water heating not applied in respect of electric hot water services incorporating a solar heating device, and when will the position be changed?

4. When will the conservation of energy resources be actively encouraged by informing householders and others of the advantages and availability of solar energy units, and by the application of financial concessions and inducements towards this end?

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

1. The development and use of solar energy is one of the matters being examined by the State Energy Committee established by the Government in December, 1973. When the report from this committee is received, the Government will consider whether the development and use of solar energy in South Australia needs to be assisted.

2. *Vide* 1.

3. The Electricity Trust's off-peak water heating tariff "J" applies to a special type of heater operating under restricted conditions that give a regular pattern of off-peak electricity consumption throughout the year. This enables the electricity used to be generated more efficiently than would otherwise be the case. The tariff is not appropriate to the small and irregular use of electricity by a standby or booster supply for a solar heater, as this involves an entirely different consumption pattern. The unpredictable demand of such supplies would create its own peak load problem, and in many cases the small consumption would not cover the cost of the special control and metering equipment required. Standby or booster supplies for solar heaters are provided at the normal tariff for domestic consumption that also applies to ordinary electric water heaters. The trust is not intending any change in this position.

4. *Vide* 1.

DRUGS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What appetite suppressant drugs, potentially able to lead to drug dependence, are still on sale in South Australia without prescription?

2. Is there any evidence to suggest an increase in drug dependence resulting from the abuse of appetite suppressant drugs?

3. Is there any evidence to suggest a decrease in the prescription of appetite suppressant drugs?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. It is believed that only one drug used for appetite suppression and which has caused some problems of drug dependence has lately been available without prescription. This drug is propylhexedrine; it will be restricted to prescription in the present revision of the poison regulations, which have been approved by the Government and which are about to be promulgated.

2. There is no evidence to suggest an increase in drug dependence resulting from the abuse of appetite suppressant drugs. In fact, with the progressive restriction of these drugs to prescription and authority there has been a decrease in such dependence.

3. There is good evidence to suggest a decrease in the prescription of appetite suppressant drugs. The principal group of drugs prescribed for this purpose was the amphetamine group; in November 1971, these drugs were restricted to use in two specific diseases or to prescription with the authority of the Director-General of Public Health. Authorities are not issued for their use for appetite suppression. The consumption of these drugs dropped by 90 per cent in the year following this restriction. There does not seem to have been a corresponding increase in the few non-habit forming drugs used for appetite suppression.

BUILDING INDUSTRY

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Is the rise in cost of materials used in house building in South Australia causing stockpiling of bricks and other materials as the rate of building slows down?

2. What retrenchments have there been in the building and associated industries?

3. For how long is it estimated the increased funds made available for housing from the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia will slow the rate of retrenchment if any such effect will result?

4. What other action does the Government intend taking to overcome the present serious building industry employment situation in South Australia?

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

1. Inquiries have been made as to the availability of supplies that have indicated that, as yet, there is no stockpiling of bricks in the metropolitan area, and, in fact, in most cases there is a relatively short wait on supplies. However, building materials are becoming more readily available than was the case five to six months earlier, but there is no serious stockpiling as can be determined at this stage. Some materials, particularly processed materials, are, in some instances, in short supply.

2. Detailed statistics are not available on this, but again general inquiries have indicated that there have not been any retrenchments at this stage, except in an isolated peripheral area, for example, clerical. It should be noted that the Housing Trust is still having difficulty in finding sufficient contractors to lodge tenders, and this indicates that the demand is still in excess of the supply.

3. From the wording involved in this question, I wonder if the honourable member has been misled by recent news-

paper reports regarding the S.R.D. ratio. This applies to the amount of statutory reserve deposits that banks must hold with the Reserve Bank. It does not apply to the Government owned banks, that is, the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia, and as these are the major lenders in this area, the recent changes announced by the Australian Government Treasury would not have any significant effect on the availability of funds in South Australia. In other States the private banks play a much larger role in this area, and therefore there will be a greater result from the Australian Government change.

However, one should note that, for example, in 1973-74, the State Bank lent Home Builders Account just over \$29 000 000. The Savings Bank of South Australia in the same period lent about \$32 600 000. In 1974-75, the State Bank expects to lend about \$37 000 000. This large increase is partly due to a greater than normal carry-over of funds from one financial year into the coming one; the main cause of this has been a much greater recovery from old funds for ordinary lending and the retardation of actual payments of approved new loans through delays in the physical completion of new houses.

4. As the Minister responsible for housing, I will be attending a conference of Australian and State Housing Ministers in Canberra on October 11, 1974, at which I confidently expect an increased allocation of funds will be made to South Australia. Although there is no present serious building industry employment situation in South Australia, the increased funds that the Australian Government will no doubt make available to us will be put to good purpose.

PISTOLS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Were pistols, recently advertised to the public as replicas, in fact genuine firearms rendered inoperative by welding procedures?

2. What proportion of these pistols were acquired at State Government auctions, and how many through wholesale trade outlets?

3. For which departments and for what purposes were the pistols originally used?

4. For what reasons was the decision made to dispose of the pistols?

5. Who was responsible for the welding procedures designed to render the pistols inoperative, and how effective is the procedure?

6. What proportion of these pistols is it estimated have been made operational again?

7. What response has there been to an appeal to members of the public to return the pistols to the police?

8. Is it intended to dispose of surplus pistols in a similar way again in the future?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. The pistols advertised as replicas were genuine pistols rendered inoperative by welding procedures but in such a manner as to make them easily restorable.

2. As far as can be ascertained, none of the weapons was purchased at State Government auctions. They were purchased through a wholesale outlet in Victoria.

3. They were not previously used by any State Government department. Some weapons are of a military type and may have been brought into the country as souvenirs.

4. They were not disposed of by a Government department.

5. In the only known case where a weapon rendered inoperative by welding procedures was rendered to effectiveness, the process was carried out by the purchaser of the

weapon. The welding process is not effective in permanently rendering a weapon inoperative.

6. Unknown.

7. There has been no response to an appeal to members of the public to return the pistols to the police.

8. Not applicable because, as far as can be ascertained, the weapons were not disposed of by any Government department as surplus weapons. A new Firearms Act to provide better controls will be introduced shortly.

FULLARTON CROSSING

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What progress has been made in the planning of the pedestrian crossing at Fullarton Road, Fullarton, announced by the Minister several months ago?

2. What is the exact site proposed for the crossing?

3. When is it expected installation will commence, and when is it expected the crossing will be in operation?

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

1. Preliminary planning for this facility has been completed and the matter has been referred to the Burnside council with a view to reaching agreement on the installation.

2. The exact site of the crossing has not yet been finalised with the council.

3. It is currently expected that installation will take place in about mid-1975, but this is subject to the availability of equipment and the priority of the project when related to other projects at the time.

COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to proceed with the local government boundaries legislation?

2. Will the Government take notice of the many representations now opposing changes in local government boundaries?

3. Will the Premier declare the vote on the Government side to be a free one, so that Government members may vote according to the wishes of their constituents?

4. Does he intend to support the legislation if introduced, in spite of the strong concern expressed by the mayor, members of the council, and citizens of the city of Kensington and Norwood?

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

1. The Government is now studying the second report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas and the expressions of support and opposition so far received from councils and other interested persons. When Cabinet concludes its deliberations, the Minister of Local Government will make the necessary announcement of the Government's intentions.

2. The Government is taking into account the representations of those both opposing and supporting the report of the Royal Commission.

3. See 1.

4. See 1.

COMMUNITY WELFARE DEPARTMENT

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. When will the Community Welfare Department complete its move into new offices in Grenfell Street?

2. When was the decision to move the department made, and when was the new office site decided upon?

3. When was an agreement or lease in respect of the new premises initially negotiated?

4. What has been the period between the date of this agreement and the time of moving of the greater part of the central office?

5. What rental has been paid by the department during this time in respect of the new premises?

6. What total sum has been expended in rental for accommodation that has not been occupied by the department during this time?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. The Community Welfare Department will complete its move into the G.R.E. Building, Grenfell Street, in about 15 weeks time.

2. On March 26, 1973, the Minister of Works approved the Government Office Accommodation Committee's finding alternative means of providing office accommodation for the department other than renovating the Rundle Street Government offices, which renovation was estimated to cost over \$3 000 000. The leasing of 44 750 square feet in G.R.E. Building, at an estimated annual rental of \$183 500 was approved in June, 1973.

3. Negotiations for the lease were concluded on July 3, 1973. Payment of rental commenced on September 1, 1973.

4. The Community Welfare Department occupied one floor on September 9, 1973, it being planned to occupy the remainder of the leasing in stages as completed by the builder over the next 15 weeks.

5. Rental paid by the Public Buildings Department during this period has amounted to \$183 500.

6. No further rental payments have been made at this time, as rental is paid on a monthly basis at the rate of \$15 300 a month.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr. McANANEY (on notice):

1. How many projects were reported on favourably by the Public Works Standing Committee during the 12 months ended June 30, 1974?

2. How many contracts have been let in respect of these projects?

3. On how many has construction work actually commenced?

4. What projects have had to be deferred because of a shortage of Loan funds?

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

1. 40.

2. 14.

3. 13.

4. Over the years many projects have been deferred because of shortage of Loan funds. Within a financial year it is not possible for all works recommended by the Public Works Standing Committee to proceed simultaneously. The final determination of the timing of projects depends entirely upon priorities allocated by Cabinet.

RESTAURANTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. During each of the last four financial years, have any restaurant businesses in South Australia, other than the Coalyard restaurant, been granted financial assistance by the Government, and, if so—

(a) which such businesses;

(b) what assistance has been given;

(c) on what terms; and

(d) when was assistance given?

2. Was any such assistance given upon the recommendation of the Industries Development Committee and, if so, what was the recommendation in each case?

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

1. The Government has made financial assistance available during the last four financial years to several restaurant

businesses in South Australia. The financial assistance to Die Gallerie, as in the case of Coalyard Proprietary Limited, involved no expenditure of Government money but the provision of a guarantee of a bank loan under conditions.

(a) The restaurants receiving financial assistance were:

- (1) The Ayers House Restaurants (under terms of lease);
- (2) The Catering Partnership—Adelaide Festival Theatre (funds via Adelaide Festival Centre Trust); and
- (3) Die Gallerie Proprietary Limited (Industries Development Committee).

(b) and (c) It is not the practice of Governments to release information concerning the amount of financial assistance given and the terms pertaining thereto which are considered to be confidential between the parties involved and the Government. However, with the consent of the applicants, the Government will make the terms of the assistance confidentially known to the honourable member.

(d) The restaurants received financial assistance on the following dates:

- (1) The Ayers House Restaurants—April, 1973;
- (2) The Catering Partnership—Adelaide Festival Theatre—August, 1973; and
- (3) Die Gallerie Proprietary Limited—March, 1972.

2. Financial assistance was given to Die Gallerie Proprietary Limited on the recommendation of the Industries Development Committee, but the information sought, concerning the nature of the recommendation, is considered to be confidential between the applicant and the Government. The Industries Development Committee did attach several conditions to its recommendation, all of which were communicated to the applicant and its bankers as conditions subject to which the guarantee was offered. All of the conditions were accepted by the applicant and, where applicable, by its bankers.

ADELAIDE SCHOOLS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What numbers of students attend the Adelaide Boys High School and the Adelaide Girls High School, respectively?

2. Is the accommodation at each school being fully used and, if not, at which school is it not so used?

3. Is accommodation at either school overcrowded and, if so, at which school?

4. What action, if any, is it intended to take about that overcrowding?

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

1. Adelaide Boys High School, 747. Adelaide Girls High School, 659.

2. The accommodation at each school is being fully used.

3. Accommodation is not overcrowded at either school. The girls school still uses a part of the Church of Christ Hall for commerce and music lessons, but this has been standard practice for several years.

4. *Vide* 3.

NOISE POLLUTION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the policy of the Government concerning the abatement of undue noise?

2. Is it intended to introduce legislation this session concerning noise abatement and, if so, when?

3. If legislation is not to be introduced, why not?

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

1. The Government is aware that, with increased population and technological development, and with generally increased community and environmental noise levels, there is a need to provide some control over excessive noise, without unduly intruding on the rights of the individual.

2. Noise control legislation is now being drafted that the Government intends to introduce later this session.

3. Not applicable, in view of answer to 2 above.

LAND ACQUISITION

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the present situation in relation to the proposed use of land bounded by South Road, Marion Road, and Sturt Road acquired for hospital, education, and road-widening purposes?

2. Was improper use of Highways Department funds made to acquire this land in 1965?

3. If so, when will adjustment be made and what is the amount involved?

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

1. The Minister of Education and the Minister of Transport are now negotiating the transfer for university and Sturt college purposes of those parts of the area surplus to road requirements.

2. When the land was acquired in 1965, some part of it, the extent not known with any certainty, was required for road purposes. Accordingly, the whole property purchase was financed from the Highways Fund. However, as some part was also required for other Government purposes, the Auditor-General deemed that the transaction was an improper use of the Highways Fund.

3. *Vide* 1. When the matter has been finalised, the Highways Fund will receive the appropriate recoup.

STATE'S ECONOMY

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Treasurer say what circumstances have permitted the Government to mismanage the economy to the point where the deficit for the first two months of the year is \$18 900 000, about \$10 000 000 or \$12 000 000 above the estimate, and will he say in what areas revenue returns have been deficient and in what areas there has been over-expenditure to this extent? The announcement today that the deficit figure for the first two months is \$18 939 000, compared to a figure at the end of August, 1973, of \$11 602 000, and the fact that it has been indicated clearly that this figure is well above the expected deficit of \$7 000 000 to \$8 000 000, which had been budgeted for or which was the expected cash flow into Treasury accounts at this time, require that this question be asked and that the Treasurer be responsible for giving the House all the detail necessary to put the matter into true perspective. Last week it was indicated that, because of the problems about the lack of funds from the Commonwealth Government, this State (indeed, all States in Australia) was rapidly being brought to its knees. Because of the type of mismanagement reflected in the figures announced today, I suspect that South Australia will be on its knees within a matter of weeks.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader has used the word "mismanagement" twice in asking and explaining his question. Let me deal with the facts, and I should be obliged if the Leader then would tell the House how he could have managed these factors to produce a different result.

Dr. Eastick: Manage the priorities better!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course, that is a vague and ridiculous statement.

Dr. Eastick: No, it's not.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let me deal with the facts and then proceed to ask the Leader, since I have been a much more conservative Treasurer than have Treasurers of his Party in some other States, how he would have coped with each of these factors. He should not reply to that by saying, "Manage the priorities better." In fact, the expenditure by the Government was \$8 000 000 more than we had expected it to be.

Dr. Eastick: In what areas?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The areas were entirely those of payment for wage decisions that incorporated a pre-dated time for the application of the specific award. The increases applied in the areas of health, education, and community welfare, and in several other areas, all of which are major spending Government departments. A series of awards that were handed down and back-dated required a lump sum payment to be made.

Dr. Eastick: It wasn't totally unexpected.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The provision for these prospective wage increases in the Budget was made on the advice of the Public Service Board, the Treasury and all other Government departments during the year. The Treasury made a fair provision for the increases and is now making an additional provision. During the two months about which the Leader is talking, a couple of awards were handed down that exceeded the sum, based on all the conceivable information to the Government, we expected during that period. Much careful investigation and forward budgeting were done in relation to this matter. Precisely how would the Leader have coped with the situation? I would not expect him to say that he would not obey the law, although one of his back-benchers has said a few words about that.

Mr. Coumbe: We've heard you say it, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So I have, and I have always said, "And take the consequences."

Mr. Goldsworthy: You've no option there.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have always been willing to take the consequences for defying the law if I thought it right and proper to defy it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You've got no option.

Mr. Gunn: But you said that—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Eyre cannot try to get himself off the hook by quoting me out of context.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Then stop trying to get yourself off the hook.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Members opposite should stop trying to change the subject. The Leader cannot—

Mr. Coumbe: You're not down at Festival Hall now.

The SPEAKER: Order

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Deputy Leader believes his Leader's question is a responsible and proper question, I suggest that he listen to the reply and stop trying to play funny Billies in the House, because that is what he is doing. If the Leader will not accept that the Government should pay award rates let him say so. What would he do in the circumstances? How has the Government mismanaged the economy by paying the award rates we were required to pay? What if we did not?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. Eastick: You've misread the economic climate.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Does the Leader suggest that the information we have received from public servants

who investigated the matter and who went through the most detailed budgetary forecasting ever in this State were negligent and incompetent in advising the Government? In addition, there has been a decline in the revenue from stamp and succession duties—

Mr. Venning: It will be less, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As far as succession duty is concerned, I am afraid I cannot always forecast when we are going to get a good death: that is not in my hands. I am afraid that the Almighty disposes of that matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: During the two-month period we are talking about there has been a marked decline in the number of conveyances and in the stamp duty received—

Mr. Gunn: Whose fault's that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —and the decline is continuing. In fact, the figures we have taken out for trading so far in September have confirmed a downward trend in stamp duty receipts. That indicator did not appear at the time the Budget was cast; we had up-to-date figures at that time.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Nor did many other things that have happened in Australia. What about the scream about unemployment?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has asked a question, one question only being permitted to each honourable member at a time. Interjections are out of order, as are replies to interjections. If honourable members persist in interjecting, the provisions of Standing Orders will prevail. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have been replying to the question of the Leader as to the basis on which there has been a decline in revenues and an increase in expenditure above the sum forecast in the Budget; I have given details to the Leader and Opposition members. If members opposite accuse the Government of mismanagement, I should like them not to carry on with juvenile laughter, vague statements about some subject being raised other than the one before the House, and the statement that their priorities would have been different (whatever that may mean); rather, I should like them to tell the House and the public, if they say there has been mismanagement, how they would have managed not to pay the awards, how they would have forecast them more accurately, and how they would have stimulated the revenue from succession and stamp duties. If they cannot do that, the charge of mismanagement is shown to be as empty as it is stupid.

COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Local Government give further details of the Government's intention regarding legislation which he has announced he will introduce to give effect to the report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas? The new report on the subject which the Minister laid on the table a few moments ago and which was released to the press before it was released to this Parliament (and, as I have not had a chance to read it, I must rely on a newspaper report) apparently recommends only a few minor changes to the Commission's first report. As the new report will need to be studied, I ask the Minister when he intends to introduce legislation on the subject, and what form it is likely to take. In addition, will the Minister, before introducing the legislation, consider the groundswell of resentment expressed by numerous ratepayers in various parts of the State about

certain aspects of the report dealing with the amalgamation of councils?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I hope I can reply to the several questions raised by the honourable member. Along with a press release and an interview with press reporters, the report was released at the State Administration Centre at 11.30 this morning. As copies of the report were in the House for all members at 9 a.m., I do not appreciate the innuendo of the honourable member that members of the press were informed about this before members of Parliament were informed.

Mr. Gunn: The report wasn't on our desks.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not responsible for that. If the honourable member wants me to be messenger as well as Minister let him say so. However, I arranged for the reports to be in the House for distribution first thing this morning, and they were here. If the honourable member is relying on the press reports, I hope he has read the statement I gave to the press which, after dealing with the amendments to the first report, concludes as follows:

In their report the commissioners, headed by Judge Gerald M. Ward, said there were some alterations not requiring any major rethinking of boundaries which would be discussed with councils before any alterations were made.

These were minor alterations only. I think the town of Rosedale in the Leader of the Opposition's district was divided in the original report by a line drawn through the centre of the town. Such amendments are not going to affect anyone and that is what the Commission was referring to. I then said that the current position in relation to the recommendations of the Royal Commission which are in the first and second reports are currently the subject of consideration by the Government as also are the views that have been expressed by the local government bodies, private citizens and other organisations both in favour of and opposed to the adopting of the recommendations of the Royal Commission. In due course, when Cabinet has had an opportunity to consider fully its attitude, an appropriate announcement will be made.

FISHING LICENCES

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Minister of Fisheries say what criteria and details are required for the issue of A class fishing licences either directly or in lieu of B class licences as applying particularly to yabbie fishing in the Murray River? I have been told that long delays occur in the processing of applications by his department. I have also been told that, at a meeting of the South Coast Fishermen's Association held on July 21 this year, fishermen generally expressed their concern about the delays and asked the Acting Director of Fisheries many questions about the delays in dealing with applications. The following question was put to the Acting Director at that meeting which he failed to answer, and I should like the Minister to investigate this matter:

Why is it that shags, water fowl and water rats are protected whilst they are known to be great devourers of yabbies in the Murray River, but at the same time licences are consistently being denied to fishermen for taking this valuable natural resource?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Several tests are applied by the department in relation to the issue of both A and B class licences and I will provide the honourable member with the general form that we use within the department and the philosophy behind it. I am surprised to hear the honourable member suggesting that there has been criticism of this policy from fishermen within his area, as primarily the policy now being adopted was introduced

at the request of fishermen because, despite the findings of a Select Committee into the problems of issue of B class licences made some years ago, no changes had taken place until July this year in relation to the issue of B class fishing licences. If a person had the vessel, gear and necessary lines or nets (depending on the species he was after), he was issued with a B class licence. This provided him with the opportunity of catching as much fish as he liked and selling it; it did not require him (as is the case with an A class licence) to devote his total time to fishing or making it his occupation. As a result of the large number of people who have been and are able to afford to buy a fully-equipped fishing vessel that can travel long distances (whether it be a powered vessel of 5 m, 6 m or larger), hundreds of people engaged in full-time occupations (some most lucrative) have been seeking and obtaining a B class licence and using it on weekends or at nights, or if working on shift work, providing it for a fellow worker to use to catch fish, competing with the fisherman by selling their catch on the open market.

This has been causing the department and me, as Minister, concern in relation to the conservation of fishing species in this State. It has also been causing considerable concern to professional fishermen, who must contend with the glut on the market from time to time caused by those who do not depend for their livelihood on fishing. We have changed the system; we will not be issuing B class licences except to people who depend, or partially depend, on catching and selling fish as their means of obtaining an income. The same thing applies to the yabbing industry, which had not been controlled until last July and in relation to which a substantial export market is building up. It is necessary for us to have control not only of the quantity of fish caught in this field but also of the number of people so engaged. We will not be issuing licences to catch and sell yabbies to people who are not professional fishermen. People can continue to catch all species of fish (as many as they like) for their personal use, but, with regard to both species, and particularly yabbies, they will not be able to sell them. The pots that have been allocated to people who are not professional fishermen will be allocated to professional fishermen to ensure their efficiency and enable them to maintain a proper livelihood.

LAND VALUATION

Mr. BOUNDY: Will the Premier reinstate, as a matter of urgency, the former levels of State land tax valuation imposed on rural land in districts where new higher levels of valuation are now being received, namely, valuations based on an improved rural economy, and relate any further assessment reviews to the present rural economic climate? This matter was reported on in today's mid-day news in relation to the concern of rural landholders, expressed at a meeting held at Bute, over the levels of valuation now being received by landholders in that area. This matter also affects my constituents in the District Council of Clinton area who have received assessments that are more than double the former figure: in fact, some valuations exceed market value.

One assessment in my possession is illuminating, namely, a letter from a Mr. Polgreen concerning what, I believe, was the Nalyappa school site in former years. Since the school was closed in 1935 or 1936, the site has been used by the council to park its implements; it has been partly quarried, but has since been filled with rubbish and levelled. Mr. Polgreen has an interest in the site, in that he has paid rates and taxes on it in the meantime. He has been issued a notice of valuation concerning the site, which is .42 of a hectare (slightly more than an acre) in area. The

notice shows that the unimproved value of the site is \$500. The tenor of his letter is that he would like to give the site back to the Government: this indicates what is happening in rural areas regarding new valuations. No doubt the Premier is aware that returns from cattle, wool, and lambs—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to debate his question rather than explain it.

Mr. BOUNDY: As all sections of rural industry are suffering diminished returns, coupled with extreme cost increases, I ask the Premier to consider this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Where assessments are made by the Valuation Department and it appears that an error has occurred in a valuation, the person concerned may query the valuation or take it to appeal. Proper provisions are made to ensure that the Valuer-General's assessment can be appealed against. If the honourable member gives me the details of the assessments that he says are out of line with current values, I will undertake to have them examined.

LAW AND ORDER

Mr. VENNING: Can the Premier say what action he and the Government are taking to enforce law and order in South Australia? In explaining my question, I will read part of a letter I have received from the Georgetown Sub-branch of the Returned Services League, following a meeting of the sub-branch, as follows:

The Georgetown Sub-branch of the R.S.L. is most concerned about the non-enforcement of law and order by both State and Federal Governments. The increasing subversive actions of some trade unions, together with the strife at universities, is going more or less unchallenged.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The enforcement of law and order in South Australia is the duty of the Police Force. If the honourable member examines the Estimates now before the House, he will see that the Government has made considerable provision for an increase in the police establishment and for the recruitment of additional trainees.

Mr. Chapman: Have you made provision for their recent salary claim?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes; this has also been provided for in the Budget.

Mr. Chapman: You will not say later that you have made a mistake?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not going to say that. I am pointing out that there has been an increase in the Budget of many millions of dollars in regard to this matter. If the honourable member looks at the overall year's figures rather than at two months trading, he will see that that is provided for.

Mr. Chapman: So, you'll get out of it.

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If we look like having any excesses in either direction that will need additional revenue, I assure the honourable member that I will introduce additional revenue measures in the House, and I hope that he will be responsible enough to see that it is necessary to ensure that the Government has money to cover such people as the police. Regarding the matter raised by the sub-branch relating to failure by trade unionists to obey the law, I point out that the only case recently cited is the Port Adelaide dispute. Yesterday afternoon, and in the mail this morning, I received the thanks of leading employers in the metal industry in South Australia, as well as from the metal trades unions, for my handling of that dispute.

Mr. Chapman: You finally took some action.

Mr. Mathwin: It took six months to fix it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The gentlemen concerned stated that they appreciated the way in which the Government had gone about it, that that had been exactly the right way to obtain the result, and that that could not have been done earlier.

Mr. Mathwin: It must have been a bit of relief to them after so long.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They appreciate good government, and they have said so. I point out to the honourable member that there was no interference by government with the normal processes of the law in relation to the university students. The discipline of students within a university is a matter for the decision of the University Council, and the Opposition's members on the University Council properly took that position. The Government supported that position and, when the University Council, after the exercise of much patience, asked for the assistance of the police, that assistance was given readily, and it has continued to be given. That is the situation, and I really do not think that the honourable member is advancing law and order by attacking those authorities that are, in fact, charged with upholding law and order. I consider that the authorities are doing it quite properly.

URANIUM PLANT

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier say what general assurance South Australia has received from the Australian Government that a uranium enrichment plant will be constructed at Port Pirie? Several days before the most recent Commonwealth election, the Australian Government announced that it proposed to build a uranium enrichment plant at Port Pirie. The *Age* newspaper, of Melbourne, on August 7, 1974, reported that the South Australian Government was making a strong bid to convince the Australian Government that the uranium enrichment plant should be set up at Port Pirie, at a cost, I understand, of \$25 000 000. However, on August 16, 1974, the *West Australian* newspaper, published in Western Australia, reported that the Western Australian Government also was making a strong bid and had plans to set up a uranium enrichment plant. I believe that everyone appreciates the political reasons for the announcement just before the Commonwealth election, as Port Pirie is in what is at times the rather dicey Commonwealth District of Grey.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member now is making a comment rather than giving an explanation.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I think the Premier owes this House and the people of South Australia a clear explanation of what assurance the Australian Government has given to justify that announcement before the recent Commonwealth election.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member, to make his own statement (which is a mis-statement) about the matter, carefully has not quoted the announcement that was made before the Commonwealth election. He knows perfectly well that the Commonwealth Minister or the Commonwealth Government made no statement whatever that a uranium enrichment plant would be built in South Australia. I was present at the conference that the Minister for Minerals and Energy called, and that Minister made no statement that a uranium enrichment plant would be built in South Australia. The member for Davenport cannot quote a statement by the Minister to that effect. He can produce any statement he likes: let him try. He has not done so now and he cannot do so, because it was just not made. The honourable member does not mind coming

here to misquote to try to misrepresent a position for political purposes.

Mr. Gunn: That's all you ever do.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The statement by the Minister for Minerals and Energy was that the Commonwealth Government would proceed, jointly with the South Australian Government, on a feasibility study, the object of which was the establishment of the uranium enrichment plant, and that the preferred site in that feasibility study would be the north of Spencer Gulf, in South Australia. The Minister gave the reasons for this. The first was that there was available the necessary electricity-generating base that could be provided cheaply from either Leigh Creek coal or Lake Phillipson coal. Secondly, it was in an area that the Commonwealth Government had supported for regional development. Thirdly, it was in the ideal location for strategic purposes and it was the safest area in which to establish such a plant. The Commonwealth Minister undertook that that feasibility study would be proceeded with and, in fact, the Commonwealth Government now has made several studies of the various uranium enrichment processes. The Commonwealth Government has made clear that it considers that we must proceed to enrich our uranium. In fact, beyond the uranium export contracts that existed before that Government came to office, it has prohibited the export of uranium in order to provide a base for uranium enrichment that will give the greatest return to Australia from the resource that we have, without involving pollution factors in this country. A study of the gas centrifuge system of uranium enrichment is proceeding. That is the present situation. The honourable member has referred to a report in the *Age* newspaper. That newspaper seems to have got the release somehow or other through a back door, or in some way to have got a report made to the South Australian Government long before the announcement by the Minister for Minerals and Energy that a hexafluoride plant should be established at Port Pirie as a first step towards uranium enrichment. That submission was made to the South Australian Government some time last year, months before the Minister for Minerals and Energy made the announcement.

Mr. Coumbe: Was it made to your Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. We had made a submission to the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy, whose immediate view was that he required a larger feasibility study to be done because he did not consider that the mere decision to establish a hexafluoride plant was sufficient. That was a submission originally made to me from a study by Amdel. We submitted it to the Commonwealth Minister and he said, "I believe that something further should be done." There was no publication of the statement about a hexafluoride plant and there was no statement by either Government, but a reporter, somewhere or other, got hold of an Amdel report that was about a year old and flogged it off for a headline in the *Age* newspaper. Regarding the suggestion in the *West Australian* that the Western Australian Government is pressing a strong submission about a uranium enrichment plant, that Government may be doing that. I can only tell the honourable member that my discussions with the Minister for Minerals and Energy are continuing.

Mr. Dean Brown: Does he talk to you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, he does. The Commonwealth Government is pursuing the course that the Minister has announced. There is nothing misleading to the public or to anyone else about that.

MONARTO

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say whom the Government intends should go to live at Monarto? Much talk followed a recent announcement that some public servants would be going to live at Monarto. I have not heard about anyone else who is planning to go there, but the Government has certainly announced plans that public servants will go to live there. In last Friday's *Advertiser* (September 13) there appears an article that suggests that many public servants were jacking up against the decision. In the words of the Assistant Secretary of the Public Service Association of South Australia (Mr. G. M. Stevens) (I believe Mr. Stevens is also the current President of the Labor Party in South Australia), members of all departments have presented what appear to be very cogent reasons why the relocation of public servants at Monarto would not be in the public interest. That is the general tenor of the article. The position of Mr. Stevens reminds me somewhat of Mr. Hawke's position *vis-a-vis* the Commonwealth Government.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Government cannot get public servants to live at Monarto, whom does the Government intend shall live there? In addition, is it really worth while continuing with the project?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is worth continuing with the project. Moreover, the public servants who we said would go to Monarto will go to Monarto.

Mr. Millhouse: I see: you're a dictator!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Jobs will be provided at Monarto.

Mr. Millhouse: And they will have to go there?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The situation is no different from that applying to public servants who are transferred from Melbourne to Canberra.

Mr. Chapman: Why don't you shift the Trades Hall up there?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am interested to see that members opposite are so keen to see that the Bill for which they voted to establish Murray New Town and the Monarto Development Commission should now come to nothing and that all the protestations, made by them and their predecessors over the years, of support for decentralisation should turn into suggestions to the Government, which is willing to involve itself in decentralising its own departments, and thus to give an earnest decision of its belief in decentralisation, not to proceed with the project.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If honourable members opposite—

Mr. Chapman: We do believe in decentralisation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I find it difficult to reply to members opposite because all they seem to do is shout.

Mr. Millhouse: All I want is a reply to my question. You haven't answered it yet.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has been given a reply. It seems that the member for Mitcham does not believe that anyone ever replies to his questions, because he does not listen to anything that is said.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Public servants referred to by the honourable member will be provided with jobs

at Monarto. A Government relocation committee is concerned with the method of their relocation at Monarto and will co-operate with public servants in providing—

Mr. Chapman: Why don't you relocate them at Renmark?

The SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with Standing Order 169, I warn the honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As to other residents in Monarto, the Government plans educational and scientific institutions there. In addition, we shall be able to provide a considerable amount of light industrial development and science-based industry within Monarto, as has happened in other similarly planned new towns in similar situations throughout the world. If members opposite do not support decentralisation—

Mr. Millhouse: When are you going to tell us about the industries that will be established there.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: How is it possible to say which industries will go to Monarto when the planning stages of Monarto have not been achieved? The Government cannot say to representatives of an industry, "We can locate you at a certain site."

Mr. Millhouse: So that what you have said is a hope and not a fact?

The SPEAKER: Order! In accordance with Standing Order 169, the member for Mitcham is warned for the first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When members opposite rose to praise the establishment of Monarto (as they did, with the exception of the member for Davenport, who was not here at the time), the Opposition spokesmen praised and supported its establishment. Moreover, no-one could say then what industries would be established at Monarto. The planning stages must proceed to establish where it is in Monarto that industries should be established. How in the world could something be established yesterday that could only be decided tomorrow? If a decision had been made before proper studies had been carried out in relation to the planning of the area, the Government would have been attacked for making decisions without making proper investigation. Members opposite always want to have their cake and eat it too, and the member for Mitcham continues with his normal course of utter irresponsibility and inconsistency.

COUNCIL GRANTS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Local Government say why local government authorities on Eyre Peninsula have received greatly reduced grants from the Highways Department this year?

Mr. McAnaney: They wouldn't be orphans.

Mr. GUNN: Probably not. I have been told by representatives of several councils that their grants have been reduced. For example, Tumby Bay council last year received \$96 000 and this year will receive only \$53 000; the council in the Cowell area received \$85 000 last year and expects to receive only \$40 000 this year; Streaky Bay council received \$61 000 last year and will receive only \$39 000 this year. I was told that, if the grants to be received are the only funds councils receive from the Highways Department, it will probably be necessary for some councils to retrench staff at Christmas.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: While the honourable member was asking his question I was trying to find the list of grants to be made this year to the various councils. Unfortunately, in the short time available to me I cannot

find the list, so I will simply reply to the question in a general way. First, the grants to be made to councils this year are, in total, no less than they were during the last financial year. I have made that same statement previously. Secondly, the matter has been discussed in the House in relation to a Bill I introduced, and grants to be made available from the Commonwealth Government amount to \$31 000 000, exactly the same amount as was available last year. When inflation is considered, it will be seen that we are receiving less this year than we received last year. Finally, I remind members that local government was not designed on the basis that it should exist only if it received grants from the Highways Department. The whole purpose of establishing a Royal Commission was to attempt to get local government to the stage where it was able economically to stand on its own two feet, without having to rely on funds from other areas. I have outlined the situation regarding grants to councils. As I have said, there has been no reduction at all in the total sum distributed.

LAND TRANSFER

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Minister of Lands what was the result of inquiries made by the Minister of Lands into allegations contained in a letter received last March by that Minister from Mr. R. S. Michelmore? I will read some sections of that letter, which was directed to the Minister of Lands on March 24, 1974, as follows:

Your letter of January 29, 1974, stated that "... no application by the lessees for consent to transfer the leases to another party had been lodged with the Lands Department". Yet the sale and transfer of the sections (formerly held by my brother, now deceased) was approved by you on March 15, 1974, to Mr. X, who paid \$52 000 for the property, in spite of my letter of November 24, 1973, wherein I submitted an application for the purchasing of Crown land. This application was completely ignored by you, as well as by the officers of the Lands Department.

Mr. Y held the property for less than two years, having paid \$12 000 (apparently) after an appeal lodged by me, on behalf of my niece and nephew, had inadvisedly been rejected by you and your advisers. At that time he was a public servant working in the Lands Department where he had access to files, etc., advantageous to him and of which he made full use; even though this was denied by the members of the hastily constituted board it remains supremely suspect. . . . My purpose in sending this letter to you and to the officers of the Lands Department is to submit to you a strong, vehement and valid protest over the thinking and action nullifying justice. At this time I shall bring forward just two points:

- (a) Normally the sale and transfer of Crown lands is governed by the effective improvements made on the property during the period of occupancy. I assure you all that few, if any, were carried out by Mr. Y. He has been encouraged to make a net profit of \$40 000 without cost. I appeal to you, and to the Government of which you are a Minister, is this just, is this fair and reasonable?
- (b) For you to approve the property to be sold by Mr. Y for \$52 000 enabling him to gain a "cool" net profit of \$40 000 in less than two years without effort, is outrageous, scandalous, disgraceful and unwarranted, and highly inflationary. For a Minister of the Crown, and particularly of a Labor Government, to consent to such an unmerited profit being allowed by a former public servant, without cost to him, is a matter the taxpayers must know about.

I should like the Minister of Works to obtain from the Minister of Lands a report stating what the Minister of Lands found out as a result of inquiring into these allegations.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Several serious allegations have been made in the letter referred to by the

honourable member. I take it that the honourable member is aware that any transaction involving the sale or transfer of Crown lands held under perpetual lease is handled by the Land Board, a statutory body that makes recommendations to the Minister from which the Minister cannot withhold his approval capriciously. Yet the honourable member's constituent (if this person is a constituent of the honourable member) has made it sound as though the Minister of Lands himself was personally responsible for the investigation into and decision about this matter, when, in fact, as the honourable member should know well, that is not the case. I will refer the matter to my colleague. It will be thoroughly investigated and, in due course, when my colleague sees fit, a report will be supplied to the honourable member.

OPEN SPACE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation ascertain whether the State Planning Authority has acquired land near Salisbury East to add to the land already purchased for development of a major district open space? Moreover, has any attempt been made to develop this land? On October 15, 1970, I was told that about 82.94 hectares near Salisbury East had been purchased by the State Planning Authority at a cost of about \$138 000 as part of the Government's development of major district open spaces. This land is rising ground immediately east of Bridge Road, running back into the hills face zone on the southern side of Golden Grove Road. The acquired space was about half of the total area intended to be acquired. It was said that this site would be most suitable for the development of sports grounds on the lower levels and picnic grounds and a golf course on the higher levels. The land was to be leased out until such time as the whole space had been acquired.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be glad to obtain for the honourable member information about the current position. I point out to her and other honourable members that land for several major open-space areas is being purchased or has been purchased through the Planning and Development Fund. The State Planning Authority is conscious of the fact that the sooner these areas are developed and open to the community the better use we will have of the land currently held. As a result, finance is being provided towards supplying management plans for the areas. This work is being done in conjunction with the Recreation and Sport Department to try to determine the types of facility required in these areas. As I am not certain whether the area to which the honourable member refers is one of the areas currently the subject of a management study, I will obtain that information for her.

BAKERS' STRIKE

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what is the position regarding the supply of bread to essential services while the present bakers' strike continues? It is reported that no delivery of bread has been guaranteed for essential services. Has the supply to these services been guaranteed, and which services, if any, will get bread?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Earlier this morning I was assured by the trade union secretary that hospitals and other essential services would be catered for. Since then, my officers have been negotiating with a bakery firm in Adelaide to make sure that this is the case.

Mr. Millhouse: Private hospitals as well as public?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I do not think I would be in order in replying to that interjection.

The SPEAKER: That is right; the honourable member for Mitcham is out of order in interjecting.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I understand that, at the meeting of union members this morning, the proposal to accept the commissioner's decision was rejected, with another meeting of union members scheduled for tomorrow, when they will consider their position. Until I have further conversations with representatives concerned, I cannot report further to the honourable member.

LEIGH CREEK COALFIELD

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the Government intends to carry out work at the disused areas of the Leigh Creek coalfield with a view to making the heaps of overburden more in keeping with the surrounding areas? No doubt the Minister is aware that there is a small disused open-cut mine east of Leigh Creek. The local people believe that in this area there is an excellent opportunity to carry out experimental work, perhaps knocking off the tops of hard heaps of overburden in an attempt to get some vegetation to grow on these mounds, so that they will eventually be more in keeping with the surrounding areas. In about two years, when another open cut will be opened south of the town, the huge open cuts north of the town will become disused, and it may be possible for experimental work east of the town, if it is successful, to be applied to the northern part of the town.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I do not know whether the honourable member is speaking about something he has heard that is being considered or whether it is his own idea, but I assume it is something that he is suggesting. The idea seems to have merit and should be considered. I shall be pleased to discuss this matter with the Mines Department and officers of my department to ascertain whether this project is practicable, and whether the Mines Department is willing to assist in using rehabilitation funds available under legislation, and I will notify the honourable member of the outcome.

PAY-ROLL TAX

Mr. BECKER: Can the Treasurer say what action is being taken by the State Taxes Department to ensure that the Treasury is receiving the maximum collection of pay-roll tax in this State? As the Auditor-General, in his report at page 208, refers to the increased number of employers paying pay-roll tax, I wonder whether the department has sufficient staff to handle its collection.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Investigations are made to ensure that pay-roll tax is being properly paid, but, if we had to chase everyone, we would need a large staff. A judgment has to be made about how much is to be spent in collecting this tax, and that judgment is made by the department and the Government after consulting with the Public Service Board. I will raise the matter with the board, and obtain a report for the honourable member.

IMPOUNDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

(Continued from September 12. Page 932.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That further consideration of the Bill in Committee be now resumed.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I refer to two matters, the first relating to an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* last Friday under the heading "Report raises rates 20 per cent", which states:

If the South Australian Government adopted the Sangster water rating report there would be an immediate 20 per cent increase in water rates, the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said last night. He told an A.L.P. State Council meeting Government experts had taken 18 months to work out what was contained in the report. He offered to make the report available to members of the A.L.P. and said they were welcome to read it "if they can understand what it is all about". Mr. Dunstan was speaking in opposition to a motion from the Hectorville sub-branch, calling on the Government to consider water rates as a service financed by a progressive tax system.

Mr. Dunstan said the suggestion was impractical. The water rating system was as "progressive as we can make it". "The suburban householder is heavily subsidised by the wealthy properties," he said. "If water rating was based on the amount of water used everybody would be paying more than they are at present." Mr. Dunstan said banks, insurance companies and commercial premises in the city of Adelaide were subsidising the suburban householder. The motion was defeated.

The Sangster report, which was commissioned by the then Government before the election in 1970, was not the work of one person. It was the work of a committee, the Chairman of which was Alexander Keith Sangster, Q.C., barrister at law, practising at Adelaide, its members being Peter Bayford Wells, F.C.A., chartered accountant, practising at Adelaide, and Kenneth Charles Taeuber, F.C.T.V., a member of the Public Service Board of South Australia and formerly Commissioner of Land Tax. The committee was serviced by the Secretary, Mr. H. J. James, B.Ec., who was Senior Investigating Officer, Department of the Public Service Board, and the report was submitted over the name of a Committee of Inquiry on Water Rating Systems.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw to the attention of the Leader of the Opposition the fact that, in a grievance debate, members have the chance to speak about practically anything at all, but Standing Orders provide exceptions, in that no matter can be discussed or debated that anticipates an Order of the Day. I draw the attention of the Leader to Order of the Day No. 12 for Wednesday, September 18, standing in the name of the member for Davenport. If the Leader wants to debate a particular matter, I point out again that, even though this is a grievance debate, Standing Orders provide that a debate cannot take place anticipating Bills and legislation, Notices of Motion, or Orders of the Day. As there is an Order of the Day pertaining to this particular matter of water rating, etc., the Leader must not debate anticipating that issue. The honourable Leader.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I will not transgress in that way. I wish to discuss the fact that members of a committee responsible for reporting on this matter had been appointed by the then Government with the specific responsibility of reporting to the Minister concerned. As the committee was required to report to the Minister, its members were not able to air or make available to the public the details of their report or the basis on which they made it. Recognising that situation, I suggest that the attack that has been made on that responsible group of people (as witnessed by the report in the press) clearly indicates that those persons have not had the chance to put their case so that the public can determine the rights or wrongs of their decision. I would be the first to accept that the entire statement made by the Premier on this subject was probably not contained in the article published in the *Advertiser*, but the article indicates that a report commissioned by a Government and

handed to the Government of the day was a report of no consequence, or one that gave little credit to those responsible for bringing it down.

The situation would have been entirely different had it involved a Royal Commission. Had it been a report which the Minister tabled in this House, it would have been available for public use and it would have been possible for the nature of the report and the basis on which the decisions were made to be publicly examined. The members of that committee, especially the Chairman, would not then have found themselves being castigated by the Premier at a political meeting last Thursday evening. Subsequent to making that report the Chairman has become a member of the Judiciary and cannot therefore defend himself against any allegation made against him. I believe it is a disgrace that a person—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Why can't he?

Dr. EASTICK: I will leave the Minister to explain why he cannot. Having regard to his position—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What has that to do with it?

Dr. EASTICK: He can hardly turn around and publicly debate something the Premier has said on an issue of this nature.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There's nothing stopping him.

Dr. EASTICK: This has been a revelation.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I do not know of anything to stop him.

Dr. EASTICK: Then I hope an opportunity is given to the other members of the Sangster committee to put their points of view, instead of their being attacked about the findings of a report that has not been made available to the public. I believe that, in their interests, the report should be tabled.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You can get it from the library if you want it.

Dr. EASTICK: I have obtained it from the library. Adhering to the restrictions placed on me by Standing Orders, I will not read the recommendations made by the committee in its report. However, if the report was made public it would be seen that the recommendations were couched in proper English and could be understood. The recommendations might not have been in the interests of the Government or its departments, but at least if they were made public members of the community could determine their attitude towards them. I suggest that the persons placed in this position should have been afforded some protection from the remarks of a person in such a responsible position as that of the Premier of this State.

In the report published last Friday it was stated that if water rating was based on the amount of water used everyone would be paying more than they are paying at present. There is no argument about that. The Premier is reported as saying that banks, insurance companies and commercial premises in the city of Adelaide are subsidising the suburban householder. There has never been any denial of that. Earlier in the report the Premier is reported as saying that the suburban householder is heavily subsidised through wealthy properties. The Premier said in a letter to trade union members about three or four years ago that it was the policy of the present Government to "trim the tall poppies", and it was indicated then that there were not enough so-called tall poppies to allow such a situation to arise.

Last Friday I travelled in an official capacity to the Riverland. Following that visit and statements I made, it has been alleged by the Minister of Works that I was out to make cheap political capital. I am disappointed that the

Minister should adopt such an attitude. Whenever a Minister visits any part of the State he is said to be on a legitimate fact-finding tour. I was on a legitimate fact-finding tour last Friday. It is not the first time the Leader of the Opposition has been accused of indulging in cheap politicking when he has been on a fact-finding tour. Before he made his allegation, the Minister should have obtained details of where I went and what I said. Indeed, I lauded the fact that the Government had announced that \$80 000 was to be made available for Government installations, and I lauded the fact that, as soon as interstate announcements indicated difficulties as regards flooding, which it was predicted would at least reach the 1931 level, the Government had made the services of Mr. Llewellyn and Mr. Andy Kinnear available to the Riverland.

I indicated that this announcement had been received very well and that the persons they had contacted were most appreciative of the fact that these officers would know at first hand the various requirements of the Riverland, extending from Blanchetown upstream to Renmark (it by-passed Morgan). During the course of my visit I was able to discuss problems with the Mayors of five councils concerned: Mr. Don Elliott, Mayor of Waikerie; Miss Pfitzner, Mayor of Loxton; Mr. Trevelyan, Mayor of Barmera; Mr. Rosenthal, Mayor of Berri; and Mr. Sims, Mayor of Renmark, as well as representatives of the Paringa District Council. Those people were able to outline their problems, and some of them produced maps of the area and clearly indicated where their difficulties existed.

When we met at the Barmera caravan park we learnt that, in discussions with Government representatives, it had been clearly pointed out that, rather than have a picture painted that tourism would suffer, it would be much better, far more positive and in the interests of the whole of the Riverland to indicate to people that there was plenty to be seen of the flood conditions, and that there was a distinct advantage in having people continue to use the Riverland's facilities during the flood period. It was estimated at that same time that about 250 000 sandbags would be required at Barmera alone, not only to protect the caravan park (where there were waves of up to nearly 1 metre the previous day)—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's already been announced. Why say all this?

Dr. EASTICK: I have a right to speak without the Minister commenting in that manner. I am pointing out that it was unnecessary for a charge to be made that cheap politicking was going on. The decision to go to the Riverland was made last Tuesday. I am pointing out that interviewing people on these trips enables me, whenever there is need, say, to support action taken in the House to increase a sum being provided, to give information with a background knowledge of the situation. I also discussed with people in the various areas their attitude to local government boundaries, as well as discussing other problems they had. It was estimated that 250 000 sandbags were required to protect the caravan park area and more especially the sewerage system, which serves not only that area but also many houses on the high land at Barmera and the whole of the motel complex adjacent to Lake Bonney plus 15 houses, many of which have been established since 1919 and which, unless protected by sandbags, will be completely inundated.

I was told that the Minister's own representatives has said the cost of the 250 000 sandbags (the bags alone) would be \$35 000. Each bag costs 15c, and then they must be filled, shifted to the required site, and placed in position.

Obtaining maximum benefit is a matter not of placing one sandbag on top of another but of placing them in a pyramid form, with several bags at the base and other bags on top of them. Waves 1 m high are not unknown in that area. In the further announcement made last evening (a report of which appears on the front page of this morning's *Advertiser*), it was indicated that grants of \$35 000 had been made to River councils, and I accept that. A radio news report I heard last evening announced grants of \$35 000, plus the cost of sandbags; yet, nowhere else in the report in this morning's paper or in any other statement have I seen that confirmed. I should be pleased to have the Minister confirm this for me.

Another issue which arose and which, I understand, is being dealt with at present by the responsible Ministers relates to the Waikerie winery. That is an issue completely apart from the normal flood control issue. I recognise that the winery has been in existence in its present location since 1919 or 1924. Having visited the Riverland, I am aware that, in the 1973 floods, a levee which had been built at Blanchetown (apparently illegally) was breached in advance of the owners whose shacks were being protected being notified that it would be breached, and that considerable damage to the personal effects of about 50 shackowners occurred at that site. Serious problems exist in that area.

As we travelled farther along the River, and as a result of news broadcasts from the Eastern States that some people in the Riverland had heard, it became apparent that there had been additional heavy falls in the catchment areas of New South Wales and Victoria last Friday. Indeed, the peak, which is expected to reach the 1931 level, could conceivably be higher or maintained for longer than was originally believed. Wherever I went I found that people were happy to receive the Government's weekly communiques based on information supplied from other States relating to the flood-level predictions and the length of time it might be expected to hold, and to the predictions when the flood peak would occur at the various centres, namely, the third week in October for Waikerie, about six to eight days later downstream at Blanchetown, and earlier than the third week of October upstream from Waikerie.

It is competent for any member, particularly one charged with a certain responsibility of leadership or deputy leadership or as a spokesman on certain issues, to view areas that may be involved in a crisis. Having made those inspections, he should be able to make a statement on the position. I do not apologise for describing the situation as I saw it along the River last Friday. Many people along the Murray River are living on a time bomb, set to go off some time after mid-October. I am also able, as a result of my visit, to hold worthwhile discussions with the Minister of Lands, who is responsible for Mays Island, regarding the island's future, having regard to the cost involved in maintaining a service to those people or in helping them out in a time of crisis.

Further, I am better able to appreciate the real problems of the Waikerie winery. I am also fully aware of the difficulties that will arise if grapegrowers (appreciating that many people who normally use the punts to transfer their grapes from one side of the River to the other, thence to wineries at harvest time) have to travel a considerably greater distance to reach the winery. The cost of production, whether for the wine industry, the fruit industry, or the vegetable industry, will be increased markedly, as a result of the problems up there.

If ever I needed the knowledge, it was shown to me clearly last Friday that, in this day and age and with the type of development that is taking place in the upper reaches of the Riverland, we should be giving urgent forward consideration to building a bridge across the River at Berri to link Berri and Loxton. I consider that, as a result of my visit (which was a fact-finding one, not one to upset any member of the Government), I am better able to speak on these matters.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I wish to deal briefly with a matter that has occupied the attention of this House several times during this session. I refer to the overseas visits by the Premier and several of his Ministers.

Mr. Millhouse: Is this what you missed last Thursday afternoon when you let the line pass?

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, and I intend to come to that matter later. It has become apparent that the amounts spent on overseas visits by the Premier, his Ministers, and his officers during the past 12 months is far more than was proposed to be spent. The actual expenditure exceeded the allocation made in the last Budget by 158 per cent, so the expenditure was much more than twice the amount allocated. There was an increase in actual expenditure over proposed expenditure of about 106 per cent for all overseas visits set down for officers of the Ministers' departments.

The amounts involved are high: an amount of \$261 600 was spent on overseas visits last year. No-one complains about overseas visits if the people of this State get value for money, nor does anyone complain when Ministers go away to examine various aspects of their portfolios and, when they come back, give South Australia the benefits of the experience that they have gained. However, I question seriously whether South Australians have received value for money from this enormous increase in the amounts spent in the past 12 months. Those amounts cannot be explained away by inflation or inflationary increases in the cost of living or in fares. They are purely and simply taken up by what I regard as an inflationary method of investigating various matters overseas. In other words, I consider that the amounts spent by the Premier in taking with him such a large staff were totally unjustified. I consider that in that respect the amounts have been inflationary and that the Premier, by his actions, has deliberately inflated them.

Be that as it may, my main concern at present is about the extreme difficulty that we on this side have had in obtaining from the Premier and his Ministers details of the amounts that have been spent. Since this session commenced, detailed questions have been placed on notice. On July 30 replies were given to questions about the Premier's participation in the Coogee by-election in New South Wales, and in those replies the Premier stated that the Australian Labor Party had paid his travelling and accommodation expenses, but he was careful not to say, until a second question was asked, that the Government had paid for his Press Secretary and his Private Secretary.

Mr. Millhouse: Who asked those questions?

Dr. TONKIN: I think the member for Davenport and the member for Mitcham did. I put on notice a series of questions for the same day and they were answered with the request that I should ask them again the next week. I did this, and on August 6 (*Hansard* at page 258) detailed answers were given to the detailed questions that I had asked. Certainly, in so far as the questions covered details of the itinerary and accommodation, the answers were full and detailed.

I could not understand why Mr. S. R. Wright, Mr. P. R. Ward, and Mr. A. E. Baker should have been required to

accompany the Premier on all occasions. However, I could not understand why, since the Premier was visiting Europe, officers of the Agent-General in England Department, who could be expected to have done the research work beforehand and undoubtedly to have set up the itinerary and made all the appointments for the Premier, could not have been seconded to his entourage, instead of officers being taken from South Australia. Why was it necessary to send three officers from South Australia at considerable public expense, when suitable officers easily could have been provided by the Agent-General? Indeed, this is one of the functions of the Agent-General in England Department. The Premier stated in his reply that he had interrupted his itinerary on April 30 to return to Australia, and he stated that the decision to return had been made before he went overseas.

However, then he stated that, when the Commonwealth election was announced, he extended his visit to Australia from eight days to 12 days. The reply merely stated that, when the Commonwealth election was announced, he decided to extend his visit back here from eight days to 12 days. The reason given for that was that he had to be back here to make decisions about the Budget early in May, in preparation for the Premiers' Conference. The return air fares that the Premier and his Private Secretary incurred in returning to Australia, taking part to some extent in the Commonwealth A.L.P. election campaign, and in making these decisions on budgetary matters, were \$4 500.

If expenditure had been incurred on postage in sending copies of the relevant documents to London, in flying the Premier to London, and in telephoning Treasury officers here to consult them, that expenditure would not have been anywhere near \$4 500. I cannot see any justification for spending that amount for the return to Australia of the Premier and his Private Secretary for that time. That expenditure is totally and absolutely unjustified.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you think it made any difference to the Commonwealth election?

Dr. TONKIN: That is a moot point. On August 6, I asked a question about the absences from this State of various other Ministers. If I remember correctly, I think that the highest number of Ministers absent at any one time overseas was four. They were the Premier, the Minister of Works, the Attorney-General, and the Minister of Agriculture, who were absent for a total of 11 days. One has some sympathy for the Minister of Education who, as I said on another occasion, filled in as something of a Pooh Bah at the time the question was asked and the replies were given. We were told that only the Chief Secretary's travelling expense figures were available and that they amounted to more than \$14 000. The figures in respect of the Attorney-General, the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister of Works were not available, we were told. The figure for the Premier was \$59 000, but we were told that the figures had not been completed. Two weeks later I put a further Question on Notice asking whether the figures that had not previously been available were now available, and I was again told that the figures were still not available.

Members would appreciate my difficulty, because it is extremely difficult to ask the same question in a different way more than twice. As the figures had not been available on two occasions previously I should have liked to ask the question again; however, it was not possible for me to do so. I therefore decided to ask the Premier only last week whether the figures were now available. The Premier once again said he would get a report. That is as

far as the matter has gone. The Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee (Mr. Simmons), in response to a further question, declined to open the matter again. He has declined to place before his committee (I thought that was the function of the committee) the matter I raised.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you think he's got something to hide?

Dr. TONKIN: Generally speaking, it is obvious that the Government does not want more publicity given to overseas trips of the Premier and his Ministers than can possibly be avoided. From the amount spent by the Premier on his recent trip it is obvious that he does not intend going overseas for some years.

Mr. Venning: He is going again before Christmas.

Dr. TONKIN: Is he? I am amazed. I am grateful to the member for Eyre for drawing my attention to a newspaper report that indicates the Premier will make a brief visit to Penang at the end of this year. However, it seems the Premier would not say what were the reasons for the visit. That is absolutely typical. The member for Mitcham, by way of interjection last Thursday, raised the question of the difficulty members experienced when dealing with this matter. Having had much difficulty in obtaining details from this so-called open Government, it was with some interest that members on this side were waiting to debate the Premier's line during the Budget debate. With great respect to you, Sir, it was the experience of most members, certainly those on this side, that they could not hear you when the question was put.

The first intimation I had that the Premier's line had been put and that it was being passed was when I heard the Premier saying, in a terribly enthusiastic voice, "Aye" when the question was put. By the time I got to my feet (and I submit, Sir, that you were entirely correct in your ruling) the line had been passed. My point is that we could not hear exactly what was going on and, because of that, we lost the opportunity to debate and probe in greater detail than we can do now the matter I have raised. Fortunately, as I understand Standing Orders, it is possible to recommit the line at the end of the debate, but to do that we have to have the support and approval of the Government and it will be interesting to see whether the Government is really an open Government, whether it is willing to have the matter ventilated, and whether Government members will allow a full debate on the Premier's line. If they do not allow such a course I can only assume that the action taken was deliberate. The way the whole matter was arranged leaves a sour taste in my mouth and suggests that that could be so.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I wish to raise a couple of matters about the Redcliff project arising out of the reply—

Mr. Payne: Your effort is bound to be better than that of the previous speaker.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not sure whether or not that is a compliment from the member for Mitchell, but I will appreciate it and accept it as being a compliment. There are a few matters I wish to raise about the Redcliff project that have been prompted by the long reply the Premier gave to a question asked by the member for Torrens last Thursday. I will come to that in a moment, though. First, as a foundation for what I wish to say, I remind the House of what the Premier is reported in the *News* to have said on August 14 about the project at Red Cliff Point, the article in which he used the word used by the member for Torrens on Thursday (a word which has been bandied about)—"crunch":

"We are now getting to a crunch situation with Red Cliff", the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said on his return from Canberra today.

He then rejected reports that the project was on the verge of collapse, and said:

The State Government had informed the Commonwealth Government negotiations with the consortium behind the Red Cliff project—I.C.I., Mitsubishi and Alcoa—had now been completed.

That is completely contrary to what he said last Thursday.

Mr. Gunn: That's not unusual for him, though.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. The article continues:

He now urgently wanted answers from the Commonwealth Government on a number of questions which would enable him to finalise the necessary legislation to allow the Red Cliff petro-chemical complex to proceed. Mr. Dunstan warned that he wanted these answers "within a couple of weeks so the indenture agreement could be drafted and presented to Parliament next month".

I remind the House that that is this month. The article continues:

Mr. Dunstan said if the answers were seriously delayed then the Red Cliff project could be in danger.

When he gave his long, rambling reply on Thursday there was no suggestion of danger, whereas a month ago he said that, if he did not get the Indenture Bill into Parliament within a month, the project could be in danger. In the *Advertiser* of August 16 (just two days later) the following report appears:

If the Redcliff Indenture Act were not before Parliament in September, the entire project could be destroyed, the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) said today. He said it was necessary to get the legislation passed quickly so that site work could begin on the \$420 000 000 scheme this year. "If we do not meet the September deadline, it will be difficult to get the plant on stream by 1978," he said. This would destroy the scheme.

On Thursday, the Premier, during Question Time, gave a reply on this matter, parts of which I will refer to (I will spare members the whole of that reply). The Premier referred to the calculation of the gas price, saying that it was up to the consortium to negotiate with the producers of gas. He said that this would take about three or four weeks. He then said:

We have tried to expedite this matter, but the calculations need considerable computer study. We are satisfied that we cannot get an earlier date than three or four weeks hence before these negotiations could conceivably be concluded.

That time must pass, taking us well into October, before the indenture can be signed and the Bill drafted. This means that, according to the time table any of us can work out, it must be the latter part of October before a Bill can be introduced. Then the Premier tried to excuse the situation that he has allowed to develop. He made some arrogant statements about the matter of the environment. The member for Torrens interjected, "Has the crunch been delayed?" The Premier did not answer that interjection directly and, when he does not answer directly, that is a signal that he cannot answer. Instead, he said:

I can only tell the honourable member that the matters which are to be determined and which I have raised previously with the Commonwealth Ministry have now largely been determined. The delay at present is that the producers—

so he is putting responsibility on the producers for the delay—

are saying it will now take them more time than we had expected or than we had been told about to calculate their price.

He went on to make some most extraordinary assertions about the environmental impact of the Redcliff project. He rejected altogether the idea of a study before a decision

was made. In reply to an interjection by the member for Rocky River (no less), the Premier said:

If the honourable member wants a four-year study of this plant, we will not have a plant, and South Australia will lose this vital resource forever.

So he is saying clearly that, come hell or high water, whatever the impact on the environment may be, the Government is determined, if it possibly can, to go ahead with this project. That reminds me of what I heard probably over 12 months ago when the project was first mooted: that no matter what environmental studies were carried out, the answer would inevitably be that the project would go ahead. The Government had made up its mind, being determined that whatever studies were carried out the answer would be favourable; that is precisely what has happened. He then said categorically that there would be no effects on the environment from the discharge of effluent, as follows:

... we can say categorically that there will be no harm whatever to the waters of the gulf or to the area surrounding the plant and land from the discharge of effluent.

In the same way, he dealt with the discharge of fumes, the noise, and the light, and he then dealt with prawn fisheries, as follows:

The prawn fisheries lire fully protected. There will be no discharge, into the gulf, of water that will adversely affect any prawn-breeding grounds...

If all these things were true, it would not be necessary to do any more studies at all, because, in his own mind, he already has the full answer. He said:

On both scores this Government is working effectively to get this vital resource developed in South Australia.

One doubts that, after what has gone on between this Government and the Commonwealth Government. He continued:

We are proceeding with all haste and have done everything that a Government could do to get finality on the project. In addition, we have done more than any other Government anywhere to protect the environment and to ensure that this plant does not disturb it.

Naturally, his reply, which had publicity on Friday, brought forth several protests from scientists and others about the arrogant assertions he had made about the environment. On Saturday morning, Mrs. Anne Reeves had a letter to the Editor in the *Advertiser*, not stemming directly from the Premier's reply on Thursday, but relating to a report that had appeared a few days before about the environment protection clause. In the course of her letter, she said:

As it stands this report indicates that the Government does not understand conservation. Prior environmental impact assessment is what is required and this should be publicly available well before the final agreement with the consortium.

The report also indicates that the Government's expressed concern for the environment was political window-dressing, as the Government seems now not to align itself with conservationists but rather sees itself in opposition.

Mrs. Reeves, who is the Honorary Secretary of the Conservation Council of South Australia (and I am informed that her letter has the authority of the President of the council), concluded her letter as follows:

The gaping loophole which this Government should close and the only one which will avoid the justified criticism by genuine conservationists is the reversal of the present order in which development decisions precede environmental assessment.

That is precisely what I and some others have said time and time again about this matter. Yesterday, we had a letter to the Editor from Professor Browning (the Waite Professor of Entomology) that was the direct result of the Premier's reply on Thursday. In part, Professor Browning said:

I know no scientist in South Australia who would be prepared to make such a statement. This is because the kinds of information on which such a conclusion could be based are not available...

The members of the consortium do not have adequate information, for recently one of them approached our department to provide information that might help in predicting the probable impact of the plant on the insects of the area, and to do so in a few weeks!

On such information the design of the whole plant and the financial planning could depend if Mr. Dunstan's assurances are correct. These and other considerations lead me to the conclusion that the assurances are unfounded, even if they should turn out to be valid.

Professor Browning has not, so far as I can remember, publicly entered into this debate before, although several of his professorial and other university colleagues have done so. The Premier saw fit this morning to reply to the letters of Mrs. Reeves and Professor Browning. I take his letter to be a considered statement of the position of the Government; after all, it was not made in the heat of debate in this place. What he says confirms precisely all the complaints that we have made about the Redcliff project. In his letter the Premier stated:

To Mrs. Reeves, the Government "does not understand conservation". This is because we have decided to tackle environmental protection at Redcliff by making environmental assessment proceed in parallel with plant design. We decided on this course once the preliminary studies in the area made it clear that there need be no insuperable environmental problems.

In other words, there is the commitment of the investment of hundreds of millions of dollars that would not go ahead if there were any doubt about the results of environmental studies, but those studies are to go on at the same time as the commitment is to be put into effect. The letter continues:

We fully appreciate the philosophy she is espousing—that environmental assessment should precede decisions to go ahead. But the nature of project development is that this is impossible without excessive delay.

Too bad if the environment is prejudiced: we cannot afford to take that into account when making a decision! That is what the Premier has written in the newspaper, and I take it to be his and the Government's considered position on this matter. What if, during the course of these environmental studies that are to proceed in parallel, someone comes up with a fatal objection to the whole project? Is the Government saying that the project would then stop and that whatever money had been invested and what work had been done would be abandoned? I cannot believe that an assurance has not been given to the consortium that this will not happen, if it is suggested that anyone can come up with such a fatal objection to the scheme. Obviously, the Government, having pre-judged the situation, has already made a decision. What is the decision based on? The only reply that can be given to my question, "What if someone comes up with a fatal objection?" is not that they will not but that they cannot, because, whatever anyone says, the project must go ahead. That is the situation in which the Government has placed itself.

I have discussed with Professor Browning the letter published today in order to get his comments, and I think that what I have expressed as my views pretty well reflect what he has said to me. Also, I have discussed the matter with Mr. Warren Bonython (President of the Conservation Council), and he pointed out that, apart from the admission by the Premier, there is nothing in the letter that we did not already know, and that it shows that the Government is not doing this in a conservation way, although it gives lip service to conservation. I refer to another letter, not written by the Premier, but written by Mr. Bruce Muirden,

who signs himself in *Nation Review* as Press Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Conservation. I suppose we may be justified in taking seriously what he has said. His letter is completely critical of those who dare say anything against the Redcliff project. Referring to Dr. Fay Gale (Head of the Geography Department), his letter states:

Dr. Gale is apparently responsible for another furore, now given further currency by Chris Hector (who would have had no ready means for checking it). Dr. Gale: "The consortium did not have control over choice of the proposed location. It was given a site and expected to produce an environmental impact statement in a short space of time."

Both legs of this proposition are extremely shaky. Petro-chemists and the Government did study possible sites at length. Four sites were actively discussed. The three unsuccessful locations were more closely settled than Red Cliff Point. The consortium has made no complaint about this final choice.

I am pleased that the Minister of Environment and Conservation has now returned to the Chamber, because I am quoting from what his Press Secretary has written in the *Nation Review* of September 6-12. I challenge the Minister to say whether what his Press Secretary has said is accurate, because there is nothing in what Mr. Muirden has written about a decision being based on any information concerning the environment. I believe that no such consideration was given. Mr. Muirden's letter ends as follows:

Apart from this bout of geo-kerfuffle, I expect now that we will settle down to a bout of greenie power play. Our leading anti-industrial activist "ecologists"—some of whom would not know sapphire from sapphire—will be vying, using Redcliff as the means, for the ancient crown of King Lud.

One wonders whether Mr. Muirden is taking this matter seriously. Also, one wonders whether any senior academics in this State support what the Government is doing at Red Cliff Point, when we consider those who have criticised it publicly: Dr. Gale; Dr. Lewis (Acting Head, Department of Organic Chemistry); Mr. Thomas (Acting Head, Zoology Department); Professor Wolmsley; and Professor Browning. Who are supporting the Government? I know of no-one and I challenge the Government to produce any academic who will support its actions. I have received several letters about this matter, the first from a man living at Kensington Park, as follows:

Several friends of mine have approached both the Labor Party Executive and a well known union organiser reputedly uptight on pollution control in an attempt to have the Redcliff petro-chemical pollution safeguards fully discussed. Dead silence from both.

The letter concludes:

If we are to have Redcliff there must be no chance of a similar disaster in Spencer Gulf—

the gentleman is referring to the experience in Japan—

As Leader of a responsible group would you please check and publicise this Japanese disaster?

I have replied and pointed out to him (and I point out to members) that I have already referred to the tragedy that happened in Japan because there was no proper study. The other letter to which I refer is from Professor Clyde Manwell, the person whom the honourable member for Kavel was pleased to call a crank when I referred to him one evening last week. I do not intend to read all of his letter of September 1, but, in part, it states:

Mr. Dean Brown: Do you support his views?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I certainly do in this matter, and perhaps the honourable member will listen to them. His letter states:

I am most impressed with your attempts to obtain a frank discussion of the proposed Redcliff petro-chemical complex. South Australians will be grateful to you and to

Steele Hall for your efforts. It is worth a brief summary of the economic, social, and environmental difficulties associated with the petro-chemical complex:

I will table the letter if the Minister would like to have it, so that he can reply to it. The letter contains several headings: the way the present Government has handled the planning; uncertainty of costs; doubts on the profitability of Redcliff; will P.V.C. plastic become obsolete; how flexible is the design of the Redcliff plant; diversification; vertical integration; and the prospects for employment are poor. I hope that the Minister of Environment and Conservation, who is now present (if not the Attorney-General who, I have noticed, prefers not to take part in discussions of this nature), will reply to the points made by Professor Manwell, because they are all important. No reply has been given to them up to now. The professor's letter continues:

Chemical engineering processes are among the easiest to automate; indeed, there is a good argument for automation to reduce exposure of workers to toxic intermediates in P.V.C. production. The scant data available suggests that Redcliffs will have less than 1 000 permanent employees. Most of these will be doing jobs for which considerable specialised training is necessary. Thus, local job opportunities will be minimal. In the present conception of Redcliffs, with ethylene dichloride or vinyl chloride monomer being produced here and shipped to Japan or elsewhere, there is little opportunity for building up such diversified industry as might be possible from the finished plastic.

Let him answer that. Paragraph 9 states:

The marine environment in the South Australian gulfs is unique. The short survey done by the government reveals an extensive marine plant community of several species of sea grasses (relations of land plants that have invaded the sea). The most conspicuous animals are a rich variety of sea squirts (tunicates). I know of no studies on the effect of pollutants on such an unusual marine ecosystem. (Nearly all studies on marine pollution are on temperate communities in areas of nutrient-rich sea water, where sea grasses and tunicates are relatively minor components.) The unusual nature of the flora and fauna in the South Australian gulfs is probably the result of recirculated sea water, which becomes deficient in certain nutrients. The absence of flushing by new oceanic sea water means that pollutants will not be carried away. The low levels of certain nutrients means that normal biological breakdown of organic pollutants is likely to be incomplete. Chlorinated hydrocarbons are often very resistant to biological degradation, even under more favourable conditions.

He then goes on to deal with damage to fisheries and expresses the fear that there will be such damage. He concludes his letter thus:

In summary, there are a number of serious objections to the present proposals for the petro-chemical complex at Redcliffs. The environment is at serious risk. How much so is impossible to predict because the area is so different from other marine areas where pollution has been studied.

I am reminded that the Premier said the other day that some of the studies suggested by the Spencer Gulf Pollution Committee had been done elsewhere. Professor Manwell went on to say:

(I have personally inspected a number of such polluted sites in the U.S.A. and U.K., including performing research on the well-known Torrey Canyon oil spill in England.) The fisheries that might be damaged are an industry in their own right, one that brings several million dollars a year into South Australia—and, with reasonable management, could continue to do this or more for many years after the Redcliffs petro-chemical plant is obsolete. Furthermore, all the indicators point to a serious world food shortage, especially of high quality protein (which fish and certain of our primary agricultural production could satisfy). It is regrettable that both Federal and State Governments have not invested in these other aspects of the economy, especially fisheries.

The investment of \$800 000 000—plus to provide steady employment for less than 1 000 seems poor economics at any time, but especially during a period when experts

predict a serious depression. The kind of economic development South Australia needs is that which will provide maximum employment for local people and cushion various industries from adverse changes in overseas markets. In particular, neither Japan nor any other country should be allowed to export her pollution to Australia. Steele Hall made this objection very well in the first parliamentary debates on Redcliffs and the Government has yet to answer it.

I call on the Government now to answer that charge and many others that have been made about the Redcliffs project. I do not believe that we will get an answer. We have been trying pretty hard for a long time. The Government is bound to, or is hell bent on going ahead with, this project, come what may, and it makes nonsense of everything it has said about pollution. The fact of the delays that have gone on, the fact that we have passed what was to be the crunch by at least six weeks before the indenture can come into the House makes nonsense of the credibility of the Government. I wonder where we are going on this project? The Government is committed to it because it is the only prospect of worthwhile industrial development we have had since it came to office; it is staking its whole reputation for industrialisation on this and I believe it has done very badly indeed in this respect. As we are going to wait now for at least four to six weeks before the indenture Act can come into this place, I challenge the Minister of Environment and Conservation, who is sitting here, to get up now and answer what I have said.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): Robert Bruce once said, "If at first you don't succeed, try, try, try again." That is what I will do in this grievance debate. I wish to speak again about land valuations. I understand that the Valuer-General values one-fifth of the State each year and that so far two-fifths of the State has been revalued. Those who have received new notices of valuation have been astounded and surprised at the increases in the valuations. This revaluation affects the State, right across the board, but the metropolitan area is affected also to a great degree because some other forms of taxation are based on land valuations. I am not permitted to refer to at least one form of taxation that depends on the valuation of property—

Mr. Dean Brown: You were going to mention water and sewerage rates?

Mr. RUSSACK: I did intend to refer to water and sewerage rates but, because the member for Davenport has on the Notice Paper a certain motion to be debated, I cannot go into details. Because of the system used by the Valuation Department the impact of a new valuation is not felt right across the board immediately: instead of the whole State being valued at one time in a quinquennial assessment, the State is fragmented into five sections. For instance, the District Councils of Bute and Clinton have been revalued recently, but the District Council of Kadina, which is between those two council areas, has not yet been revalued. This does not have the same impact as would have been felt if the valuation had been carried out in the same way as it was three or four years ago. The average person does not understand the system, what is involved, and the effect of the valuations on the various systems of taxation.

Mr. Payne: He understands when he sells, though.

Mr. RUSSACK: The member for Mitchell will understand the position later. The valuation is not the only problem now: it is the scale of tax that should be altered. We know that land values have increased, but I am pointing out the effects that land tax has on people who, in the

main, do not understand. Although they receive a notice of assessment, it is not until they receive the actual tax bill that they realise what is involved. There ought to be some means of education and some way of information being imparted to everyone concerned. It is not only the wealthy landholder who is affected, but also the person who owns a block of land. If the scale of tax and the exempted sum are not amended, everyone (even the person with a small property) will be drastically affected.

I refer now to the availability of appeal forms. I understand (and I do not know whether the Minister realises this; possibly he does) that, to obtain a form, the prospective appellant must present himself to the office or write a letter to obtain a form.

Mr. Wells: How could you apply otherwise—by smoke signal?

Mr. RUSSACK: No. Appeal forms should be made available in the same way as many other forms are made available. Surely the member for Florey, if a constituent of his wanted to appeal, would like to be able to issue a form from his electorate office. These forms cannot be used for any purpose other than an appeal. The difficulty of obtaining the form probably discourages prospective appellants. The forms should be easier to obtain. I went into the departmental office one day to obtain a form for a country person and was asked, "Where is your property?" I said, "It's not for me." I was told, "I'm sorry. If you can let me know whom it is for, I will give you a form." I said, "All right, I'll tell you his name." I was told, "Please write it on this paper." I wrote the name down and was given two forms. I cannot understand why it should be so difficult to obtain a form or why the forms cannot be distributed in country areas. I ask the Minister responsible to see whether some better means could be devised whereby it would be easier for an appellant to obtain a form.

The situation in the country is becoming most serious, particularly in the rural sector. I accept what Mr. Malcolm Fraser said, in effect, at a meeting at Keith last week: that every time the Commonwealth Labor Government gives the farmers a kick, it gets more votes from Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide. The same thing applies to the State Government to a large extent. It seems that the landholders and the farmers are not accepted; yet, as regards food, exports, etc., they are the backbone of the country. The people in my district depend on rural industries. At Wallaroo, which is a good port and a good town, the only industry (apart from tourism, which the people there are developing well) is that coming into the port, namely, superphosphate rock, which is processed there and distributed to farmers in the normal way. Then the grain is shipped out, and that is about the only commodity exported from Wallaroo. What will happen to the superphosphate works there when the bounty is removed?

Mr. McAnaney: There'll be unemployment.

Mr. RUSSACK: Yes. The farmer will not be able to buy superphosphate and use it in the quantities in which he is using it now. I heard one man say last Saturday that his superphosphate bill would rise to \$3 000 a year if he continued to use the quantity he used in the past. Be that as it may. Perhaps the farmer can stand the extra cost in normal circumstances but, when the price of a commodity falls by one-half, who is to say that there can be a definite reliance on grain prices in the future? I hope there is, though.

Some big inconsistencies have been noted in certain valuations. The Act requires that the Valuer-General value

an area at least once every five years. The definition of "area" is a district council area. However, I know of properties that are divided by a road, and the productivity of the land on one side in one district council area and on the other side in another district council area would not vary by as much as \$1 a hectare, yet there may be a great difference in the assessed values of such land. This reveals an inconsistency.

A meeting, held last evening at Bute, was attended by over 100 people concerned about this matter. One man rang me this morning and said that he had bought a property (this man is not just a farmer, but has an interest in the land). Located in a small country town, he employs 17 men in manufacturing implements used in the rural and other industries. As a result of the steel strike (the steel could not be moved from berth 29 at Port Adelaide), he had to use secondhand steel. He has been battling to keep his 17 men employed. Through sheer hard work and initiative he has managed to buy some land. Three years ago the land was bought for \$140 a hectare, together with a standing crop valued at \$12 a hectare. He has received his valuation for the unimproved value of the land. The definition of "unimproved value" in the Act is as follows:

The capital amount that an unencumbered estate of fee simple in the land might reasonably be expected to realise upon sale assuming that any improvements thereon (except in the case of land not used for primary production, any site improvements), the benefit of which is unexhausted at the time of valuation, had not been made; for the purposes of this definition:

- (a) "improvements" means houses and buildings, fixtures and other building improvements of any kind whatsoever, fences, bridges, roads, tanks, wells, dams, fruit trees, bushes, shrubs and other plants planted or sown, whether for trade or other purposes, draining of land, ringbarking, clearing of timber or scrub and any other actual improvements.

He bought the land, with improvements, for \$140 a hectare, yet he has been charged, only three years later, on the basis of \$160 a hectare. Another property owner in the Alford area will be charged \$2 750 for the year. Another landholder's tax will be \$3 060 for the year, or about \$60 a week for land tax alone. That is an imposition. I use the word "imposition" advisedly, because land tax does not apply in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland or Western Australia. There is no rural land tax in those States.

Mr. Dean Brown: South Australia is the only State, is it?

Mr. RUSSACK: I am uncertain about that. I believe that some companies in New South Wales pay rural land tax, but the private landholder does not.

Mr. Dean Brown: All those States have Liberal Governments?

Mr. RUSSACK: Yes. The grievance that I want to bring forward in a real way is that on August 6 I asked the Treasurer whether consideration would be given to amending the land tax scale, and until now I have not received a reply, although I asked for one again last Tuesday. I now make a further request to the Treasurer about whether consideration can be given to giving me a reply.

The scale of land tax has not been altered since 1966, and it is in the Land Tax Act, 1936-1971. The policy was to have a quinquennial assessment, and I take it that an assessment was made in 1965. In 1966 the scale of land tax was altered to decimal currency and a Labor Government (I give it credit for doing so) reduced the scale. I would say that that Government reduced the scale because there had been a new assessment and the

values were increased. I appeal to the Government to be consistent and reduce the scale again now, when values are so high.

I compare the position regarding land tax with that regarding councils. They rely on rate revenue, but they consider what amount of money is needed and, when there is a new assessment, they rearrange their budget. If the assessment is high, often the rate is lowered. Councils consider what money they require, and the rate can be reduced. I ask what this Government expects to receive from land tax, particularly rural land tax. I understand that in recent years it has been receiving a little more than \$1 000 000 a year in rural land tax, but this amount will escalate in the next five years if the increasing valuations are adopted consistently and the scale is not altered. In terms of the scale, if a property is valued at \$40 000, a flat rate of \$200 applies and then there is a charge of 10c for each \$10 of valuation or part thereof up to \$50 000; but, if the valuation is \$80 000, the flat rate is \$720, plus 18c for each \$10 or part thereof up to \$90 000. The valuation is doubled but the tax is increased to more than three times the old amount.

Therefore, if \$1 000 000 a year is received in rural land tax now, in five years time, according to this scale and the increasing valuations, receipts could be up to \$10 000 000. The Minister of Local Government has told councils to stand on their own two feet, and I wonder whether, because of the reduction in grants to councils, this Government expects them to keep their rates high and once again place a greater imposition on landholders throughout council areas. I refer particularly to receipts from rural land tax and again appeal to this Government to consider, first, the valuation being made and the inconsistencies and, secondly, the scale of land tax. I appeal to the Government to make the scale more commensurate with the present high land values. If the Government is creditable and if it is consistent, it will do now what it did in 1966.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I am delighted to support the views of the member for Gouger about land tax, which I consider to be an iniquitous tax and one that the State Government should reassess and, preferably, abolish. That tax has no basis whatever and it is an unjust means of trying to raise revenue in this State as a so-called wealth tax that has no relationship to the ability of the people to pay it.

Mr. Langley: If your Party becomes the Government, will you abolish it?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I wish to deal with certain matters relating to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I appreciate the previous ruling that I cannot refer to a matter that is dealt with in the motion that I have before the House, and I will be careful not to do that. The first thing I wish to raise about that department and its assessment is that the Minister offered that any person who was experiencing hardship because of water accounts could seek relief from the department. A letter written to the Director of the Engineering and Water Supply Department on September 2, 1974, by a widow with four children states:

I enclose my cheque for \$64-13, being the balance of my account this quarter. I ask that my case be given consideration for assistance. I am a widow with four children and am on a fixed income of approximately \$3 250 per annum. I believe that, to give children the best start in life, the mother should remain at home if at all possible. Also, my eldest son is autistic, which would make most forms of employment impossible for me, so I am attempting to live within my income. However, the staggering increase in the cost of water and sewerage charges is going to mean a very real hardship for myself and family.

That letter was sent (o the Director of the department, and that lady has received a reply that I consider ignores her hardship. The reply, which is dated September 10, 1974, states:

I refer to your further letter of September 2, 1974. Should you have difficulty in paying future accounts, you may contact our Recovery Officer regarding payment by instalments. Your payment of \$64.13 has been noted in our records.

That letter was written by the Chief Revenue Officer. In the light of the letter that the lady sent, the reply is nothing but a slap in the face. It completely ignores the matter she raised, and in our Government taxes we are completely ignoring the problems that people have. That lady, who is a widow with four children, had asked for relief.

Mr. Wells: She got it, with payment by instalment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Obviously, an instalment is not relief. Irrespective of when she pays, she still is required to pay the full amount of water and sewerage rates.

Mr. Max Brown: It wasn't any different under your Government.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I turn now to the Auditor-General's Report, and his coverage of the Engineering and Water Supply Department for 1973-74 (commencing at page 85), and specifically to the revenue raised by the department and how that revenue was redirected in expenses for the year ended June 30, 1974. The E. & W.S. Department raised \$44 200 000 revenue from water and sewerage rates and other forms of revenue, although almost the entire amount was collected from rates. Of the \$44 200 000, operating expenses for the year amounted to \$21 900 000. However, the immediate question one asks is: what has been done with the rest of that money? The only other substantial item relates to interest rates especially on Commonwealth Loan funds. The sum of \$22 200 000 a year is directed to no other source than interest on Commonwealth loans.

If that is not a tremendous indictment of our present Commonwealth-State financial relationship, I am not sure what is. The time has come for the States to receive far more financial assistance from the Commonwealth without having to pay high interest rates. The Commonwealth Government uses personal income tax to finance its own works. The States, through the Australian Government, need to raise finance to pay interest rates, with the result that we have this ludicrous situation where about half the revenue received by way of water and sewerage rates is directed to paying interest on capital Loan funds.

I therefore appeal to all politicians to work for a fairer system of Commonwealth-State finance. Last week I suggested that a fixed percentage of personal income tax should be returned to the States in addition to equalisation grants, and I reiterate that suggestion today. Another point I raised relates to the contract work carried out by the E. & W.S. Department. In a reply from the Minister of Works last week it was indicated that the department carried out much contract work, a large amount of it at cost. Today the Minister gave me a further reply, indicating that about 30 per cent of the total cost of the Port Stanvac to Christie Downs railway line was represented in work being carried out by the E. & W.S. Department on a contract basis because that department has the manpower and equipment available to do the work. Obviously, that equipment and manpower should be used.

However, the point I raise relates to the accounting techniques used by the department and whether the department is correctly charging the railways (or any other body

for which it carries out contract work) for depreciation of its equipment and labour costs (not so much direct but indirect labour costs). If the correct accounting procedure is not used it could well be that the E. & W.S. Department is financing work for other Government departments. We, as members of this House, deserve better information from the E. & W.S. Department, and I appeal to the Auditor-General to make the relevant information available in future.

Since the House last met, it was pleasing to note that the residents of the Stirling and the Glenelg council areas supported Burnside and Henley and Grange residents in their fight for a new water rating system. Unfortunately, I cannot debate the matter, because I would be debating the motion appearing on the Notice Paper.

Mr. Mathwin: It was a good meeting.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I was pleased to see the support shown, and I am sure the Minister of Environment and Conservation now appreciates the feelings in his own area in relation to the water rating system. The Minister of Works apparently promised yesterday that he would later this week bring down a report on the matter. The report follows an investigation carried out by his department into rating systems and how they can be used to alleviate the present problems within this State. I have done some homework on land valuation techniques used in New South Wales, other States of Australia, and in New Zealand, and I know that the member for Gouger touched on this matter. Land valuation techniques are important when assessing water and sewerage rates.

New South Wales has almost the same system of rating as we have in South Australia: an assessed annual value and an unimproved value system. New South Wales water rates were based on the assessed annual values. When New South Wales ran into trouble with the inflation of land values, the Government immediately implemented, last year, legislation to ensure that sudden increases in water and sewerage charges were alleviated. The Government did this by declaring a new rate in the dollar. Earlier this year the New South Wales Government introduced an entirely new method based on an entire valuation throughout the State every two years, using unimproved land values. Water and sewerage rates are then charged according to the unimproved values, the only exception being the city of Sydney where the annual assessed value is still used. It is therefore possible to make an assessment over the whole State before adopting a new rate. I reiterate that New South Wales does not adopt the new valuations until the entire State has been revalued.

We could also look at New Zealand, because the Minister sent two departmental officers to look at the system that applies there. The New Zealand system, I understand, is based on so much of the State's being assessed each year. However, the Government varies the rate in the dollar, according to when the area in question was assessed, for the most recent assessment. The rate in the dollar for the last 12 months would obviously be much lower than for an area assessed four or five years ago. I believe the New Zealand system is called the "valuation equalisation system".

The two systems I have mentioned could easily be adopted in South Australia. I can see no reason why the South Australian Government should not introduce one or other of the systems to alleviate the sudden increases faced by the State. Western Australia, too, is apparently facing similar problems, and it was for that reason that the Western Australian Government formed a committee to investigate all forms of land valuation and taxation

based on that land valuation. My plea to the Minister of Works is to adopt as quickly as possible a new method of assessing land values and to implement it retrospectively to July 1 of this year. It would be pointless for the Minister to adopt a new procedure to become effective next year, because the people hardest hit by increases in land values and water and sewerage rates would receive no financial relief over the next five years. Yet it is these people who complain and who have fought so strongly for a new system.

The Minister of Works, the Minister of Education (when he was Acting Minister of Works), and the Premier only last Thursday have tried to confuse the whole issue of payment for water on a usage basis by saying that such a system would require an increase in the price of water of 26 per cent. That reference is to the procedure if the Sangster report recommendations were adopted. The fact that is buried as Ministers try to mislead the public is that most people who have advocated payment on a usage basis refer to it only in relation to private houses. The Premier has deliberately misled people in this regard. Only last Thursday evening, I understand a motion was moved at the State Council meeting of the Australian Labor Party by the Davenport sub-branch, as follows:

The State Council believes that the present system of charging for water and sewerage services leads to a waste of water.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Crimes): Order! There is a motion on the Notice Paper dealing with the matter of water rating.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes, but the motion to which I am referring deals with the wastage of water. It also recommends that the Sangster report be released for public discussion. Other Labor sub-branches are also dissatisfied with the present position. A motion of the Brighton sub-branch condemns the present system of rating and calls for a new system, but I am not able to refer to that. At this meeting on Thursday, the Hectorville sub-branch of the A.L.P. moved a similar motion. Out of several motions moved, three motions severely condemned the present system.

I now wish to refer to the interest rates charged on funds loaned by the South Australian Superannuation Fund. Many people who contribute to this fund borrow from it for housing purposes. A brief letter, entitled "Let's cut super loans interest" in the *Public Service Review* of June 18, 1974, states:

Sir: At this time of rising and extreme interest rates, surely it is time for our association to take a long, hard look at interest rates for loans on offer from the S.A. Government Superannuation Fund. Current interest rates offered by the above fund are:

8¾ per cent on loans up to \$12 000.

9½ per cent on loans from \$12 000 to \$16 000.

9¾ per cent on loans from \$16 000 to \$20 000.

Recent checking has shown that Savings Bank interest rates for similar amounts are approximately 1½ per cent lower. Why should our Superannuation Fund charge us so much more, particularly in view of the fact that only

per cent—which is equivalent to Savings Bank interest rates—is paid in voluntary savings with the Superannuation Fund? Why should not our rates be even lower than these counterparts? Come on association! Existing and new borrowers want these rates lowered. "Too Much".

The following editorial comment relates to that letter:

The association's policy is that members should receive preference for home loans, both interest-wise and in service. The S.A. Superannuation Fund Board adopts the view that it has a duty to contributors to maximise profits. A member of the association's superannuation committee says he is inclined to agree with "Too Much" that the board should offer concessions to contributors.

Obviously, the rate is too much. Most banks or other lending institutions make concessions for people who already have invested substantial funds with them. Therefore, one would expect that the Superannuation Fund would make money available for housing at much lower interest rates than are charged by other financial institutions.

However, that is obviously not the case, as the interest rates charged by the fund are about 1¼ per cent higher. Since that letter was published on June 18, 1974, the fund has increased interest rates even more. The rate of interest now charged for a mortgage of between \$12 000 and \$16 000 is up to 11 per cent a year, having increased from a rate of 8 per cent in early 1973 and a rate of 9¾ per cent on September 1, 1973. Therefore, the information in the letter is out of date, and the difference between the fund rate and other rates is even greater. To compare rates, I will refer to the Co-operative Building Society, a body often criticised by the A.L.P., particularly by the Australian Government. I understand that the most recent interest rates applying to loans to people who have been members of the society for two years are as follows up to \$13 000, 10¾ per cent; up to \$20 000, 11 per cent; and up to \$30 000, 11¼ per cent. The interest rate for the Superannuation Fund is ½ per cent higher than that but, if the person pays within 21 days of the due date, the rate is reduced by ½ per cent.

If one looks at the interest rates charged by the Hindmarsh Building Society, the same type of differential exists between those rates and rates charged by the Superannuation Fund. The South Australian Public Service Savings and Loans Society Limited lends money currently at a flat rate of interest of 6 per cent, but I will not go through its interest rates. The point is that, clearly, the Superannuation Fund should reassess the interest rates it charges on house loans that are made to people who contribute to the fund. Not all that long ago, the same fund lent money to contributors and non-contributors at a fixed interest rate that could not be adjusted, regardless of what other lending institutions did. However, the interest rate is now adjustable, and so we have the current problem. The increase in interest rates has placed many people who have borrowed from the fund in a most embarrassing position.

I also wish to refer to the nuisance caused by dogs in the community. As an agricultural scientist who spent most of his time dealing with animals, I fully appreciate them; for instance, I do not try to decry the value of the friendship of a dog. However, in residential areas dogs are a major problem. A recent article in the *Messenger* press referred to dogs lending to foul lawns, upsetting garbage bins, chasing cats, causing nuisance at schools, and annoying neighbours. Several weeks ago a large dog attacked a small child, and many dogs cause a major hazard on our roads. The Minister must reassess the relevant legislation in order to ensure that dogs do not wander through residential areas unless they are controlled, and that penalties for such offences are increased. I make these points in the interests, of, first, road safety; secondly, postmen; thirdly, our trees and lawns; fourthly, cats; fifthly, the general public; sixthly, many young children; and seventhly, the dogs themselves. Many owners show a lack of respect for their dogs by allowing them to wander, and the Government should now implement stricter regulations to control straying dogs.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): Today, the Treasurer gave a long but not explicit explanation of the position of this State's finances. I recently pointed out the difficulties that the State would encounter following a decline in business

activities. With a Labor Government in Canberra, the State Government thought it would be sitting pretty but, as the State is spending at a higher rate than the increase in the gross national product, we must inevitably have troubles. I do not always agree with what is said by the President of the Housewives Association (Mrs. Hausler); but recently she was wise enough to express the view that we must live within our means and that it was impossible to continue spending more than we received. For the first two months of this year the working loss of the Railways Department was \$4 800 000, compared to \$2 600 000 for the same period last year. The Minister of Transport keeps saying that, ultimately, the Commonwealth Government may take over sections of our railway services, so that someone else will find the necessary money. How long can a rail service operate to Victor Harbor, when it carries very few passengers and very little freight, and has to be subsidised at the rate of about \$500 000 a year?

A new road is being built to Victor Harbor, so that less use will be made of the railway service, and this situation must be faced. The Commonwealth Government has such a poor outlook in its business administration that any railway services that it takes over in this State will continue to lose more money. Despite some increases in Budget receipts, stamp duties have decreased by \$400 000 in two months: how long can we continue at that rate? At the same time receipts from pay-roll tax have more than doubled. If the experts are correct, soon there will be many thousands of unemployed people who will have to be paid unemployment relief and retrained. Recently, 52 people were retrenched from Clarks shoe factory at Strathalbyn. These people are supposed to be retrained and, at the same time, are allowed to earn up to \$20 a week in outside work.

The Government does not receive pay-roll tax on money paid to keep these people employed in doing something that produces nothing. Surely we have to face the fact that we cannot have a large body of unemployed people in Australia used in unproductive jobs. This situation prevailed during the rural unemployment relief scheme two years ago, from which little was achieved for the money that was spent. Surely we can organise and run our economy so that everyone is employed. Why have we run into unemployment? I suppose *Hansard* will show that I have said this many times, but I will say it again because it may make a greater impression. The reason for our unemployment is that the Commonwealth Government spent when there was a balanced economy and when we were beginning to suffer shortages. The Commonwealth Government budgeted for a deficit; this caused shortages and had employers competing for labour, and every request for increased wages was granted. Members of certain stronger unions received a larger share of the cake. Some skilled tradesmen are working for only two-thirds (or even less) of what some unskilled employees now receive.

The reason why Clarks had to sack its employees at Strathalbyn was not the 25 per cent tariff cut, but the Commonwealth Government's running too hot, an economy that causes an excessive demand for goods. This is why we have this artificial inbuilt inflation in Australia. Those circumstances were unnecessary. Some people have claimed that many countries in the world are suffering from inflation. Some countries have had to pay more for their oil and wheat, whereas the Australian prices of these commodities have remained more or less static. Some people have said that meat prices have increased considerably, but the Australian prices of beef, mutton, and lamb are much lower, per kilogram, than

the prices I received when I was a farmer in 1952. It is the cost factor (mainly made up of wages) of getting the meat from the saleyard to the consumer that has increased the cost of meat. All these factors have a bearing on the problem I see in the South Australian Budget. When we have a \$18 000 000 deficit, it means that there are insufficient Loan funds in reserve to cover it and that trust funds and deposits from the various departments are being used. I suppose it could be argued that, because of South Australia's wealth, the Government can grab the lot, but is it a good thing that trust funds and the deposits from various departments should be used to meet current expenditure?

It has been said that land tax is becoming an unjust burden on country people, whose incomes have dropped and the productive value of whose land is much below its assessed value. The assessed values are based on the 18 months during which country people enjoyed good returns for their various commodities. However, during the 18 months they did not have time to make up for the losses they had suffered since 1968 as a result of drought and the low prices they had received for the ensuing three years. The values on which their land is being assessed are far above their productive value.

Earlier today a member said he believed that land tax should be abolished altogether. I do not agree with land tax being imposed on some parts of the State. Henry George, the advocate of the single tax policy, said that land became valuable, without any effort on the part of people, as a result of their going to live in cities. A considerable proportion of land tax is collected from the Adelaide area, where the increase in the value of the land has not occurred through individual effort: it has increased because many people live in a relatively small area. However, the value of land used for primary production depends on the effort put into it. Much of the land in South Australia was worth nothing before people started to use it for primary production. Because it has been only through the efforts of the individual that rural land has value, the individual should not be taxed on what he himself has created. The sooner we can eliminate land tax from areas used for primary production, the better it will be for everyone.

Earlier, Government members referred to subsidies for primary producers, but most of those subsidies have been eliminated over the last 18 months. One Government member interjected that no-one in Adelaide was subsidised. However, a worker at General Motors-Holden's is, in effect, subsidised, and the consumer has to pay. When I worked on the land I would have given away every subsidy I received if every subsidy received in the metropolitan area had been taken away, too. Government members are quiet now, because they realise that metropolitan consumers are pretty heavily subsidised. There should be no difficulty in the Commonwealth Treasurer bringing down a Budget tonight that solves our monetary problems, provided the Commonwealth Government adopts the right approach. Some people are paid twice what they are worth, while others are under-paid. Some sections of the community are exploiting other sections. Indeed, most strikers affect other workers. Until the leaders in our community adopt a sensible approach, we will not solve our problems. We hope that, in the Budget to be announced tonight, the Commonwealth Government will adopt a sane and sensible attitude.

How can South Australian taxpayers be expected to contribute \$40 000 000 (and it will be \$50 000 000 this year) for the railways without the Minister making

some approach on these matters? He said today that councils must collect revenue to provide money to spend on the roads in their areas. To me, that attitude is so old-fashioned it is hardly worth considering. The people who use the roads should pay for them. That could be achieved only through a petrol tax. Why should pensioners, who do not use the roads, have to pay? We must get away from the artificial economy in which someone determines who should pay for the services used by other people. That is the greatest cause of dissatisfaction and unhappiness in the world today. People were independent 20 years ago, and wanted to pay their own way, but today so many sections of the community are getting handouts that everyone wants to be in it. The individual outlook has improved and the community is a much better one than it has been in the past, but it has got into the habit of demanding a share of the artificial economy: someone else decides what they should receive for what they earn.

I have spoken previously about the people who are working around Parliament House. There are some good workers and excellent people, but it is incredible that a piece of ironwork in front of Parliament House, a fence 5 metres or 6 metres long, should have required the work of two men for more than two weeks. They have a radio turned on, and they scrape away and paint a bit. This sort of thing is dragging down the living standards of all sections of the public. The living standard is determined by what is produced, and to paint that fence has probably cost 10 times or 20 times the original cost of the iron. How can we prevent inflation and lift living standards in a country where people are not willing to produce anything? Australia has the greatest natural advantages of any country in the world, the only disadvantage being our vast distances. With our living standards, our gross national product should be among the best in the world, but that is not the case. It is sad to see the conditions prevailing in Great Britain, but I have been told that people there are being advised not to come to Australia because of the situation we have here.

Some members opposite, as trade unionists, have done less work than others in this House, but in getting slightly higher wages for some people they think they have achieved something. No-one objects to paying high wages when it is possible to pay them. When I employed people it hurt me to pay the basic wage to some because they did not earn it, whereas others deserved substantial bonuses for what they were willing to contribute.

Mr. Groth: Sweat bonuses!

Mr. McANANEY: That is the sort of childish attitude that drags down living standards. Profits on capital invested in Australia at present are lower than the interest rates introduced by the Labor Government. Members opposite should be ashamed. They are supposed to represent the working people, yet young people today cannot own houses. Millions of dollars will be put into the Land Commission to help young people buy cheap blocks, but what is the use of a cheap block if they must pay 10 per cent interest? They will be paying for the block for as long as they live.

When I visited Asia three years ago I had an appointment with the South Australian agent in Singapore. As he was late in keeping the appointment, he apologised, saying that the delay had been caused by his having to work out whether polythene could be imported into Singapore in competition with the Japanese product following a 4 per cent revaluation of the yen. If the previous Common-

wealth Budget had brought about adequate control and correct financial management, Australia now would have been able to export to many parts of the world. What position are we in when we cannot compete against imports and our exporting industries are being crippled? No member opposite can deny that what has happened in the past six months has been caused by the Commonwealth Government in budgeting for a deficit of \$600 000 000 and having a deficit of \$1 500 000 000 last March. Inflation is going on and on, and people will be forced out of work.

We hear about retraining, but if people who live in Strathalbyn are retrained what will we do with them? I also ask how we will get industries to go to Monarto. The Premier says that he will send public servants there and that they will have to go, regardless of whether they want to; but how will we attract new industry to Australia or South Australia when we cannot hold the industries we have? We can name the industries that are running into trouble, and we all hope that wisdom will be shown in the Commonwealth Budget to be introduced this evening.

We hear talk of the means test and the suggestion that we abolish radio and television licence fees because some people can pay the cost more easily than other people who have not so much money. However, we make concessions to pensioners already and surely equalising of ability to pay should apply to income tax. We cannot have Governments having two bites at the cherry at the expense of the man who is willing to work harder. If we have that, we kill incentive. When we consider the various tax groups, there is not a big discrepancy between the a salary of \$8 000 less tax and a salary of \$5 000 less tax. That applies certainly to the amount of effort necessary to obtain the higher salary.

In the case of student teachers, one person may not get an allowance, whereas another person with slightly less income may get an allowance. I had experience of allowances when my daughter was studying. There were no facilities in my district for State education, and children from that area had either to travel 32 kilometres or be educated at college. The cost to me was nearly my total income, yet I could not get a Commonwealth allowance.

We are running into trouble in South Australia and we cannot go on increasing expenditure by 20 per cent each year. I am confident that the young people today who want to do their own thing will become fed up with this society. Recently I read a newspaper report about the theoretical system of Government in Sweden and the statement by a person who had lived there for a long time that the people of Sweden were the unhappiest people, that the suicide rate was high, and that the people did not have the courage to break away and get into free enterprise.

Members interjecting:

Mr. McANANEY: I am pleased that one member has dared to criticise something that I have said. Members know that I speak words of wisdom. I am not old enough to be the father of all members, but I am old enough to be the father of most of them.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I wish to add to the comments that other members have made about the valuation of property. Doubtless, in a fluctuating economy, with sometimes inflation and sometimes deflation, we experience an effect on taxation. Land tax is one of those areas. Properties that have been valued late last year or early this year have been valued at the highest rate that has prevailed in this State in this century. As the economy is running down, and as the Treasurer has admitted that fewer transactions are going through the Lands Titles Office, we know

that there will be a devaluation and that property value will drop. Therefore, properties that are valued in the period up to three years from now will enjoy a distinct advantage over those that have been valued last year or this year.

That position will be unjust, because some property owners will have to pay the excessive tax for up to five years. Knowing Government procedures, we know that the Government will avoid the process of revaluation so that it may receive the excessive tax revenue from the highly-valued properties for the longest time possible. Therefore, it is important to remember that the member for Gouger and the member for Davenport have a genuine complaint about an injustice. In my district water rates are escalating by up to 500 per cent. A painter in the Railways Department, a unionist on an average wage, built a house for about \$9 000 or \$10 000. Other people came and lived near him and, because of his interest in his house and because he painted it, kept a decent lawn and garden, and built a front fence, the valuation has been increased to about \$40 000 and the charge for water rates now is about \$150 a year.

The SPEAKER: Order! Earlier in the debate I drew the honourable Leader's attention to the fact that, in a grievance debate, an honourable member could speak about practically anything, except that, as provided in Standing Orders, he could not speak on a matter that anticipated a Bill, a Notice of Motion, or an Order of the Day. Order of the Day No. 12, standing in the name of the honourable member for Davenport, deals with the assessment of water and sewerage rates, and an honourable member may not speak on that matter, anticipating the Order of the Day.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order. Standing Order 147 provides:

No member shall allude to any debate of the same session.

I do not think that the member for Fisher was alluding to that debate or even to a matter contained in that debate. I thought he was referring to the general problem at large, whereas that Standing Order refers to a specific debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! On the information read out by the honourable member for Davenport, I cannot uphold the point of order. The Standing Order provides that an honourable member cannot anticipate a debate on a subject appearing on the Notice Paper as an Order of the Day. Therefore, as no honourable member can debate a matter anticipating a Bill, a Notice of Motion or an Order of the Day, it is not permissible for an honourable member to discuss this matter anticipating the Order of the Day of the honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. EVANS: I accept your ruling on that. I shall not refer to that Notice of Motion. I am merely referring to the specific case of an individual in my area who has had imposed on him a rating of \$150 a year. In that area (the Stirling council area) there was a move at the same time by this Government, because a Commonwealth authority wished to build a post office, and it found some difficulty in disposing of the effluent there by means of septic tank, or by installing one. The Government built in that area a police station and had the same difficulty in disposing of the effluent and, because a shopping complex was built, it decided to put in a sewerage system. It was not considered that the sewerage system came within the metropolitan area, even though my electoral district is considered to be a metropolitan electoral district, and even though Stirling is considered to be a metropolitan district for water rate purposes, for motor registration fees, for

insurance purposes, and for planning and development. Despite these criteria, the Government has imposed on that area a country sewerage rate of 9 per cent instead of 6¼ per cent, the rate at present imposed on the metropolitan area.

That means that this person, who is just a unionist who works overtime and does all sorts of things to pay his debts and educate his children, must pay \$330 a year in water and sewerage rates. A sewerage system is not yet there, but it is intended to make a start and have it there within the next two years. This Government has imposed the 9 per cent country sewerage rate on a small area, the main street of Stirling. It does not affect many private dwellings as yet, but the basis is there, and I know that I and whoever represents the area in the years to come will have to try, year in and year out, to change the Government's mind to achieve the success I was able to achieve last year with water rates, because those people should not have paid a 60 per cent penalty for nearly 10 years, under both Liberal and Labor Governments, even though the area was within the metropolitan area.

It took a long time to change the system with a Labor Government in office. We saw the very same thing happen in regard to sewerage rates. Why? This Government has done it, and I have brought it to the notice of the House. I ask the Government to justify such an action. I know that my district of Fisher is a Liberal district, but many of the people there vote for Labor representatives in the Senate and Labor members in the Legislative Council. Why impose that sort of penalty on them? The Minister of Education may laugh, but it is the only place in the metropolitan area where that sort of imposition is placed on the community.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We were laughing at your implication that such electors voted for you in the Assembly election.

Mr. EVANS: My point in mentioning the Senate and the Legislative Council is that we do not select the individual for an area as we do in elections for the Representatives and the Assembly, and that that may have an effect on who may represent the electors in the Legislative Council or in the Senate. I give that explanation for the benefit of the sort of conniving mind the Minister of Education has. Another matter I should like to speak to concerns the statement made by the Premier in this House earlier today, when he said, "Where would you make the changes to start cutting costs in the Government's expenditure so that we could get a balanced Budget rather than go down by \$19 000 000 in two months?" One aspect on which this Government has fallen down is in respect of day labour against private contracting. If we want an example of what can happen (I do not say this of every worker employed on work in Parliament House), I ask any member of Parliament to say that he believes every man employed in this building by the Public Buildings Department to carry out repairs and renovations has done a fair day's work while he has been here. Let members stand up and say that.

Mr. Wells: I believe they have.

Mr. EVANS: I ask any member to get up and justify that later this evening.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You believe they have not?

Mr. EVANS: I believe that many of them have not, and many of their colleagues, who have a pride in their trade, will tell us in the corridor that some of their fellow workers are not pulling their weight. In fact, they have had to lock some doors in this building to make sure that people do not leave work before time, to make sure that

they must walk past the foreman's office and, in a sense, cheat by leaving early. That happened only last week.

Mr. Wells: You hate trade unionists.

Mr. EVANS: I do not hate trade unionists, because I make the point that some people in this building are tradesmen who take a pride in their work and, when asked about it, are disappointed that other men working alongside them do not pull their weight.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What percentage would you say are bludgers?

Mr. EVANS: I do not know but, if the Minister of Education believes they do not pull their weight—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You said that; I didn't.

Mr. EVANS: —I ask him to justify it. As regards the Christie Downs railway line and its electrification, the construction work is being done by the Engineering and Water Supply Department with the use of day labour, when the work could have been let out to private contract. At a time when we are short of sewerage facilities in the metropolitan area, the Government has transferred the labour force to work for the Railways Department. We have transferred it there on the estimation that the cost of doing the job will be so much but, when the final figure is arrived at by the Railways Department, it will be found to be much higher than originally expected. That can be clarified by the Minister in an effort to justify his action, but he cannot justify it. Another problem concerns how we can really check figures given to us when day labour is used on that basis. How do we know the overheads that have been written off on a job? We cannot check them; Parliament cannot check them; and the Public Accounts Committee knows it cannot check them.

Mr. Payne: But you can—

Mr. EVANS: The member for Mitchell knows it is impossible to follow that line right through. There is no doubt that this Government has set out to break private contractors in the earth-moving business, and it has succeeded to such an extent that in the construction field in the past 12 months some well known private contractors have felt the pinch so much that they will have to leave the trade and go elsewhere to get an opportunity to tender on a private contract basis.

Mr. Payne: You are speaking not for your electors but for the private contractor.

Mr. EVANS: I do not deny that I am speaking for the private contractor, because he is an important part of the economy. The man in the street realises that we need him to maintain a balance with day labour in the public sector. The man in the street knows that the private contractor can, in the main, do the job as well and efficiently as, and more cheaply than, day labour in the public sector.

Members interjecting:

Mr. EVANS: Another point, which I will mention after the dinner adjournment, is the 35-hour working week. The Premier asked: "What can we do about the economy in trying to balance things?" However, I ask what can we do about that when we are encouraging a 35-hour week. The average man, who should work 40 hours, does not work any more than 35 hours, from the point of view of really productive work.

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

Mr. EVANS: The Government has contributed to the present situation in South Australia where we have a \$19 000 000 deficit in the first two months of this financial year. The Treasurer has asked for suggestions from

members on this side to remedy the situation. The Government has not encouraged people to make a greater contribution to the work effort. In fact, the Government has even encouraged the introduction of a 35-hour week. True, some people in high positions in the private sector spend much time pursuing leisure activities, for example, playing golf, yachting and generally not accepting their responsibility as a leader in industry. Automatically, that outlook creates apathy within the work force and has a direct effect on the economy of this State and Australia generally.

Some members of the Government say that I hate unionists, but that is not true. Indeed, some of my best friends belong to unions. However, I do detest that type of person, whether he be a businessman, a unionist, or anyone else, who is a parasite on the rest of society. Our present State and Commonwealth Governments have legislated to encourage parasites (these are people who live on the efforts of others without contributing anything themselves), and—

Mr. Crimes: Speculators?

Mr. EVANS: If the honourable member wishes to refer to speculators in that way, he can do so, but I point out that most people in the community are speculators in one way or another. Most people take a punt and speculate on where their profession will take them, especially if they want to get anywhere in the world. I would prefer to have a society of people willing to speculate on the future, by using their initiative, in whatever their field, rather than having a society in which people sit back and bludge on the efforts of others and do not use their imagination and ability at all.

Mr. Langley: How many of those people are there in the community? What percentage do they represent?

Mr. EVANS: I make the point that the present Government encourages them. The present State and Commonwealth Governments encourage a society that is becoming more dependent on the State when the State is really dependent on society. There is no way in which we can defeat inflation until we contribute more in effort. No honourable member can deny that it is illogical to say that we could all sit down tomorrow, do nothing, and the nation would prosper. There are three features that are necessary in a society such as ours. First, our natural assets, secondly, our technology and, thirdly, our work effort, and neither of the first two is of any use at all unless they are used in conjunction with the third; and the greater the work effort, the greater the advantage that will accrue to the economy.

Members interjecting:

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. EVANS: I now refer to the construction work being undertaken on this building and ask the Government whether it is willing to say whether or not similar operations are undertaken by the Public Buildings Department on other projects where extravagant expenditure has taken place. First, I refer to the new toilets being constructed in Parliament House. They are tiled from floor to ceiling, and the walls are about 3½ metres high. True, there may be some big people here, but I doubt the necessity for tiling to that height. Secondly, I refer to the painting requirements on this job. One undercoat and five other coats are being used, a total of six coats of paint. This is complete extravagance, especially as no abnormal conditions apply to the surfaces being painted. Does this same

standard apply in other buildings being constructed or modernised by the department, or is it just that this project involves working on Parliament House?

Mr. Langley: Are you sure it's six coats of paint?

Mr. EVANS: That is the information I have received, and some of the tradesmen working here point out that the department has gone to extremes on this project. What about the furnishing of the Premier's office, where antique and period furniture provide the decor? How can this standard be maintained in the face of this State's economic situation? If those same standards prevail on 200 or 300 other jobs undertaken by the department, how much money is being wasted? The sum of \$11 000 is involved in just one room—

Mr. Langley: What about company directors? They have good offices: who pays for them?

Mr. EVANS: I have been asked to say where cuts of expenditure and savings could be made. All members know that reductions in expenditure can be made and that there is insufficient control in these areas.

Mr. Crimes: Everything private is all right with you.

Mr. Duncan: You want to reduce the P.B.D. standards to those applying in spec buildings.

Mr. EVANS: The member for Elizabeth is caught out by his own comment. He knows that some of the best houses built in South Australia are built by spec builders. He knows, too, that some of the shoddiest work in South Australia has been done by building firms under Housing Trust supervision. The honourable member cannot draw a general comparison, because he knows there is good and bad in both sectors.

Further, the Government, having introduced a Builders Licensing Act, has priced the average house out of reach of the would-be house purchaser, and the average young couple cannot sign a house contract today with any confidence that they will be getting a house of good quality or that that house will be available at a price that they can afford.

Members interjecting:

Mr. EVANS: The Minister in charge of housing has failed at his task, yet the Government continues to back him. True, the Government backs him with reluctance, as it knows he has failed and it knows that housing costs in South Australia are rising at a rate greater than in any other State. Members opposite heard the reply given me by the Minister when I asked him several questions about trust operations in house purchases and the way in which he evaded the questions.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Never!

Mr. EVANS: The Minister admitted that the trust pays half the normal commission to one agent who operates for it, yet it pays full commission to another agent, whoever it may be, when working in co-operation. I admit that only one part is paid by the Housing Trust and the other by the vendor. However, this is an unnecessary operation, and the Government is merely giving an extra benefit to private enterprise. I condemn this action, as this money should not be spent in this way. Indeed, this action is totally against the Government's normal thinking if one can take its members' statements as representing their real thinking.

Mr. Payne: You know that—

Mr. EVANS: As the member for Mitchell knows, the housing situation in this State is such that the average young couple will not be able to afford furniture let alone a house in which to put it.

Mr. Langley: What about when a married couple is working?

Mr. EVANS: The member for Unley believes that everyone should work for only 30 hours a week. He wants everyone to work for fewer hours so that both married partners will have to work in order to survive. Everyone who understands the building industry realises that bankruptcies will occur and that people will be out of work. Unfortunately, South Australia will be the State that suffers first, it having fallen into the trough much more rapidly than has any other State.

Dr. Eastick: There will be a petrol tax to make up the \$18 000 000 deficit.

Mr. EVANS: True, and there will be many more taxes. Much money could have been saved in this State had we gone to the private enterprise system and not drifted, as we have, into a day-labour situation, which will bring this State to its knees compared to other States. Indeed, the Government has had the first real indication of this. The Premier has introduced legislation regarding the price of urban land. Although he really intended initially to retard the number of land transactions, he now says that, in relation to stamp duty, he did not anticipate a reduction in the number of transactions. What type of Premier is this: he created the situation and is now seeing the results of it.

Dr. Eastick: He refused to accept the challenge.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You know very well that that's not true.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister of Education was not present in the Chamber this afternoon. He was elsewhere giving evidence in relation to something that the Government had created.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order. Standing Orders refer to matters that are *sub judice* and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to rule that the honourable member is not entitled to refer to matters that are being dealt with by a Royal Commission and, indeed, that he is out of order in so doing.

Mr. EVANS: I will repeat what I said.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Education has raised a point of order. The matter referred to by the honourable member for Fisher is being considered by a Royal Commission and is, therefore, *sub judice*. However, it is not *sub judice* for an honourable member to say that another honourable member has been giving evidence to a Royal Commission. The honourable member for Fisher cannot refer to any subject matter being dealt with by a Royal Commission.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member said that I had to give evidence because of a problem caused by the Education Department or me, and that is drawing a conclusion. If it was repeated outside of this House, it would be in contempt of the Royal Commission.

Members interjecting:

Mr. EVANS: I will repeat my words.

The SPEAKER: Order! As the honourable member for Fisher did make that remark, he must withdraw it. Any further reference to a matter before a Royal Commission cannot be made in this House.

Mr. EVANS: I will repeat what I said. I said that the Minister gave evidence in relation to a situation that the Government had already created.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: I believe that, by setting up a Royal Commission—

The SPEAKER: Order! A Royal Commission is investigating certain matters, and I rule that any reference at all by any honourable member to that Royal Commission is not permissible in this House.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I also take objection to a remark that the Leader of the Opposition made that I have a thin epidermis on this matter.

Mr. Coumbe: Isn't it true?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, but I happen to believe that the rules regarding contempt that must be observed outside of this Chamber ought also to be observed within this Chamber and that, if a member—

Mr. Coumbe: You didn't take objection at the time!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I did. There was a further point of order at the time.

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the point of order?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That an honourable member ought to be able to take objection to a breach of the normal rules of this House without the Leader of the Opposition reflecting on him by saying that he has a thin epidermis, and I object to the remark made by the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold that point of order. However, I repeat that any reference to a Royal Commission is definitely out of order.

Mr. EVANS: I do not wish to say any more.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): South Australian taxpayers are at present in the same situation as the 12-metre yacht *Southern Cross*: they are battling the breeze of inflation. They have three "noughts" in front of them and, with the way in which the present Budget is going in Canberra, they could really be lost in the fog. They cannot change the rudder (that is, this Government and the Commonwealth Government) at present, but we will have to get off our keels and work a little harder, tightening the old belt. No matter what it is, the \$6 000 000 from Alan Bond's sojourn would be greatly appreciated in this State's coffers at present, because we have real problems. Indeed, in the first two months of this financial year payments have exceeded receipts by \$19 000 000. To date, the Municipal Tramways Trust has received only \$400 000 from a proposed allocation of \$800 000, and the Railways Department has not yet received any payments towards its deficit. Those payments will amount to \$6 600 000. Therefore, this State has an actual deficit of about \$26 000 000 after only the first two months of the financial year. The Treasurer has said that this is unfortunate and that it is due to certain factors.

Dr. Eastick: He said we would have to pay more taxes, too.

Mr. BECKER: True, and I will come to that soon. The Treasurer said that the wages situation has had a large impact on this State's deficit. However, I cannot accept that, as we knew what impact wages would have. The Opposition knew what the full impact over a 12-month period would be. What has happened is that there has been a short-fall in income for the first two months. Naturally, after the end of the first quarter, some of that income could be picked up. In the meantime, South Australia has been placed in an awkward situation with an official revenue deficit of \$19 000 000. However, I claim that it has an actual deficit of \$26 000 000. That money has to be obtained from elsewhere. Probably at this stage surplus funds from the various departments are being used. If the money is not readily available in cash, it has to be borrowed, and the interest incurred adds to operating costs. This has happened in the past, when various Governments have been caught short through some unusual situation, then having to borrow money on the normal money market. This puts further pressure on the Revenue Account of the State. In a report in today's *News*, the Treasurer hints at further tax increases.

Dr. Eastick: He went further in this place.

Mr. BECKER: Yes, he gave an indication this afternoon. He hopes to receive an additional \$6 000 000 from the Commonwealth Government. Whether or not he receives that, he is faced with the down-turn in real estate transactions which, he said, to some degree could not be predicted; in fact it was not predicted by Treasury officials. Although I can visualise the situation that has arisen, I cannot completely accept that explanation. Whilst the control of the price of land was expected to have some effect on the market value of land, the impact on real estate transactions has been caused by the effects of the Land and Business Agents Act. I would not say that that legislation should not have been introduced, because 90 per cent of it is worth while and had to be enacted. However, the Act has caused confusion, with most people in the industry not being ready for it or able to understand it. The real impact has been caused by this hold-up in real estate transactions. The position could improve. In the interests of the State's welfare, I hope it will and that minor problems will be ironed out so that real estate transactions can start to flow again.

I cannot accept that there will be a permanent down-turn in real estate transactions or that there will ever be a complete decline in property values, because the position is that insufficient land is being made available at a time when the shortage of housing is probably graver than has been experienced before in South Australia. With the shortage of flats and other accommodation, there will always be development in this area.

Mr. Mathwin: If water rates continue as they are, there will be no flats left to rent.

Mr. BECKER: There is a grave shortage of flats now. In Glenelg, it is almost impossible to find a flat at a rent of less than \$35 a week. On my side of the tram line, many stables have been converted into flats; this proves that there is a shortage of flat accommodation. This situation also applies on the side of the tram line represented by the member for Glenelg.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you on the wrong side of the track?

Mr. BECKER: I believe that I am on the right side. However, people on both sides of the line are well represented.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are people on the other side unfortunate?

Mr. BECKER: One side is as good as the other and both sides are well represented. What I have said shows that demands will continue to be made in the real estate area. Certain aspects of the Land and Business Agents Act should be dealt with. It will be in the interests of the Government to attend to these minor matters so that the industry can begin to operate along the lines that members of this House would like to see. This would have a real impact on the finances of the State. A problem facing the Treasurer is that the standard States of New South Wales and Victoria are recommending a further petrol tax. Although the Treasurer has said that such a tax will not be imposed in South Australia, if the standard States introduce it, South Australia may find it has no option but to follow suit.

The Grants Commission will probably insist that some taxation increase be made here, as we cannot approach the Commonwealth Government and demand additional assistance if we are not maintaining a reasonable level of taxation. That is the problem facing the State Government, which hopes to receive \$6 000 000 as a special grant; otherwise, there may be new taxation. For the reasons

I have outlined, the Treasurer will have to examine his overall Budget. Either a new tax may have to be introduced (and this would be expensive to establish), or existing taxes may have to be increased. I think that the Government would be fairly loath to do anything that would affect property values or water rating, bearing in mind the impact that recent increases in this area have had on people in the metropolitan area. Certainly, there will be a benefit with regard to land tax. In my area, from experience we know that in some cases land tax payments will increase tremendously from 125 per cent to 250 per cent and more. As land tax is presently fixed at a fair rate, I would certainly not like to see it increased.

At page 205, the Auditor-General's Report states that the Registrar-General's Department embraces the Lands Titles Registration Office (Real Property Act), the General Registry Office and the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registry Office (Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act). Receipts for the financial year ended June 30, 1974, were about \$1 800 000, with costs of administration and so on amounting to about \$1 200 000. Therefore, the net surplus to the Treasury was about \$600 000. For every \$1 collected by that department, 66c was taken up in costs of administration and so on, with the Treasury benefiting by only 33c in the dollar. This highlights the expense involved in collecting these relatively small fees. I do not advocate substantial increases in this area, but the Treasurer will have to examine the system adopted in some Government departments in relation to the ratio of administration costs as against money received. I fear that such an investigation is happening now. Under a new system, retrenchments may have to be made or taxes will be increased to a level far greater than is really justified. To enable equitable collection, this will have to be done. When we consider the Railways Department and the Tramways Trust, we can see the subsidies involved and the amount paid by motorists, who are already paying more than their fair share. The Commonwealth Government has let down the State with regard to road grants; local government areas are certainly paying the penalty for that.

At page 215, the Auditor-General's Report shows that the deficit for the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport was about \$1 081 000. Tourism can be profitable and beneficial to the State. The receipts from the tourist division for commission, day tours, and so on, were about \$326 000. I wonder whether we are promoting tourism wisely in this State, and whether the best use of the Tourist Bureau is being made in the interest of the taxpayers. We have sustained a loss of about \$1 000 000 in this activity for the last financial year, and, if this situation does not improve, we will have a tremendous problem. I cannot understand why the Savings Bank of South Australia appointed Thomas Cook and Son Pty. Ltd., as its travel agency, when the Tourist Bureau could have been appointed. The Sydney branch of the Tourist Bureau had a deficit of \$135 000 and the Melbourne branch a deficit of \$98 000, and one wonders whether we are receiving full benefit from these branches and what is wrong with our tourist promotion in the Eastern States. Why cannot we receive the benefit through our Tourist Bureau, and thus earn more commission? At present it does not seem worth the effort.

In reply to a question I asked of the Minister of Transport concerning the road toll in this State, he said little except that he, with other people, was concerned, and called for suggestions to overcome the problem. A constructive suggestion would be to institute an education

programme for South Australian motorists, but this will cost money. Should this be paid from the State or should insurance companies subsidise this cost? We should be doing more: it is all very well to relate the number of accidents to the number of motor vehicles on our roads, but it has been proved that impatience and errors of judgment by drivers, the design of roads, and situations in certain climatic conditions have led to the worst road toll we have had in this State. Further studies should be undertaken, because proper statistics have not been kept about the causes of road accidents. If one makes an error whilst driving a motor vehicle today, it could be a fatal one.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I refer to the question of beach protection in my district. Last week I asked a question of the Minister of Environment and Conservation concerning the beach at the end of Broadway at which the Coast Protection Board is to erect a groyne and whether he had made a final decision regarding the building of a groyne. In part, the Minister in his reply stated:

The Coast Protection Board has told me that, because of problems associated with that part of the beach, a groyne (not a system of groynes)—

I then interjected and said, "Once you build one, you have to build more" and the Minister replied, "No". I suggested that it was necessary, because anyone who knows about this type of groyne would realise that, if a groyne is erected, scouring will occur, and it is then necessary to erect another groyne about 200 metres away, and so the process must continue. This has happened in parts of Europe and America, in which much of the coastline has been ruined because groynes have been erected, initially to protect the beach but eventually causing serious problems. In his reply the Minister stated:

My recollection of this matter is that there is a weakness that the board believes could be strengthened by the building of one groyne. Although I am uncertain whether the work has been finally approved, it has been reported to me that this is the view of the board.

He also stated:

I am willing to encourage the board to undertake work of this nature, particularly when we can observe and use the knowledge gained, even if the work itself is not the total success we would like. I will obtain such additional information as is available for the honourable member.

If we are to experiment in this matter, many other places can be used.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you think the rock structure in the sand has anything to do with it?

Mr. MATHWIN: When groynes were constructed at Glenelg there was scouring, and the groyne to be erected at Broadway will ruin the beach as far as Brighton.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Wouldn't it cause scouring to the north rather than to the south?

Mr. MATHWIN: No, because of the flow of the tide.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It built up sand to the south at Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister should be interested, because he has much beach front in his district. Page 10-14 of a publication *Beach Erosion Assessment Study* by Mr. Culver and others states:

Groyne behaviour: when a groyne is introduced into the path of a littoral drift, the passage of sand is interrupted. If the rate of littoral drift is sufficient, the updrift side fills with sand pushing the water line out to sea until sand can pass around the end of the groyne. What happens to the sand then depends on local conditions, and some of these have been investigated in an exploratory model using a groyne with an aspect similar to that of the Patawalonga mound.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Scouring is to the north and the build-up of sand is in the south. You may be right in

complaining about a groyne, but you should get your facts right: you've got your groynes back to front.

Mr. MATHWIN: What does it matter? Whether it scours to the north or to the south makes no difference. It simply makes it necessary to erect another groyne. In the *Guardian* of June 19, 1974, the Minister of Environment and Conservation is reported as saying that \$7 000 000 will eventually be spent on the upgrading of Adelaide's beaches, shore-front reserves, and recreation areas. How much of this money is to be spent on groynes? The Minister said that the Coast Protection Board, now about two years old, had a clear responsibility for the protection and improvement of the coast. If he thinks the erection of these monstrosities will protect or improve the coast, I am sorry. The Minister would know that the Playford Government initiated the investigation into problems relating to the beaches. The investigation resulted from pressure by the seaside councils committee, and continued for five years. I was a member of that committee, and each year I visited the University of Adelaide to hear a lecture by Mr. Culver and other people connected with the investigation, and to see the working models. To the best of my recollection, Mr. Culver did not recommend that groynes be built; his view was quite the opposite.

The Coast Protection Board was set up under the provisions of the Coast Protection Act and was given responsibility for the protection of South Australia's coast from erosion, damage, deterioration, pollution and misuse, for the restoration of the coast, and for any development and improvement considered necessary or desirable. Anyone who knew what the Coast Protection Board was all about would have been most surprised to hear the reply to my question given by the Minister of Environment and Conservation on September 12. I had asked the Minister whether the construction of the groynes along the beach-front was his decision, because I could not believe that the Coast Protection Board would have taken this action on its own initiative, as most members of the board were quite familiar with Mr. Culver's report.

Mr. Arnold: What should be done?

Mr. MATHWIN: There are several answers.

Mr. Harrison: Are you in disagreement with the principle of groynes?

Mr. MATHWIN: Certainly. They have never been successful. I have seen them in other parts of the world. In the United Kingdom, the beaches are in a disgraceful state. Whether of stone or timber, the groynes are about 500 metres apart right around the coast. A similar situation prevails in Belgium and France, and even on the Mediterranean coast in the south of France, where our Treasurer spent some time lolling about, groynes have ruined the beaches.

Mr. Arnold: What is the answer to the problem?

Mr. MATHWIN: One solution is to restore the beach by bringing sand to the area or, as is done in America, by pumping the sand back from dredging, on to the beach area.

Mr. PAYNE: I think the timber constructions are called wave screens and the others are called groynes.

Mr. MATHWIN: It does not really matter. The only difference is that with the timber ones it is easier to shelter from the wind. In July, 1973, the Minister of Environment and Conservation was reported in the *News* as having stated that consultants would be asked to produce within 12 months a forward-looking blueprint to provide for greater enjoyment of our coastline with a minimum disturbance of the ecology. The 12 months expired in July

last, but no-one except the consultative committee has seen this blueprint. When I asked the Minister, I was told that no copies were available. The situation now arising at the end of Broadway, Glenelg, must not be allowed to continue. If it is not corrected, Adelaide beaches will have a series of groynes right along the coast, and that would be a disaster. It would be a disgrace to the Minister, because he is responsible for this matter and the whole affair rests on his shoulders.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: There's been no suggestion that there will be any other groynes, but you say they'll be everywhere.

Mr. MATHWIN: I agree with that, but the Minister ought to know (and if he does not know, he ought to find out) that once we erect one of these monstrosities, the sand will be pulled from there and we will immediately create another problem area, so we must erect another groyne. That produces another problem, and so we would be erecting groynes right along the coast.

I refer now to the matter that the member for Bragg raised before the dinner adjournment, and I support his remarks. He was referring to the debate on the lines in the Estimates last Thursday, when I drew attention to what had happened. I was told that the matter was under control and that, at the end of the debate on the Budget, it would be possible to recommit the vote for the Premier's Department. I hope that this is done, because I consider that, through some misunderstanding by the Acting Chairman of Committees, we had difficulty hearing what he was saying and, when I rose to bring the matter to his attention, I said he had dealt with two lines at the one time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not discuss that matter or reflect on the person who was in charge of the Committee at that stage. He may not reflect on the proceedings of the Committee. I am not conversant with this matter, but it should have been raised at the time. The honourable member must not reflect on the person who was in the Chair then.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am not reflecting on the Acting Chairman: I am saying that two lines were passed at the same time. They were "State Governor's Establishment, \$125 500" and "Premier, \$2 221 000". I was waiting for one line to be passed, but the matter was not dealt with this way. Both lines were dealt with together.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have ruled that no reference may be made to what happened at some other time.

Mr. MATHWIN: All these were given under each heading—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: —although they came—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already stated that reflections cannot be made on the person who was presiding then. If there was doubt about what was happening, the matter should have been raised then. Reference to consideration in Committee at that time cannot be raised at any later stage.

Mr. MATHWIN: It seems that I have made my point. I am not reflecting on anyone but I hope that all members will accept the motion to recommit this line. I also wish to support what the member for Fisher has said about problems regarding day labour compared to contract labour. What the honourable member said seemed to reflect on members opposite, and they did not like what he said. The member for Fisher mentioned the painting specification for work in Parliament House, and what he said was doubted by the member for Unley and the member for Elizabeth.

Mr. Slater: And by me.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, the member for Gilles also doubted it. I can tell honourable members that six coats of paint have been specified for this building, and that is ridiculous.

Mr. Payne: From what level are you speaking?

Mr. MATHWIN: I am speaking from experience.

Mr. Payne: That's what I was trying to establish. You've always said that you were a member of a union, but tell us a bit more. What are you? We're not saying you're wrong, but just tell us.

Mr. MATHWIN: If the honourable member opens his ears and closes his mouth, he will hear something. He is proving two things. Members opposite tell the people of South Australia that they are the only ones who represent the working class, and they are the only people who have ever worked. I have been in the building trade all my life. I am proving two things, and—

Mr. Payne: You haven't proved anything yet.

Mr. MATHWIN: I have been a worker all my life.

Mr. Payne: Tell us what the trade was, how long you worked at it, and what were your qualifications, and then we'll know whether to give any weight to what you say.

Mr. MATHWIN: It does not matter to me whether the honourable member takes any notice.

Mr. Payne: If you don't want to put up, don't baloney that you're well qualified. If you're well qualified, tell us about it.

Mr. MATHWIN: Will you give him the call next, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: No, I will give it to the honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: I know that the member for Mitchell supports equal relativity between tradesmen and ordinary people. I know that he would advocate that everyone be on the same level, whether they be builders labourers, street sweepers, or tradesmen who have taken five or seven years to learn a trade. I know that he supports that principle, and that is exactly what he is getting at now.

Mr. Payne: You've no evidence. I'm willing to state what my qualifications are. I don't think you have any.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member would not know on what day he was born.

Mr. Payne: My qualifications are in electronics, and everyone knows what that means. Now, come on and tell us your qualifications.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member could not work in an iron lung. The specification of six coats of paint for this building is absolutely ridiculous. It would be too much even for the kind of house that the member for Mitchell lives in. I agree with the statement by the member for Fisher that we have had extravagance in this matter. The cost is high with an area such as the area of this House and, if we are talking about day labour on a job of this size, we are talking about a colossal difference in the cost of the work done under the two systems. We have a Minister in charge of housing who, I suggest, knows very little about housing. He criticised the plasterers in the weekend newspaper because they used a certain type of bleach in plaster to make it whiter. This type of thing is called a trade secret. That is common to all trades. It does no damage, and has been used for dozens of years on thousands of houses, so the Minister should keep quiet about it. It may interest honourable members to know that one way of slowing down

the setting of plaster is to squeeze a lemon into it; that will slow down the drying process. I am surprised that the Minister in charge of housing criticised the plasterers (of whom there are many hundreds in this State) for using bleach to whiten their plaster and do a good job.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I wish to mention the highways grants allocated to local government in the salubrious District of Victoria. The Naracoorte corporation has been notified that it will receive no highways grant this year. I ask the Minister of Environment and Conservation to pass this on to the Minister of Transport. This and other councils fear they will be put in an embarrassing position during this year. The Naracoorte corporation intended to construct a bridge across Naracoorte Creek, to give access to the Housing Trust area that had been developed there recently. However, that project had to be laid aside. The Naracoorte district council did not get a grant this year, but it is in a happy position because last year it did considerable work for the Highways Department on the construction of the Bordertown-Naracoorte road, which is the main highway. Also, it was able to receive some assistance in the work it did on the construction of the new saleyard, and it has a carry-over of unspent moneys from last year of \$40 000. That is all it has in the kitty, plus the grant-in-aid of \$2 600 received recently.

The Tatiara council has been notified that it will receive a grant of \$20 000 for the Cadell road, which is a small but important road in the Bangham region, to which the council will be required to make a matching grant of \$9 000; it has received a grant-in-aid of \$5 000. The Penola District Council has been notified of grants of \$23 000 for the Lucindale-Penola road, to which it is required to put a matching grant of \$5 750. There is a highways grant of \$9 000 to construct the Kalangadoo road, with a matching grant from the council of \$2 250. Those grants, too, are down. The Lucindale council has received grants of about \$38 000, to which it has to make a matching grant of about \$9 000. So, generally, there is concern among the councils in my district. I am drawing to the Minister's attention that, although the councils have been grateful to receive assistance from the Grants Commission (Tatiara council, the biggest one, has received a reasonable sum of money) and the money from the Grants Commission will assist, they fear for the future.

Also, some of the councils have been notified that they will receive money from the "Meters" programme for minor traffic improvements and traffic safety, and the Commonwealth is making available \$1 500 000 to the State. As far as I know, the Penola council is the only council in my district that has been notified about this money. Certainly, it will assist that council. Some councils are greatly concerned about receiving nothing, and others are concerned that their grants are cut. They could face the possibility of having to stand down staff. Although neither the Minister nor his department has indicated what will be done about debit orders, it is likely now that grants will be made for some of the work the councils have carried out for the Highways Department on road junctions. We have been hearing much about the \$25 000 000 that Mr. Clyde Cameron has mentioned to help combat unemployment. I noticed in the *News* this evening that that sum could be quadrupled. I bring to the notice of the House, and the Minister in particular, the plight that local government in my district finds itself in from this cutting back in the grants. I give notice now that councils in the District of Victoria, and probably many other councils, will probably have to seek aid in this financial year. With those few

remarks, which I hope do not fall on deaf ears, I bring to the notice of the Minister and his colleagues the fact that some councils are very worried about the future.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): This afternoon the Treasurer was decidedly upset when under attack by the Leader of the Opposition. I believe he demonstrated then to this House that he was under pressure, that he has been under pressure from the Opposition, and in fact is under pressure while attempting to manage the affairs of this State. He was embarrassed and so he should be. He has realised that he is fighting a losing battle, although there are occasions, I admit, when he tries to act responsibly. We have in this House witnessed several occasions when he has tried to uphold his responsibilities as Treasurer but has been sold out by elements of his own Party. The left wing element of the Australian Labor Party in this State is eroding the Treasurer's efforts on those occasions when he is trying to look after the interests and welfare of industry. On many occasions we have seen the Treasurer left out on a limb. I cite particularly the recent wharf dispute where, despite attempts by the Treasurer and his Cabinet colleagues to have the steel removed, the unions maintained their dominating hand. Obviously, the same situation is occurring at Commonwealth level, and taxpayers and consumers are paying the price of the Government's inability to hold the reins and govern this nation and this State in a proper manner.

In the interests of curbing inflation and in the interests of people generally; in fact, in the interests of Australia's international standing, we must see a change in the attitude of the Treasurer as well as that of the Prime Minister. I believe there is a great need to inject enthusiasm back into industry as well as a great need for a return in confidence at all levels, because both primary and secondary industries have reached an all time low.

I have said before and I repeat that, if we continue in this vein to destroy the incentive at industrial level and at every other level of the work force, Australia will no longer be able to provide goods for overseas markets at all. I now briefly refer to the effects of this economic mismanagement on the rural sector, on Australia's backbone, the industry on which people at all levels must rely at some time. If there is a jolt or a kick in the pants to the primary producer, it is not long before the effects of that jolt flow on to the consumer even at the metropolitan level. It is disappointing to witness the continuing jolts being experienced by the rural sector, and the lack of attention given this sector by our State Government when primary producers are so heavily affected.

I am vividly reminded of the statement by the Governor in opening this Parliament that his Government (this State Government) would act responsibly and care for the interests of South Australians if they were affected by the Commonwealth Government's fiscal policies. The rural industry is being threatened to be grossly affected by one of the Commonwealth Government's fiscal policies now. I refer especially to the all-important superphosphate bounty, which has been enjoyed by our rural community since 1963. It is not a gift, and it is not a hand-out: it is an essential assistance to a section of the community that does not otherwise enjoy tariff protection or hand-outs similar to those applying in other industries. I am not saying that concessions and protections applying to secondary industries are not necessary: I am saying that a superphosphate bounty as it has applied in Australia is essential to retain, especially during a period of low primary producer incomes, the viability of primary industry.

The Prime Minister engaged the services of Dr. Coombs and accordingly wrote to him on March 28, 1973. He sought the services of Dr. Coombs and his consultants to provide guidance and assistance in forming policies to govern Australia. Among other things, Dr. Coombs referred to the superphosphate bounty and, although his role was to cite facts and provide information to the Government, he almost reached the point of making policy recommendations. In his review of continuing expenditure policies of the previous Government, Dr. Coombs referred to the superphosphate bounty and stated:

The price of phosphate rock is about to increase; the increase would be equivalent, on average, to \$1 per ton of superphosphate.

We have found that statement to be a long way from the mark. He went on to refer to measures open to the Government in respect of this subsidy, as follows:

(a) Maintain subsidy pending review foreshadowed prior to termination of existing legislation.

(b) Phase out subsidy over, say, three years, with an immediate reduction of \$4 per ton.

(c) Reduce subsidy rate by half.

Those were the three possibilities open, according to Dr. Coombs. Despite these suggestions, the Prime Minister went a little further, and I refer to the *Advertiser* of February 16, and the headline "Government will drop super bounty". That is not a reduction of \$4 a tonne, nor is it a reduction of half: that is a \$12 bounty reduction. Only three days after the Prime Minister's statement, in a press report of February 19, 1974, under the headline "Super grant may remain", the following statement was made:

The Federal Government will now almost certainly scrap plans to drop \$60 000 000 superphosphate subsidy to farmers.

Once again the farmers and the users of superphosphate are immediately led up a tree. On the same day the *Advertiser* reported, "Minister may resign over super bounty". That shows how much disruption and division there was in the Commonwealth Government at that time. The report states:

The Minister for Northern Development, (Dr. Patterson) may resign over the Federal Government's decision to drop the \$58 000 000 a year superphosphate bounty.

Much reference has been made to this matter. The *Australian* reports on the reaction by the rural community generally across the Commonwealth and refers on February 20, 1974, to this matter under the banner, "Victoria crowd angry over end to subsidy". Indeed, members of the Commonwealth reacted and fought against the Prime Minister's announcement which exceeded the bounds of the Coombs report recommendation.

Many statements were made on whether the bounty was or was not to be removed. However, in recent months, people in the rural sector have come increasingly to believe that the Commonwealth Government intends to remove the subsidy. Many statements have been made. On March 7, 1973, the *Advertiser* reports under the heading, "Prime Minister heads off Party clash on phosphate". Again in the *Advertiser* of March 13, 1974, there is the headline "Super bounty 'idiot'—Prime Minister". In other words, he is ignoring the value of the bounty to Australia and to farmers in particular. What about the situation in more recent times? I refer to the banner headline in the *Advertiser* of July 3, 1974, "Government firm on 'super' bounty". The *Advertiser* reported as follows:

The Commonwealth Government yesterday stood firm on its decision not to reintroduce the superphosphate bounty to farmers.

One finds among these threats of removal of this important bounty to primary producers that there is an invitation by the Prime Minister to organisations acting on behalf of certain sections of the community to submit a case for consideration of reintroducing this bounty. There was, therefore, at least some hope for primary producers. The Prime Minister promised the rural community that if it submitted a case claiming hardship the submission could be dealt with by the Industries Assistance Commission. As far as can be understood at present, only one submission was made by a South Australian growers' organisation. I understand that the State Minister of Agriculture was sympathetic to the retention of the bounty and made a submission to the Prime Minister that has not yet been forwarded to the Industries Assistance Commission.

The United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated has acted responsibly and taken up the challenge by the Prime Minister, having accepted the invitation he made. On July 24, that organisation made a submission to the Prime Minister regarding the removal of the superphosphate bounty, and the high cost of superphosphate and its effects. The 18-page document prepared and submitted by U.F.G. was comprehensive and extremely informative, and brought to the notice of any who read it the importance of retaining the superphosphate subsidy. The submission points out not only the need of the rural sector for this assistance but also the effect it would have on the consumer if such assistance was not given. It refers also to the effect on food prices, farmer usage, and erosion of land if proper superphosphate dressings are not applied, as well as referring carefully, and properly, to South Australia's soil status. I should like to refer to one or two of the points made by U.F.G. in its submission. Regarding the effect on food prices, it says in the first part of its submission that, assuming no further price rises and the removal of the phosphate bounty, the ex-works price of bulk superphosphate in South Australia in January, 1975, will be \$45.39 a tonne. The January, 1975, price for superphosphate in new containers will be \$51.69 a tonne, with about 38 per cent of South Australia's superphosphate deliveries being made in containers.

I remind the House that in January, 1974 (that is, only a few months ago), the ex-works price to South Australian farmers for bulk superphosphate was only \$15.55 a tonne. This three-fold increase in the price of superphosphate will have severe repercussions on South Australian agriculture and the general community. I do not believe it is appreciated, when farmers appeal for the retention of this bounty, that its removal will be felt not only in the rural community but also throughout the whole State. The submission continues:

Based on average fertiliser sales in the four years to 1972-73, to maintain production, South Australian farmers will have to find an extra \$18 500 000 a year.

Had this proposal to remove the bounty occurred two years ago, it might well have been received a little better than it has been received, for the rural community is at present at an all-time low. Although it is not accepting the lowest prices for its products, it is accepting, with no alternative, an extremely low return for meat, wool and dairy products. Its export markets are almost exhausted and non-existent. At the same time, it is facing an almost intolerable situation in relation to outrageous wage demands. This organisation believes that a case for assistance on the price of superphosphate is justified, for the reasons I have given and, in particular, for the reasons that it has carefully cited in the submission. It is justified not only because of its effects on food prices but also on the

following grounds (which, as can be seen from its submission, are comprehensive):

(a) This State has considerable areas of soil which are not only phosphorus deficient but, because of their phosphorus fixation capacities, require a continual application of phosphorus at rates higher than those used in other parts of Australia to maintain yields.

(b) This State has farming areas where the cost of freight is abnormally high. A rise in the superphosphate price which forces these farmers to cut production because of high cost inputs can only lead to severe hardships.

I am proud to say that the organisation is there referring particularly to Kangaroo Island. It appreciated the need to attend to such communities. The submission continues:

(c) This State has many developing farmers who will be severely disadvantaged by removal of the bounty, as the phosphate requirements of their soils are high. They have not had the time and/or the capacity to increase the phosphorus status of their soils.

Some of these points are inter-related; for instance, some developing farmers have high freight costs and the added burden of phosphorus binding soils. Although I do not wish to refer in detail to this document, I assure the House that a desperate attempt was made to cite the effects of this matter on the rural community and the community generally. The organisation also went into much detail and prepared and submitted evidence and examples in the document to which I have referred, which one would have expected automatically to be handed on to the Industries Assistance Commission in accordance with the Prime Minister's promises.

But what happened following the receipt of this document, to which I have referred at length? One finds that on August 22, just a few weeks after it was forwarded to the Prime Minister, the Commonwealth Minister for Agriculture wrote to Mr. Andrews, of U.F.G., saying that, despite his organisation's plea, its submission would not be received by the Industries Assistance Commission. The Prime Minister had decided that because, in his opinion, the submission did not establish a *prima facie* case for assistance, it would not even be referred to the I.A.C. I reject the suggestion that the South Australian organisation failed to establish a *prima facie* case; I do not accept that it failed in any regard in submitting its case on behalf of South Australian growers and the community generally. What has the State Government done to assist this section of the community that is being affected by the Commonwealth Government's fiscal policies? What does the Minister of Education suggest that the Government has done to improve the position? I throw out a challenge to the Government to say what has been done.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you aware that water rates have been reduced in country areas by this Government this year?

Mr. CHAPMAN: That could well be. I happen to represent a community that provides most of its own water from its private resources. A great part of that community does not even enjoy a Government water service.

Mr. Evans: Do the people pay taxes?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Of course they do and, if they receive the service, they will readily pay the current rate, and they would have paid the rate that applied before the reduction to which the Minister has referred. However, I do not intend to leave this subject of the superphosphate bounty, as I believe it is extremely important, warranting the time and attention given to it. I am pleased that Opposition members have, during this debate and on other occasions, brought it to the notice of the Government.

Mr. Langley: To be frank, I thought it was a Commonwealth matter.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Of course it is, and it is up to the State Government to assist growers to receive the attention of the Commonwealth Government in this regard. On that basis, I criticise the Treasurer and his Government for failing miserably to act responsibly in this matter. This is the only subsidy that the rural community in these wetter areas enjoys. At one time, assistance was provided to the dairying industry but, as a result of the fiscal policies of the Commonwealth Government, such subsidies have tended to be eroded. On December 31, the subsidy to which I have been referring will be affected. I am most concerned about the erosion of such essential assistance.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're running out of steam.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am running out of time on this occasion, but in no way will I cease to remind this Government of its responsibility towards the rural sector. If I do not have time on this occasion to refer to all the matters affecting this case, I will take advantage of another opportunity later to refer to them.

Mr. Langley: Who's going to stop you?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am damn sure you will not stop me! It is incredible that members opposite fail to see that, when we help rural producers or industrial producers, we help the man in the street. The inability to understand that by helping industry we help others is causing this country to fail so miserably at present. This afternoon, the Leader rightly accused the Treasurer and the Government of gross mismanagement. I welcome this opportunity to raise this matter, making no apology for using my whole time to concentrate on it. I hope the Government will adopt a responsible attitude towards the superphosphate bounty, using all its efforts to impress on the Commonwealth Government the need to retain the subsidy at least in the areas of the West Coast, the South-East, and Kangaroo Island.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am sorry that the Minister of Local Government is not present.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He may be able to hear you in his room.

Mr. GUNN: This afternoon I referred to the Minister a problem brought to my attention by councils in my district that have received grants this financial year that are much lower than the grants they received last year. Is only the Eyre Peninsula area being discriminated against, or are all areas being treated equally? The Minister of Local Government said that South Australia had received from the Commonwealth the same sum as was received last year, and that councils would receive the same sum as they received last year. The Commonwealth Government has ignored inflation, the blame for that resting on Mr. Jones and Mr. Whitlam.

Mr. Langley: What about the previous Commonwealth Liberal Government?

Mr. GUNN: If the member for Unley supports the type of situation that I will outline, he is supporting the unemployment that will be created by this Government and its Commonwealth colleagues. One clerk of a council in my district has told me that, on the current figures, his council will have no alternative but to lay off staff at Christmas time. Is that the type of Christmas present that the member for Unley wants employees given?

Mr. Langley: Of course not; you're making that up.

Mr. GUNN: That is what the honourable member has implied; he cannot understand common sense. I have been informed that last year the Tumby Bay council received a sum of \$96 000, with the amount being reduced this year to \$53 000. How will this council meet its financial obligations? Will it have to reduce services provided?

This afternoon, the Minister said that councils must be willing to stand on their own two feet. Is he suggesting that councils must increase rate revenue in order to carry out roadwork programmes? As motorists in country areas pay petrol tax, they are entitled to fair reimbursement. In addition, they pay registration fees. Many primary producers have petrol motors in their headers, machines that are never driven on public roads, yet petrol tax is paid on petrol used in those headers. Why has no proper explanation been given to councils about the current situation? In a letter received by councils, the Secretary of the Highways Department said that there would be no general cut-back in the amount of funds received by the Highways Department. Mr. Frost signed the letter on behalf of the Commissioner. Councils on Eyre Peninsula want to know why they have been selected for cuts, whether other councils have received the same amount as last year or not, or what the situation is. This House is entitled to know, as are the councils, and I hope the Minister will make a detailed statement tomorrow.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): An important matter to which I refer involves the Government's interpretation of the Fruitgrowing Industry (Assistance) Act, 1972, and how the provisions of this Act are being implemented. The Act provides for a tree-pulling scheme, which is an agreement between the State and Commonwealth Governments whereby funds are made available to fruitgrowers, particularly those growing peach varieties that are no longer of commercial value. Under this scheme, the grower enters into an agreement with the Government that, after the trees have been removed, peaches will not be grown in the same area for at least five years. The money is in the form of an interest-free loan, and at the end of five years this is converted to a grant. I have information about an incident in which the grower entered into this agreement and removed the trees, but before the five-year period had expired he wished to sell the property.

The proposed purchaser is willing to sign any agreement and continue it to the end of the five-year period, but the Government will not allow the owner to sell until the end of the five-year period, unless he returns money advanced to him under the provisions of the scheme. The purpose of this loan is to enable the removal of trees that are no longer of commercial value, and I believe the Government should reconsider its present policy, because nothing in the Act covers the situation to which I have referred. All the requirements of the Act have been met, the trees have been pulled, and the purchaser is willing to uphold the remainder of the agreement. There seems to be no reason why the former owner should have to refund the money advanced to him before the property can be sold.

The other matter refers to the present flood situation facing this State. For years there have been floods, and statistical information has been collected as it affects the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Lands Department. To my knowledge there has never been a complete study made during a flood to determine accurately the total cost and losses incurred. I suggest that the Australian Bureau of Statistics should make a complete study immediately, so that at the end of the forthcoming flood the Government will be able to estimate accurately the total costs and losses that have resulted from the flood. At each flood we are faced with costs for levees, sand-bagging, and similar measures and, if a complete study is undertaken, it may indicate that it will be more economical in the long term for the Government to shift some houses from low-lying areas, rather than

continue spending money on protection. I refer to small areas containing 10 to 15 houses in which the cost of protection is extremely high. I ask the Government to consider seriously such a proposition.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

(Continued from September 12. Page 932.)

Schedule.

Chief Secretary, \$205 000.

Mr. COURCE: Can the Minister of Works say what is the future of the Chief Secretary's Department, which used to be regarded as an important department in the affairs of the State?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The Government intends this department to remain as it is. The reorganisation that has taken place was a matter of Government policy. The Premier decided to take over the activity that traditionally had been the function of the Chief Secretary in relation to Cabinet and other matters. The Chief Secretary still handles the important task of being responsible to the Government for the operations of the Police Department, and for such measures as the Lottery and Gaming Act, the places of Public Entertainment Act, and so on. The Government does not intend to run down the department any further.

Line passed.

Public Actuary, \$72 500; Auditor-General, \$761 500—passed.

Government Printing, \$2 649 000.

Mr. COURCE: Since last year's Estimates were considered, the Government Printing Department has opened its new establishment at Netley. Can the Minister say how efficient is the operation? Is it up to expectations? Are any delays being experienced in the printing of Parliamentary Papers because of the department's distance from Parliament House? Is any delay being experienced with *Hansard* pulls?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: To the best of my knowledge, the commuter service is working efficiently. I have no knowledge of complaints by staff at Parliament House that inordinate delays have occurred. I understand there is some delay in the printing of annual reports from the time the report is tabled in this House until it is printed and available to all members. I shall get a report from the Chief Secretary on the department's general performance up to the present time and the likelihood of future improvements.

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister obtain a report on all printing undertaken by the Government Printer? I understand there is a general delay, supposedly caused by the Commonwealth elections.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: True, from time to time extra demands are made that were probably unforeseen and not part of the planning. I shall get a full report.

Mr. BECKER: The Auditor-General stated in his report that during the year an examination had been made of various aspects of financial control, including budgeting and other accounting methods, which revealed shortcomings and deficiencies in certain areas. The department was asked to investigate these matters and report on action taken. Will the Minister obtain a report on the progress made in this matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do that.

Line passed.

Police, \$26 061 000.

Mr. COURCE: Early today, the Treasurer, in reply to a question on law and order, referred to the establishment strength of the Police Department.

The sum for the Police Commissioner's Office has been increased from \$479 739 to \$1 647 843. In relation to the Police Force proper, the figure has increased from about \$16 800 000 last year to about \$20 000 000 this year. Can the Minister indicate what increase is being made in the establishment of the Police Force?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Dealing, first, with commissioned officers, provision is being made for the promotion of 13 officers within the existing ranks and for the appointment of eight additional inspectors from sergeant ranks. Provision is made for the augmentation of 59 adult recruits as part of the additional manpower scheme and the appointment of 113 cadets graduating from the Police Academy to the rank of probationary constable. Further provision is made for the appointment of 19 additional sergeants from the constable ranks and also for the payment of automatic increases during the year. Provision is made for the replacement of the 113 cadets who will graduate from the academy during the year and for the recruitment of an additional 52 cadets to increase the current number in training to the cadet establishment of 450. There is no mention of increased numbers of women police, but the increases mentioned are indicative of the drive to build up the Police Force. That appears a fairly substantial increase this year.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I refer to the increase in the provision for Emergency Fire Services to \$48 735 from \$32 291 last year. The report on the Emergency Fire Services, which the Government has had for a long time, contemplated a new structure encompassing the whole State, with officers being made available to selected country areas on a paid basis. The increase in the allocation seems hardly sufficient to give effect to the recommendations in the current financial year, and this will disturb people who have given voluntary service over a long period. It also will not encourage other people to give voluntary service.

I refer also to the provision of \$223 650 as the cost of fleet replacements. We understood that the Government was placing an order with the motor car industry in South Australia to induce that industry, which has been in difficulty, to continue. I ask whether it has just happened that we have major replacements every second year or whether the allocation has other significance.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It seems that the increase in the allocation this year for the purchase of motor vehicles is due to the shortage that existed last year in the supply of new vehicles. Provision is made for the purchase of 74 automatic sedans and 40 solo motor cycles and the sale of 81 automatic sedans and 37 solo motor cycles to complete the replacement programme scheduled for 1973-74 which was delayed owing to a shortage of supply of new vehicles. Provision is also made for the replacement of 170 automatic sedans, 26 automatic utilities, 20 prison vans, 14 station sedans, and six manual sedans, which will enable the department to achieve the established Government policy of replacing passenger vehicles every two years or at about 40 000 kilometres to ensure economical running and higher resale value. Further provision is made to replace nine heavy-duty vehicles which have reached the end of their economic life.

Regarding the provision for Emergency Fire Services, it does not seem at this stage that there will be a big increase in activity in that area. I think that Cabinet last Monday approved either to refer to the Public Works Committee, or to let a tender for, new headquarters at Keswick. Whether the reorganisation of the department hinges on completion of that building I do not know, but I will inquire for the Leader about the programme to implement

the report. The Government does not intend to disregard the report: it would not be going ahead with the new headquarters if that were the case.

Mr. CUMBE: I refer to the provisions made for civil defence, the allocation for which has not increased much for several years. Assistance has been given to councils and district organisations, and I pay a compliment to the devoted people who give their time voluntarily in this field. I understand that there could be a change in the set-up, and I ask the Minister whether an interstate conference has been held on the subject of disaster areas and the future of civil defence. I also ask whether the service is to be known as the State Emergency Service in future and whether this service will be expanded throughout South Australia. Further, I ask the Minister whether this organisation could assist with the impending trouble on the Murray River.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think that anyone could help in that situation. I am not familiar with the role played by the civil defence organisation in this State. I say that because I think I am more familiar with the role in other States, where the organisation seems to be on a much larger scale than it is here. Possibly this is because the Police Force is responsible for civil defence in this State. Evidently, the organisation tends to rely more on the Police Force or on elements drawn from the Police Force. I agree with the member for Torrens that some emphasis could be given to the development of civil defence. It has played a useful role in other States and I see no reason why it cannot do so here. The head of the civil defence organisation is a most enthusiastic and competent officer and I am sure that, given the opportunity and the wherewithal, a splendid organisation could be mounted.

However, I qualify that by repeating that the Police Force organisation probably is such that it replaces what civil defence does in other States. On the other hand, I hope it does not occur but I can visualise emergencies, or situations leading to emergencies, that possibly we would not be able to handle adequately. Voluntary assistance from civil defence (and that is the real purpose of the civil defence secretariat) in enlisting the aid of these people and teaching them what they should be taught could be of great benefit.

Dr. Eastick: And the enthusiasm of the local director.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I agree, but that needs backing up.

Dr. Eastick: I am talking of the regional directors; there is a good one at Saddleworth-Riverton.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes. I do not disagree with the role of civil defence; it is a good thing, but the enthusiasm of people involved in it cannot be fully exploited without the resources to back it. I am prepared to ask for a report for the member for Torrens from the appropriate authority on whether or not it is intended to enlarge the activities of civil defence in this State, what was the outcome of the conference that he has referred to (if it took place; I am not aware of it) and what developments are likely to spring from that conference.

Mr. Coumbe: I should like civil defence to be used along the Murray River, if possible.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Irrigation has a claim in this as well. I think there would be a tendency to rely on the Police Force rather than my going direct to civil defence. Certainly, I should be happy to see it used in any role possible, if necessary (I hope it will not be) in the forthcoming floods on the Murray. I

will keep that in the back of my mind and, if I can find a place for it or suggest to the proper authority that civil defence be used, I will make that suggestion.

Mr. BECKER: The information I seek relates to the administration of the Police Force. Has there been considerable administrative saving in decentralising the force in the metropolitan area into regions? My region is Darlington. Is the accommodation there satisfactory? More importantly, at this stage, has the decentralisation plan implemented some time ago effected any savings and improved the general efficiency of the Police Force in that area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have no report here on that but shall be happy to have it inquired into and let the honourable member know what improvements have resulted from that reorganisation.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister obtain for me details of the films that were produced for the \$20 000 spent last year for the Police Department and can he say whether those films have been used?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crimes): Order! There is no allocation for that in these lines.

Mr. EVANS: Are you suggesting that, when we speak on the Budget, we cannot ask the Minister questions about the line on which money was spent last year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Mr. BOUNDY: I have two points that concern rural police services. I note that \$75 500 is proposed for the purchase of additional motor vehicles for the fleet. Members are all aware that speed is an all-important factor in the road toll, and the apprehension of speedsters is vital in controlling this. In my own area, the Police Force has not a sufficiently powerful vehicle in which to "burn" the youngsters off the road, and the police officers have had to resort to the ruse of using the official police car as a decoy and, through the good offices of the other members of the force in the town, they use a high-powered car to catch the offenders. It would not be a bad idea if more powerful vehicles were provided for our officers in the country to secure this essential deterrent effect.

My second point relates to the provision of two-way radio for rural police cars. Perhaps that is covered by the item "Purchase of technical and other equipment". I refer to the recent spate of stock thefts in the country. The *Country Times* mentions \$300 000 worth of stock being stolen and only \$16 000 worth being recovered. Therefore, it is a great problem. In my own area, the local police officers could have apprehended the thieves had they had a two-way radio contact with their colleagues in the neighbouring town. They lost the thieves through not having that contact. The level of their contact is that, as they patrol during the night and the early hours of the morning and go through the town, their wives leave the porch light on if there is a message for their husbands. That is a ludicrous means of communication.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: One cannot help but admire the initiative of the policemen referred to by the honourable member, who obviously operate under great hardship but have evolved an effective means of catching offenders, by the sound of it, by getting messages from their wives. The Police Force does, of course, have a number of high-powered vehicles, but there is a requirement over the whole State, and not only in the honourable member's electoral district, to try to "burn" (to use his expression) off the road the young people who are over-enthusiastic about speed driving. What the honourable member says is true; it happens everywhere. If there can

be a better distribution of high-powered vehicles, I will draw the attention of the appropriate authority to that. As regards the honourable member's reference to two-way radio, it seems to me in this day and age to be a reasonable request. Purchase of equipment that may cover this line includes a portable air compressor, breathing and diving equipment, and other rescue equipment, provided for the Emergency Operations Group (\$4 260); a colour enlarger analyser processor, 12 cameras, three projectors, and other specialised equipment required for use in the forensic science and fingerprinting fields (\$7 580); and two French horns, one clarinet and one sousaphone for the Band Branch (\$1 860). In addition, eight bullet-proof vests and a mobile bullet-proof shield, along with six gas masks, a weapon and surveillance sight for night vision, and other miscellaneous items are required for the Armed Defenders Squad and Ballistic Section (\$7 020).

Radio equipment involving 75 VHF mobile transceivers, six VHF base stations, 41 UHF mobile reporters with interface, 82 UHF portable transceivers, two radio towers, 15 VHF portable transceivers, five VHF motor cycle transceivers, 16 single-side band HF transceivers, four electro-writers, three VHF telephone interfaced units, and other miscellaneous radio equipment are required to improve communication throughout the force (\$170 230). I cannot say whether two-way radio will be installed in the honourable member's electoral district, but I hope that communication between the policemen and their wives will continue to improve.

Mr. BECKER: I seek information about the cost of police fleet replacements. I do not agree that the Police Department should acquire highly powered motor vehicles to burn off speeding motorists. Some time ago there was a high-speed chase of a policeman in pursuit of a motor cyclist with a pillion passenger at tremendous speeds through the suburbs. This happens every now and again, and policemen should realise that they have a responsibility on the roads just as the average motorist has. We must make an all-out effort to reduce the road toll and to use every means of apprehending speeding motorists and other law breakers.

For some time we have been unaware of whether the Police Department has used unmarked motor vehicles or unmarked motor cycles. Some time ago, having asked a question on this matter, I was told that it would not be prudent to reveal the information. I believe that, if the department has unmarked vehicles, it should inform the public. If it has not, the public should still be informed that it has not, so that people will know. If we were to adopt the practice followed in New South Wales, of having unmarked police vehicles, this could have an impact on motor vehicle drivers. Will the Minister ascertain how many unmarked vehicles are used by the Police Department, and how many are to be acquired this year? If the department is not to acquire such vehicles, will the department consider their acquisition?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In reply to the statement about the lack of knowledge concerning unmarked cars, I do not think it is a fact that only a few people are privy to that information. Members of the public are aware that the police use unmarked vehicles. I think that previously someone asked for the actual registration numbers and the colours of those cars. As to the actual number of the cars, I do not think there is any problem about that. I believe these cars are a necessary part of police operation. Some people object violently to their use but, on the other hand—

Mr. Coumbe: They were used with success last Easter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, and I know from my own experience in observing others that the presence of a marked police car has a great effect on the behaviour of the travelling public. I cannot say whether the police should pursue a speeding motorist or motor cyclist. My view is that, if the public saw a police car idling along a street while a motorist went past at a great rate, and if the police did nothing about it, complaints would be received, and I know to whom they would go and who would be lambasted as a result of what people would term the complete disregard and negligence on the part of the police. It seems that whatever they do, and no matter what they do, the police will be criticised.

Mr. Becker: I am referring to chases that go on for half an hour or more.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Why should a person, simply because he has a higher-powered motor vehicle or motor cycle, be able to defy and escape the police in the course of their duty?

Mr. Becker: Why should the police risk their lives?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The officers driving these vehicles are perfectly competent and capable. They know their limitations and they know the dangers to which they subject themselves. They are not forced or even asked to take unnecessary risks: they are asked only to handle the situation in a commonsense way. It is a matter of judgment. I believe it is most necessary that the department be equipped with the sort of motor car or motor cycle to enable officers in certain cases (and I cannot say this will happen all over the State) to be equipped with vehicles where appropriate to enable the police to apprehend offenders and bring them to justice. The honourable member would agree about that generally, and there is a limit to what we can expect to be done by the police.

Mr. MATHWIN: I believe that Q cars, the unmarked cars, are a necessity in the community. In most countries such vehicles are used by police, and the more the public knows about their use the greater is the deterrent effect. Regarding the expenditure of \$75 500 on the police motor vehicle fleet, I hope this figure includes some Q cars. The establishment of the police dog squad is now completed, and I believe that expenditure in this area is now included in the general expenditure of the Police Department. Alternatively, is there an item of expenditure on the dog squad? Are more dogs to be used, or is the number at present in use considered adequate?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The sum of \$18 249 was the amount involved in the establishment of the dog squad. I do not know whether the level of activity will be increased in the future. The cost of the administration and running of the centre will be absorbed into normal departmental administration costs. There is no doubt that the new vehicles to be purchased include Q cars. As I have said, they have been in operation for some time and some are no doubt due for replacement. I do not know the number, and I do not think it particularly matters. I am not certain whether the Commissioner is willing to say how many such cars are operating, and I do not see why he should be compelled to disclose that information if he does not want to, especially if some advantage is to be gained by not doing so.

Mr. MATHWIN: How successful has the use of police dogs been? Is it intended to extend their use? I understand that the use of the dogs has been most successful. Regarding the women's police auxiliary, an extra \$173 000 has been allocated to that section. I know that women police have been trained to direct traffic. Is this new section of the Police Force to be expanded?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain the information requested by the honourable member regarding the police dog section. Regarding increased costs for women police auxiliaries, the application of the female clerical staff determinations under the Public Service Act effective from October 1, 1973, and January 1, 1974, and the effect of the total wage case applicable from May 27, 1974, resulted in increased costs during the year. Provision is made for the payment of 26 pays at the current rates and for the appointment of four additional officers for typing and clerical duties. Provision is also made for the payment of automatic increases that are to become effective during the year. I take it that, apart from the additional four new staff, the increased allocation will be taken up by expected increases in salaries and other award payments.

Mr. BECKER: I refer to the proposed allocation of \$2 171 128 for administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries for the Police Department, and to the reference in the Auditor-General's Report to the theft from the department of one U.H.F. radio, a Kodak camera, watch, bags and contents, two secondhand bicycles, and 600 cigarettes. Will the Minister say how these property thefts occurred and whether the Police Department is responsible for their replacement?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I do not know how the thefts occurred, I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Correctional Services, \$4 563 000.

Dr. EASTICK: I am interested in the allocation for the Cadell Training Centre. Having visited this establishment about 12 months ago, I sought information from the Attorney-General about the implementation of the recommendations of the Mitchell committee regarding its closure. It was clearly slated in the report that, although many prisoners seemed happy in a rural situation, isolation from their families and the difficulties associated with families visiting them was a real problem which tended, in the opinion of the Mitchell committee, to reduce the effectiveness of the establishment.

One can see from page 63 of the Auditor-General's Report that the average daily number of prisoners at Cadell in 1971-72 was 119, with 33 staff as at June 30, 1972. In 1972-73, the average daily number of prisoners fell to 95, with a staff of 35 at June 30, 1973. For 1973-74, the average number of daily prisoners declined to 64, with 32 staff members employed at June 30, 1974. For that year, therefore, there was one staff member for every two prisoners. Obviously, the expense of such an exercise must be causing the Government concern. In other areas, the figures have been fairly consistent. Indeed, with the exception of Gladstone Prison, the relationship of the number of prisoners to staff has remained almost static. Although I realise that an establishment of this nature cannot suddenly be closed, I ask the Minister to obtain a report on the economics of maintaining it and, indeed, the Gladstone Prison, and on how essential are the products which they produce and which are injected into the hospital system and other prisons.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I do not have the relevant information, I will obtain a report for the Leader.

Mr. MATHWIN: I refer to the allocation of \$500 for overseas visits of officers, the actual payment for which in 1973-74 was \$5 096. Will the Minister say what is contemplated in this respect?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I know that the Comptroller of Prisons has just returned from overseas and, although I am not certain, this may be a carry-over from that trip.

Line passed.

Chief Secretary, Miscellaneous, \$1 531 000.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the proposed allocation of \$2 000 for the Lions Club, which I suspect is for a specific project. Realising that some Lions Clubs have applied for financial assistance in relation to safety equipment, I seek information in this respect. I refer also to the proposed allocation to the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron of \$34 100, which is a marked increase over actual payments of \$13 850 in 1973-74. That increase almost suggests a doubling of the service.

Regarding the allocation to the Committee of Inquiry into the Racing Industry, I realise that the sum spent last year of \$39 319 was to enable the committee to produce a report that is of great concern to horse racing, trotting and dog racing interests. Is the \$2 000 provided this year to enable the programme to continue? When can we expect the Government to implement some of the recommendations of the committee? Recently, at Morphetville the Minister of Education said that the Government was looking at matters contained in the report. A sum of \$7 000 is provided for transport concessions to charitable organisations. What organisations are involved?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The sum allocated to the Lions Club is a once-only grant to enable this organisation to print a booklet about child safety. The allocation to the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadron is to enable the completion of stage 2 of the headquarters building at a cost of \$5 800, and the replacement of radio equipment at a cost of \$28 300. The sum of \$2 000 provided for the Committee of Inquiry into the Racing Industry is the cost of printing the report, together with the outstanding fees of members. The transport concessions for charitable organisations are to meet the fares and freight of approved charitable organisations connected with orphanages, welfare, distress, and relief.

Dr. Eastick: What about the recommendations of the racing committee?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get the information for the Leader.

Mr. COUMBE: There is a considerable increase in the allocation to the South Australian Fire Brigades Board. I have introduced deputations to the Minister concerning contributions made by councils to this board. Recently, sums payable were adjusted. A disproportionate sum is paid by some metropolitan councils, having regard to what is paid by other councils situated in the same fire district. Can the Minister give information about this matter, or will he raise it with his colleague?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member knows, the Government provides 12½ per cent of the cost of running fire brigades and the marine facility established at Port Adelaide. I am not completely familiar with the funding of this operation. Publicity has recently been given to the fact that the board believed that it was alone in receiving less than it had asked for, but I assured it that it was not an orphan in this respect. I know that, following the adjustment in contributions by councils, there has been disagreement by some councils as a result of what they consider to be inequities.

Mr. Mathwin: That's putting it mildly.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: People want the best services, but they do not want to pay for them. There have been recent developments in this matter but, as what

has happened was in Cabinet, I cannot divulge details. I will obtain the information requested by the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: The sum of \$1 000 is provided for freight concessions on and costs associated with the cartage of water to dry areas. Apparently, the Government has done this in the past. I understand that, as a result of the present water rating system, some people who have paid for their water in advance wish to sell water that they do not use. When a person at a meeting last evening asked whether he could do this, he was told that it was not permissible. As there could be financial advantage in such a scheme, can the Minister say what is the exact position?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I realise that the honourable member is being facetious. Actually, I thought that he had arranged the meeting to which he referred. The members for Eyre and Frome will realise that in the past the Government has spent thousands of dollars on concessions associated with carting water, and this action has been much appreciated in the dry areas concerned.

Mr. BECKER: A sum of \$380 000 is provided for the cost of printing, publishing and providing paper for the *Government Gazette*. Is this amount the net loss for printing and publishing the *Gazette* and, if it is, will the Government accept this rather than increase subscriptions?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The provision is for an increase in the cost of labour and materials together with a carry-over for 1974-75. The receipts for sales is shown in the Estimates of Receipts rather than in the Estimates of Expenditure.

Mr. BECKER: I do not know how to find out how much is received.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

Line passed.

Attorney-General, \$2 190 000.

Dr. EASTICK: Courses of instructions for justices, for which \$1 500 has been allocated, seem to have been beneficial. Have these courses been effective? For operating expenses, minor equipment, and sundries in the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch, a massive increase has been allocated. Will this allow for major equipment purchases? What are the details of the \$73 000 allocated to the Weights and Measures Branch for purchase of plant and equipment?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): The last item is a new line replacing Loan funds that were previously provided when this branch was part of the Lands Department. The money will pay for three vehicles ordered but not supplied last year, replace 12 vehicles this year, and replace a farm milk tank vehicle, which will cost an estimated \$32 000. Concerning courses for justices, these are correspondence courses provided through the Education Department College of External Studies. The courses are supervised by Judge Marshall, and I understand that reasonably satisfactory results have been obtained. A small part of the increase in the allocation for the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch is caused by a general rise in the cost of goods and services, but most of the increase has been caused by a significant increase in producing additional pamphlets and booklets relating to the working of this branch.

Dr. Eastick: A public relations exercise!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not just that: it is more of an information exercise, and is designed to inform people of their rights, what the law is, and how the branch can help them.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister consider obtaining supplies of all these documents for members?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If a request is made, these pamphlets will be supplied.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Does this branch pay for the cost of producing the excellent television series shown just before 7 p.m. on ABS2?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: Why has such a small sum as \$750 been allocated to the law library for the Credit Tribunal?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The original provision was to establish a relatively small law library last year. This year's allocation is to pay for subscriptions for regular additions to the library, plus some new items.

Mr. VENNING: Why has the amount provided as *ex gratia* pension for the widow of a former Prices Commissioner been reduced to \$1 825?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The only note I have is that the payment is as advised by the Superannuation Department. Beyond that, I cannot give any further explanation. However, if the honourable member wants an explanation I shall inquire.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Last year \$3 500 was allocated for the oversea visit of the Minister, the Minister's wife, and officers, but the expenditure was \$28 363. When the Budget was presented last year there was no indication of such a trip. The allocation this year is to be \$1 000. Does this mean that the Minister, his wife, or some of his officers are going overseas again; if so, can the Minister indicate who is expected to make such trips and whether we should allocate a larger amount?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The provision this year is to meet any balance of expenditure carried over into this financial year from the trip made by the Attorney-General and others last year. There is no provision for oversea visits this year. When the Budget was presented last year, I understand the Attorney-General had not made plans for his trip; they came later in the financial year.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Last year \$153 000 was voted for reimbursement of jurors and witnesses and other expenses of prosecution, and the actual expenditure was \$212 826. This year the allocation is \$165 000. Was last year an exceptional year, due possibly to the Van Beelen trial, or is there some other reason why last year's expenditure was exceptional?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Last year was an exceptional year. The excess expenditure was due in part to the Van Beelen case and also to a long commercial trial. It is expected, as far as we know at present, that this year we will return to a more normal situation.

Line passed.

Crown Law, \$762 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister explain why pay-roll tax has been included for the first time?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Throughout the Budget, the Government has adopted a new procedure regarding its accounts. To cope with comparable situations between Government departments and semi-government authorities, and so on, it has decided that a more satisfactory method of accounting is to provide for the pay-roll tax payments in the Expenditure Estimates, and pay-roll tax receipts are correspondingly increased in the Revenue Estimates. The provision for pay-roll tax is a notional item. The argument was that it enabled a more suitable comparison of some semi-government situations where pay-roll tax was payable to the Treasurer for the Government situation. Beyond that, I am not sure.

Mr. Dean Brown: Some of the semi-government bodies were trying to get exemption, but you did not want that exemption.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There may have been arguments of that nature going on. If the Treasurer could tell such people that everyone was in it, it would be a glorious cover-up.

Line passed.

Public Trustee, \$802 000.

Mr. MATHWIN: The sum of \$2 000 is to be allocated for motor vehicles. Is the Public Trustee to ride a motor cycle?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No.

Mr. RUSSACK: Would the amount be to cover the expenses of an officer of the department visiting country areas? Is this done and, if not, could it be considered? Many elderly people and those who cannot conveniently come to the city would like wills made, and so on. The matters with which the Public Trustee is concerned usually do not come up at regular times of the year, but perhaps an officer could visit country areas periodically.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall get the information for the honourable member.

Mr. EVANS: Recently, I asked the Attorney-General whether he could give me details of properties sold by the Public Trustee. I understand the difficulty in locating such information and, although I was disappointed with the reply I received, I could understand the reasons for it. I was told that, in the four-year period, 1 691 transactions took place, involving more than \$16 000 000. I asked whether the sale was by tender, auction, or private negotiation, and the reply was that the method was by auction, private negotiation, or, in a few cases, by tender. I wanted each property isolated and I also wanted the name of the agent who handled property for the Public Trustee. I should like the Minister to obtain some of the information for me, even if it means that officers of the Attorney-General's Department will have to check.

Because of recent comment about Monarto and other matters, certain people from a Government department telephoned me and said that they believed that one agent handled nearly all the transactions for the Public Trustee, few were put to tender (and that is clarified by the reply), many were auctioned, and many were sold by private negotiation. The two persons who telephoned me were concerned and submitted that people in what might be called an area of public service (I do not want to go further) had bought more than one property, retained them for a short time, and disposed of them.

Will the Minister ask the Attorney-General to check this area to ensure that private negotiating has not been going on whereby agents or an agent could co-operate with a private individual, whether employed by the Government or not, to gain a benefit at the expense of people who should be getting the benefit of some trust that had been left to them?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If I understand the honourable member correctly, he is suggesting that public servants may have taken part. If he wishes to have such a statement investigated, in view of the many transactions, I think he would need to give the information, on a confidential basis, to the Attorney-General, indicating the nature of the allegations made. Regarding the general purchase of property sold by auction, some speculative activity is bound to go on.

Mr. Evans: The private negotiation matters are the ones that concern me.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In some cases there may be private negotiation following an auction. I imagine that the Public Trustee's normal procedure would be to set a price—

Mr. Evans: Some are not auctioned but are sold by private negotiation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will ask the Attorney-General about the matter, but I honestly think that he will say that we have so many transactions that, unless the honourable member can be more specific, the matter becomes difficult. He is really asking officers of the Attorney-General's Department to chase around rather blindly, hoping that they will pick up something. If the honourable member has information, he does not need to provide it publicly here, and I think the Attorney-General would accept its confidentiality and protect the honourable member's sources. If the honourable member gives that information in writing, it will give a more precise basis on which to proceed and avoid much cost being involved for the Government in chasing what may be unfounded allegations.

Mr. Becker: We've had complaints.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think it was time it was stated here that I believe that the reputation of the Public Service in this State is second to none in the country.

Mr. Jennings: What you're saying is that it is the best of all.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not trying to make international comparisons, but most of those would be favourable to Australian Public Services. I think that most members who deal with Government departments are aware of the strict integrity of the vast majority of our officers, and making rather vague statements about things that may or may not have gone wrong is not entirely fair to the Public Service.

In my dealings in the Education Department, in the four years that I have been Minister I have had one case of an officer being involved in anything that could be described as disreputable in any sense at all. When I had information in that case, immediate disciplinary action was taken. I assure the honourable member that, if he has specific information, immediate action will be taken but, in view of the overall reputation and fine record of the Public Service, I think we must be careful in making statements here, particularly statements of the kind made by interjection by the member for Hanson.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I certainly do not wish to suggest that there has been improper action by the Public Trustee Department, but I wonder whether the Minister could supply information about the percentage of business that goes to different real estate companies. I ask this because recently someone gave me information and asked me to ask a question in the House. I have not yet had a chance to do that. This gentleman, in whom I have much faith, has made accusations, not so much against individuals in the department but about departmental policy, and I hope the Minister will differentiate here.

Will he make available a list of the various companies involved and the approximate percentage of the overall business they deal with for the department? I understand that the work goes mainly to three companies, particularly to one. I ask the Minister whether, when that information is available, it could be considered whether a change in policy for the department is necessary. I think it necessary that the work be spread amongst the larger reputable land agents, and I see no reason for selecting three of them. I may be wrong in claiming that only three are involved, but that is the information that has been given to me.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will raise the matter with the Attorney-General, but I point out the word "Trustee" in the title of the Public Trustee Department. The Public Trustee is a trustee not for real estate agents but for the people who arrange for him to handle their business, and his prime responsibility is to those people. So far as real estate business is concerned, his prime responsibility is to ensure that the business is carried out efficiently and as cheaply as possible, in the interests of the various people whose estates are being managed.

Mr. Becker: You're saying some agents will do it more cheaply than others.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am suggesting that, if the Public Trustee tried to spread the business amongst all the major estate agents in Adelaide, there would be a deterioration in the efficiency of the conduct of the Public Trustee Department.

Mr. Becker: Rubbish!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Apparently the honourable member thinks there is no extra cost to the Public Trustee in having to handle real estate transactions with, say, 20 companies instead of three. If that will not increase the load of work and the amount of contacts that will have to be undertaken, new contacts being formed in the Public Trustee's Department, and increase the costs to the Public Trustee, and therefore increase the charges against estates handled by him, I do not know what will. It is not rubbish. The honourable member should think a little more before he makes these silly statements.

Mr. Becker: But there are some complaints.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Then will the honourable member be precise about them and provide information so that they can be investigated? I have said that I will raise the matter with the Attorney-General, but it is clear that the Public Trustee must operate in the interests both of the people whose estates are being handled and of their successors. That is part of his job.

No honourable member, least of all the member for Hanson, would suggest that private executor trustee companies should spread their business over as many estate agents as possible. I imagine that private executor trustee companies would invariably use one or two real estate agents. It is convenient, once the connection is established, that the people are known to each other; it is quicker and therefore cheaper. No doubt, on a scale operation lower charges may result, in the interests of the people for whom the private executor company is trustee.

There is a clear obligation on the Public Trustee in this matter. He would not be, I think, subject to Government direction on what he should do, other than the direction that he must act in the interests of the people he is representing. It would be grossly improper for the Government to lay down a policy that the Public Trustee should follow if he was able to demonstrate that that would increase his costs, either directly or indirectly, by making his operation less efficient. It is reasonable that the question be asked of the Attorney-General, but I point out that it is not an area in which any member, let alone the Government, should be moving, saying, "Look after more boys in the real estate field than you have." That is not on.

Mr. EVANS: There may be a reason why the business goes mainly to one agent. Earlier, I was not making an allegation that the Public Service was bad. There are 74 500 State public servants in South Australia, and there will always be some rumours. We must be cautious about how we make our statements but, if there is justification for most of the business going to one agent, it must

be justified in this House so that people who may believe themselves to be unjustly treated can look at the statement and understand why they do not have the opportunity to get business. There is competition in business, and that is perhaps where those stories emanated from. This will need to be checked through. I accept that we have a good Public Service, but when thousands of people are working in the Public Service, there is always the possibility that one may not stay within the bounds of that which we accept as good practice. I welcome the Minister's statement that he will check the position. I will endeavour to get the names of people and hand them on to the Attorney-General. One person in a Government department would not give me his name, but the other name I can get. If he is prepared to name the persons, I am prepared to pass it on. However, he may back down. That is why the question appeared on the Notice Paper.

Mr. BECKER: The Minister was only too keen to point the finger at me, saying I was reflecting on the officers of the department. We on this side are used to that. Every time a member says he has received a complaint from a constituent, we are told we are smearing a Government department. If we want to reduce costs, we—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! To which line is the honourable member speaking?

Mr. BECKER: General administration of the Public Trustee. The reason why I am concerned about this is that two land agents in my area complained that suddenly they were not receiving the opportunity to act as auctioneers for various properties. As the Minister said, there could be some reason for that. They had approached the department but had received no satisfaction. It is probably general in the metropolitan area that agents have contacted other members. These agents thought it was unusual because, in Glenelg, there are many elderly people, and the opportunity for auctioning properties there is probably greater than in some other suburbs. I do not say that any conspiracies are going on. There may have been a change of policy in that department. Can the Minister say whether the Public Trustee or the Government has considered extending the services of the department either by establishing an agency or agency arrangements through the State Bank or the Savings Bank or by representation in large country towns?

I think the time has come when, through the banking system, the facilities of trustee arrangements should be made available. This is done in some other countries. As the State now receives a proportion of the profits of the Savings Banks and the State Bank, we should consider whether these banks could act as agents for the Public Trustee and enhance their opportunities of increasing their profits, at the same time spreading the service of the Public Trustee throughout the State and making it more convenient for people in outlying areas to use the services available through the Public Trustee.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will raise the latter matter with the Attorney-General. As regards the former matter, I repeat that the Public Trustee is a trustee for the people whose estates he is handling, and he must act in their interests. If using fewer agents means that the costs, either direct or indirect, to the clients for whom the Public Trustee is acting are lowered, he should act in that way.

Mr. Dean Brown: Perhaps they could rotate year by year.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That may lead to increased costs and considerable disruption in the business of the estate agents.

Mr. Dean Brown: You are trying to justify the present policy.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not. I point out that members opposite, who seem to be so concerned for the interests of the estate agents in getting business handled through the Public Trustee, are putting up an argument on behalf of people who have a direct commercial interest, which may be in conflict with the interest that the Public Trustee must represent.

Mr. Becker: What about his taking out a real estate licence?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Certain capital costs would be involved. Further, the Public Trustee may not have the continuity of business over the years to justify that, and a private real estate company, with a relatively large business, can take advantage of economies of scale and make the necessary arrangements with the Public Trustee. Clearly there is a factor, which the member for Hanson should clearly acknowledge, that the Public Trustee is acting not on behalf of real estate agents but on behalf of his clients.

Mr. Becker: Fair enough.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am glad to hear that acknowledgment. Those are the people in whose interests the Public Trustee must act and, if those interests conflict with the interests of some real estate agents whom the honourable member may represent, it is just too bad.

Line passed.

Supreme Court, \$799 000—passed.

Local and District Criminal Courts Department, \$2 366 000.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister say whether the figures we are now asked to consider are already out of date as a result of yesterday's decision concerning the salary of magistrates? I express my personal thanks to the members of the magistracy who saw fit to accept a salary settlement below the amount they were seeking. I believe this group showed a responsible attitude at this important time. The sum provided for magistrates' salaries is \$468 000, but this figure will be greatly increased by the end of this year, markedly increasing the \$19 000 000 deficit we have already achieved in the first two months of this financial year.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am amazed! I do not recall having heard the Leader of the Opposition saying that he wanted to congratulate oil company workers on accepting a \$30 a week increase when they were claiming a \$50 a week increase, yet he now congratulates magistrates for their sacrifice in accepting \$40 a week when they claimed a \$80 a week and when their salary will increase from \$18 000 to \$20 000 a year. The Leader has a most peculiar idea of sacrifice.

Mr. Coumbe: What do you think about it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: My personal view is that the salary of magistrates should be fixed not by an arbitration procedure but in the same way as other judicial salaries are fixed. I think that the general spectacle we have experienced in respect of this case is not particularly conducive to the reputation of the administration of law in this State.

Mr. Payne: Will this result in a flow-on to tipstaffs?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I doubt very much that tipstaffs get what they get as a percentage of magistrates' salaries, so the flow-on would not apply. I point out the contrast to the Leader—

Dr. Eastick: What about answering the question?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader made a gratuitous comment, and I am making one in reply. I suggest to the Leader that, if the *Advertiser* is going to publish what he says, he might care to suggest to the *Advertiser* that it scrub his comments. Perhaps we could even reach an agreement to scrub the Leader's comments from *Hansard* altogether. I understand there are about 20 magistrates—

Dr. Eastick: There are 27.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Then the total cost of this increase in a full year will amount to about \$54 000, or about \$40 000 for the remainder of the year.

Dr. Eastick: Such figures are never right.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The figure is never right concerning increases awarded during a year. The Budget is drawn up to include increases that are known to apply. As the Leader would appreciate from the Treasurer's Financial Statement, an overall aggregate allowance is made. That overall allowance was \$30 000 000.

Dr. Eastick: And \$15 000 000 has been spent already.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That may well be so, but it is not a case for rejoicing, for gloating, or for congratulating the magistrates.

Mr. MATHWIN: The actual payment of \$3 203 in the financial year 1973-74 has increased to a proposed \$150 000 for the operation of mechanical reporting equipment. Is this increase related to a monitoring system that has been installed, or does it relate to another matter of which I am not aware?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is for the operation of mechanical recording by contract with Court Reporting Services Proprietary Limited in three courts from July of this year, an additional two courts from August, and a further three courts from November. The honourable member would appreciate that several years ago virtually all South Australian courts, including the Supreme Court, were reported on a typing-shorthand basis. This system was slow and relatively inefficient, and extended the length of any case. When asking a question, counsel had to proceed slowly so that the reporter could keep up with them. In the Supreme Court, the introduction of efficient court reporting techniques has reduced by about one-third the time of cases heard.

Regarding the use of mechanical methods of reporting, the Supreme Court is now fully converted to up-to-date methods of court reporting, as is the Industrial Commission. The Full Court of Local Jurisdiction is also fully converted to mechanical reporting, although the various lower courts are not. This provision is to enable this process to continue. Although this is a cost to the Government, and some part of the cost may have to be met by increased court fees, nevertheless the substantial saving in legal costs that results from a shortening of cases, and the substantial ultimate saving in the size of the bench of the Supreme Court and the Local and District Criminal Courts more than offsets the cost of introducing this type of system.

Mr. EVANS: It has been the practice to charge, I think, 50c a page in the Supreme Court and 30c a page in the lower courts for copies of evidence, which is usually in an abbreviated form. Occasionally, some non-legal persons require all details of evidence, some of which are eliminated. Now that this State is moving into a mechanical system of reporting, will the Minister ascertain whether reports will now be complete and not abbreviated? The Attorney-General recently assured the House the court officers would not divulge evidence relating, say, to rape or that which could be embarrassing to certain people, as

they had their jobs on the line, so it would still be confidential. I would like to be assured that the same will apply to the people employed by this company. I have been informed that nearly as many personnel are employed in relation to monitoring tape recorders and taking tapes to recording services as were employed when reporting was done manually. Also, those in the courts have said that the actual transcription time takes longer than when evidence is taken by shorthand writers and typists within the court structure. Will the Minister ascertain whether this is true, and ask the Attorney to say whether a real saving in money and time will be effected?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In reply to the honourable member's question whether transcripts are available from the recording service in a full form, the answer is "Yes"; that is part of the arrangement. Regarding the second part of the honourable member's question about confidentiality, I can only repeat the Attorney-General's assurance. The effectiveness of their contracts with the Government depends on these people carrying out their function suitably. The third aspect of the honourable member's question related to the cost saving. The honourable member should be able to see that, if the time taken by counsel in cross-examination is shortened by one-third, even with the same number of staff involved in preparing the transcript, it must result in a substantial cost saving to those who must ultimately pay the legal fees.

Mr. Dean Brown: That is not necessarily the case.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is necessarily the case. The member for Playford could probably give the Committee some idea of counsel fees. If a person engages senior counsel, who earn about \$700 a day, and junior counsel also is being employed, one must pay about \$1 000 a day. Therefore, if the number of court sitting days was reduced by one-third, there would be a substantial saving to those employing senior counsel. There would also be a substantial saving for anyone employing junior counsel. There would be a further saving that would compensate the Government for the cost of this scheme, as more work could be done by the courts in a given time. This would mean less demand on scarce facilities: the existing number of court buildings and judges and magistrates could handle more cases. There would therefore be an overall benefit that would more than justify this cost.

Line passed.

Registrar-General, \$1 470 000—passed.

Attorney-General, Miscellaneous, \$196 000.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to the allocation of \$24 500 for contribution towards cost of legal research on the territorial sea. It was stated about 12 months ago that South Australia was acting in concert with the other States in this matter and that any expenses incurred would be shared. It appears from this allocation that we must be nearing finality on this matter. Will the Minister ascertain whether South Australia has advanced, or will be advancing, a case and whether the details that have resulted from research on this matter indicate the likely success of the case advanced on behalf of the States in relation to the attitude that has been advanced and defended by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The bulk of the work has been done. The sum of \$18 000 was approved for payment to Professor O'Connell but, because of an oversight, that sum was not paid. This line makes provision for that payment, as well as for a further \$6 500 for the work

to continue this year. This work is being undertaken by South Australia on behalf of all States, and five-sixths of this sum will be recovered from the other States.

Dr. Eastick: What position is South Australia in now?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will check that with the Attorney-General.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The sum allocated for compensation for injuries resulting from criminal acts has been increased from \$3 318 to \$12 000. Does this indicate a more generous policy by the Government in future?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Government has increased the limit for payment of compensation from \$1 000 to \$2 000. The provision is estimated on the basis of that increase, on the applications being processed, and on the expectation that other applications will be processed and paid before the end of the year. In the initial stages of this scheme, as some people would not have been aware of their rights in the matter, a build-up of applications could have occurred.

Line passed.

Treasury, \$370 000—passed.

Superannuation, \$359 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I hope that the Minister will refer to the South Australian Superannuation Fund the comments I made this afternoon about the need for lower interest rates on loans made to contributors to the fund.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: To which line is the honourable member referring?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am referring to the allocation for administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries. If the interest rate were lower, more people would borrow from the fund.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I am afraid the honourable member is out of order, as his remarks do not relate specifically to that line.

Line passed.

Valuation, \$1 379 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister of Works has sent two officers to New Zealand to assess the valuation technique used there in relation to water and sewerage rate assessment. If a new system is implemented for this assessment, will there be a need for additional officers in this department to make the assessment?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: To which line is the honourable member referring?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am referring to the allocation for the Assistant Valuer-General, senior administrative officer, valuers, draftsmen, clerical staff and temporary assistants. I hope that you, Mr. Acting Chairman, appreciate that land valuations are used in relation to water and sewerage rates. If a new scheme is introduced relating to land valuations, additional staff may be required.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I must rule the honourable member out of order.

Mr. BECKER: I refer to the allocation for the Assistant Valuer-General, senior administrative officer, and so on. What system is adopted by the Valuation Department in determining the value of a property?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member will have to relate his remarks precisely to the line.

Mr. BECKER: My question relates to the line to which I have referred.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The question is not relevant under that line.

Mr. BECKER: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Chairman, the line to which I have referred makes an allocation to certain officers of the Valuation Department. What do these officers do in the course of their duty? In carrying

out their duties, these officers value properties. In agreeing to this line, the Committee should know what method is adopted by officers in making valuations.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: As the question does not relate precisely to the line, I must rule it out of order.

Mr. BECKER: On a further point of order, Mr. Acting Chairman. If we did not agree to the salaries of these officers, they would not undertake their work. I want to know what they do.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The question is in order up to that point.

Mr. BECKER: I want to know how they arrive at their valuations.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is in order in asking what the officers do, and I will refer that question to the Minister.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: They value.

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the line include the salaries of officers who value property and provide information for water rates assessments?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Does the Minister expect any additions or reductions in the number of staff and the sum allocated for this line because of the expected report that he will give later this week, and will a different method of valuation be used that may alter the number of staff required?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot see it at present.

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the staff value each property separately or make an assessment from the sale of properties in the area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think we are now referring to details of the staff's work, and I am not going to be involved in this matter. We are considering in this line whether we will pay these people to value properties in accordance with an Act passed by Parliament, and I do not intend to take the matter further.

Mr. BECKER: Does the department hire or seek the temporary services of outside valuers to assist in property valuations?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is what "temporary assistance" means.

Line passed.

State Taxes, \$962 000.

Mr. GUNN: Succession duties is a matter that grieves many people, because in this State we have a form of taxation—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the honourable member relate his remarks to a particular line?

Mr. GUNN: I was referring to the staff and administration expenses of this department.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The question must relate to salaries.

Mr. GUNN: Because of administrative difficulties inherent in the Succession Duties Act, does the Government plan to alter the Act to make it easier to operate to the benefit of the people of this State?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: That matter is not covered by these Estimates.

Line passed.

Treasurer, Miscellaneous, \$62 986 000.

Mr. EVANS: Does the Minister know how much the State will get under urban sewerage agreements from the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: I think \$3 200 000 was allotted to South Australia, and the \$80 000 provided here

is for the payment of interest on advances by the Australian Government under urban sewerage agreements. Liability for principal payments has been deferred.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: As \$500 has been allocated for fees and expenses of the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal, does that mean that this tribunal will sit this year and, if it does, why will it not cost more than last year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This amount provides for fees and expenses of members and Secretary of the tribunal for sittings, and I think it is probably a carry-over from last year.

Mr. Dean Brown: Are you sure it is not for an increase?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not aware at this stage that there will be a sitting of the tribunal, or whether there will be an increase in salaries.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I seek in writing, if possible, specific details of how this \$500 will be spent.

The Hon. I. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to supply that to the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I would appreciate information on whether this is a flow-on from last year's sittings, or whether it is the expected expense of a sitting this year.

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister give details of the proposed \$36 000 to be spent on debt services for the Coast Protection Board?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This provides for payment of an amount equivalent to the difference between interests at Government rates and semi-government rates on amounts the Coast Protection Board was obliged to raise outside the Loan Budget. The Government has agreed to meet the extra cost of this latter type of borrowing.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the \$40 000 000 allocated for transfer towards deficits of the Railways Department be sufficient, and what progress has been made in the Commonwealth Government's take-over of railway services in this State?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This is a transfer designed to reduce the prospective railways deficit to a figure that will give officers some incentive to improve efficiency to the point where the adjusted deficit (after the transfer) can be eliminated.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister explain why stamp duty paid on transfers of land in West Lakes for roads and recreation purposes is to be refunded and why it is to be refunded at this time? Does it relate to all roads and recreational areas established or does it refer to additional areas to be established?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In accordance with the West Lakes indenture, West Lakes Limited is required to provide certain areas of land for roads and reserves. If this is done as part of a plan for subdivision no document is required and no stamp duty is payable. On the other hand, if the location of roads and reserves is not determined until after the transfer from the Minister, stamp duty is payable on the conveyance document. To overcome this anomaly it has been agreed that, in the latter case, the Woodville corporation will pay the duty and the Government will refund it.

Mr. MATHWIN: Why is the contribution to deficits of the Municipal Tramways Trust to be more than double the amount paid last year?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is expected that the trust will incur a much greater deficit this year, partly because of higher wage levels and partly because it will have responsibility for a full 12 months instead of for only four months, as in 1973-74, for routes formerly operated by licensees.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Is the allocation for insurance of motor vehicles to cover general insurance or third party insurance? As I understand it, Government motor vehicles are not normally insured against accident.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It covers third party only.

Line passed.

Lands, \$6 979 000; Minister of Lands, Minister of Repatriation, and Minister of Irrigation, Miscellaneous, \$270 000; Minister of Works, \$118 000—passed.

Engineering and Water Supply, \$26 729 000.

Mr. EVANS: Recently I raised with the Minister a matter relating to two workmen carrying out private contracts while being paid by the department. What penalty was imposed on those persons?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: They were demoted, I think for three months. I remember the case. The penalty was rather harsh in terms of loss of salary. They ceased to operate for a period of time. They were severely reprimanded and subsequently were reinstated. However, I will get a report.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister indicated today that, on the Christie Downs railway line, the Engineering and Water Supply Department carries out 30 per cent of the work on a contract basis. Is allowance made in the salary provided here for that work or is that additional money obtained from the Railways Department paid, presumably, on a day-labour basis?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The payments are made by the department from this vote. This would be a recovery not to the department but to general revenue. The employees concerned would be paid in the normal way because they are employed by the department. The reimbursement due to the department as a result of its activities as a contractor would be paid by the Railways Department into general revenue, as I understand it.

Dr. EASTICK: Can we accept that the E. & W.S. Department costs include costs which should be attributed to the Railways Department and that, in effect, the E. & W.S. Department is getting less value of work in its own right than is indicated?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As construction on the various mains runs down, we absorb the additional labour.

Dr. EASTICK: The department is showing a figure recouped from the Railways Department, so that the Railways Department, in the long term, does show that as a cost against it, but general revenue benefits. Costs against the E. & W.S. Department are not a true reflection of work carried out by that department.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is right.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I may have misunderstood the Minister. I understand that, included in the expected expenditure for the E. & W.S. Department, amounting this year to \$26 729 000, is included contract work that it does, even if on a railway line or in some other area. Do I understand that, if the E. & W.S. Department sustains a loss of \$6 000 000, the cost of carrying out contract work is included in that amount?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Daily-paid people are working in the form of contractors, under the supervision of the E. & W.S. Department, on construction of the railway to Christie Downs. Their wages are included in that vote, and any reimbursement is not made direct to the department but to general revenue. The reimbursement is charged to other accounts and does not necessarily show in the E. & W.S. Department.

Mr. EVANS: Recently I have raised the point that the area in Stirling that is now sewered has been classified as a country sewerage scheme, and the charge is 9 per cent. However, that area is in the metropolitan area of Adelaide for other purposes and I ask the Minister why the scheme has been declared a country sewerage scheme.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is because of the differential rate that applies in Stirling, similarly to what applied to water until two years ago, when we abolished that differential rate. That was an advantage to the people of Stirling at that time. One rate is a metropolitan rate and country schemes attract the other rate.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister is saying that the people of Stirling paid an extra amount for 10 years, but they did not receive an advantage: they were brought back to equality. The rate for sewerage is 30 per cent more than people in the city pay. The department is getting large amounts of rates from properties in that area with high values based on the recent valuation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There is the cost of installing the scheme. The justification is there.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I refer to the terms "Less—Amounts transferred to districts" and "Less—Charged to other accounts" in the provision for the Engineering and Water Supply Department, General. Will the Minister say whether that is a reference to amounts transferred to country sewerage?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is for salaries and wages transferred to districts and other loan and deposit accounts.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Is the amount transferred to country sewerage?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No; we have several water districts throughout the State and we transfer to them.

Mr. Dean Brown: What about the amount charged to other accounts?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There is a salary and wage transfer to districts. There are three separate accounts and the amounts are charged to districts and to loan and deposit accounts.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Is the Minister saying that any money from railway contract work goes to general revenue and then comes back to the E. & W.S. Department?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No. It goes to general revenue. It is not funded back to the E. & W.S. Department. It does not affect expenditure, either.

Mr. Dean Brown: Will the Minister explain that?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Because of a run-down in activity on mains such as the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main, we had a surplus of labour available and, to avoid retrenchments and maintain that labour, we entered into a formal contract with the Railways Department to absorb those people. In effect, the activity of the E. & W.S. Department has been reduced, but without lessening the work force. We are still working for the Government. We are paying out salaries and wages but the money does not come back to the department, because the Railways Department pays it back to general revenue. The E. & W.S. Department is responsible for paying the men who do the work, and the Treasury handles the money that comes back into general revenue.

Mr. Dean Brown: Therefore, if the E. & W.S. Department lost \$4 000 000—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That would not mean that the department had been inefficient. The Treasurer probably would have \$4 000 000 that had been paid back to general revenue.

[Midnight]

Dr. EASTICK: So that members may be better informed after tonight, will the Minister make available to members details connected with the line "Less—Charged to other accounts"? In effect, it will be a distribution of the accounts for which those amounts were distributed.

Mr. MATHWIN: I seek information from the Minister about the payment of moieties to local government authorities, for which last year the proposed amount was \$5 000, as it is this year, but the actual payments were only \$1 786. Does this \$1 786 include the reinstatement of council property such as footpaths and roads? That is a very small amount to be paid back in moieties, and more so if it includes reinstatement done by the department.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It involves payment to local government where it provides footpaths, kerbing or roadways fronting departmental properties.

Mr. EVANS: Will the same amount of sewerage facilities be provided this year regardless of tonight's announcement of \$3 200 000 instead of the expected \$3 500 000?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think it was stated in the Loan Estimates that, if the amount forecast was not forthcoming from the Australian Government, adjustments would be made to our own line to make up for any loss.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister has now given a fairly full explanation. If I still have any doubts when I consider his answers in depth, will he be happy for me to consult the Under Treasurer on the exact accounting procedures?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No worries.

Mr. MATHWIN: For the oversea visits of officers, I see that last year \$10 877 was actually spent, and this year the allocation is to be \$30 000. Several officers from the department are to go overseas; can the Minister give me some information on that?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, I cannot, other than to say that the Engineer-in-Chief is currently overseas. I cannot give the details but will find out and let the honourable member know.

Line passed.

Public Buildings, \$24 656 000.

Dr. EASTICK: Are the expenses connected with electoral offices included in the line "Other Government buildings"? If they are not in that line, can the Minister say whether they are contained in the line "Government offices and buildings—services costs"? If they are not there, where are they? I note, too, that there has been a massive increase from an actual expenditure of \$12 154 last year to \$30 000 this year on the operating expenses, minor improvements, minor equipment and sundries for the West Terrace Cemetery. I refer also to the figure for school buildings.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's for maintenance.

Dr. EASTICK: I take it there is a transfer of funds from, for instance, the Railways Department to the E. & W.S. Department to pay for the Christie Downs railway line or any other construction works carried out.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The \$1 748 000 for "Other Government buildings" provides for maintenance, minor improvements, and furniture for Government buildings, other than schools and hospitals, including payment of road moieties, but excluding salaries and wages. The allocation for "Government offices and buildings—service costs"

provides for service costs of Government offices including rentals, rates, cleaning, electricity, telephone charges, etc. Allowance is made for increased rental and new leased accommodation in the Guardian Building, Jennings Building, and Queensland Insurance Building, and the increased cost of contract cleaning, telephones, electricity, etc., in leased accommodation. So it would include electoral offices. The allocation of \$30 000 provides for the maintenance of West Terrace Cemetery, including minor improvements and office expenses, but excluding salaries and wages.

Mr. Coumbe: Why the big jump?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A committee has been meeting on this. I have had an interim report from it, but there is a possibility of the Government's taking over the responsibility of other parts of the cemetery from, I think it is, the war graves section; in other words, complete control and a general cleaning up of the cemetery will take place. I think this is the first amount of money to be allocated for increased staff, which will be required to do that work. That is the reason for the increase in the allocation. Although it is not mentioned here, it was reported to me the other day. I will check that.

Line passed.

State Supply, \$1 100 000—passed.

Minister of Works, Miscellaneous, \$664 000.

Mr. COUMBE: I seek information about the Torrens River allocation. This line refers to the purchase of land and subsidies to councils, many of which have done a good job, some more than others. The allocation here is increased from \$7 000 last year to \$24 000 this year. I was interested to see that, whereas previously the Adelaide City Council had been excluded from these operations because it was doing some other work, it was suggested it might be included. Is it to be included in this line? The original work of the River Torrens Committee was to clean up the river, to make it as natural as possible, and as accessible as possible, without making it terribly formal. Much good work has been done in this area. Will the Minister ascertain how the committee is working on this and why there has been such a welcome increase in this allocation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is probably aware that in the past it has been the practice to make small amounts readily available to the various councils but without much success. The committee has recently met with me and put a certain suggestion to me, which I have yet to put to the Government and which would alter the approach that has been past practice. Although this figure does not reflect that change, the idea will involve expenditure which will commence in the next financial year. The explanation I have is that it simply provides for the acquisition of lands and subsidies to councils for beautification work. I will check the exact details of the increase and let the honourable member have that information.

Mr. VENNING: Last year \$500 was allocated for the repairs and maintenance to the Laura embankment, and the allocation is now increased to \$10 000. Has this increase anything to do with the relocation of the railway crossing at Laura, or does it merely provide for maintenance work on the existing embankment?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It covers anticipated maintenance on the embankment at Laura.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Auditor-General in his report refers to State authorities being supplied with water at cost. Is this cost covered by one of these lines? If water is supplied to State authorities at cost, what is the cost?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get that information.

Mr. VENNING: How can it be anticipated that maintenance on the embankment will be required at Laura? Either the work is to be carried out or it is not to be carried out.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is anticipated that this money must be spent this year. Inspections have been made and a decision taken. Approximately \$10 000 will be needed to be spent this year. I shall be happy to get information for the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister say whether work on metropolitan drainage maintenance and south-western suburbs drainage scheme has been completed? Why has the sum allocated been increased by \$15 000?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The sum has been increased because of the provision for a contribution to be made by the State Government towards the estimated deficit on metropolitan drainage maintenance in the south-western suburbs drainage funds; that is, the difference between the statutory contributions by councils for maintenance work and the actual cost of the work. It will amount to about \$50 000, which the Government is finding.

Line passed.

Minister of Education, \$67 000; Education, \$174 341 000; Libraries, \$2 848 000—passed.

Minister of Education, Miscellaneous, \$9 707 000.

Mr. COUMBE: Several items on this line have been changed considerably since last year, presumably because of the assumption by the Commonwealth of certain responsibilities in respect of tertiary education. I think that the Treasurer referred to this in his statement. Certain items regarding the arts appear for the first time. When the Treasurer was talking about the arts the other day, I got the impression that all these things would be handled by the Premier's Department. In fact, I believe that legislation is to be introduced concerning this matter and the transfer of certain functions from the Minister of Education to the Premier. Why, then, are such items as Australian Opera included under this line?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This item is incorrectly noted. Although it is put under the Australian Opera, it should appear as a grant to the Festival Centre to enable it to provide special rates for the children of Government and non-government schools to attend special performances at the theatre. Whenever a visiting company puts on an extra performance, it is often possible to offer schoolchildren an opportunity to go to the theatre. This will enable the Festival Theatre to do this and to keep the charge below \$1.

Dr. EASTICK: The allocation of \$2 460 000 for the per capita grant to independent schools is not much larger than the actual payment of \$2 239 926 made in 1973-74. Does the Minister agree that the proposed allocation is unrealistic considering the announcement made in Canberra this evening that the permissible taxation deduction for education expenses is to be reduced, thereby throwing a considerable strain on persons who want to have their children educated at independent schools? Does the Minister not agree that the cost to the Government will be considerably greater than that which has been budgeted for, having regard to the number of students that will be forced into Education Department schools?

I refer also to the allocation of \$5 128 000 to the South Australian Pre-School Education Committee, the first such allocation which has been made. Does the Minister agree that, if the Commonwealth Government had not re-

instituted its pre-school education programme, this allocation would not have been made because these funds would not have been received from the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In reply to the honourable member's second question, the answer is "No, I would not agree." The honourable member would have noticed earlier the allocation for the Kindergarten Union which was funded separately from State sources and which has been eliminated as it now comes under the allocation for the South Australian Pre-School Education Committee. That committee will receive \$2 000 000 of State funds, and it is assumed that it will receive at least \$3 128 000 of Commonwealth money, assuming South Australia receives its share of the Australian allocation of \$34 000 000. In fact, we have known for some weeks that the allocation would be different from that.

Regarding independent schools, a substantial increase will be paid to them in the 1975 school year compared to the amount paid in 1974. At the request of many independent schools and of the Cook committee, we have changed from a system of three term payments to two half-yearly payments. The schools have requested that the first half-yearly payment for 1975 be paid before the end of 1974; in other words, they will receive the funds for 1975 before the beginning of that year. Therefore, in the 1974-75 financial year the last term's payment for 1974, and the first half-yearly payment for 1975 will be made. The second half-yearly payment for 1975 will be paid in July, 1975, which is in the next financial year.

Therefore, the \$2 460 000 is equivalent to the payment for five-sixths of the year. Instead of payments being made in February, in June and in September or October (two of which would have been made in the 1973-74 financial year, together with the payment for the 1975 calendar year), the first payment for 1975 is being brought forward, at the request of the schools, to December this year and will be made on estimated enrolments. The Cook committee will by then have brought down its report to enable that payment to be made. The second payment will not be made until July in the following financial year.

The total per capita assistance given to independent schools next year will be 17½ per cent of the estimated cost of running a Government school in the 1974-75 financial year. The Government's aim is to reach 20 per cent of the cost of running a Government school by 1976. However, I will obtain for the honourable member the precise total allocation for the 1975 calendar year so that he can compare it with the 1974 figures.

Mr. Coumbe: It really means that we are changing from a term-type payment to a semester-type payment.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is so.

Mr. Coumbe: The Minister is really taking an educated guess, though, because he is waiting on the Cook committee's report.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. We have already told the Cook committee of the 1975 allocation.

Mr. Coumbe: The Minister did not make that point clear earlier: he said he was waiting on the committee's report.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The point is how the money should be allocated and, until that committee makes its report, no payment can be made.

Mr. Coumbe: You are saying that so much money is available and you are recommending how it should be allocated.

Dr. Eastick: That is assuming that the number of students at the independent schools is maintained and does not decrease.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We assume that the figures for the first half of the year are based on present enrolments; adjustments will be made for the second payment.

Mr. COUMBE: To some extent, the Minister is making an educated guess. However, he has not taken into account the point made by the Leader of the Opposition regarding the announcement made in Canberra this evening. Many parents of children attending private and State schools will have much difficulty in meeting their obligations. This sum may have to be increased to meet some of these costs. At several private schools parents rely on taxation concessions to a considerable extent, and what the Commonwealth Government has done will result in an impost on them. Will there be requests for the allocation to some schools to be increased?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The provision is in line with the commitment of the Government to move by 1976 to 20 per cent of the cost of running a Government school. In its Budget, the Commonwealth Government has provided for additional supplemental funds through the Australian Schools Commission for Government and non-government schools.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In future, I hope that a greater allocation than the \$500 provided this year will be made available to the Specific Learning Difficulties Association of South Australia, which does excellent work. I believe Mrs. Dibden works almost full time with no remuneration whatever for her efforts. This organisation has done tremendous work under great difficulties. What is the function of the South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: To my knowledge, Speld has not applied for increased financial assistance. If it did apply, in the light of all the circumstances, the application would be considered. People associated with Speld and the officers of my department work closely together, with much work taking place on a special committee we have established. As much of the work with Speld is on a voluntary basis, the actual costs are not great. The department is taking an increased responsibility in this area.

The Council for Educational Planning and Research was set up last year with an interim committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Bright. It is represented in the tertiary, secondary, primary, and educational interests broadly within the community. Its functions are to be as described in its title. It is responsible for long-term planning advice in all areas of education in the general research area. The Executive Officer is Mr. Doug Anders, and this is its first allocation of funds.

Dr. EASTICK: An allocation is made for a school for the German language, with another allocation being made to the Greek Orthodox community of South Australia. Are we to expect special consideration for a series of language courses?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Various communities run language classes. For children of German migrants and Greek migrants, these classes are run by these communities separately, although they usually use Education Department premises. The cost of running the course has been expanding each year. As applications have been made for assistance, we have determined a per capita basis of payment.

Mr. EVANS: Speld does an excellent job. I am disappointed that it has not applied for an increased grant. During the last two years, I have suggested to the Treasurer that a film for this organisation be produced. The only films available to it now are American films, but American pronunciation and idiom create difficulty for the children and some of the parents. Perhaps, through the Education Department or the Premier's Department, the South Australian Film Corporation could produce a film that would help this organisation no end.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will consider the matter.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister provide specific information in written form about the allocation of \$5 128 000 for the South Australian Pre-School Education Committee?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes.

Mr. MATHWIN: I take it that this allocation is to train new teachers that the department will need for pre-school education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It refers to costs relating to Kindergarten Union and Education Department pre-schools, and it deals with capital and recurrent costs. Some part of it relates to establishing certain special refresher or crash courses for pre-school teachers. The bulk of pre-school teacher training takes place at the Kingston College of Advanced Education, which is separately funded by the Commonwealth Government. There are a few separately financed short-term courses that are not financed directly through the Swanson commission or the Universities Commission. They are financed by about \$100 000 of the total sum.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.41 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 18, at 2 p.m.