

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 19, 1975

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

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the revenue and other moneys of the State as were required for all the purposes set out in the Loan Estimates for the financial year 1975-76 and the Public Purposes Loan Bill, 1975.

QUESTIONS

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

GRANTS COMMISSION

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. When was the Grants Commission Regions Working Party established and why?
2. Of the working party—
 - (a) who are the members;
 - (b) what regions and interests do they represent;
 - (c) what is the term of their appointment;
 - (d) what is their remuneration; and
 - (e) who is the local government representative and how was he selected?
3. Who defined the regions and what are they?
4. What are the recommendations of the working party?

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

1. The working party was established in December, 1973, to advise the Minister of Development and Mines on the most appropriate long term regions to be established for the purposes of section 17, Grants Commission Act, 1973.
2. (a) Its members are:—Messrs. K. C. Belchamber, D. Aitchison, D. A. Speechley, E. Venning, G. S. Lewkowicz, and Dr. M. Hemerling.
 - (b) None. The committee is an expert group of officers.
 - (c) Until the working party completes its findings.
 - (d) Nil.
 - (e) There is no local government representative. However, Mr. Venning is the Senior Local Government Inspector.
3. The working party. Interim regions are: Region 1, Metropolitan (Northern); Region 2, Metropolitan (Western); Region 3, Metropolitan (Eastern); Region 4 Metropolitan (Southern); Region 5, Eyre Peninsula; Region 6, Yorke Peninsula; Region 7, Northern Spencer Gulf; Region 8, Mid North; Region 9, Southern and Hills and Kangaroo Island; Region 10, Murray Lands; Region 11, South-East.
4. The working party recommended the above regions in August, 1974, for interim use, but has not completed its findings on long-term regions.

UNIFORM REGIONAL BOUNDARIES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. When was the Committee on Uniform Regional Boundaries for South Australian Government Departments established and why?
2. Of the committee—
 - (a) who are the members;
 - (b) what departments and interests do they represent;
 - (c) what is the term of their appointment;

- (d) what is their remuneration; and
- (e) who is the local government representative and how was he selected?

3. Who defined the regions and what are they?

4. What are the recommendations of the committee?

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

1. The committee was established in May, 1974, to report to Cabinet on the advantages and disadvantages of requiring Government departments to adopt uniform regional boundaries.
2. (a) Its members are: Messrs. P. D. Agars, D. Aitchison, P. Cooper, G. S. Lewkowicz, and Dr. M. Williams.
 - (b) None. The committee is an expert group. Dr. Williams is a Reader in Geography at the University of Adelaide and the others are public servants.
 - (c) Until the committee completes its findings.
 - (d) Dr. Williams will receive a sum yet to be determined.
 - (e) There is no local government representative.
3. No final regions have been defined.
4. See No. 3.

CORRECTIONAL CENTRES

Mr. MATHWIN (on notice):

1. How many inmates are being detained in each of the following care centres: McNally Training Centre; Brookway Park; Vaughan House and Seaforth Home?
2. Are there any first offenders in these centres being integrated with the more experienced offenders, and if so, in which centres?
3. If first offenders and experienced offenders are being mixed, what is the reason?
4. What is the standard of security at the McNally Training Centre; Brookway Park; Vaughan House and Seaforth Home, respectively, and what ratio of staff to inmates is there at each of these centres?
5. What is the number of weekly abscondings since June, 1974, at the McNally Training Centre; Brookway Park; Vaughan House and Seaforth Home, respectively?
6. Of these abscondings, if any, how many were first offenders; second offenders; third offenders; and fourth or more offenders, respectively?
7. Are any steps being taken to stop recurrence of abscondings from these homes, and if not, why not?
8. Have any attacks been made on staff members by inmates during the period from June, 1974, in each of the following centres: McNally Training Centre; Brookway Park and Vaughan House and, if so, how many, and at which centres did they occur?
9. Were any staff members injured in these attacks, and if so, at which care centres did they occur, and what was the nature of the injuries?

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

1. The number of residents in centres as at August 14, 1975, was:
 - McNally Training Centre—75 boys
 - Brookway Park—39 boys
 - Vaughan House—17 girls
 - Seaforth—34 boys and girls (20 boys and 14 girls)
2. Except in the case of a few very serious offences, it is unusual for first offenders to be sent to McNally Training Centre and Brookway Park. Some female first offenders are sent to Vaughan House. Seaforth Home is used for children of both sexes who are placed there because of neglect rather than for offending. All of the above centres

are divided into a number of separate self-contained units to facilitate desirable segregation and to enable the young people to be dealt with in small groups.

3. See No. 2.

4. Standards of security at McNally Training Centre, Brookway Park and Vaughan House are regarded as being appropriate to meet the needs of the particular units. Some improvements to security are being made or are about to be made at McNally Training Centre, and Brookway Park. When weaknesses are discovered they are rectified. Seaforth Home is an open centre.

Staff establishments at McNally Training Centre, Brookway Park and Vaughan House provide for a staff ratio of one staff on duty to eight youths during waking hours. At Seaforth Home staff establishments differ in the various units according to the function of the unit. The minimum ratio of staff on duty during waking hours is one staff to eight children.

5. Number of weekly abscondings—see table appended. These abscondings were not all from the training centres but some were from leave outings, school and work.

6. Most absconders from McNally Training Centre and Brookway Park have committed four or more offences for which penalties imposed by the courts frequently did not involve placement at a residential training centre. Such penalties involve fines, bonds and placement in community treatment centres. A total of 27 first offenders absconded from Vaughan House, 22 second offenders, 15 third offenders and two fourth offenders (or more).

7. See 4 above. Continual vigilance is being practised by the staff to prevent abscondings.

8. McNally Training Centre..... 1
Brookway Park..... 7
Vaughan House..... 8

9. McNally Training Centre—
bruises, no days off duty.
Brookway Park—
bruises to staff
one staff 6 days off duty
one staff 2½ days off duty
Vaughan House—
bruises and one strained back
one staff 2 days off duty

McNALLY TRAINING CENTRE—WEEKLY ABSCONDINGS		
Date	No. of Abscondings	
1974—		
July—		
7.....	2	
14.....	3	
21.....	2	
28.....	6	
August—		
4.....	5	
11.....	7	
18.....	2	
25.....	—	
September—		
1.....	4	
8.....	2	
15.....	1	
22.....	1	
29.....	2	
October—		
6.....	1	
13.....	—	
20.....	1	
27.....	8	
November—		
3.....	3	
10.....	—	
17.....	7	
24.....	3	

McNALLY TRAINING CENTRE—WEEKLY ABSCONDINGS— continued		
Date	No. of Abscondings	
1974—		
December—		
1.....	1	
8.....	1	
15.....	—	
22.....	6	
29.....	4	
1975—		
January—		
5.....	—	
12.....	—	
19.....	5	
26.....	—	
February—		
2.....	—	
9.....	1	
16.....	—	
23.....	6	
March—		
2.....	8	
9.....	1	
16.....	—	
23.....	—	
30.....	3	
April—		
6.....	—	
13.....	—	
20.....	—	
27.....	2	
May—		
4.....	—	
11.....	—	
18.....	—	
25.....	7	
June—		
1.....	—	
8.....	1	
15.....	4	
22.....	3	
29.....	3	
July—		
6.....	3	
13.....	4	
20.....	3	
27.....	3	
August—		
3.....	—	
10.....	4	
BROOKWAY PARK—WEEKLY ABSCONDINGS		
Date	No. of Abscondings	
1974—		
July—		
7.....	4	
14.....	3	
21.....	7	
28.....	5	
August—		
4.....	1	
11.....	—	
18.....	7	
25.....	8	
September—		
1.....	4	
8.....	—	
15.....	3	
22.....	7	
29.....	—	
October—		
6.....	3	
13.....	1	
20.....	2	
27.....	1	
November—		
3.....	5	
10.....	5	
17.....	2	
24.....	5	
December—		
1.....	3	
8.....	—	
15.....	1	
22.....	—	
29.....	—	

BROOKWAY PARK—WEEKLY ABSCONDINGS—continued

Date	No. of Abscondings
1975—	
January—	
5.....	1
12.....	6
19.....	8
26.....	—
February—	
2.....	—
9.....	—
16.....	—
23.....	—
March—	
2.....	—
9.....	5
16.....	1
23.....	2
30.....	2
April—	
6.....	—
13.....	1
20.....	2
27.....	—
May—	
4.....	1
11.....	—
18.....	1
25.....	1
June—	
1.....	1
8.....	—
15.....	2
22.....	2
29.....	3
July—	
6.....	—
13.....	3
20.....	2
27.....	4
August—	
3.....	—
10.....	—

VAUGHAN HOUSE—WEEKLY ABSCONDINGS

Date	No. of Abscondings
1974—	
July—	
7.....	—
14.....	1
21.....	—
28.....	3
August—	
4.....	1
11.....	4
18.....	1
25.....	5
September—	
1.....	2
8.....	1
15.....	—
22.....	1
29.....	3
October—	
6.....	1
13.....	2
20.....	1
27.....	—
November—	
3.....	—
10.....	2
17.....	1
24.....	1
December—	
1.....	2
8.....	2
15.....	—
23.....	1
30.....	—
1975—	
January—	
5.....	5
12.....	—
19.....	—
26.....	—

VAUGHAN HOUSE—WEEKLY ABSCONDINGS—continued

Date	No. of Abscondings
1975—	
February—	
2.....	—
9.....	5
16.....	2
23.....	—
March—	
2.....	1
9.....	2
16.....	—
23.....	—
April—	
2.....	1
9.....	—
16.....	4
23.....	—
30.....	—
May—	
4.....	1
11.....	—
18.....	1
25.....	1
June—	
1.....	1
8.....	—
15.....	—
22.....	—
29.....	—
July—	
6.....	1
13.....	1
20.....	1
27.....	—
August—	
3.....	1
10.....	3

SEAFORTH HOME—ABSCONDINGS FROM JUNE, 1974

Date	No. of Abscondings
1975—	
April—	
16.....	3
23.....	1
May—	
8.....	1
16.....	1

ROSE INN HOTEL

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How much has been paid in licence fees by the proprietors of the Rose Inn Hotel for each of the financial years 1970-1971 to 1973-1974, inclusive?

2. What is the estimated licence fee due for the period from July 1, 1974, to the time the licence was relinquished?

3. What action is being taken to obtain collection of this fee, and if no action is being taken, why not?

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

1. Licence fees paid pursuant to the provisions of the Licensing Act, 1967-1975 are confidential. The rules of Court made under the Act do not authorise the disclosure of percentage fees.

2. No information is available to enable the assessment of a licence fee on the purchases of the Rose Inn Hotel for the period from July 1, 1974. If this information were available it would be treated as confidential.

3. Officers of the South Australian Government departments concerned are examining the present method of assessment of liquor licence fees.

SEWERAGE CHARGES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. What increases in water and sewerage charges have occurred in South Australia since May 30, 1970?

2. From what dates were these increases operative and what were the water and sewerage charges then levied?

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

1. and 2. As per attached schedule. The increases were operative from July 1 of each year.

VARIATIONS IN WATER AND SEWERAGE RATES						
	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
Water Rates— Metropolitan Town- ships	7.5% up to \$2 000 A.V. 5% over \$2 000 A.V.	7.5% up to \$2 000 A.V. 5 % over \$2 000 A.V.	} 7.5% of A.V.	7.5% of A.V.		
Country Townships— General	9.5 % up to \$2 000 A.V. 5% over \$2 000 A.V.	9.5% up to \$2 000 A.V. 5% over \$2 000 A.V.	9.5% up to \$2 000 A.V. 7.5% over \$2 000 A.V.		} 7.5% of A.V.	*51% to 10.7% of A.V.
Special	12% up to \$2 000 A.V. 5 % over \$2 000 A.V.	12% up to \$2 000 A.V. 5% over \$2 000 A.V.	12% up to \$2 000 A.V. 7.5% over \$2 000 A.V.	} 9.5% of A.V.		
Country Lands— General	85c to 37c per acre	8.5c to 37c per acre	8.5c to 37c per acre	20c to 90c per hectare	20c to 90c per hectare	25c per hectare
Special	10.5c to 57c per acre					
Minimum	Calculated on Unimproved Value \$12	Calculated on Unimproved Value \$12	Calculated on Unimproved Value \$16	Calculated on Unimproved Value \$16	Calculated on Unimproved Value \$16	On all Land \$20
Sewer Rates— Metropolitan— General	6.75% of A.V.	6.75% of A.V.	6.75 % of A.V.	6.75% of A.V.	} 6.75% of A.V.	*4.8% to 9.9% of A.V.
Special	7.5% to 10% of A.V.	7.5% to 10% of A.V.	7.5% to 10% of A.V.	7.5% to 10% of A.V.		
Country	10% of A.V.	10% of A.V.	10% of A.V.	10% of A.V.	9% of A.V.	5.5% to 11.4% of A.V.
Minimum	\$12	\$12	\$16	\$16	\$16	\$20
Water— Rebate	7.7c/kl	8.8c/kl	} 8.8c/kl	10c/kl	11/kl	14c/kl
Excess	7.7c/kl	7.7c/kl				
	Scales unchanged from 1969-70					*Rates Equalisation

STAMP DUTY

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): What increases in stamp duties on new registrations and transfer of registration of motor vehicles have occurred in South Australia since May 30, 1970?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Prior to December 1, 1971, the rate of stamp duty according to value of a vehicle levied upon new registration or transfer of registration was \$1 for each \$100 or part thereof of the value, with a minimum duty of \$4. This applied to all vehicles except trailers, which do not attract stamp duty. Rates have been increased on two occasions to the following:—

As from December 1, 1971: Vehicles other than commercial vehicles and primary producers' tractors—

- (a) Value up to \$1 000—\$1 for each \$100 or part thereof (no change).
- (b) Value from \$1 001 to \$2 000—\$10 plus \$2 for each \$100 or part thereof over \$1 000.
- (c) Value over \$2 000—\$30 plus \$2.50 for each \$100 or part thereof over \$2 000.

Commercial vehicles and primary producers' tractors— as above except that the rate for value over \$2 000 is \$30 plus \$2 for each \$100 or part thereof over \$2 000. Minimum stamp duty—\$4 (no change).

As from January 2, 1975: Vehicles other than commercial vehicles and primary producers' tractors—

- (a) Value up to \$1 000—\$1 for each \$100 or part thereof (no change).
- (b) Value from \$1 001 to \$2 000—\$10 plus \$2 for each \$100 or part thereof over \$1 000 (no change).
- (c) Value from \$2 001 to \$3 000—\$30 plus \$3 for each \$100 or part thereof over \$2 000.
- (d) Value over \$3 000—\$60 plus \$4 for each \$100 or part thereof over \$3 000.

Commercial vehicles and primary producers' tractors— as above, except that the rate for value over \$3 000 is \$60 plus \$3 for each \$100 or part thereof over \$3 000. Minimum stamp duty—\$5.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. What increases have occurred in stamp duties on property transactions, including conveyancing of land titles and stamp duties on registration of mortgages, since May 30, 1970?

2. When did these increases take place and what was the magnitude of the increase on each occasion?

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

1. and 2. Details of the rates of Stamp Duty on property transactions as varied since May 30, 1970, are contained in Acts numbered 71 of 1971 and 90 of 1974, which came into operation on December 1, 1971, and December 16, 1974, respectively as regards those rates.

Conveyances: The following schedule sets out the minimum and maximum rates of stamp duty in respect of conveyances of land titles by sale or gift which have operated since May 30, 1970.

Prior to December 1, 1971	From December 1, 1971	From December 16, 1974
<i>Minimum</i>		
1.25 per cent up to value of \$12 000	1.25 per cent up to value of \$12 000	1.25 per cent up to value of \$12 000
<i>Maximum</i>		
1.50 per cent for value in excess of \$15 000	3.00 per cent for value in excess of \$100 000	4.00 per cent for value in excess of \$100 000

Mortgages: The following schedule sets out the rates of stamp duty payable on mortgage documents since May 30, 1970.

Prior to December 1, 1971	From December 1, 1971 (current rates)
For every \$200 or fractional part of \$200 of the sum secured—50c duty.	For every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 of the sum secured up to \$10 000—duty 25c. For sums secured in excess of \$10 000, duty of \$25 plus 35c for every \$100 or part thereof in excess of \$10 000.

ELECTRICITY TRUST

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: (on notice):

1. In what year did the Government announce the levy to be imposed on the profits of the Electricity Trust of South Australia?

2. How much revenue has been made available to the Government from the trust in each year since that announcement?

3. Has the percentage levy been increased since it was imposed?

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

1. The Electricity Trust of South Australia Act Amendment Act, 1971, required the trust to pay 3 per cent of its revenues from the sale of electricity to the Treasurer; the first payment being made on June 30, 1971.

Financial Year	Revenue \$
1970-71	468 007
1971-72	2 080 629
1972-73	2 241 906
1973-74	3 755 107
1974-75	4 862 854

3. An amendment to the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act in 1973 increased the levy from 3 per cent to 5 per cent.

TEACHERS' ACCOUCHEMENT LEAVE

Mr. NANKIVELL (on notice):

1. How many teachers have commenced accouchement leave during the first six months of 1975?

2. How many of these teachers were primary teachers and high school teachers, respectively?

3. How many of these teachers have been replaced by temporary teachers appointed for a period of less than six months?

4. What action, if any, is being taken to ensure that the students concerned are not disadvantaged as a result of such accouchement leave being taken?

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

1. 215.
2. 144 primary—71 secondary.
3. Nil.
4. In the first six months of 1975, all replacements of teachers on accouchement leave have been on a permanent basis by teachers with similar teaching qualifications and skills.

TERTIARY EDUCATION

Mr. NANKIVELL (on notice):

1. Was the South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research established to rationalise tertiary education in this State, and if so, what matters concerning tertiary institutions have been referred to the council?

2. On what dates were these referrals made and on what dates did the council report on these matters?

3. What action, if any, has the Minister taken to prevent wasteful duplication of courses in the seven new colleges of advanced education?

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

1. The South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research was established to promote the development, rationalisation and co-ordination of educational services. It has no mandatory directive or executive powers in these areas. See reply No. 2 for answer to second part of this question.

2. "The future of public examinations" and "the teaching of foreign languages" was referred to an interim committee on August 22, 1973, and August 28, 1973, respectively. The council met for the first time as a statutory body on July 28, 1975. On August 4, 1975, I requested advice regarding the findings of the council on these matters but no reports have yet been received.

3. The prevention of wasteful duplication of courses for the eight colleges of advanced education in South Australia is one of the functions of the Board of Advanced Education. The board has acted continuously in the rationalisation of new courses in the colleges since its formation. The board makes recommendations to the Minister in the allocation of courses and the resources required to conduct them, and in every case the Minister has endorsed the recommendations made.

FURTHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Mr. NANKIVELL (on notice):

1. Is the Further Education Department seeking approval to plan and offer courses at the tertiary level leading to the awarding of diplomas or associate diplomas?

2. What would be the implication so far as the teaching staff of the Further Education Department if such approval was given?

3. If such courses were to be introduced would the Further Education Department have the resources to offer these courses?

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

1. The Further Education Department is seeking accreditation and therefore approval to offer accredited courses at the associate diploma level. There has been no effort at this stage to offer a course at the accredited diploma level but courses in music already in operation appear to be at that level. Any submission for such courses will have to satisfy the Board of Advanced Education requirements for assessment and will have to be in accordance with the board's responsibilities in regard to rationalisation of tertiary courses.

2. At this stage there are no great implications for the teaching staff of the Further Education Department if accreditation is given.

3. The Further Education Department has the resources to offer the courses for which it is applying for accreditation.

RURAL LAND TAX

Mr. RUSSACK (on notice): What are the anticipated receipts for rural land tax for the 1975-76 financial year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Estimated receipts for rural land tax for 1975-76 are \$1 250 000. This figure does not include receipts in respect of land used for primary production within the metropolitan planning area. Because of a recent amendment to the definition of land used for primary production which has application within that area, it is not possible to supply a reliable estimate for the area at this stage.

RADIATA PINE

Dr. EASTICK (on notice): Over the period from July 1, 1971, to June 30, 1975, what has been the percentage increase in the average selling price from Woods and Forests Department mills of radiata pine and in particular for the following radiata pine products:

- (a) head and tail for use in flush panel doors; and
- (b) core for the manufacture of slide doors?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Over the period July 1, 1971, to June 30, 1975, the increase in the selling price of general sawn and dressed radiata pine has been 62 per cent. For the specific products referred to in the question, the following increases occurred during the same period:

- (a) head and tail for use in flush panel doors—110 per cent, current price—\$156.23 per m³.
- (b) core for the manufacture of slide doors—130 per cent—current price—\$100.60 per m³.

The reason for the apparently high percentage increase in the price of these products is that for many years the Woods and Forests Department made available this timber to the company concerned at a price incompatible with the value of the wood. The prices have now been rationalised to a level commensurate with the quality and work content of the product and compare very favourably with those applicable to other components of a similar nature.

SAMCOR

Mr. BLACKER (on notice):

1. Who are the members of the Samcor board and has there been a change in membership since the inception of the board?

2. What is the remuneration of members of the board?

3. Has their remuneration changed since inception and, if so, when and by what amount?

4. How many employees are engaged by Samcor and what is the productive output in terms of kilograms of meat per man per day?

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

1. The members of Samcor are Messrs. I. B. Gray, Chairman; R. G. Atkinson, G. J. Inns, M. A. Kinnaird, K. P. Lynch, LL.B., C. O'Connor. There have been no changes in membership since the initial appointment of the Samcor board.

2. The Chairman receives a remuneration of \$4 750 per annum and members each receive \$3 000 per annum. Whilst the new works are under construction one board member, Mr. M. A. Kinnaird, as Chairman of the Works Committee, receives an additional amount of \$1 000 per annum.

3. The Chairman's salary was increased from \$4 000 to \$4 750 per annum from January 1, 1974. With the exception of the extra payment to the Works Committee Chairman, which was also operative from January 1, 1974, the remuneration payable to members has not altered since the Board was appointed.

4. 1 340; 208 kilograms of meat a man a day.

STUDENT TRAVEL CONCESSIONS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What are the reasons for the delay in implementing travel concessions for all secondary students using public transport?

2. Is it still the Government's intention to grant such concessions, and if so, when?

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

1. There is no delay.

2. The scheme has been operating since July 1, 1975.

ROBBERIES

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. How many cases of robbery with violence were reported in South Australia during 1974-75, for the last 12 monthly period for which figures are available?

2. How does this figure compare with the number of cases of robbery with violence reported for each of the past five years?

3. In how many of the reported cases of robbery with violence during 1974-75 were the persons concerned either previous inhabitants of the McNally Training Centre or absconders from this centre?

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

1. For the period July 1, 1974, to June 30, 1975, the cases of robbery involving violence reported were 279.

2. Similar figures for the past five years are as follows:

1973-74	256
1972-73	184
1971-72	184
1970-71	146
1969-70	120

3. The information required is not classified and it will take approximately one week to research the answer, which will be supplied at that time.

HOUSING TRUST FACTORIES

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. How many factories are currently owned by the South Australian Housing Trust for rental to industrial clients?

2. What was the approximate estimated value of these factory buildings at June 30, 1975.

3. What industrial projects were completed or were still under construction during 1974-75, and what is the value of the work involved?

4. What was the total revenue collected from the rental of industrial properties during 1974-75?

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

1. The South Australian Housing Trust presently owns 46 factories.

2. The trust does not presently maintain a record of the contemporary market value of these factory buildings. It is estimated that at June 30, 1975, the cost of factory buildings was \$20 964 000.

3. The following factories and extensions were under construction and were completed during the 1974-75 year at an estimated cost of \$12 795 000.

Completed during 1974-75:

Australian Rennet Manufacturing Co. Pty. Ltd.

Ceramic Tile Makers Ltd.

Chloride Australia Ltd.

Raymond Industries Pty. Ltd.

Menzel Industries Pty. Ltd. (Vinidex)

Rainsfords Metal Products Pty. Ltd.

O'Neill Wet Suits (Aust.) Pty. Ltd.

F. J. Trousers (Mt. Gambier) Pty. Ltd., Stage III

Iplex Plastic Industries Pty. Ltd., Extension III

S.A. Battery Makers Pty. Ltd.—Extensions

Cable Makers Aust. Pty. Ltd.—Block Store.

Fasson Pty. Ltd.—Stage I of extension I

Under Construction:

Bonaire Industries Pty. Ltd.

Cable Makers Aust. (S.A.) Pty. Ltd.—extensions

Dalgety Wine Estates Pty. Ltd.

Omark Australia Ltd.

Christensen Diamond Products Aust. Pty. Ltd.

S.A. Fishermen's Co-op. Ltd.

Atco Structures Pty. Ltd.,

Country Homes Division

Atco Industrial Division (Extension 2)

Schrader-Scovill Co. Pty. Ltd.

4. The total revenue collected from the rental of the industrial properties during the 1974-75 year was \$1 027 704.

PARADE INTERSECTION

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Since the new "give way to all traffic" rule was introduced for "stop" signs, how many accidents have been reported at the intersection of The Parade and Glynburn Road?

2. How many persons have been seriously injured and have any deaths occurred as a result of those accidents?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Accidents involving death are reported to the Highways Department immediately, but other accident statistics take about three months to process and are only readily available to May 2, 1975. The replies are as follows:

1. Five for the period March 1, 1975, to May 2, 1975.

2. None in the five mentioned in No. 1 above, and no deaths have been reported since May 2, 1975.

CONTAINER TERMINAL

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): Does the Government propose to build an international container terminal at Outer Harbor, and if so—

(a) what will be the anticipated cost;

(b) what is the anticipated date of completion;

(c) where will the Government obtain the necessary finance; and

(d) what ancillary facilities and railway links will also be constructed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government is building a cellular container ship berth at Outer Harbor, and work started in February, 1973.

(a) \$7 000 000.

(b) April, 1976.

(c) Loan funds.

(d) (i) Broad gauge rail connection.

(ii) One 45-tonne container crane.

(iii) Administrative block, amenities, fencing, plug points for reefer containers and car park.

(iv) Storage area for 1 000 containers.

ELECTORAL ACT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What amendments to the Electoral Act, if any, is it proposed to introduce during the present session and how soon will such amendments be introduced?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As stated in the Governor's Speech, it is intended to introduce amendments to the Electoral Act to provide for optional preference voting at House of Assembly elections.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT FOR SCHOOLCHILDREN

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):—Why has it not yet been possible to answer my letter of May 12, concerning concessions on public transport for school children?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A reply was posted on August 13, 1975.

LIBERAL MOVEMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it proposed to answer my letter of July 30, 1975, concerning assistance for Parliamentary members of the Liberal Movement and recognition of the Liberal Movement as a separate party and if so, when?

2. Why has no answer yet been made to that letter?

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

1. Yes, when it has been considered with other requests for staff to assist Parliamentary members.
2. See 1.

CONSTITUTION ACT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it still proposed to introduce during this session measures to alter the Constitution Act to provide for electorates for the House of Assembly of equal numerical size and if so, when?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. As soon as the measure can be drafted and debates on financial matters will permit.

RUNDLE STREET SHOPS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What action has been taken against the shop-keepers in eastern Rundle Street who have remained open contrary to the Industrial Code, and what has been the result of such action?

2. What further action, if any, is it proposed to take against such shop-keepers and why?

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

1. Summonses have been served against those shop-keepers who were in breach of the law. Three convictions have been recorded; the remaining charges have been adjourned to a later hearing.

2. Section 222 of the Industrial Code provides that non-exempt shops must close at the closing time on each day, that is 5.30 p.m. Monday to Friday and 12.30 p.m. on a Saturday. Any shop-keeper who occupies a non-exempt shop and commits a breach of Section 222 will be prosecuted. The Government stands firm on its policy of equal trading opportunity for shops and thus will not tolerate small groups of shop-keepers attempting to gain a trading advantage over other shop-keepers.

STAMP DUTIES ACT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it proposed to introduce legislation to remove duty at present payable under the Stamp Duties Act on an instrument of discharge or partial discharge of a mortgage or charge over land or an interest in land, and if so, when?

2. If legislation is not to be introduced why not?

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

1. No.

2. Whilst the Government is granting relief from taxation in some areas, it is not intended to remove this form of stamp duty at present.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mrs. BYRNE (on notice): Did the planning and subsequent building of the Modbury Hospital include a room to be used by the Meals on Wheels service?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No.

SHEEP SLAUGHTERING

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (August 6).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture has informed me that acceptable markets have already been established for all edible meat salvaged from the operation and disposal is being made as follows:

(a) Full carcass of export quality—sold to a meat wholesaler and exporter for export in carcass form.

(b) Full carcass export boners—sold to a meat wholesaler and exporter. These are being boned out and packed at Port Lincoln for export, the exporter paying full boning and packing charges.

(c) Full carcass local boners—sold to a meat wholesaler and exporter. These carcasses are being moved to Adelaide for processing by the operator.

(d) Shop quality carcasses rejected from export—being moved to the department's Light Square butcher shop, or to the meat auction market at Light Square.

(e) Legs—suitable legs are being removed from some carcasses for use by the department's butcher shop.

(f) Edible offals—offals fit for human consumption are being packed for export or the local market.

(g) Rendering—all condemned carcasses and offals are being rendered down for meal and tallow production.

(h) Skins—at the direction of the owner, skins are being dried and marketed, or buried by the department, depending on value. Negotiations are in progress with a skin merchant concerning disposal of poor skins and it is hoped that some better outlet than burying may be found for the producer. To date nearly 100 per cent of all skins removed are pelts only, and are being disposed of as worthless. Of all sheep treated so far, 52 per cent of the carcasses have been salvaged for human consumption on the export or local markets.

MODBURY HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (August 7).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A contract has been let for repairs to the walls at Modbury High School. It is expected that work will commence during the first week in September, and will be completed about 14 weeks from the date of commencement.

BROOKWAY PARK

In reply to Mr. SLATER (August 12).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: On August 14, 1975, there were 39 boys at Brookway Park; 13 of the boys were on remand and for assessment and 26 were under the care and control of the Minister and placed at Brookway Park for training. The boys are in separate units. The security arrangements at Brookway Park are sufficient to cope with the situation following the closing of Windana. Additional security provisions are being provided to further improve the security.

DUKES HIGHWAY

In reply to Mr. NANKIVELL (August 12).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department is aware of the condition of the Dukes Highway and reconstruction will be carried out subject to the availability of funds from the Australian Government. The work is tentatively listed for commencement in 1979. Apart from the funds for routine maintenance, specific provision has been made for the expenditure of \$30 000 in the current financial year for more extensive repair work where and as needed. Provision will continue to be made for maintenance until reconstruction is possible.

FIRST-AID

In reply to Mr. OLSON (August 5).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: While first-aid is not prescribed for secondary schools it does appear in various aspects of the curriculum in many schools. It occurs in the following areas:

1. The safety education section of the health education course in the junior secondary school.

2. Road safety education courses in junior classes mainly.

3. Home economics courses, which extend to year 12 in internal courses.

4. The sports injuries section of Physical Education, where it may reach senior students.

5. As a general experience activity at any level.

St. John's council officers make a considerable contribution to these activities, and Junior Red Cross groups are active in a number of schools. It is considered that the final year is not necessarily the most fruitful year for such courses as many of the skills and understandings required are within reach of younger students. Many schools are seriously concerned to promote courses in first-aid which they do with the full support of the secondary division of the Education Department. I see no reason to intervene personally in what is being done in this area.

WORKING WEEK

Dr. TONKIN: With the severely depressed nature of the private sector in Australia, including South Australia, brought about by the crippling cost increases that have resulted from Government mismanagement of the economy, does the Minister of Labour and Industry still support the Australian Labor Party's policy to introduce a 35-hour working week in South Australia and, if he does, when and what action does he intend taking to promote its introduction?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Australian Labor Party policy is to introduce a 35-hour working week, but we do not yet intend introducing a 35-hour working week in South Australia. Some industries, of course, already enjoy a 37-hour working week. I suggest that the 35-hour working week will be introduced on a national basis rather than on a State basis.

PETROL TAX

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the Treasurer aware that the petrol franchise tax is causing considerable difficulty and hardship? In addition, can he say what are the guidelines being used by the Treasury in remitting some of this tax? I am aware of grave hardship being experienced by petrol station proprietors in my district (and from reports I have received, in other districts) as a result of the impact of this tax. The tax is causing not only hardship but also considerable resentment, because it is levied on past sales. It is a fact of life that petrol and fuel sales occur very much on a seasonal basis and that many people involved in the sale of fuel are paying tax on fuel they are not selling. From inquiries I have made from officers concerning this tax, it seems that Treasury is remitting some of it and that the people who complain loudest and longest are getting more of this tax remitted than are others. As the Treasury's decision to remit part of the tax seems to be arbitrary, I ask whether the Treasurer is aware of the hardship being caused, especially in the case of people who are required to pay tax on fuel they are not currently selling or are likely to sell and what are the guidelines Treasury is using, somewhat arbitrarily, in remitting some of this tax.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am aware of difficulties that arise from changes in the amount of fuel sold by a specific outlet in circumstances where the franchise tax necessarily is fixed as a requirement of the constitution on the turnover for a previous period that is separated by a specific gap in time from the time at which the tax is paid. While the honourable member says that it is paid on a seasonal basis, I point out that it is paid on the turnover of the previous year and the total of the year's sales is taken.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I know that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am aware that there have been some changes between various outlets as to the amount sold, especially as some people have been allowed

by companies to discount petrol and to increase their gallonage, while other people have not been discounting and their gallonage has fallen. This matter is being investigated, and I have asked for regulations to be recommended by the Motor Fuel Distribution Board within the terms of the Act. In addition, an examination is being made by Treasury, and I will get a report for the honourable member on the criteria used by Treasury for the allowance of remissions in cases of hardship. I remind the honourable member that, if in fact the recommendations of the Government to this House had been followed, none of this would be occurring at all.

LOVE METRES

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare obtain a report from the Minister of Health on the use of methylene chloride in a sideshow prize called a "Love Metre" at the Whyalla show over the past weekend? The Minister may have read in the daily newspapers about the incident to which I now refer, but I am concerned that an incident of this nature could have occurred. I would have thought that sideshow participants would have health and legal requirements to fulfill regarding this type of prize-giving. As the incident could have been fatal, I wonder whether some consideration should be given in the report to the idea of strengthening any such future requirements.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I have not read the report referred to, but I understand the honourable member's concern when he refers to the possibility of a fatality, and I will try to obtain the information he desires from my colleague.

TRAIL BIKES

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether the Government intends to provide suitable areas to allow trail bike and sand buggy enthusiasts the opportunity of pursuing their sport? I am prompted to ask this question by a report in the *Sunday Mail*, dated August 17, stating that the Minister and the police seem to be having a difference of opinion regarding the manner in which this activity should be controlled. The report refers to various comments by the Minister going back to 1972, in which the Minister pointed out that there was a problem but that he was not quite sure how it should be handled. As councils have indicated that they would like to see special areas set aside for this activity, I would be interested to hear the Minister's comments on what the Government intends to do to provide suitable areas for this activity.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I assure the honourable member that the Government intends to try to find, for those people who are willing to conduct their activities in a proper way, areas that they will be prepared to use, instead of causing the damage that they are currently causing. The fact that such areas have not been provided is one of the reasons why legislation has not been placed before Parliament imposing stronger penalties in relation to, and placing stricter control over, the existing use of areas where damage is caused. It is only reasonable that, if we intend to impose heavy penalties on people using machines in these areas, we ought to be able to provide them with reasonable areas in which they can enjoy their recreation. We are trying to find suitable areas. However, it is not easy to find areas that these people consider suitable, because the need varies according to the type of machine used. I assure the honourable member that we hope that, when we introduce the legislation, we will be able to say that we intend

to police vigorously the use of these vehicles in areas where damage is being caused but that, at the same time, we are offering reasonable alternative areas to the people concerned.

The honourable member has referred to a press report that suggests that there is a difference of opinion between the police and me on this matter. I never made that suggestion: I think that the writer of the report came to that conclusion. I think it fair to say that the point the writer is attempting to make is that we have discussed this matter with the police, and no complete solution has been found to the problem of catching offenders. People on fast machines who use areas, such as the Coorong or forest reserves, are difficult to apprehend. I made no suggestion that a difference of opinion existed between the police and me; the writer of the report made that assessment on material provided to him.

BATTERED CHILDREN

Mr. ABBOTT: Is the Minister of Community Welfare able to submit a progress report on the three-monthly survey now being conducted in schools with regard to battered children, and can he explain the need for this survey? From an article I have read in the *South Australian Teachers' Journal*, I understand that school principals have been asked to keep a record of all battered children they see in their schools.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In reply to the first question, I am unable to give a progress report now. The advisory committee, which is concerned with this matter and which is chaired by Judge Murray, has an important function in advising me on matters of community welfare generally. The inquiry into battered babies was initiated, I think, by my predecessor in office (Hon. L. J. King). I understand that a committee report is to be submitted to me next November. The honourable member asked about the need for such an inquiry, and I think I can say that there appears to be a need for it. From time to time, officers of the Community Welfare Department are notified that children of varying ages suffer injuries that do not appear to be capable of having been caused accidentally. I am sure that the honourable member would understand that this is a tricky area, as children suffer certain injuries that may appear to have normal causes but could have some other cause. Certain sections in the Community Welfare Act have been included to try to cover this situation by making it possible for medical officers and certain other people at least to make a report, on cases that come before them in which there may be a doubt of the type to which I have referred, either to a police officer (if I remember these provisions correctly) or to an officer of the Community Welfare Department. It is for this reason that such a survey has begun, because occasionally these cases come to light, whereas other cases may not come to light. If the committee served no function other than to obtain statistics that could be used to gauge the extent of this problem in society, that, in itself, would be a worthwhile effort.

SAMCOR CHARGES

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture what positive plans the Government has to reduce the cost now being charged by the South Australian Meat Corporation at the Gepps Cross works? The Minister knows that there has been a continuing escalation of costs over the past 12 months that has been passed on to producers. These costs are greatly affecting the returns producers are receiving. In view of the depressed meat market producers can no

longer afford to be placed in a position in which they cannot transport their stock to the abattoirs. I am aware of the decision of the Minister (which has support) to pay 75c a head for stock processed at Port Lincoln. In view of that decision, I shall be pleased if the Minister can obtain from his colleague any plans the Government has to allow producers, particularly beef producers, to get a reasonable return for stock they wish to sell.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain from my colleague the report the honourable member requests and bring it down as soon as possible.

PARA VISTA SCHOOL

Mr. WELLS: Has the attention of the Minister of Education been drawn to the reports in the *North-East Leader* on August 13 and in yesterday's edition of the *News* in which serious and alarming statements are made about conditions at the Para Vista Primary School, which is in my district? Will the Minister state the true facts of the situation, because I understand that the articles were grossly misleading and completely misrepresented the true position at the school? The report on the front page of the *Leader*, headed "Blocked toilets and poor drainage leads to a crisis at Para Vista Primary School", sets out a series of complaints made by members of the school council. One portion libels me as the member for the district. It is a scurrilous and vicious attack on my ability and character. I have already taken legal proceedings to settle the matter. The article states that, according to Mr. Downs, it took 12 phone calls and more than two gallons of petrol to encourage local member Charlie Wells to take action. I believe my explanation should be permitted to explain the true facts. First, a Mrs. Downs, the wife of a member of the school council, came to my office and complained about the situation prevailing at the school whereby the children had to wade through mud and slush to get into the classrooms. I went with her immediately in her car to survey the situation; within an hour I was in contact with the Minister of Education and the Minister of Works. Within 12 days the matter had been dealt with as far as I was concerned. I have received a letter of appreciation and congratulation from Mrs. Downs, thanking me for the work I had done so promptly and stating that it was good to have a member who championed the cause of children in the area. I take exception to this rag's publication of a libel such as this, but I will take action in another place to settle the matter.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I saw both articles to which the honourable member has referred and, expecting a question from him, I have not come unprepared. I will give the honourable member a full report on this matter, but I believe one or two things should be specifically referred to for the benefit of the House and people outside. The report is mischievous; it is completely misleading; and it has been actuated either by spite or by attempts to obtain some sort of political advantage. The claim that raw sewage overflowed from toilets at the school was made by either a person who was grossly misinformed as to the nature of any sort of liquid or effluent that might be in the vicinity, or by someone who was willing to utter a downright lie. At no time has raw sewage ever overflowed from toilets or run down walls as claimed in the articles. There was a stain on the wall, but this was a water rust stain caused by a leaking cistern and was quickly remedied by the Public Buildings Department. There have been few instances of blocked toilets at the school. It would be most surprising, in view of the traffic that such facilities have to take, if blocked

toilets did not occur from time to time, but there has always been a quick remedy from the Public Buildings Department. Occasionally, it has been necessary to turn off water while plumbing work has been undertaken on the site, but this has never happened at recess or lunch time. Claims of widespread sickness and absenteeism are complete nonsense. The incidence of absenteeism because of illness at this school has not been higher than it has been at any other school during this winter. The school buildings are sound and are not sinking or cracking. There is a dampness problem in the floor of the bottom section of the junior primary school, but consultants of the Public Buildings Department have devised a ventilation plan that will overcome the occasional dampness that occurs.

I think I can give the honourable member one or two other matters in detail, and I am sure that he will see to it that both the school and his constituents are made aware of the situation. I can certainly reassure people outside this House that there is no health problem at this school whatsoever. I make two other points: first, the school council as a formal body has always been proper in going through the correct channels in its negotiating with the Education Department. The information that has been given to the press has certainly not been given through the proper channels of the school council; an individual, or individuals, for whatever reasons, have put this story forward to the newspaper. Secondly, I believe, having read the article, that the honourable member has been grossly maligned. I am well aware of his conscientious service to his constituents and especially to the people associated with the schools in his district. I hope he is willing to take the matter further. If the press of this country wants to avoid establishing a case for the creation of a press council, it had better not carry on in this way.

KINGSTON SCHOOL

Mr. VANDEPEER: Can the Minister of Education assure me that the new schoolrooms to be built at Kingston will be ready for use at the commencement of the new school year? At a public meeting held at Kingston earlier this year to discuss, and agitate for, a new school, the previous Minister of Education promised that the new schoolrooms would be built at the end of this year. I seek confirmation of that promise.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I hope to have all detailed information of that sort available for the Loan Estimates debate. However, pending that I will get a report for the honourable member.

SEAWEED

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister for Environment say whether officers of his department or of the Coast Protection Board have considered the problem (and this has been a problem for some time), of the accumulation of seaweed on Taperoo beach? Mr. Speaker, I think the question is self-explanatory. Heeding your request to keep questions short to allow the maximum number of questions to be asked, I will not seek time to explain further.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The problem of seaweed at Taperoo beach has received much attention from the Coast Protection Board. Unfortunately, the tremendous build-up of seaweed in that area tends to destroy the advantage that people there could enjoy of a large, open beach. For many years, seaweed has tended to drift down to this area from along the coast. As an experiment, two years ago the Coast Protection Board had seaweed removed from a section of the beach to try to determine

how long it would take to build up again, and what sort of effort would thus be required to keep the area continually clean. The result was a return of seaweed within 48 hours; after that period the area that had been cleaned could not be distinguished from the rest of the beach. It therefore appears that an attempt to keep the area clean by bulldozing the build-up of seaweed has little future. However, I assure the honourable member that the Coast Protection Board is anxious to try to develop that section of beach so it can be fully used. It is looking, without the likelihood of any immediate success, at the possibility of the seaweed's being used by a fertiliser plant, or in some other way that would make it economical to shift it. I assure the honourable member the board is examining all possible ways in which seaweed can be removed from that section of beach.

STAMP AND GIFT DUTIES

Mr. CHAPMAN: Can the Premier say whether his pre-election announcement, reported at page 3 of the *Advertiser* of July 9, 1975, regarding relief from State stamp and gift duties on home transfers applies to homes in the rural community? If it does, will that relief extend to the war service land settlement properties, where the home is part of a rural property? The article, which is headed "State duties lifted on house transfers", states:

People transferring their homes to joint names within the next 12 months will not have to pay stamp duty and gift duty on the transfer.

Many financially embarrassing situations have arisen following the death of returned servicemen who were drafted to war service settlement properties following the Second World War. Every effort is being made to seek relief for these people and other primary producers who currently have their backs to the wall. I should appreciate an interpretation of that press statement, so that the situation may be clarified.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have had the Commissioner of Taxes prepare a circular, which will be made available to all members, explaining the nature of the remissions in State stamp and gift duties. The matrimonial home exemption applies to the value of the actual home, and a reasonable yard around it. It would not apply to a large area of primary producing land on which the home was situated. The moratorium on stamp and gift duties in this State will apply for a period of 12 months from July 14. All members will receive a circular which sets out these matters and which is being provided by the Commissioner of Taxes.

PENSIONER BENEFITS

Mr. JENNINGS: Can the Minister of Transport say whether it is a fact that, with the transfer of the State non-metropolitan railway system to the Commonwealth, pensioners will no longer be entitled to the concessions they now enjoy? On Saturday morning a friend of mine, a member of the Kilburn pensioners association, told me that he had read in the *News* on Friday that concessions would cease. I told him that I thought this was highly unlikely but that I would find out the position. I have since found out and, of course, have told him that he was up a wattle completely. I ask the Minister whether he knows how this kind of rumour could have got around.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, I know how the rumour got around, because I read, with horror, the statement attributed to the Liberal member for Hanson, who had written to the Australian Transport Minister (Mr. Jones) seeking pensioner concessions for one country rail journey within South Australia each year. The honourable member

should have known that this Government granted to pensioners one rail trip each year, and, if the honourable member had also read the agreement that was debated by this House on two occasions, in clause 8 (2) he would have found the following words there:

Passenger concessions that exist in respect of the non-metropolitan railways at the date of this agreement shall continue after the declared date so far as they lawfully may do so.

Mr. Becker: You haven't advised the officers in your department?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Therefore, it is obvious that the member for Hanson is doing what so many of his Liberal colleagues have done, namely, stirring up trouble amongst people—

Mr. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO—and frightened them about loss of their concessions.

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

Mr. EVANS: The Minister is debating the issue, and we believe we should cut down explanations. He is using this opportunity for political purposes and is not replying to the question.

The SPEAKER: I must ask the honourable Minister to make his explanation brief.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I certainly will, Mr. Speaker, because I want to scotch once and for all these ill-founded and untrue stories that the member for Hanson and his colleagues are so prone to circulate, because those stories are nothing more than damaging to the population of South Australia. They are completely untrue, and the honourable member ought to have the decency to withdraw the statement.

TORRENS RIVER

Mr. CUMBE: As we are talking about pollution and raking up mud, will the Minister of Works give me information about the quality of water in the Torrens River? I ask the Minister, as a result of recent publicity about the headwaters of the Torrens River, what is the position in that part of the river as it passes through the city and through my district in particular. Has the problem of the leaking sewerage system at Gilberton been solved by the installation of the new pipe system and has the nuisance near the Adelaide Zoo, where run-off was occurring, been dealt with? What is the situation, particularly in summer, when foreign matter in the water is concentrated at the Adelaide weir and the Torrens lake? Is there any danger to swimmers? What action is the Minister's department taking to maintain Torrens River water in the least dangerous condition possible?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member having asked me a series of questions, I think it probably would be better if I got him a detailed report. I think he will appreciate, following the reply I gave to the statement reported in the *Advertiser*, that the findings of the people at the school (I am not sure now which school it was) were, in fact, no cause for alarm, because the things they were talking about, coliforms, have no bearing on the quality of the water so far as its suitability for human use is concerned. If the honourable member read that reply, he would have realised that a slight mistake had been made on their part. It was a good story, but they did not want to upset it by finding out a few facts, and we supplied those on the following day. Regarding sewerage that was entering the Torrens River, I am certain that the new system has been finally completed, but that will cater for that matter when it is completed. The main problem

there was that the system could not cope with storm-water. If we had heavy rain, there was a problem with the overflow, and that has been catered for by the new system. I am not sure what has happened regarding action to counter the problem at the Adelaide Zoo. I will get an accurate report for the honourable member from my officers in the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Of course, the honourable member will appreciate that the entire length of the Torrens River is not the responsibility of the Government: the Adelaide City Council and other bodies are involved, some with beautification and others with other things, but I will get a report for the honourable member.

SCHOOL DENTAL CLINICS

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Education say what efforts the Government is making to provide school dental clinics throughout the State?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As the honourable member was good enough to tell me that he would ask this question, I have information for him. There are 39 static school dental clinics currently operating throughout the State, 27 being in country regions and 12 in metropolitan Adelaide. There are five mobile dental clinics providing treatment for children in the remote parts of the State, two of these being on Eyre Peninsula (Ceduna and Kimba), one in the Far North (Hawker), one in the South-East (Tarpeena), and one in the Murray Mallee (Pinnaroo). On July 30, the Minister of Health stated by public announcement the forward programme, and I will give the House that information briefly. Three-chair school dental clinics will be constructed at Modbury, Para Hills, Salisbury, and Blackwood Primary Schools. School dental clinics of two chairs will be constructed at Port Lincoln South, Ridgehaven, Para Vista, Elizabeth Downs, Elizabeth Park, Elizabeth Vale, Pennington, Ethelton, Belair, and O'Sullivan Beach Primary Schools. The three-chair clinics will be the headquarters in their respective areas for the regional dental officer who will supervise the trained dental therapists in the two-chair clinics. Regarding the overall programme, this is one that we are conducting within the general umbrella of an Australian Government programme, and the objective of that programme is to try to have all the primary and junior primary school-children in the State covered by 1980 and then to extend the programme to secondary school students up to 15 years of age by 1985.

PRISONER'S WEDDING

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask a question of the Premier in both his own capacity and as the Minister representing the Chief Secretary, if he does represent the Chief Secretary, as I think he does. Will the Premier say whether the Government intends to prevent the plans for the wedding next Thursday afternoon of a prisoner at Yatala? During the weekend I was approached by the father of a 19-year-old girl (or 20-year-old) who told me that the girl planned to marry a Yatala prisoner next Thursday afternoon and that the wedding was to take place not at the gaol but at the Registry Office here in town. The father expressed to me the greatest personal opposition to the wedding and gave me the reasons for that opposition. The prisoner is serving a three-year term for a serious offence. I told him that I would inquire about the matter, and yesterday I did so. I spoke to the Chief Secretary late in the afternoon, but only after attempting to get hold of him when he was, I think, in Cabinet. I also spoke to the Director of Correctional Services and to the prison

chaplain. I now know that a full inquiry and investigation of the matter have been made and that a judgment has been reached that the wedding should be allowed to proceed. Subsequently, I spoke to the Chief Secretary and said that, despite this, I believed it was my duty to the man who approached me (who, incidentally, does not live in my district but lives somewhere else) that I should ask the Chief Secretary to review the matter and decide whether this wedding should proceed, because of the bitter opposition expressed by the girl's father. The Chief Secretary promised such a review. I have since seen a report in yesterday's *News* that the man concerned intended to approach the Premier about this matter. That is why I said what I did at the beginning of this question. I know it is extraordinarily difficult for a private citizen ever to see the Premier on a matter of this kind or, for that matter, any matter. It is because of the newspaper report and, indeed, because of what the father said to me that I am putting this question to the Premier. It is, of course, an urgent matter, because the wedding is scheduled for next Thursday afternoon.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was not aware of this matter, so I will get a report from my colleague.

LOAD RESTRICTIONS

Mr. WOTTON: Will the Minister of Transport say why restrictions have been imposed on graingrowers' trucks when they are carting grain to silos in the Strathalbyn area? I understand that no permit will be issued to allow any grower to carry on his truck a load weighing more than 20 per cent above the gross vehicle weight. I have received letters from the Strathalbyn council and the Strathalbyn and district branch of United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated stating their concern about the imposition that has been placed on graingrowers in this district. They point out that grain delivered to Strathalbyn is grown on the plains country east and south of Strathalbyn and that the vehicles used to cart the grain do not create a traffic hazard. The terrain of the area is mostly flat and the roads could be generally described as being adequate to carry the loads allowed to be carried by graingrowers. I believe that an unfair penalty has been placed on growers in this area and that it is rather difficult to see why restrictions have been placed on them. I therefore believe that the restrictions should be lifted.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In accordance with the terms of the legislation controlling this matter, the Road Traffic Board early in the piece granted exemptions to farmers carting their own grain from the farm to the nearest practicable silo.

Mr. Venning: On what basis?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am replying to the member for Heysen. If the member for Rocky River were to keep quiet he, too, might learn something. Exemptions were granted on the basis that growers transporting their own grain could overload by 40 per cent rather than the 20 per cent allowed under the Act. However, some areas were not included in the exemptions. Whether Strathalbyn was exempted I am not aware, but Port Lincoln was certainly not exempted, because of the tremendous road hazard (about which I know the member for Flinders would agree) created by a truck of any description travelling out of control down a hill. Likewise, because of road safety, vehicles were not permitted to come into the metropolitan planning area. Since the exemptions were granted the matter has been under review, and the Road Traffic Board has exempted from the provisions of the

Act, from July 1 for a period of up to three months, the cartage of grain, grapes, wood, and another commodity. I am therefore at a complete loss to understand the logic of the honourable member's question.

ST. AGNES PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education obtain for me a report on whether present planning is to be adhered to regarding the occupation of the new St. Agnes primary school at the beginning of the third school term in 1975? As previously stated, present planning by the department is to occupy the new school at the beginning of the third term and for the school to operate as an annexe to Tea Tree Gully Primary School for the remainder of the year. In the Minister's reply I should like him to point out how children from Hope Valley Primary School (who will eventually transfer to the new school) will fit into the arrangement.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member will have a report as soon as is physically possible.

TRADING HOURS

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether the Government will amend immediately regulations to the Industrial Code to enable new and used car companies to operate outside the restricted trading hours that are to operate in relation to those companies after September 1 this year? In 1972 the definition of "shop" in the Industrial Code was amended to include "yard" and "place". This amendment is to take effect as from September 1 this year. A letter published in yesterday's newspaper outlined much of the difficulty that would be experienced by the companies affected by this amendment. It is interesting to note that reporters from *This Day Tonight* spent all yesterday trying to contact the Minister, who said he was too busy for the entire day to spend even five minutes to discuss this subject with them. This attitude clearly indicates the way the Minister has continually tried to dodge the issue of shopping hours.

The SPEAKER: I call the honourable member to order. He must ask a question and not debate the matter.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is possible for a person to buy a shirt, a suit, or groceries in a short time, say, 10 minutes or 20 minutes during the lunch hour. However, it is not possible to buy a new or used motor vehicle in half an hour after work. It is in the interests of consumer protection and safety, which the Premier continually claims he supports, that the trading hours affecting these people should be extended and the Industrial Code should be amended.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The simple reply to the honourable member's question would be "No". However, for the benefit of the honourable member, I will tell him some of the history of the early closing provisions of the Industrial Code.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Is this a Dorothy Dixer?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: One would think so. Evidently, I can anticipate what the member for Davenport is likely to do.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Before dealing with the early closing provisions of the Industrial Code, I think I should answer the honourable member's accusation that I refused to go on television or discuss the matter with the media. I have appeared three times on television regarding the early closing provisions of the Industrial Code.

I think that is sufficient to explain the Government's attitude in this regard. I will be fair about this, and if I have not reached the member for Davenport I will try to explain it to him once more. The Early Closing Act, 1926-1960, was the original Act controlling the trading hours of shops in this State. The definition of "shop" in that Act included "premises" and, by virtue of that provision, controlled the trading hours of any retail businesses not conducted from a building, etc., as such. This meant that used car businesses were required to observe the normal closing times of all other non-exempt shops.

On December 3, 1970, an amendment to the Industrial Code repealed the Early Closing Act and brought the shop trading hours provisions of that Act under Part XV of the Industrial Code. The definition of "shop" in the amending Act stated, *inter alia*:

"shop" means a whole or any portion of a building, structure, stall, tent, vehicle, platform, ship, or boat in which goods are offered or exposed for sale by retail . . ."

In the case of early inspections under the new Act, it became obvious that many car yards and similar businesses had only a small office on their block and all cars were on open "lot" display within a fenced area. A Crown Law opinion was sought, and that opinion confirmed that those premises were not a shop within the meaning of the Act, as they did not offer or expose goods for sale by retail, other than cars in the yard.

It further became apparent that an anomalous (or inequitable) position pertained in the motor vehicle retail industry in that, dependent entirely on whether or not the car retailer had a building or structure on his premises, the Act could be invoked to enforce the observance of the trading hours prescribed in the Code.

It was recommended, therefore, that at an opportune time the definition of shop be broadened to include either the word "premises" or an equally suitable description. Subsequently, the Industrial Code Amendment Act of 1972 (assented to on November 30 of that year and coming into operation on September 1 this year) amended the definition of "shop" by including the word "yard", thus correcting the anomalous situation that had existed since the 1970 Act. The new amendment removes the discriminatory provisions of the Act that forced a car dealer operating from a building or structure to close his business at normal times, whilst other competitors trading from an open yard were not bound to observe those provisions. One of my most competent officers has investigated this matter and has reported further to me on it. The member for Davenport should listen to my comments, because they are interesting, and they will do him good and show—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has the floor.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: This report will show the member for Davenport what sort of role *This Day Tonight* is playing in the shopping hours question. My officer's report states:

I advise that a resume of the above facts was provided by me by telephone to a reporter of *This Day Tonight* on Monday, August 18, 1975, for what I was told would be included in the programme that evening. Although I was not at home to see the programme, I have been advised that the statement from this office was not included in the programme.

PACKAGING

Mr. DUNCAN: Is the Minister for the Environment aware that the Australian Conservation Foundation's new publication *The Packaging Plague* states that the average

Australian family is paying \$700 a year for packaging that is largely unnecessary? What action does the Government intend to take to limit this wasteful and unnecessary practice, which is prevalent in the packaging of goods? It is well known that in some cases the cost of packaging products is more than the cost of the product. It is a great waste and one which the community, especially in present circumstances, can little afford.

Mr. Gunn: Whose fault is that? It's the fault of Gough Whitlam.

Mr. DUNCAN: It is the fault, of course, of the packaging industry. Consumers do not want most of the packaging that is foisted and forced on them when they purchase goods, so I ask the Minister what action can be taken to limit the amount of packaging that we, as consumers, are forced to buy when we purchase goods.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I think the assessment made by the honourable member of what it costs the community was probably accurate and something that ought to concern all of us. This situation is borne out when we consider the recently reported figures on the additional costs that people pay for a shirt that is packaged and covered in all sorts of things (a cardboard box and cellophane and the like), compared to the price of the same shirt being sold loose on the counter of a shop: the additional cost is incredible. Legislation to control the wasteful use of resources in relation to non-returnable containers will be introduced into Parliament soon. In addition, State Ministers for the Environment expressed concern about this question at a meeting held about two weeks ago in Perth. A suggestion was made that a tax should be placed on people who manufacture goods and package them in a way that could be considered wasteful. The Minister who made this suggestion properly argued that the wasteful packaging not only cost the community more but also created litter problems and extra garbage disposal costs that the community has to face generally. However, it was considered that this type of tax would not solve the problem. It would simply be passed on to the consumer and would provide no discouragement to the producers of excess packaging to reduce their activities. It is necessary to have a uniform approach by all States in this matter, as this is something that is difficult for one State to deal with alone, because of the complications of interstate trading. The Ministers decided to set up a subcommittee of the Ministers for the Environment with the object of making a recommendation to all States that hopefully might improve the situation.

COUNCIL GRANTS

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the proposed road grants allocation to councils for 1975-76 of \$4 100 000 is the maximum that can be expected by councils during the present financial year? Can councils expect a further allocation in view of the more recent information from the Australian Minister for Transport (Hon. C. K. Jones)? In a reply to a question during the previous Parliament, in a letter dated July 15 the Minister stated:

The proposed allocation to councils for the 1975-76 financial year totals \$4 100 000.

A copy of the news release from the Australian Minister states that South Australia's allocation from the roads grant Act this year is \$4 500 000, so there seems to be a discrepancy of some \$400 000. In addition, the Australian Government has assumed the responsibility of the national roads and, therefore, it is suggested by the Minister that South Australia will save some \$12 000 000. The press release of Mr. Jones states:

"I would expect the State Government to allocate an amount equal to this saving towards roads which are primarily the concern of State Governments and local government," Mr. Jones said. "These include rural arterial and local roads and urban arterial and local roads. I hope that a fair proportion of that money will be made available to councils for rural local roads."

Can the Minister say what proportion of this \$12 000 000 will be allocated to local government?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not familiar with the press release from which the honourable member has quoted but, obviously, he has misquoted or has quoted only in part. I should like to think that we had \$12 000 000 to allocate.

Mr. Russack: I'll let you have a copy of it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I should be grateful if the honourable member would do so because I would then be able to read the release in full and get the full purport of it. The point the honourable member has obviously ignored is that this is a recent press statement—

Mr. Russack: It's dated July 31.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Then, I imagine that the release is simply about the approval of the expenditure in accordance with the legislation that has previously been passed by the Australian Parliament. In accordance with the terms of that legislation, it is necessary for the States to submit the projects to the Australian Minister and, in the case of projects other than urban arterial roads, to gain his approval and, in the case of urban arterial roads, also to gain the necessary approval of the Minister for Urban and Regional Development. Unfortunately, what has occurred in the way in which the reports have been written up from time to time is that, when the various steps had been taken, one could be excused for believing that the \$4000 000, which was announced when each of the three or four steps had been taken, had been approved three or four times and the initial legislation carried. Therefore, one could be excused for thinking the sum was three or four times the \$4 000 000 (or whatever the sum is) when, in fact, it has been the same sum, which has been going through the processes as required by the present legislation.

At 3.7 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the introduction forthwith and the passage through all stages of a Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972, as amended.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972, as amended. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Mr. Dean Brown: No.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister must read the explanation.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: This Bill, which is in the same form as a measure which passed the House of Assembly in the latter stages of the last Parliament and which lapsed, owing to the dissolution of Parliament, has two objects: (a) to deal, in the industrial sense, with matters arising out of the report of the Select Committee of the House of Assembly on the Sex Discrimination Bill; and (b) to facilitate the operation of the principles of "wage indexation" as enunciated by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in its recent judgment. Accordingly, it endeavours to ensure that as far as possible there can be no discrimination in conditions of employment as between the sexes, to the extent that those conditions of employment are determined by the Industrial Court or Commission in this State.

In 1973, the Government indicated to the Commonwealth Government that it favoured the ratification by Australia of International Labor Convention No. 100 regarding equal pay for the sexes. Following discussions between State and Federal officials and between officers of the Australian Government and the International Labor Office, it was recognised that ratification of that convention would necessitate a change in the present practice of determining different living wages for males and females. At that time the Government indicated it would at the first opportunity amend the present provisions in the principal Act empowering the Industrial Commission to determine different living wages for males and females.

It would have been possible to achieve one of the objects of the measure by repealing only the references to the female living wage. However, following representations from the major organisations representing employers and employees, the Government has decided to abandon the living wage concept. Provision was made in the Industrial Code, in 1967, requiring the Industrial Commission to award equal pay for males and females in certain circumstances. This provision was re-enacted as section 78 of the principal Act and, as a result, equal pay has now been introduced in many awards and for many occupations. In accordance with the principles contained in the 1967 legislation, the introduction of equal pay has been phased-in over a period of some years.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am having difficulty in hearing the Minister's explanation because of a discussion the Deputy Premier is having. If the Deputy Premier wishes to carry on a discussion in the House, he should show the Minister the courtesy of allowing him to be heard.

The SPEAKER: Generally speaking, conversations are becoming audible, and I ask all honourable members to tone down their private conversations. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Last year, the Industrial Court decided that the present provisions in the legislation prevented the Industrial Commission from determining wages for females in occupations in which males are not employed, such as typistes or switchboard operators, on the same basis as females in those occupations in which persons of both sexes are employed. The Government considers that there is no longer any necessity for Parliament to lay down strict guidelines that must be observed by the Industrial Commission in determining equal pay. Equal pay has been introduced in Commonwealth awards, without the benefit of legislative guidelines, by the Full Commission determining principles which are followed by the various members of that commission. It is believed that the same procedure can now be adopted in the State Industrial Commission. The repeal of the living wage

and equal pay sections of the Act does not mean that the Government considers "equal pay" should be implemented overnight: rather, the intention is that the Industrial Commission should have the power to make a decision having regard to the circumstances of each particular case.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 3 of the principal Act and makes an amendment consequential on amendments made later in the Bill. Clause 3 touches on section 6 of the principal Act and amends the definition of "industrial matter" by removing from that definition references to questions arising over the sex of the employees and also strikes out the definition of "living wage". Clause 4 repeals section 31 of the principal Act, this being a section relating to the "living wage", references to which are proposed to be repealed. This section enjoined the commission not to fix wages that did not secure the payment of the living wage. As it is intended that there should no longer be a separate living wage, this provision is redundant. Clause 5 makes a formal consequential amendment to a heading in the principal Act.

Clause 6 repeals section 35 of the principal Act which provides for the determination of living wages and also enacts a new section in its place. The reason for the repeal of the provision relating to living wages is two-fold: (a) first, that it will enable proposed quarterly cost of living adjustments to wages by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission to "flow on" to employees under State awards. So long as the living wage existed as part of the State wage-fixing machinery any such "flow on" could only be accomplished by periodic adjustments of the living wage. However, by subsection (5) of the section proposed to be repealed new determinations of the living wage could only occur at not less than six monthly intervals; (b) secondly, since the living wage is related to the sex of the employee all references to the living wage should be removed.

It is, however, necessary to enact a new section 35 to deal with the situation during the period between the coming into operation of this measure and the time when all awards can be varied to prescribe rates as total wages. Most awards now provide a total wage rate although about half of them also include the margin above the living wage. However, there is a small number of awards and industrial agreements that, at present, only provide for margins above the living wage for the time being in force. It is necessary, therefore, for the time being for the purpose of those awards and agreements to preserve a figure equal to the present living wage.

Clause 7 amends section 36 of the principal Act by striking out from that section reference to the living wage. Clause 8 repeals section 37, which provides for the declaration of a living wage, section 38, which provides for wages to be generally varied in accordance with variations in the living wage, and section 39, which requires the Industrial Registrar to republish all awards in the *Gazette* after any alteration has been made in the living wage or in awards generally. The removal of the requirement concerning republication of awards following living wage variation is consequential upon other provisions of this Bill. At the same time, it has been decided to delete the whole section because it will be physically impossible to republish in the *Gazette* every award if wage indexation is introduced and awards have to be varied quarterly. Administrative arrangements will be made for the reprinting of the wages clauses of the major awards in such an event, but it would be wasteful and unnecessary to republish the whole of every award every quarter.

Clause 9 amends section 69 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (2) which contains a reference to the "living wage" now proposed to be eliminated. Clause 10 repeals section 78 of the principal Act which provided for the fixing of equal pay as between adult male employees and adult female employees performing work of the same or like manner and equal value. Since to some extent this section inhibited the commission in its endeavours to give effect to the "equal pay" provisions its repeal seems desirable.

Mr. COUNBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

Later:

Mr. COUNBE (Torrens): I support this Bill, and certainly do not intend to make as long a speech on it tonight as I did early in June when I canvassed this important question fully. I wish tonight to make one or two cogent points. I realise the Government's desire to pass this Bill fairly urgently because of its indexation provision, enabling it to operate in the State sphere if a similar provision is to operate in the Commonwealth sphere.

The Bill has two principal objects, the first of which is equal pay, which is tied up with the report of the Select Committee on Sex Discrimination. I pay a tribute to the new Leader of the Opposition (Dr. Tonkin) for the work he did in that respect. The Party of which I am a member has always supported the principle of equal pay and believed that it should be introduced in stages. Let there be no doubt, therefore, in anyone's mind regarding that matter and where we stand on it. The second object relates to wage indexation. It was indeed a historic decision that was handed down by His Honour Mr. Justice Moore in the Commonwealth court, when he laid down the principles to be observed in wage indexation. If it were to work in the Commonwealth sphere, as I believe it could and should, we should have the same facility in our Industrial Court. However, we are prevented from operating on the quarterly basis, as suggested by Mr. Justice Moore, because our Act provides that the living wage, reference to which is now to be deleted, cannot be altered until a period of six months has elapsed. This Bill seeks to remove that six-month waiting period. I am therefore saying that, if it is good enough to operate in the Commonwealth sphere, we in South Australia should not be disadvantaged in any way.

I have in the past canvassed Industrial Labor Organisation determinations, and I have had much to say about the living wage and the total wage. I do not wish to canvass those matters this evening. The Government has decided to abandon the concept of the living wage (which we in South Australia have known for so many years and which had to be adjusted when there was an appropriate Commonwealth determination) to keep our own State awards in line with the Commonwealth.

Having examined the Bill, I point out that it is the same as the Bill that left this House early in June but not the same as when it was introduced. I am pleased to see that the Government has accepted my suggested amendment in this Bill. So, this Bill is the same as it left this House, without any opposition, at that time. It is important to reiterate one or two principles. I have already stated that I support the passage of this Bill. In his second reading explanation of the Bill, the Minister said:

The Government considers there is no longer any necessity for Parliament itself to set down strict guidelines which must be observed by the Industrial Commission of South Australia in determining equal pay. Equal pay has been introduced into Commonwealth awards without the benefit of legislative guidelines by the Full

Commission itself determining principles which are followed by the various members of that commission. It is felt that the same procedure can now be adopted by the State Industrial Commission.

The Minister continued:

The repeal of the living wage and equal pay sections of the Act does not mean that the Government considers equal pay should be implemented overnight—

I agree with him; he might strike some bother there—

but rather that the intention is that the Industrial Commission itself should have the power to make certain decisions regarding the circumstances of each particular case.

I believe this is terribly important because, when I was speaking on this matter previously, I cited the case which was conducted by the member for Playford in his private capacity as an industrial lawyer and which was regarded as a hallmark and test case. In that case there was no classification for a female equivalent to a male occupation. However, the Minister is now suggesting (and I think there is some merit in this suggestion) that the court itself will determine a case on its merits and set down the guidelines, instead of Parliament's doing so.

The other point I wish to make is that, as I understand the legislation, where previously in equal pay hearings the Full Commission had to consider the matter, it will now be the province of a single commissioner to do so, as is the case in the Commonwealth jurisdiction. A single commissioner will therefore be able to hear a case for equal pay. I hope that by altering this system we obtain uniformity and that one award will not be out of kilter with another. That was the advantage before of having the Full Commission hearing these applications. However, there is now a saving grace in section 101, which is the appeal section. An appellant, be it a union or an employer, will now have the right to have the Full Commission review the case; or the commissioner himself, on his own motion, can refer the matter to the Full Commission. That provision is indeed important.

When I dealt with this matter previously I referred the Minister to the historic handing down of guidelines by His Honour Mr. Justice Moore, and particularly to the eight points which he made and which should be observed if indexation is to work in the Commonwealth sphere. On June 18 (page 3466 of *Hansard*) I asked the Minister whether the eight points would be observed by his Government or by the court, in reply to which he said:

I want to make the position clear that I am not accepting, nor is the Government accepting, all of the eight points for wage indexation. The Government has not made a policy decision on this matter, and it will not do so until the Premier returns from the Premiers' Conference.

That conference was over and done with long ago. I should therefore like the Minister to say when he replies how much he agrees with Mr. Justice Moore on those points and whether he has considered them.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: No, I have not.

Mr. CUMBE: The only other thing I have to say relates to something the Minister said in his second reading explanation. He stated:

It is necessary to enact that new section to deal with the situation during the period between the coming into operation of this particular measure and the time when all awards can be varied to prescribe rates as total wages. Most awards now provide a total wage rate although about half of them also include the margin above the living wage; but there is, of course, a small number of awards and industrial agreements that at present only provide for margins above the living wage for the time being in force. It is necessary, therefore, for the time being for the purpose of those awards and agreements to preserve a figure equal to the present living wage.

Of course, while I was arguing the bit about total wages, the Minister has set out in clause 6 that the living wage shall be, in the case of adult males, a wage of \$48.20 a week and, in the case of adult females, a wage of \$38.60 a week.

That seems a strange figure, but I believe I understand the reason for it. However, that is all I wish to say for present, because I believe this matter was fully debated previously in this House and no opposition was expressed to it, except that I raised several points, which were subsequently cleared up. As this matter must be dispatched smartly for the court to work on the indexation side of it, I wish it a speedy passage through the House.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I rise to speak briefly on this matter. I refer people who wish to look at this Bill at great length to the previous speech of the member for Torrens in this House, which was a thorough address to the purposes of this Bill. It covered all the possible implications. I add that his coverage of the Bill was so thorough that he picked up one loophole in it that the Government had missed, and the Government has now accepted that amendment.

The member for Torrens has referred to three specific points of this Bill—the abolition of the living wage, the adoption of the total wage, and sex discrimination. On that, I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on the excellent work he has done in this field. He has pioneered in South Australia (in fact, throughout Australia) the fine work of trying to eliminate any sex discrimination that should occur in our community.

It is interesting that the Government should introduce this Bill as a follow on from the private member's Bill he introduced in this House. I therefore fully commend the Leader because it is a tribute to the dedicated work he gave to this matter. The third and important area that this Bill relates to is wage indexation. One could give a lengthy dissertation on the cases for and against the introduction of wage indexation into Australia. However, it has been accepted by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, and so I believe that we as a State equally should be prepared to accept it and give it a trial in this State. Wage indexation may go part of the way towards helping to solve inflation, but I have some severe reservations about it. I refer to these areas of reservation. The first is that wage indexation without tax indexation is meaningless. There is no point in increasing wages if the consumer price index increases, if a person is not able to obtain a real increase in wages rather than a simple gross increase in wages, the reason being that, as the wage increases, the portion of it taken in tax also increases.

I was deeply disappointed this evening when I heard the Commonwealth Treasurer deliver the Budget speech to find that tax indexation had not been included in the Budget. Wage indexation without tax indexation does not really alleviate the hardship caused to the wage earner in a period of high inflation. I appreciate that wage indexation could cost a great deal. The Commonwealth Treasurer quoted a figure of over \$1 000 000 000. Under our old tax structure it would have cost that, but under a new revised tax structure it could cost much less. I still support strongly this concept of tax indexation and am sorry that it has not been implemented in the Commonwealth Budget.

The second important area relating to wage indexation is the criteria laid down by the Full Bench of the commission insisting that the trade unions had to adopt certain criteria for wage indexation to work effectively. It disturbs me greatly that some trade unions in Australia at present

are not prepared to abide by those criteria. If they are not prepared to abide by them, the whole theory of wage indexation is likely to collapse. In this State we have seen this in the case of the metal workers (in fact, the whole of Australia has) and it is, therefore, threatening at least one of those eight criteria laid down by the commission and is threatening the potential success of wage indexation. I say that because, unless industrial blackmail against this philosophy of wage indexation stops immediately, we shall have industrial anarchy and even higher inflation rates in Australia owing to greater wage increases. It is important that wages do not increase at a faster rate than the consumer price index does.

That is all I wish to say on this Bill. With those two reservations—first, the Commonwealth Treasurer on tax indexation and, secondly, the trade unions abiding by the criteria laid down by the commission—I support the second reading of this Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Repeal of sections 37, 38 and 39 of principal Act."

Mr. CUMBE: Will the Minister reply to the suggestion I made to him about Mr. Justice Moore's eight points or guidelines that he laid down for indexation to be a success? I quoted the Minister's reply to me in June. I now invite him to explain the Government's attitude on those eight points. Has he had an opportunity since June 18 to consider this matter?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): On June 18, at page 3466 of *Hansard*, I stated:

I want to make the position clear that I am not accepting, nor is the Government accepting, all of the eight points for wage indexation. The Government has not made a policy decision on this matter, and it will not do so until the Premier returns from the Premiers' Conference. Regarding the flow-on situation, that is the principle being adopted. I say now that the Government has accepted the policy of wage indexation. It has been for some time examining the situation. I attended a conference in Sydney in relation to the matter. A working party was set up of heads of departments of all States and at that conference, although our State was supporting indexation, some Labor and Liberal Premiers were not completely supporting it. I think they have come into line in the wage indexation struggle and are attempting now to implement it in the various States. However, a difficulty is occurring now in the State Industrial Commission regarding acceptance of these guidelines. It is a difficulty that I do not think will be properly overcome until after the next Commonwealth decision, which will come down about the end of this month. I have had officers attending there supporting the Government's wage indexation policy and asking the Commonwealth Commission to spell out in more detail exactly what is meant regarding the community catch-up areas and also where the finishing line and the new commencement point will be in relation to work value. When those points are cleared up we will be in a much better position in South Australia to handle the situation.

Mr. CUMBE: Is it a matter of the Minister giving an order to the court for automatic adjustments, as was the case with the living wage which was automatically adjusted, or will it be a question of a union, or a group of unions acting on behalf of others, making application to the commission in the formal manner? The other alternative may be that the commission may have the right, without the Minister's intervening, to make its own order. I think this is important.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The matter is covered in section 36 of the principal Act which provides:

(1) Where the Full Commission is satisfied that, having regard to any decision of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission affecting or likely to affect the wages or other remuneration payable generally to employees subject to its awards in this State, any variation (which variation may include provision for a minimum wage in excess of the living wage) should be made in the wages or other remuneration payable generally to employees under awards, the Full Commission may order that any such variation be made, and such a variation shall come into force as from a day or days determined by the Full Commission.

In effect, what happens is that the Full Commission, of its own volition, can implement the increase when sought.

Mr. RODDA: Do I understand that in the subsequent quarter there will be this automatic adjustment of the living wage or the State awards, notwithstanding any application to the commission? It will be a flow-on. Is that what I understand?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I thought I explained what the method of flow-on would be. I have no idea of the amount, nor has the commission at this stage. It must be more than 1 per cent, but when this legislation becomes law the commission will have the right to do it of its own right. The commission is not accepting some of the principles of wage indexation, but there is no argument about this principle.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (9 and 10) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 14. Page 279.)

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I place before this House the need for the establishment of a freak disaster fund. Members opposite may recall that on January 7 this year what was referred to as a mini cyclone went through the New Residence area of the Upper Murray. On that occasion damage to the extent of \$277 000 was caused. Unfortunately, no funds were available from either State or Commonwealth Government sources to enable the people involved to receive compensation. Of the \$277 000 damage, \$250 000 was in the form of crop loss and damage to permanent plantings. Members will be aware that horticultural plantings and crops cannot be insured as can wheat and barley crops. One family suffered damage to the extent of \$89 650 during the mini cyclone. These figures have been prepared by the Agriculture Department.

If anyone believes that one family can suffer a loss of that magnitude and have any real chance of survival without receiving assistance from somewhere, I would like to know how the family should go about it. Approaches were made to the State Government for assistance for these people, but we were told by the Premier that no funds were available and there was no legislation to enable funds to be made available in such circumstances. This seems incredible when we look at the money handed out in unemployment relief and other forms of social welfare benefits to people who, in many instances, are not prepared to try. Yet here we have people who have put their whole lives into the development of a property who have been virtually wiped out overnight, and no assistance of any sort is available for them. To the people concerned the disaster of New Residence was equal to that sustained by individual people in the Darwin cyclone. One family

suffered a loss of \$89 000, which is more than comparable to the losses incurred in the Darwin cyclone.

I suggest to the Government that it is high time (and it is the responsibility of whichever Government is in power) to establish a freak disaster fund to take care of such situations. I do not say that the fund should be established and money handed out on the basis of damage done: I suggest that the Government establish a freak disaster fund and the community itself determine the degree and need for assistance. Immediately following the cyclone at New Residence, the Mayor of Loxton created a disaster fund. I suggest that contributions by local people to any natural disaster fund in a given area should be subsidised on a ratio of \$2 for \$1. A considerable sum was donated by people in the Riverland to the New Residence disaster fund, and since then much volunteer help has been given to the families to help them re-establish their properties. It will possibly be two or three years before some of the properties are rehabilitated.

If it had not been for the money donated by people in the district and, more importantly, the volunteer work done in this area, the people concerned would have had no chance of retaining their properties. I believe that any Government has a responsibility to establish a freak disaster fund so that calamities such as this can be taken care of. The people involved were not entitled to any assistance through the Department of Social Security, because they were not unemployed, and yet countless of thousands of dollars are handed out every week to people who are not employed.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Did they get any assistance at all?

Mr. ARNOLD: Very little.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you know how much?

Mr. ARNOLD: I think they got one week's benefits from the Department of Social Security. The State Government was not able to provide anything. The Minister said they could make application under the rural industry assistance legislation. Let us be quite honest: to a man who has just lost \$89 000 worth of his property and crop, of what value is that sort of offer?

Dr. Eastick: The maximum is \$6 000, isn't it?

Mr. ARNOLD: I am not sure what the maximum is, but such a loss amounts to probably 90 per cent of his assets when he has already probably borrowed to his limit to develop the property, and then he is told that he can apply to the Lands Department for assistance at the normal bank interest rate. Obviously, it is a complete and utter impossibility, and naturally no-one in the area applied for it, because it could not help them in any way. Therefore, the State Government's assistance, to the best of my knowledge, amounted to precisely nothing in this instance. It will remain the same on every freak disaster that comes along, until the Government faces up to its responsibilities and provides for a disaster fund. I believe if it is done on the basis whereby the disaster fund subsidises amounts of money and man-hours of work donated by the community at the ratio of two for one, there will be a controlling factor over the money provided from the fund. I believe people in the district accept that responsibility and, if it is a natural disaster and is a worthy cause, people in the area will respond, and this will be the guideline to the Government as to how much will be paid out of that disaster fund for the benefit of the people concerned.

If we consider the primary producing industry in general (and I refer to the fruitgrowing industry because of its high labour content, and to some of the actions taken by the

present Government) it is a wonder how it has survived as long as it has. The shadow Minister for Transport asked a question of the Minister of Transport a week or so ago regarding the permissible carrying capacities of primary producer vehicles. It was suggested by the honourable member that the carrying capacities provided for in the amendment to the Road Traffic Act were such that the vehicles at present owned by primary producers in the main would not be worth maintaining or keeping because of their extremely low carrying capacity. Some growers have trailers which they use to cart wine grapes to the wineries and dried fruit to packing houses and which in the past have been carrying four and five tonnes. Such trailers are now limited under the amendment of the Act to about one tonne. We have other instances of trucks which were, in the past, carrying five and six tonnes to wineries and greater loads to silos and which are now limited to carrying two and three tonnes. An example was put before me over the weekend of a truck with a weight of three tonnes having been granted a load capacity of just over one tonne. That same vehicle in past years has been carrying between five and six tonnes a load to the local wineries. It is now limited to one tonne. If members opposite could imagine a bulk grape tank on a truck which normally carries five to six tonnes with a load of one tonne inside it, they may be able to imagine just how ridiculous the situation would be to have a V8 truck carrying one tonne to the winery, yet the Minister in his reply said:

To suggest as does the honourable member (and regrettably so many other people seem to have the same idea) that, provided the axle limits are enforced all aspects of road safety have been complied with, is quite erroneous. That would mean that, in the case of a truck capable of carrying 1 524 tonnes, provided the operator put no more than 8 t over the back axle, according to the honourable member's argument, that truck would be safe on the road. That is a foolish attitude to adopt.

I fully agree if the truck was a one-tonne truck, obviously the producer would not be carrying eight tonnes on it. The primary producer is not as silly as the Minister would lead us to believe, and he is the one who has to pay maintenance on that vehicle if he overloads it and damages it. In many instances vehicles carrying grain and fruit are the vehicles that producers have used for many years. If they had carried loads far in excess of the safe capacity of the vehicle, it would have been destroyed and the maintenance would have been so high they would not have been able to continue to do it. The attitude that has been adopted by the Government in this measure alone has dramatically increased the costs that growers face. The biggest problems facing the fruit industry are the escalation of costs and the general inflation in this country, because most of our products have to be sold on the world market. A large percentage of our dried fruit, dried sultanas, apricots and so on is sold on the European market. Because of the escalation of costs in this country in many different directions (and I have cited one instance where the Government has considerably increased costs of production) and because most of our fruit must be sold on the world market, not only is the dried fruit industry but also the canned fruit industry in strife, with increasing freight costs and general costs in Australia and increasing oversea freighting costs.

The action not of the South Australian Government but of its Commonwealth counterparts has been a complete disaster for the wine grape industry. The wine industry would probably be the most viable primary industry in Australia if it was given a reasonable chance.

The only problem that this industry has is that it has been completely taxed out of existence. Even as late as last month in the *Winews* for the month of July, 1975, was an article on the front of this journal headed, "Repeal of section 31a of the Income Tax Assessment Act crippling the wine industry". I think we have heard this statement not only in relation to the repealing of section 31a but also in relation to brandy excise. The article states:

There will also be a great restriction of growth within the industry, flowing on to the grapegrowers and suppliers of packaging materials.

Once the wine industry is affected, all allied industries will be affected in the same way. Already one major wine-maker and distilling firm in Australia has issued notice of dismissal of 70 employees. The Government in Canberra wonders why the unemployment figure grows month by month. Another leading wine and brandy producer in South Australia has retrenched 15 workers, and has informed 143 South Australian grapegrowers that it will not be able to take their grapes in 1976. That is critical. The wine industry has been making representations since 1973, when the Commonwealth Government made its first move against the brandy industry on the basis of the Coombs report. The Chairman of the Australian Wine Board, Mr. Hardy, when addressing the South Australian Wine Grapegrowers Council, used words which ably set out the feelings of wine-makers and growers alike when he said:

The oily words coming from the Government in Canberra are akin to arsenic poisoning. If fed in calculated amounts the effect is cumulative, and eventually it will kill.

This is precisely what is happening to the wine industry in Australia as a result of actions being taken by the Government, not because the product cannot be sold or it is not a good product. The wine and brandy produced in Australia are equal to any in the world. We in South Australia have a very real pride in the wine industry and, as we are the major producer of this product in Australia, this State is far more affected than is any other. If the Commonwealth Government goes ahead with its 1973 promise to increase the excise on brandy, we can expect a further 40c a litre increase in brandy prices in the Commonwealth Budget this evening.

I now briefly comment on the work and actions of the State Planning Authority. Recently we have had put before us a development plan from the State Planning Authority regarding the Riverland area, and this has created great concern, especially to the broad-acre farmers with holdings fronting the river. Most of those farms are a viable proposition only because they have a river frontage and are able by irrigation to produce during the dry years a certain amount of fodder on the river flats. If the proposal by that authority to acquire most of the river flat land from the present farmers is carried through, the farms concerned will no longer be viable units; there is no possible way they can be. It is only because they are situated on the river flat and have water available from the river for diversion that the properties are viable.

I recognise that the State Planning Authority and the department want to make available much of the land and river frontage to the public. However, there are other aspects to the matter. If the Government resumes this land from the present farmer, who will look after it and ensure that noxious weeds and vermin do not run riot and take over this land? Instances where the Government has stepped in and taken over the river flat area have shown that the area soon reverts back to lignum,

noxious weeds such as noogoora burr and Californian burr, and vermin of many species. While there is a need for access to the river frontage, I suggest that it be a controlled access. No-one is better suited to look after this land than are the present landholders, because they have, as members opposite often say, a vested interest in the property. I am convinced that they are the ideal people to take care of the land. For example, Murtbo forest, which covers about 1 860 hectares, has been resumed by the Government as a forestry reserve, yet the public has absolutely no access to that land.

Mr. Nankivell: What about Woolenook Bend?

Mr. ARNOLD: Woolenook Bend is another example. Other than on special occasions, the dates of which have been gazetted, members of the public are not permitted into the area. This is not providing better access to the riverfront land at all. In fact, the people are denied access altogether. Under private ownership, the experience in that area has been that wherever people approached the landholder they were readily given access to the river frontage so long as they looked after the area and did not destroy it. That is extremely important. So, to all intents and purposes, the landowner is acting as a voluntary ranger on behalf of the Government. If we are to open this land in any way, it is essential that there be sufficient rangers to ensure that the environment is looked after, and landowners are doing that now. For the Government to acquire this country would not be in the best interests of conservation in South Australia.

Earlier today a question was asked by a member opposite in relation to dental clinics, and the Minister gave a lengthy reply. I point out that, while some of the dental clinics provided are within two or three miles of one another, in many areas throughout the country children have absolutely no access to a clinic. They have no right to attend one even if they are willing to travel the distance. Those comments apply to two major areas in the Riverland. The Waikerie area, which qualifies by having the numbers laid down by the Government as being necessary before a permanent dental clinic is provided, includes Ramco, Cadell, Morgan and Blanchetown, but has no dental facilities. Barmera also qualifies by numbers for a facility that would service the area of Barmera, Glossop, Winkie, Monash, Loveday, Cobdogla, Kingston and Moorook. The Minister of Education read out a list this afternoon, and I noticed with interest that two of the new dental clinics to be established were within about 3.2 km of one another. I point out that there are many areas of the State where this need is just as great as it is in the areas he mentioned. I hope he will consider the comments I have made when the allocations for the sites of additional dental clinics are made.

Mr. Nankivell: They have to have 600 children.

Mr. ARNOLD: That is right. If we add the number at schools in the Monash, Loveday, Barmera, Winkie, Cobdogla, Moorook area, we have many more than 600 students, so the number is not a problem. The area is compact, and the children would have to travel only 15 kilometres at the most. I again put to the Minister of Education and the Minister of Health that these areas must also be considered. A case can easily be made out to show that a dental clinic should have been established before now.

In conclusion, I should like to comment on an interjection made by the member for Ross Smith last Thursday when he stated that we probably could solve many problems in South Australia and in other States if we abandoned the

States. We all know that this is the policy and attitude of members opposite. It is certainly the Prime Minister's policy, because in a recent address he stated:

We do not envisage in the future the continued exercise of six State Governments and some 975 local councils. We reject the idea that local government should comprise so many individual bodies. What we envisage in the future is one Federal Parliament in Canberra, consisting of one House, with the abolition of the Senate and no State Governments.

There is no doubt about the attitude of the Commonwealth Government. This leads to only one thing, namely, a Government that is totally inaccessible to the public. Our present Government system has survived over the years because, through local government and State Governments, ready access is available for constituents to State members of Parliament and local councillors. If State Parliaments and the States are phased out, I ask members opposite what access the Chairman or Mayor of a council anywhere in South Australia would have to the Commonwealth Minister. The Minister would be so protected by the Public Service that there would be absolutely no access.

We have the totally different situation at present that a Chairman or a Mayor can contact the Minister of Local Government and, within a day or so, come to Adelaide and put to the Minister a problem existing in that area. If the Prime Minister is ever successful in achieving what he has stated in the report that I have read, that access will be gone for all time and the people of every State in Australia will suffer, because the closer a Government is to the people the better informed that Government is.

The biggest problem now facing the Government in Canberra is that it has lost touch with the people. Most of all, the Prime Minister has lost touch completely with the day-to-day needs of the people. This situation will go from bad to worse if the States and State Governments are phased out and the Senate is abolished. If that happens, we will have a single House representing the whole of Australia, with the public having little access to individual members. Members of the public would find that their only access would be to the Public Service, not to the Minister. When that day comes it will be a sorry day for Australia. That is because ultimately the Minister must accept the responsibility for the final decision and, if he is not willing to do that and if he wants to hide behind the Public Service, it is high time the Government is changed. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): In supporting the motion, I join other members in extending my sympathy to the families of the two gentlemen who have died since the House last met. I refer to Sir Norman Jude and the Hon. Mr. Densley. I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, not only on your election to this House but also on your election to the office of Speaker. It is refreshing to see that the people of Port Pirie have made a wise decision by bucking the Party machine and electing, I hope, a true representative of the people of that area.

I now refer briefly to the remarks made by the member for Florey. He launched an attack on members on this side, and I think he referred to us as a rag-bag Opposition. I refer that honourable gentleman to the comments of one of his colleagues in another place who, in a maiden speech in that Chamber, took the opportunity to denigrate personally and attack two members who have died. He took the opportunity to attack, without any justification, my colleagues in that other place. I wonder whether the gentleman who set himself up as judge and jury in regard to the Hon. Mr. Rowe and the Hon. Mr. Kemp

had ever had any personal contact with those two gentlemen. The Hon. Colin Rowe was known to most members on this side and to most members opposite as a gentleman.

One of my first political experiences was with the honourable gentleman at meetings throughout the country, and wherever he went he was held in the highest regard. I think it ill behoves the Hon. Mr. Dunford, who can only be described as a political thug, to carry on in such an ungentlemanly way and offer insult about a deceased person who is not here to defend himself, and it ill behoves members opposite to cast aspersions on members on this side when those members opposite have colleagues carrying on in such a disgraceful and deplorable way.

The Hon. Mr. Dunford attacked the Hon. Arthur Whyte, M.L.C., who is held in the highest regard throughout South Australia. I wonder who the people on Kangaroo Island would like to have representing them, the Hon. Mr. Dunford, who has used his position in the trade union movement to belt those people into submission, or the Hon. Mr. Whyte. I wonder to whom those people would appeal. I know in whom the people of Eyre Peninsula would put their faith. They would not have a bar of the Hon. Mr. Dunford, because he has used the trade union movement for his own political purposes. He is a disgrace to that organisation. He has destroyed what I believe to be the true concept of proper unionism. He wants to stand over the general public in South Australia in a ham-fisted and iron-handed way. I think it is a disgrace to the Australian Labor Party that it should endorse such a person, and it is a disgrace that the Party has not taken action to make him apologise to the Chamber of which he is a member. If he was a man of any principles at all he would withdraw the statements that he made in another place.

Mr. Duncan: By your statements you're showing yourself to be just a loathsome hypocrite.

Mr. GUNN: I make no apology for the statements I have made in this House.

Mr. Duncan: You wouldn't know how.

Mr. GUNN: The Hon. Mr. Dunford took the opportunity in his maiden speech, when members would not interrupt him, to abuse other honourable members, especially those who are dead. He therefore deserves all the criticism and condemnation he receives. If he has any guts he will apologise.

Mr. Duncan: He'll give it and take it; that's what he'll do.

Mr. GUNN: It is hard for the dead to reply, though. I make no apology whatever for what I say. One could say much more about that honourable gentleman, but we on this side would not stoop as low as he has stooped.

Mr. Duncan: The Government—

Mr. GUNN: The member for Elizabeth should be the last to talk about the Government. I now want to turn to what I consider are more important matters.

Mr. Duncan: I should think so.

Mr. GUNN: I could speak at some length about what the Hon. Mr. Dunford said. I am sure the member for Alexandra and other members could speak about him, too. However, I think we have said plenty about the activities of that person.

Mr. Duncan: What he said about you blokes was a bit too close to the mark; that's the problem.

Mr. GUNN: I am not concerned about anything the member for Elizabeth says, and will now turn to other matters referred to in His Excellency's Speech. Before doing so, however, I want to say I was interested in

the remarks made by the member for Price about job security, about which I will have more to say later.

Mr. Whitten: I said little about job security.

Mr. GUNN: I am sorry; it was the member for Spence. I am not criticising the honourable member but making comparisons that I hope will be constructive. His Excellency, in opening this session of Parliament, stated that the Government intends to introduce optional preferential voting in South Australia. Such a measure was put before the House last session but was defeated in another place. It would be a step in the wrong direction if such a proposal was passed into law because, in my opinion, it is undemocratic and does not allow for proper representation. In fact, it would allow minority Governments to come to power. Perhaps we could say South Australia has a minority Government today. Such a measure would not allow the people of this State to express their opinion fully. I therefore sincerely hope that the measure is defeated in another place.

In considering the concept of one vote one value in relation to the proposed electoral redistribution in South Australia, I want to make clear that I could not in any circumstances support a measure that reduced country representation, as that would not be fair, just, or in the best interests of the people of South Australia. I believe the size of the House should be increased by at least six seats or perhaps even eight seats. In considering this matter, I have looked at the situation that applies in other States. I sincerely hope that the Labor Party will not put forward this measure in order to obtain an electoral gerrymander. If one examines the proposition the Government is putting forward, one sees that it could be used to set up the greatest gerrymander ever seen in South Australia. It would be quite simple to redraw electoral boundaries on the mythical arguments of one vote one value and entrench the Labor Party, with a gerrymander, for ever and a day.

South Australia should follow the lead given by other States that have increased the number of members in their Houses of Parliament. The Victorian Legislative Assembly has recently been increased from 73 members to 81 members, and the Legislative Council has been increased from 36 members to 42 members. A better comparison is that of Western Australia, where the Legislative Assembly has 51 members but intends to increase that number to 55 members. The Legislative Council has 30 members and it is intended to increase the number to 32 members. Western Australia has about 600 000 voters, whereas South Australia has about 760 000 voters on the roll. There are far more members of Parliament per capita in Western Australia than there are in South Australia. If democracy is to continue in this State, we should increase the size of this House, but should not abolish country seats.

Any fair and reasonable person would recognise that the number of seats in the metropolitan area should be increased, because many seats are completely out of proportion with other seats. When looking at any increased representation, we should consider the electoral system we are using in South Australia and see whether it is necessary to set up a Royal Commission to look at it. We should consider whether we should allow the Commissioners to determine how many members of the House there should be, whether they should examine electoral systems operating in other States to see whether they could be used in South Australia, whether we should consider introducing proportional representation or forms of proportional representation, or whether we should continue with single-member districts.

That is a matter about which the people should decide; at least they should have the opportunity to make submissions to a properly constituted Royal Commission.

With regard to redistribution legislation, attention should be paid to the terms of reference given to the Victorian Royal Commissioners. Three of the terms of reference are as follows:

(a) community or diversity of interest, (b) means of communication, and (c) physical features.

The most relevant, of course, is "community of interest". The definition of "community of interest" used by the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas was as follows;

A body of people having a common interest.

That aspect is important when considering any electoral redistribution. I sincerely hope that, when the Government looks at this matter and intends introducing legislation, it is realistic and fair and does not try to entrench itself in office forever and a day by using the catchery "one vote one value" which, in many cases, could become the basis of the greatest gerrymander that the people of this State have ever seen. If the Government were to adopt that attitude, and if it were successful in implementing optional preferential voting, South Australia would be faced with a situation similar to that which operated in Queensland for many years where a Labor Government was elected to office after receiving only 40 per cent of the votes cast. I do not say that I subscribe to the system that now operates in Queensland.

Mr. Whitten: The Queensland Government was recently elected after receiving only 17 per cent of the votes.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member is not being fair, nor is he being realistic; he is fooling himself. If he is honest, as I believe he should be, he should look at the total anti-socialist vote that was achieved in Queensland at the recent election and he should also look at the total Australian Labor Party vote. If he did, he would realise that the A.L.P. received the greatest thrashing it has received at any election: a thrashing similar to which it will receive at the next Commonwealth election. One could be uncharitable to the honourable gentleman and say that that is why the Labor Government wants to introduce first past the post voting. In the last general election held in the United Kingdom, the Wilson Government was elected to office with about 39 per cent of the vote. If Labor members want to support that sort of election result, they should go on record as supporting minority Governments.

Mr. Whitten: What percentage did the Liberals get in South Australia last time?

Mr. GUNN: It was 27 per cent, but the honourable member should be more realistic. If he cannot work out calculations, he should ask his friend, the member for Spence, to work them out. The honourable member should consider the total anti-socialist vote in South Australia. If he is fair and just, he will recognise that, in another place, the Labor Party has the majority representation after receiving 47 per cent of the votes. If the Labor Party is fair and wants to put into practice what it preaches, it will alter the system in another place, and introduce a system similar to that used in the Senate. The present system operating for the election of members in the Legislative Council is unfair and undemocratic. I pass on to other matters referred to in the Governor's Speech. It was disturbing to see the scant attention that the Government has paid to primary industry in South Australia.

Reference was made to the eradication of diseases in stock.

Members on this side are aware, but Government members seem to be unaware, that most of these funds come from the Commonwealth Government, so little credit can go to the South Australian Government. The new meat industry legislation, which will be introduced into Parliament soon, is a matter about which I am concerned. Representations have been made to me by several butchers in my district who feel that, if these proposals are implemented, their costs will be greatly increased. The situation will probably eventuate in which small country killing facilities will have to be closed and producers will have to ship their stock hundreds of kilometres by rail or truck, and this will increase their costs and virtually eliminate the opportunity for growers to sell small numbers of stock to the local butcher. If this is the action that the Government wants to take, why does it not say so, instead of doing it by back-door methods? I believe that the present situation is quite successful. Councils have the authority to inspect killing facilities and could insist on action being taken if they did not believe that existing facilities were up to date.

As a member of a council, I was involved several times in asking local butchers to make improvements to their facilities. I hope that, before this matter is discussed in the House, the Government will give it serious consideration, because we already have a very depressed market for meat in South Australia and Australia, and measures of this nature certainly will not improve or assist; all they will do is put a few more problems in the way. In relation to the attitude of this Government and its Commonwealth colleagues, it is unfortunate for the people that at present South Australia has a Labor Government and a Commonwealth Labor Government that have no regard for primary industry. They fail to recognise the importance of rural industry to the welfare of the nation, and have set out on a deliberate campaign to destroy primary industry. I think that the first intimation of that policy of the Commonwealth Government was in March, 1973, when the Prime Minister set up a committee headed by Dr. Coombs. Before commenting on that report, I quote from a statement that Dr. Coombs made in 1944, when speaking at the Melbourne University. He said:

People could not expect complete freedom after the war. It would be necessary for some individuals to be given the right to say what was best for the community.

At that time Dr. Coombs was supporting Dr. Evatt's ploy of using the war situation to tear up the Commonwealth Constitution. Dr. Coombs presented a report to Mr. Whitlam on March 28, 1973, and I quote from the letter that Mr. Whitlam wrote to Dr. Coombs:

The purpose of this letter is to confirm to you the outcome of a recent decision arising out of Cabinet's decision that action be set in train to apply a close scrutiny to the continuing policies of the previous Government so that room may be found for our higher priority programme.

I do not know what tangible benefits have flowed at this stage to the people of Australia. The letter continues:

As you know, I regard the importance of such action as self-evident. Quite apart from any other considerations, a thorough-going review of the policies of our predecessors seems to me to be highly desirable in its own right.

If anyone has any knowledge of primary industry in this State, or across the nation, he will be aware that the policies of the Whitlam Labor Government are virtually paving the way for the ultimate destruction of the family

farming unit. The member for Spence, in his speech, paid careful attention to job security. Some members on this side of the House support the concept of job security. We also support the concept that viable industries, which are essential to the total welfare of the nation (as primary industry is), ought to be given some favourable consideration and some incentives to produce. If what the member for Spence said is taken to its logical conclusion, I would sincerely hope that he would support policies that would guarantee the future viability of rural industry in Australia but, unfortunately, the Labor Party, which has an inherent dislike for people living in country areas, has made decisions that are based on the fact that, because most country people cannot support a socialist philosophy, these people must be punished for their failure to support the Labor Party.

Mr. Keneally: They are masochistic; they are punishing themselves. Look who represents them in this Parliament.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Stuart ought to be the last person to make comments about primary industry.

Mr. Coumbe: He is an agricultural expert!

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member was going to grow maize at Port Augusta, and spoke about diversification. He was going to have farmers in the Mallee area growing maize, and I am not sure what other ideas he had.

Mr. Keneally: Perhaps you should read the speech again.

Mr. GUNN: I would not waste my time and that of the House quoting what the honourable member had to say. Several actions ought to be taken immediately in the interests of primary industries. There should be an immediate reintroduction of the superphosphate bounty, and I believe that the Commonwealth Government should immediately release to the public the Industries Assistance Corporation's report into the bounty scheme. What people must understand is that the bounty was really a consumer subsidy that allowed producers to produce good quality produce so that it could be placed on the market at a realistic price.

Mr. Keneally: Did the Country Party ever take the superphosphate bounty—

Mr. GUNN: What took place when the Whitlam Government removed the bounty—

Mr. Keneally: What about the Menzies Government?

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member may make his speech, and I will make mine.

Mr. Keneally: You don't want to answer the question.

Mr. GUNN: What happened on that occasion was that the Government failed to take any notice of the advice the industry provided to it because, soon after the bounty was removed, a dramatic increase took place in the cost of rock phosphate. The cost of superphosphate today has risen from about \$20 a tonne to about \$60 a tonne. To give an example, a person living 240 kilometres from Port Lincoln who normally has his superphosphate carted by a truck carrying 30 tonnes a load pays \$1 800 to have a load of superphosphate carried on to his farm. To make it even worse, if he wants to buy a 200-litre drum of spray, he must pay between \$600 and \$700 a drum for it. If the member for Stuart thinks that the little assistance which was accorded to the industry was wrong, he should stand up here and make his position clear. His friend Mr. Duthie, from Tasmania, and other Caucus members of the Commonwealth Government who have been vocal on this matter should use their influence with their colleagues if they want to see Australia develop and to see our export income continue to increase. The only way we will see a continuing increase in grain

production is by the superphosphate bounty's being reintroduced as a matter of urgency. To show my concern in this matter, I have written to Senator Wriedt and asked him to use his influence as the reasonable person I hope he is to release the relevant report and to recommend to Cabinet that the bounty be reintroduced urgently.

Mr. Russack: Who subsidises the home consumption price of wheat?

Mr. GUNN: I agree with the point the member for Gouger has raised.

Mr. Keneally: You don't answer my interjections but you answer his interjections.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Stuart should make a study of the wheat stabilisation legislation.

Mr. Keneally: That's socialistic legislation.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are reaching the stage where the honourable member is not being allowed to make his speech.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am trying to ignore the interjections, but that is becoming difficult. In Australia, the main reason why agriculture has been so successful is that, basically, we have had family farming, not large company operations, and, if we want that to continue (and I believe that this is desirable and is the way in which agriculture should properly be conducted), we must do something about the taxation structure now applying in Australia. The first step to ensure that the family farm is protected is that the Commonwealth Government should immediately abolish Commonwealth estate duty and our State Government should adopt a realistic policy towards State succession duties. I believe that the State Succession Duties Act should be amended so that any person ought to be able to inherit \$50 000 without paying State succession duties.

There should be at least a 20 per cent reduction in the rate of duty, and an extension from six to 18 months of the period before interest is attracted to an estate, because anyone who has had any experience of succession duties knows how difficult it is to wind up an estate. The Act should be amended to allow people to take out insurance policies to be assigned to the Treasurer for the purpose of paying State succession duties, and all private superannuation schemes ought to be free from State succession duties. I believe that in the case of a family business, whether in primary or secondary industry or commerce, there ought to be a 40 per cent rebate of the valuation of the estate if that estate is continued to be run as a family unit for five years. If those measures were taken, much of the hardship and many of the problems which this unjust form of taxation creates today would be eliminated. I am pleased that some Government members are smiling; I hope that they are agreeing with what I am saying. Undoubtedly, some Government members, like Opposition members, have people come to them who will have to sell their house or the major part of their business to pay this kind of tax. The trouble in the rural sector today is that most farms are not viable, because 50 per cent of the property has had to be sold to pay the tax. Let us consider the rate of interest that the Commonwealth Government has caused to be charged on money that people must borrow.

Recently, the I.A.C. produced a report on the average provisions of the Income Tax Assessment Act that apply to primary industry. I believe that these provisions should apply to people engaged in the mining industry as well, because it would greatly assist many of my constituents who mine opal and who face many problems. Some of these miners have worked for three or four years and are

lucky to make a living and, if they strike a lode, they find most of their earnings are taken in provisional tax.

Mr. Keneally: That is their declared strikes.

Mr. GUNN: I do not care to engage in such aspersions. Another of the I.A.C.'s recommendations that I believe ought to be supported by the community is the recommendation that income equalisation deposits should be made available not only to primary industry but to all taxpayers. If such a scheme was adopted, it would greatly assist all sections of the community. Everyone is aware of what takes place. The year in which a person has a high taxable income and the year in which he had a low income should be balanced out. This would assist particularly primary industry, which is subject to fluctuations of income, especially when affected by drought, flood, falling prices, and bushfires, and more recently, Government action. I hope that the Commonwealth Government will adopt the recommendations in the report it commissioned. When this body was set up, many of us (and I still believe it) thought that it was a stalling action similar to the commissioning of the I.A.C. report into the superphosphate bounty, and that the Government was trying to sweep the problem under the carpet. However, reality has caught up with the Commonwealth Australian Labor Party, and it must decide. I do not believe that it can afford to refuse to reinstate the bounty.

Mr. Keneally: Will you send an autographed copy of your speech to Senator Wriedt?

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member may do that if he likes. I would tell the Senator to his face what I am saying today. I have engaged in considerable correspondence with Senator Wriedt, Mr. Hayden, and Dr. Cairns, but I have had considerable trouble in getting a reply. When a reply is forthcoming, it is not very favourable.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr. GUNN: I will ignore the interjections. I have another 27 minutes to go, so I have plenty of time. I will continue in the same way and I will not be ruffled by Government members. I had intended to speak for another 10 minutes, but I may as well take my full 27 minutes, because I have much to say about the Minister on the front bench. The South Australian Government has a poor attitude towards primary industry. The facts speak for themselves. The money allocated in the South Australian Budget each year to the Agriculture Department compared with the money spent by other Governments proves my point. Allocations to the Agriculture Department in the 1954-55 Budget (under a Liberal Government) were \$1 100 000 or .98 per cent; in New South Wales, the expenditure was 3.4 per cent of the Budget; in Victoria, it was 1.7 per cent of their Budget; in Western Australia it was 1.5 per cent; and even in Tasmania it was 3.7 per cent.

Mr. McRae: What about Queensland?

Mr. GUNN: It spent 2.5 per cent. I did not miss Queensland deliberately; I thought I had given enough comparisons. In 1970, the South Australian Government spent \$2 900 000 or .87 per cent of its Budget, and New South Wales spent \$17 600 000, or 2.8 per cent of its Budget. Another State Labor Government, in Tasmania, spent \$3 600 000 or 3 per cent of its Budget on primary production.

The South Australian Agriculture Department is doing excellent work on behalf of the people of South Australia, protecting our rural industries against pests, plague and

disease. The department should be given appropriate facilities to enable it to carry out its responsibilities. For years it has been housed in a disgraceful building in Gawler Place that is nothing more than a rabbit warren. All the people over the years who have been responsible for that state of affairs ought to be ashamed of themselves, and I am not talking only about the Labor Government. I believe the conditions in the Agriculture Department are a scandal. It is a disgrace to this Parliament that the conditions have been allowed to continue for as long as they have. The proposal to transfer the Agriculture Department to Monarto is ridiculous. Members of the department do not want to go to Monarto, and it will be inconvenient for people who want to have access to the department. It is nothing more than a fairy story of the Government. I believe that the Government should take the necessary action to acquire a suitable site for the department. If it is unwilling to do that, it should relocate the department at Northfield where it should be given proper facilities. It should have a decent building with facilities to carry out all the work necessary; it should have a proper lecture theatre and areas where the public can be informed properly. I think the figures I have quoted show that this and previous Governments have not spent the money on agriculture that the people of South Australia would want them to spend. I certainly hope that common sense will prevail and that the public servants who serve in the Agriculture Department will not be conscripted and sent to Monarto. Having looked at the Monarto site on Sunday, I believe it will be a long time before anyone is living at Monarto; I doubt personally whether this scheme will ever get off the ground.

I would like to quote a few figures for members opposite, who seem keen to knock what I have been saying, about the contribution rural industry makes to South Australia. In South Australia, rural production exceeds \$400 000 000 a year; it makes up one-third of the total State's production; it contributes 50 per cent of South Australia's exports; there is a rural work force of 42 000 people; and the industry supports other industries that employs 30 000 people. We have in South Australia some of the best manufacturers of farm machinery in the world. This Government and its Commonwealth colleagues should allow primary producers the benefits which they enjoyed before Mr. Crean's Budget in 1973 in relation to accelerated depreciation allowances and investment allowances, so that when their stock and plant is worn out they can reinvest in stock and plant at a reasonable cost. If the Income Tax Assessment Act is not amended soon I believe producers of farm machinery will be affected seriously, and many people employed in the manufacture of farm equipment will join the growing number of the unemployed. It appears as though the Labor Party in South Australia is not concerned about this. I recall that prior to the 1972 election members on the Government benches were asking Dorothy Dixers of the Ministers about unemployment in South Australia. At the moment more than 250 000 people are unemployed in Australia, and it is predicted that the number will grow to 500 000. Yet there is not one word of criticism from the people who a few years ago were most vocal about unemployment.

I have been reminded to make one or two comments about daylight saving, a matter dear to my heart. I believe people in South Australia should be given the opportunity to express their opinion on daylight saving. We ought to have a referendum in South Australia on the issue. A referendum was held in Western Australia by that progressive Liberal Premier, Sir Charles Court.

Mr. Max Brown: Have you seen the Gallup poll on him lately?

Mr. GUNN: I would bet that if there was an election next week Sir Charles Court would be returned with an increased majority. The people in Western Australia rejected daylight saving. I believe Government members would be surprised at the results of a similar referendum in South Australia, as many people are not satisfied with daylight saving. Before a referendum was held, I believe the Act should be amended and daylight saving should cease in February when the school year commences, because the real problem is for little children travelling many miles on school buses early in the morning before the sun gets up.

Mr. Keneally: What about the extra hour of sunshine in the afternoon fading the curtains?

Mr. GUNN: That is really nonsense. If it was not so serious, I could see the funny side of the situation. I am disappointed that there was nothing in His Excellency's Speech about the establishment of a country fire authority. Opposition members are aware that the Government has a Bill drafted to establish a country fire authority to combine the operations of the three Ministers who now have control over the Emergency Fire Services. It was brought to my attention recently that the members of the E.F.S. are concerned that the Government is deliberately delaying this proposal because Mr. Overall, who is secretary of the fire fighters' union, desires that there be salaried fire officers throughout South Australia to take the place of the volunteers who now provide an excellent service to the country people. If Mr. Overall's suggestion is put into effect, costs will be fantastic. Currently, the E.F.S. costs about \$500 000 a year to run. The Port Pirie fire station costs about \$500 000 a year to operate. About 9 000 people protect the whole of the area outside the designated metropolitan area. Therefore, I believe that the costs clearly indicate that Mr. Overall's proposition is not realistic and would not be in the best interests of the people of South Australia. The matter which has been concerning members of the E.F.S., particularly those occupying senior positions in that authority, is that the Government has not yet made an announcement about the new headquarters for the E.F.S. at Keswick. The Public Works Standing Committee recommend that a building be erected at Keswick costing about \$800 000, but in the Estimates it does not appear as an individual line. Whether it is hidden away in some other heading I am not sure, but I hope the Minister will announce that the project will be commenced soon, because the organisation is most concerned. I received a letter from the District Council of Kimba in relation to these matters, which states:

This council along with many other councils is perturbed with the movement to have country fire services brought under control of the Fire Brigades Board. At the annual meeting of the Eyre Peninsula Fire Fighting Association held at Wudinna on the 11th instant, it was resolved that the following resolution be forwarded to the Chief Secretary and the Minister of Local Government, namely:

1. Conference welcomes the recent press release by the Minister of Local Government reiterating Government's policy of consolidation of the Volunteer Country Fire Services; and urges that the new Act, which has been drafted, be introduced without delay this session.
2. That the new headquarters at Keswick be built without delay.
3. Conference is strongly opposed to another committee of inquiry into the affairs of emergency fire services, which will only cause delay to the Country Fire Services Act, and new headquarters.

4. That the Director of Emergency Fire Services be given urgently needed staff and facilities for the coming fire season.

Council requests that you use your every endeavour to bring about the implementation of the matters referred to in the resolution.

I sincerely hope that the appropriate Ministers will take the necessary action. If they do not, it will be clear that they have bowed to union pressure. I should like to say how pleased I am to have received again the confidence of my constituents at the last election.

Mr. Keneally: Now you are in Opposition you are completely irresponsible again.

Mr. GUNN: Members on this side are not irresponsible. We go about our endeavours in a diligent and honest fashion, and responsibility is always uppermost in our minds when we make statements in this House and when we consider matters brought before us. I am pleased to say this is the third time I have been elected, and each time I have received an increased majority. I am also pleased to see the two new members on this side, one from Mount Gambier and one from Millicent, and I am quite confident that, whenever the next election is held, we will change sides and will serve as a Government with a large majority. In regard to what the member for Florey said about people not attending at the declaration of polls, this is the third declaration I have attended, and none of the candidates who has opposed me has turned up for the declaration of the poll. This is unfortunate. I wanted to say something in relation to the comments a candidate had made about me, but he did not present himself, so I could not make my comments. They will keep: I will do it another time.

Mr. Keneally: Why not now?

Mr. GUNN: I would not make them under privilege, but would rather wait for the chance to confront the person personally. The member for Florey referred to the leadership of the Premier and the credibility of the Government. The credibility of this Government would be at zero.

Mr. Keneally: What did the electors say?

Mr. GUNN: The electors clearly indicated that they were dissatisfied with the Dunstan Labor Government, which received a serious rebuff, particularly in the traditionally staunch Labor seat of Pirie, because we know what happened to the Party hack. In Mount Gambier, which the Labor Party thought was a safe Labor seat, the Liberal candidate received a 14 per cent swing. The Deputy Premier saw the writing on the wall, and he vacated Millicent. I refer now to some rather peculiar advertisements that circulated during the election campaign. We were told before the election in December, 1972, how everything would be right if we elected Don: everything would be rosy and there would be no problems. The Premier went around Australia beating the drum and praising policies of the present Prime Minister. In the *Advertiser* of July 9 appeared an advertisement showing an unsmiling Premier (who did not have much to smile about): his Ministerial colleagues would not have had much to smile about either, but had to dig deeply into the barrel of dirty tricks to solve the problems. It seemed that, at all costs, the Dunstan Government must be elected, so he dropped his colleagues. Before 1972, the Premier and Gough Whitlam had discussed economic policies best suited to Australia, but these policies have led to record unemployment figures, inflation, and high interest rates, and to the most incompetent Government that has ever

been in power in Canberra. The advertisement on July 9 states:

I want to say this. My Government's being smeared, it hurts.

The Premier should be the last person to speak about smearing people: he has a most powerful machine, a Dr. Goebbels set-up, in his office paid for by taxpayers to try to smear the Opposition, and he keeps a filing system on anyone who criticises Government policy. The article continues:

Our opponents want you to think we're to blame for Canberra's mistakes.

Of course it is to blame, because it is part of the same Party, and, if anyone helped to elect Gough Whitlam, it was the Premier of this State. Our Premier returned from overseas in 1974 to help Mr. Whitlam, but now the Premier has dropped him like a hot potato. The article continues:

The State Government is in danger on Saturday because of this smear. Don't be misled. Your vote on Saturday is a vote for South Australia. Not for Canberra. Not for Australia. But for South Australia.

What an interesting change of policy! The Labor Party dropped from its advertising campaign all references to Canberra and tried to represent the Dunstan Government as the one for which to vote. What will happen at the next Commonwealth election? Will the Premier ask the people of Australia to vote for Gough Whitlam, after dropping him like a hot potato? We will see what the Premier's credibility is then, and whether, after having criticised his Commonwealth colleagues, he will tell the people of South Australia what he had told them before our recent elections. If he is true to form, he will tell people to vote the Commonwealth Labor Government out of office, and, if he did that, everyone would be satisfied. I look forward to hearing my colleagues, and it will be interesting to see whether members opposite are allowed to make a contribution. I support the motion.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I, too, support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Speech. Before referring to the legislative programme within that document, I extend my sympathy to the families of those members who died during the last Parliament, Sir Norman Jude and Mr. Leslie Howard Densley. From the reports of my colleagues, it would seem that both of those gentlemen made a significant contribution to the Legislative Council and also to the State of South Australia during their term in office. I add my recognition to those Legislative Councillors, mentioned by other speakers, who have resigned from Parliament, and also those members who resigned from this House because of age and perhaps for other reasons.

Mr. Slater: What do you think about some of the new ones?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I do not wish to take up the interjections that float across. I have the greatest respect for several members who have resigned from the other side, just as I have for members who have resigned from this side. I say that quite sincerely and make special reference to your predecessor, Mr. Speaker, the former member for Pirie, Mr. McKee.

Mr. Jennings: I don't think it was reciprocated.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Irrespective of what the honourable member thinks, what I say in this regard is sincere; both in and out of the House he was a gentleman to me. I take the opportunity to mention the resignation from this side of one of our senior members, Mr. McAnaney, the former member for Heysen. I suppose it is fair to mention at this stage those members who sought re-entry but who, for

one reason or another, failed. The reason put forward by the member for Fisher is that they did not get enough votes. I am sincere when I express regret in this regard, particularly in relation to the Hon. Mr. Story and the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan. I was able to get to know both of these gentlemen during the last Parliament. They were helpful to me on my entering this place, within the House and without. Apparently we are to take that sort of failure and disappointment as being the hard, cruel side of politics. I think it was the Hon. Arthur A. Calwell who said:

Today a crowing rooster, tomorrow a feather duster. I feel sorry for the two gentlemen I have mentioned, because both had great practical experience in the rural sector, and I regard their displacement from the other place as a distinct loss to the State.

Mr. Duncan: They were knifed by the Liberal Party.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Apart from what I have said, their manner was cheerful and their attitude reasonable towards all, irrespective of their political colour. I think that from time to time we lack that sort of open and flexible character within this place. We have a few new faces on the front bench on this side, and I think already you, Sir, along with other members of the House, would have seen how they have demonstrated what a grasp they have of their respective positions. They are a mixture of flexible, sincere, sometimes abrasive, wise and educated men. Their talents, linked with the talents possessed by members on the back benches on this side (which includes some very experienced members, some very sound, practical men, and some enthusiastic new colleagues), produce a pretty lively outfit, and we do not aim to let the Government get away with its tricks much longer. Whether you agree with this or not, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we will give them a kick where it hurts, and much sooner than many people expect. The people opposite have gained government by the skin of their teeth. We appreciate, as I am sure they do, just what a delicate position they are in. After all, the A.L.P. entered the Treasury benches in 1970 with a majority of seven, and whilst the prediction about the election being a landslide might not have come to fruition at the end of the count, I suggest that it was fairly close to the mark, because over the period from 1970 to the snap election in 1975 the Government has, in fact, melted away like an iceberg. It has drifted from a seven majority to no majority at all.

Mr. Jennings: So you sacked your Leader.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I may even comment about that in a moment if I can cultivate enough interest from the other side, because I can find it very easy to speak about our new Leader's predecessor. First, however, I should like to speak about our new Leader. I believe that, in his short term in office, he has already demonstrated that he has a grasp of his job and also a grasp of another job in which he has been engaged recently. He is doing everything in his power to pick up the essential unity that is important for us to go ahead and win government at the appropriate time. He has extended his olive branch to our left-wingers, I gather with some success. I have nothing on paper to support my remarks in this regard, but I just get the feeling that they are giving that olive branch just a little bit of a wave. I have to add, before going any further, that I thought those people, like a crossed cheque, were not negotiable, but it seems that, now the tide is running so well for the Liberal Party, even the L.M. people have some desire to splash around in the same pond as the balance of the Opposition. I believe this not only is desirable but is a clear demand by the public.

Mr. Duncan: Very muddy waters you are swimming in.

Mr. Millhouse: A most unattractive proposition.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I have a feeling things are going our way. In taking up the comment of the honourable member for Ross Smith, I should like briefly to mention our new Leader's predecessor, the honourable member for Light, and in particular to refer to the contribution he has made to this Parliament. His reign as Leader of the Opposition in no way could be described as colourful, but nevertheless he worked hard and he gave his best at all times.

Mr. Keneally: Hear, hear!

Mr. CHAPMAN: To my knowledge, he never unloaded on to his colleagues a job that he either had not already covered himself or was not prepared to do. That quality is essential in a Leader, and it is only the members of this side who, having worked with him, would appreciate the significance of it.

Mr. Keneally: That's the most hypocritical statement I've ever heard.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am sure that every member on this side would support the reference I have made to the member for Light, even if it is not recognised by members opposite. While his policy speech before the election did not attract the majority of metropolitan electors, it was packed with responsibility, honesty, and straight talk, and I believe that it reflected the stability and character of its writer.

I congratulate all Opposition members who held districts previously represented by the Liberal Party, and I congratulate particularly the members for Mount Gambier and Millicent. It cannot be claimed otherwise than that they rolled the Australian Labor Party candidates in those districts in fine style, although the present members had the benefit in those districts of the hostile attitude towards the Government over the railways issue, and that also cannot be denied by members opposite.

I cannot let the opportunity pass without recognising the outstanding efforts of my supporters in the District of Alexandra. I admit that, when the Premier called the election, we in the district had no campaign funds in kitty. I went to the poll (I am not too proud to admit it) basing my total campaign on a record of personal approach to the electors and, of course, that was linked with the Liberal Party's long and great record in that community. The electors were spurred on by the roughshod deal that they had had from both the Commonwealth Government and the State Government in recent times, and I believe that the people, at several levels in the community, reflected this attitude in their vote. I believe that many people who were voting Liberal for the first time were registering a vote against socialism as it had emerged from Canberra and as it has been reflected here since I have been a member of this place from the Ministry right down the ranks on the other side.

I should like to refer briefly to what happened in my district regarding the polling booths and the votes cast. First, there are about 1 700 voters on Kangaroo Island. The A.L.P. did not field a candidate in 1973, so it is difficult to make a true comparison between that election and the one just past, but before 1973 the A.L.P. had gathered a traditional vote on Kangaroo Island of between 500 and 600. These figures were consistent for several years, but this time the A.L.P. vote was slashed to just over 200. I wonder why that was. I will refer to a short editorial in the local newspaper to show the sort of apathy and to show that, in fact, the A.L.P. realised that in that district it had no hope and gave up before it started.

The Editor of the *Islander*, in the issue of July 16, 1975, states:

It's nothing new for newspapers and the media generally to be accused of political bias. Many newspapers would openly admit to an editorial bias, but this is seldom carried through to the news columns. Editorially, the *Islander* believes it reflects the non-socialist philosophies and aspirations of the great majority of islanders, but the news columns are available to all shades of opinion. We have repeatedly stressed that no political comment is ever refused space simply because it conflicts with editorial views. . . . We were amazed therefore to be charged the other day with not having put in a single advertisement or word of news about Labor in the recent election. The fact is that nothing was published about Labor because nothing was received from Labor.

I believe that the A.L.P. attitude toward that community, even at election time, is parallel to its attitude for as long as I can remember. It seems that the Commonwealth Government colleagues of members opposite have a little more political interest in the outer communities, because only a few weeks before the election the "heavyweights" from Canberra, Senator McClelland and Senator McLaren, went to Kangaroo Island to cultivate the A.L.P. camp. They even tried to set up a branch there. Have members ever heard of such a thing! Perhaps they should have taken the then Secretary of the Australian Workers Union over to organise things. However, the result was naturally rather miserable, to say the least. The Liberal Movement vote in that area was also fairly insignificant, and there are many good reasons for that. I refer here to the sort of false advertising published in the *Islander* newspaper during that campaign. The advertisement, headed "Defeat the Labor Government", states:

This should be the major concern of all liberal-minded people of Alexandra. What can you do? How important is it to you? Think clearly. Get interested. Get involved.

The significant point that I raise is in regard to how misleading this advertisement was. It also stated:

There are 47 seats in the Assembly, of which Labor holds 26, so we—

"we", mind you, the Liberal Movement claimed—have to win at least three of the 26 to win government.

The advertisement went on to read like a Liberal Party advertisement, and it was not until we got right to the bottom of the page that we found these comments:

Become a real part of the defeat Labor campaign—Forget your inhibitions.

What a joke: "Forget your inhibitions"! This was published before the election. It is incredible how some people can doll themselves up to sell their wares. The crunchline comes in this statement:

Donations are urgently needed now ... All cheques—nonbearer—crossed—and made payable to "Alexandra—and in fine print we see—

L.M. Trust".

I did not think it was unjustified for someone, in reply, to write the following letter, which was published in the next issue of the newspaper:

I wish to draw your readers' attention to the advertisement in the *Islander* of June 25, 1975, under the heading "Defeat the Labor Government" soliciting funds for that purpose. As there is only one Party who by the winning of three additional seats in the coming State election can unseat the Dunstan Government, one is compelled to read on, and it is not until you search for an address to which to send the contribution that you find this is not the Liberal Party asking for campaign funds but some obscure Alexandra L.M. Trust. I suggest that this advertisement comes dangerously close to false advertising, and is as devious as their future intentions and the past history of their leader.

The only comment I add to that is that the Leader of that Party has much to answer for to the people of South Australia. I will listen with much interest to the reaction, if any. The Country Party vote was difficult to find in that community. The Liberal vote on the mainland was maintained, collectively giving us a clear win in 33 out of the 34 polling booths in the district. Despite a vivid and flamboyant campaign by the Liberal Movement, it never really got off the ground. That Party, too, had its heavyweights out. It was interesting to note that the Party Senator from Canberra visited Victor Harbor. He is well known down there as "Black Prince". He appeared on the platform. We found that his shadow sniper "Ankles" appeared on the Kangaroo Island platform and said a few unkind words. "Smiley and Colonel" did not appear in front of the spotlight in my district; I have been told that he was lurking in the shadows but never really came out.

In all fairness, I think the candidates ran a clean and proper campaign. Any rough stuff that was dished out in the district could be related to the head office organisation of the Party opposite, not to the candidates themselves. Mr. George Graham (retired) of Victor Harbor was the Country Party candidate, and I have no hesitation in describing him as a gentleman. He is a man of about 70 years of age, but is a real battler. I met Mr. Graham during the campaign, and I believe him to be a real gentleman. The L.M. candidate, too, seemed to be a reasonable sort of person. I have nothing personal to say that would denigrate him. However, he was grossly misled into accepting endorsement for that organisation, but that is no reflection on his character. Mrs. Newall, the A.L.P. candidate from Goolwa, was a real dear. I say that sincerely. I hope to get her vote at the next election. Generally speaking, my thanks go out to all who supported the Liberals in Alexandra in 1973 and gave us a clear majority (when we received 5 229 votes) and an even greater majority in 1975 (when the vote went up by 1031 to 6 260 votes).

Mr. Slater: If they had had a good candidate they'd have won by 7 000 votes.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I have few people in the community with whom to make comparisons. My predecessor was member for the district for 24 years; I believe he was a great candidate and a good member. In reply to the interjection I point out that the Hon. David Brookman only once exceeded the vote I received at the recent election, and at that time, 1968, he had about 3 000 additional voters. Apart from that election, 6 260 people voted for me; a record since Federation. I extend my special appreciation to the 300 people who manned the polling booths on July 12.

Mr. Jennings: If you keep on going you'll win the election.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am practising to win the next election. Finally, I refer especially to the tolerance and support that my wife and family have given me during my Parliamentary career. That tolerance and support has allowed me to serve the two geographically divided parts of the Alexandra District each week when Parliament was sitting and when it was not sitting. I point out some of the problems I face in that district that members opposite probably do not appreciate are involved in servicing a district that is divided in the way my district is divided. It is not impossible to service it properly. I believe the vote I received has reflected that it can be done. However, there are some physical difficulties about handling it.

A country member must start servicing his district long before metropolitan members are out of bed.

Mr. Coumbe: Have you tried walking across the water yet?

Mr. CHAPMAN: J.C. might be able to do that, but I cannot.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Do you think you'd be able to manage Barker?

Mr. CHAPMAN: That is an interesting subject, and I might deal with it later. For the benefit of ill-informed members on the other side, I will give an example of the difficulties experienced servicing a district such as mine. As a new member of the House, Mr. Speaker, you may care to note this aspect. My district office is about a 640-kilometres round trip from my home and involves, in order to move from my home to the electorate office, the use of at least two motor vehicles (one at Kangaroo Island and another on the mainland and an aeroplane). When all is going well, the trip cannot be done in under three hours. Having heard that example, honourable members should appreciate that some physical and practical difficulties exist in servicing a district of the geographical type that I service. I do not know what the Government has in mind regarding the redistribution of electoral boundaries in relation to the South Coast area. I hope the Government will provide a bridge link between Cape Jervis and Kangaroo Island to make the transport situation a little more attractive and assist the rural and tourist trades, as well as assisting me to service the district a little more conveniently.

I suppose, to retain a community of interest, it would be logical to include Meadows, Strathalbyn, and maybe Milang to provide the numbers necessary to fit the criteria referred to by His Excellency. I in no way support the intended redistribution plan, because at this stage it seems to be a weird and distorted interpretation of "one vote one value" rather than the catchcry phrase tends to imply. With the recent rate of increase in population in Alexandra, the present number of voters will increase from about 13 000 to about 15 000 at the next election.

Mr. Keneally: What about the other 6 000 or 7 000? Are they well served?

Mr. CHAPMAN: They are well serviced, and I say that with humility. I do not think the Government will be unreasonable enough to deny some form of tolerance in country areas. The Government claims to be tolerant in this place and in its general policies throughout the Government structure. I for one look forward to hearing of some form of realistic tolerance regarding representation between country and metropolitan seats. I appreciate that His Excellency referred to one vote one value, but surely it is realised that some country districts are already beyond the physical capacity of one member to service fairly and reasonably.

Last week we heard the member for Tea Tree Gully make loud noises about the difficulties that apply in her district. I appreciate that she has about 30 300 voters in her area and that they are spread out over about 125 km². There are about 2 400 square miles in Alexandra, but even then this area is quite insignificant compared to some districts in the far outback, namely, the District of Frome, in which about 146 000 square miles is serviced by one member. The member for Eyre, in fact, has an even greater area, which I understand, is about 180 000 square miles. I hope that the Minister of Works

is fair enough to recall the limited period that he had with his family when he was member for Millicent, and that he will use his influence on his Cabinet to take into account the tolerance to which I have referred. I understand there was some fairly wide publicity on this subject when the Minister to whom I have referred went to some lengths to explain the family problems that occur, and how a member is divorced from his family as the result of being in the job and representing a rural district so far away. Representing an area as large as that of the Minister's, I appreciate what he meant. In the light of his experience, I hope he will give us a fair go in the country area. The Minister is in the fortunate position, as referred to earlier in this debate, that he saw the writing on the wall and opted out of Millicent, getting into a secure political position in the metropolitan area. He got out just in time.

Mr. Jennings: Everyone said he couldn't win it.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Whatever the reasoning, the important part about the Millicent election is that the Liberal Party won there and the new member, Mr. Allison, secured himself in that district in grand style; there is every reason why he should hold it.

Mr. Keneally: I think you have the wrong name.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Sorry, Mr. Vandepuer. I see no reason why the member for Millicent or his neighbouring colleague, the member for Mount Gambier, cannot represent those areas well for a long time to come. So much for the snap election. I think sufficient detail has been related about that interesting exercise, and it was interesting for me. I regard the snap election 1975, the campaign leading up to it, and the period following that election, as being very educational and much more interesting than the first round. I was indeed pleased to hear the Minister of Mines and Energy say last Tuesday that, in the Government's opinion, the area around McLaren Vale and Willunga is not a suitable area for further urban development. Whilst other members in the Chamber at that time may not have realised the significance of that comment, I can only say, on behalf of the people in that northern part of my district, that I was delighted to hear the attitude announced by the Minister.

I think he was expressing concern about expected delays in transport from that area into the metropolitan centre should it be developed for housing and so on, and he was generally promoting the concept of Monarto. We in Southern Vales happen to have other ideas of a more productive nature to support the retention of that rural community, and we cannot go along with the concept of Monarto as explained by the Minister, or the reasoning for justifying Monarto, but we agree with the common sense of his earlier comment and are therefore pleased to hear him commit the Government with regard to development of the south of Adelaide as he did on that occasion.

The next point in His Excellency's Speech is the proposal to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, as amended in 1974. I assure members that it would be a welcome move to industry throughout the State to have this subject re-opened. The only comment I make now is to bring respectfully to the attention of the member for Florey an error he made last week during the Address in Reply debate. He said in relation to a compensation case:

If he has a serious accident, say, breaks a leg, he may be home from work for six months. If an award wage is \$90 a week, that is all his employer pays him.

This is far from the practical intent or the application of the new Act, and I think it reasonable to remind the honourable member that he was right off the rails with respect

to his interpretation of this matter, because the employer is requested to pay the employee, on injury, his full average earnings, and invariably that exceeds the award rate. That sum can include overtime, over-award payments, loading, such as dirt and dust money, travelling expenses, height money, or whatever the employee may have enjoyed during the preceding period.

If the Act were confined to the understanding as expressed by the member for Florey, that is, that the employer's requirement was to pay the basic award, it would be more acceptable than it is now. It is in everyone's long-term interest that at no time should an employee enjoy more net return while off work than his toiling colleagues enjoy while on the job. As has been pointed out many times, this destroys the basic inducement for the employee to return to work. On that point, I agree wholeheartedly with the Leader of the Opposition, to whom the member for Florey was directing his remarks at the time.

I will now take up one other issue raised by the member for Florey, and I am disappointed that he is otherwise occupied now. The following appears in last Tuesday's *Hansard*:

The idea of giving a fair day's work for a fair day's pay as part of the total community responsibility, so that the State may prosper, seems to be almost completely lost in many sectors. The benefits handed out by the welfare state are no longer seen as benefits or concessions; rather, they are regarded as rights that cannot be taken away.

The member for Florey, in answer, said:

I say, "My oath they are rights." Unfortunately, they could be taken away by rescission if ever a Liberal Government came to office. That is certainly what such a Government would do. Social welfare is the right of every person in this country, whether he is a capitalist or a worker, but in particular it is the right of a worker to have a welfare situation that will see to it that he and his wife and family are fed and looked after in adversity.

I take him to task on that comment. Generally speaking, I agree with the principle he expressed that, if a man is down and in a corner, he deserves to be helped, and no member can deny that I have expressed that attitude many times. However, we see that situation now in the rural community where many families are down, but they cannot qualify under this Government's legislation for assistance in line with the rights to which they ought to be entitled in the opinion of the member for Florey. Many people in the rural community are receiving no net return but, because of a provision in the social service legislation, they are prevented from enjoying social services or unemployment benefits. They are regarded as self-employed if they are primary producers and, therefore, on that simple inclusion, disqualify themselves from being assisted while on the ground. I believe that this Government ought to encourage its Canberra colleagues to remedy this situation immediately. Although today there are hundreds of such people, soon thousands will be in this position of being unable to obtain credit from their grocer any more or to get further credit from their stock firms: they are really on the ground.

They cannot be employed in rural communities, because their neighbours cannot afford to employ them. Simply because they are described and recognised by the Department of Social Security as self-employed people, they are denied the same opportunity as anyone else who claims he is out of work and who can enjoy unemployment benefits.

If ever there was a shocking anomaly in the very sustenance level of the community, it is in that regard. Agreed, for many years the people from the rural sector have been able to obtain from their practices sufficient to

live on, to feed their families and, in some cases, to give their children further education. In almost every case they have enjoyed sufficient income to make great contributions to the Commonwealth Government in the form of direct income tax and indirect sales tax on their plant and equipment. Generally, they have made a much greater contribution in the form of tax to the Commonwealth Government than has the other employed sector. However, in these adverse conditions, when they have their backs to the wall, they cannot even be fed, or have their families fed, by the unemployment benefits system.

I will now comment on His Excellency's remark about new meat legislation which is also to come before the House. For some years now, I have heard that legislation will be introduced to enforce an upgrading of slaughtering premises throughout South Australia and that there has been a desperate attempt to have a more wholesome product available to metropolitan consumers. The new meat industry legislation that will be placed before us this session will apparently be introduced to ensure that the slaughtering of livestock for human consumption will take place only under the most hygienic conditions. I suggest that the present Health Act requires that all meat sold for human consumption be slaughtered and processed in the most hygienic conditions. I agree that those conditions in many cases have run down, that the Act is not being complied with in that regard, and that in many cases slaughtering premises are far below the required legislative standard.

Therefore, I agree that those premises should be upgraded and brought into line, but to suggest, as some members have suggested, that there is an inbuilt implication that will require the meat throughout the community to be killed in such premises, is ridiculous. What would be even more ridiculous would be to try to implement it, because for a start neither this Government nor any Government has any control over the meat one uses for one's own private consumption. I hope that no such attempt will be made in this direction. To begin with, the legislation can be confined only to the area where meat is to be processed for sale for human consumption, and not in any way can it refer to meat generally used for human consumption. The practical aspects of this proposal lead me to wonder how the Government can possibly hope to introduce inspectorial laws in country areas. A country butcher with licensed premises may go out once or twice a week to kill his shop's requirements, and I do not think it is impractical or unreasonable to have inspectors to inspect the meat on those occasions. However, what happens when he wants to kill one or two extra animals because he thinks he may need more meat before the weekend? Will there be so many inspectors in South Australia that they can keep up with that sort of situation? No fear! It is impractical, uneconomical, and unreasonable to suggest the whole State could come under such legislation.

Mr. Keneally: What you are saying is that people should be able to eat meat that has not been inspected?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Common sense should prevail. I do not deny that, where it is practical to implement it, inspectors should be available to visit these premises periodically to ensure that they are kept to a reasonable standard. What is disturbing about this proposal is that it is only a repetition of what has been put forward for years. Legislation to upgrade the premises of butchers has been talked about in this place for years, and this is not doing the industry in the field any good; nor is the

suggestion that there will be a blanket cover across the State. I hope that the Minister and the department responsible for this proposal will discuss the matter with the butchers and those close to the scene in the field before drafting is completed, because I believe that the relevant proposal should be prepared properly before it comes to the House rather than try to slaughter it thereafter.

The reference in the Governor's Speech to the Government's proposal to proceed with a campaign to eradicate cattle diseases is welcome, to say the least. Bovine tuberculosis and brucellosis are two diseases that we just cannot afford to tolerate in this country. There is no more ideal time than now for the Government to make money available for such a programme. The Agriculture Department was embarrassed by this programme a few years ago because of the price of beef livestock but now, in the northern areas particularly, growers would welcome a few dollars for their cattle that might be identified in this diseased category. This will not only relieve them of the diseased stock but it is the cheapest possible situation the Government could ever hope to have in which to exercise such a programme; for that reason alone it is justified. There are other reasons, such as the export market point of view, why in this country we ought to be making desperate efforts to clean up the diseases which are frowned upon by the importers of our products, such as Canada and Japan.

If we are to be genuine about assisting the beef industry, the type of financial help that we give these people must be of a grant or transport rebate kind. It is of little or no help to the beef industry to give it limited amounts of money on a long-term loan basis, irrespective of the interest rate, because when a member of the beef industry is in difficulty, mostly he has a debt that exceeds the value of his stock. In some cases also, the property is mortgaged. To borrow more money in those circumstances is neither wise nor desirable.

The position does not arise often, but by seasonal or other market conditions from time to time these people find themselves in trouble. This is one such time, and it is only reasonable and responsible for the Government to help them when they are down. The dairy industry called on the Government for assistance some years ago, and the dairy industry assistance plan was introduced. Similarly, the motor car industry has called on the Government for tariff and other protection from time to time when it has been in difficulty, and it has received assistance.

I agree that, immediately the people concerned get on their feet, the assistance should be removed, but in the meantime we have seen not indiscriminate hand-outs but essential assistance being given. I could include also the mineral and oil exploration group in Australia, as this is another group that the Government has assisted in order to keep the industry alive when it has been in difficulty, and I see no reason why those precedents should not be extended to the beef industry at present. Regarding our fishing industry, as the Government is calling on the Opposition periodically to submit alternatives, not to criticise, I say that the swiftest way in which to get the fishing industry back into gear is to first stop the imports of fish. I cannot in the short time available give the House all the detail that I have on the matter, but the quantity of fish being imported to Australia is alarming. At the same time, many persons involved in our own fishing industry have their boats tied to the wharves.

I refer also to the position that local government in South Australia is in. There are many areas of concern in this regard, but as an example I refer to the situation of the District Council of Port Elliot and Goolwa. This is

not an outstanding case but a sample of what I believe is applying in many council areas, and it only emphasises the need for further Commonwealth Government and/or State Government help to be given to these people. A document received from the District Clerk of that council states:

In reply to your letter of June 18, 1975, I enclose the information that you requested.

The table referred to covers the years from 1971-72 to 1974-75. It refers to debit order grants, Federal rural aid or district grants, and grants in aid. The totals of those grants are set out, as is the amount of the actual rates raised by the council. I seek leave to have that table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: Is it a factual table?

Mr. CHAPMAN: It is a table that has been prepared by the council, audited by the council's auditor and, I understand, checked by the Local Government Department as required under the Local Government Act.

Leave granted.

Date	Debit Order	GRANTS (\$)		Total (\$)	Rates (\$)
		District Grant	Grant in Aid		
1971-72 ..	94 350	25 000	1 265	120 615	119 786
1972-73 ..	113 199	14 500	1 297	128 996	144 989
1973-74 ..	59 000	28 000	1 646	88 646	191 468
1974-75 ..	26 500	30 000	2 118	58 618	247 784

Mr. CHAPMAN: One would have thought that the Government, in fairness, would have recognised the council's effort to help itself. The increase of about \$50 000 in the council's own local revenue was significant enough, in my opinion, at least in the ensuing 12 months, for the council to receive a similar grant figure in both debit order grants and Commonwealth rural aid grants. The Commonwealth Grants Commission has come into the picture and advanced to the council, in the current year, \$18 000. The district road grants, instead of increasing, in accordance with the current inflation rate, from \$30 000 in 1974-75, have been slashed to \$19 000, to which a council contribution of \$3 000 has been required. The grant in aid has remained fairly static, but again this figure is fairly insignificant in comparing the total financial position of that council. It is \$2 597.

There are no debit order grants, there is this \$18 000 Grants Commission allocation, and there is the slashing of the district grant. The council has been forced into that position. We have heard the Minister of Local Government many times saying that councils must learn to stand on their own feet. This council has stood up. It is like many others; it is now on its knees, and cannot call on its ratepayers for more money. On behalf of this council and many others in South Australia, I plead with the Government to be a little more realistic, to keep not just councillors in the honorary positions that they hold, not just to maintain the maintenance situation in the community, but to keep the labour force in those councils in a job.

The council that I have mentioned, despite the kick that it has received this time from the Minister and the Government, has increased its minimum rate but it cannot, in a rural community, increase the rate again this year, because the rate has increased from about \$119 000 in 1971-72 to about \$247 000 in 1974-75. This is as much as that community can handle; those concerned are exhausted for funds. The capacity to pay in that rural area is at a stage where the people cannot go any further. Not only out of sympathy but also for the purpose of bringing to the attention of this House the plight that these people are in, I raise that point on behalf of the District Council of Port Elliot and Goolwa.

Mr. Venning: It's not an orphan.

Mr. CHAPMAN: No, I appreciate the comment by the member for Rocky River. Many similar situations exist in councils throughout the State. I hope that, in the Government's programme and in line with the Treasurer's comment recently that the finances of this State are robustly healthy, the Government will see fit, in the ensuing 12 months, to spend money where it is needed and where it can be put to most use. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support the motion and take the opportunity to extend my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment to the highest position that this House can offer. From all the reports I have heard I know only too well you, Sir, will carry out the duties of your office with distinction. I add my condolences to the families of the late Sir Norman Jude and the Hon. Leslie Densley, both of whom I did not know but, according to reports I have received, they were gentlemen in every respect. I offer my congratulations to the two Government members who were recently elected to this House, the members for Price and Spence. I also congratulate the member for Heysen, and especially congratulate the members for Mount Gambier and Millicent on winning their seats from sitting Labor members. I wish honourable members who retired at the recent election well in their retirement, knowing full well that they made valuable contributions to the affairs of this Parliament.

Throughout the Address in Reply debate I have not heard an acknowledgment of the efforts of officers of the State Electoral Office. I commend them for their efforts and the manner in which they conducted the election that was called at such short notice. Although I do not believe Mr. Douglass's comments were recorded when the election news broke (I believe he was on his honeymoon somewhere in America when it happened and had to be called back to Australia), they would not have been too pleasant. He carried out his function with distinction, especially when it is remembered that this was the first election held under the new Legislative Council system. I would be first to acknowledge that this was a heavy task for Mr. Douglass to school up his officers on how the system should operate and to conduct a campaign to educate fairly the public on how to vote.

I take this opportunity to thank the electors of Flinders for their support. Without doubt the result I achieved was far greater than I could possibly have expected. I could not have planned the result even if I had tried to do so. I am pleased to say that, with three opponents contesting the election in my district, I came out with a clear majority of 51.1 per cent of the vote. The most pleasing result for me was that electors supported me throughout the length and breadth of the district: it was at only one polling booth that I was beaten. Some members have referred to the poor showing of the Country Party at the recent election. Whether such criticism is justified, I do not know. In some respects I suppose it is, but in other respects it is not justified. In the seats in which we showed most promise we received a good vote, making it worthwhile to continue to field candidates in those areas.

The interesting aspect of the election was that, wherever a Country Party candidate stood, the non-socialist vote was probably the highest it has ever been. In my district I do not think the Labor vote has ever been pushed to such an all-time low vote. On this occasion it was down to 23 per cent, and is a clear indication that an effective coalition can combat the socialist vote. At the recent election the Premier sought a mandate for electoral redis-

tribution on the concept of one vote one Value. That concept is a complete fallacy; in a sense it is meaningless. How can we possibly achieve one vote one value? It is a human impossibility. Representation in Parliament gets back to what we believe is the role of a member of Parliament. Is he supposed to sit in this Chamber and vote when his Leader tells him to vote, or is he elected by his constituents to serve them and look after their needs by making representations on their behalf and being available to them when he is needed? Is this the role of a member of Parliament, or is he just someone who sits on a back bench and votes when he is told to vote?

The position to which I have been elected is one of service to my constituents. It is a position in which I try to honour the confidence that constituents have placed in me. Fair representation cannot be achieved by the one vote one value concept or by equal-sized districts. The situation could arise easily where 80 per cent of South Australia could be in one district, whereas in a metropolitan area a member could, if he so desired, ride around his district before breakfast on a push-bike. That is the anomaly that could occur. It cannot be tolerated in any way. There must be a weighting towards country areas if members are to maintain their representation of the people. The greatest admission along that line was made by the member for Gilles. Although his admission was made indirectly, he did acknowledge that he did not experience the brucellosis problem faced by the member for Rocky River or the problem of rust in wheat experienced by the member for Mallee. The honourable member's comments may have been insignificant, but they point out the reason why there should be a country weighting. In my district, as in most districts represented by the Opposition, I cover just about every phase of representation that arises in South Australia. In fact, the problems I experience in my district vary from the field of social services to primary production and from the wine industry to the fishing industry. I am expected to represent all those matters. I have probably as many contacts throughout the spectrum of South Australia as have all Government members combined. This is a difficulty a country member experiences. I have heard Government members freely admit that they would not wish to represent a district such as mine. However, I point out that my district is not the worst in that regard. If we are to provide equal representation, we must do it in a way in which all South Australians can expect to have an equal voice on the floor of this Chamber. My objective and the objective of my Party is to defeat the Labor Government.

Mr. Keneally: Shame!

Mr. BLACKER: I make no apology for that statement.

Mr. Keneally: Why don't you get some objectives that are achievable?

Mr. BLACKER: I have supported that philosophy since I first stood on the platform and asked electors to support me. My Party is aiming to defeat the Labor Government. To do that we on this side must form a coalition that is specialist in its approach, since it should represent both rural and metropolitan interests. I do not wish to criticise remarks made by Liberal Party members, because some of them represent rural districts and, without doubt, they made exceptionally good speeches on behalf of rural districts. However, those speeches would not be inspiring to a metropolitan Liberal. Most country members of the Liberal Party espouse platforms such as they have espoused today and during last week, which have been commendable for their areas but which do not appeal to a

metropolitan voter. This is the problem which, as an Opposition, we must solve in order to win government.

Socialism has been the key issue in my political career; it has been portrayed throughout every aspect of politics, and we saw it grow to a head in the most recent election in more ways than one. The transfer of the non-metropolitan railways was more an issue of socialist philosophy than an economic measure. This socialistic issue is a strong desire by the State Government to hand over South Australia's country railways, to conform strictly with the Australian Labor Party pledge. All A.L.P. candidates are asked to pledge themselves to support the socialisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange. At the A.L.P. Terrigal conference a motion was moved that the Premiers of all Labor States hand over powers to the Commonwealth when requested, and the railways move is merely carrying out that decision.

When we look at this issue we find it similar to the manipulation by the Commonwealth Government of the Medibank issue. Instead of the national health scheme being implemented by a majority decision of the people in the majority of the States, we find that the two minor States have been used, even though the wishes of the remainder of the States, representing more than 80 per cent of the population, have been ignored. Nevertheless, all people throughout the Commonwealth are being taxed. The effect of this is that financial pressures are being brought to bear on the non-co-operating States, and they in turn will be forced to succumb, not at the will and wish of the people but by financial manipulation. This pressure is being applied as regards the railways, other States sharing the cost to the financial embarrassment of those wishing to retain State rights. To suggest that this is a financial arrangement is just not on. Transferring the non-metropolitan railways will not assist our financial problems, because we will still have to pay the debt, which cannot disappear.

The Premier has said that no-one will lose his or her employment, but there will have to be separate administrative staffs, so the costs will be greater. The transfer Bill opens up further cause for concern. The member for Stuart said that the railways should be serviced by the Government-owned and Government-operated road transport service. This service would compete with private enterprise transport and would force private operators to close down. Government vehicles would operate without paying fuel, road or sales taxes, whereas private enterprise would have to pay such taxes. It would then be simple to regulate so that all produce be carried, by Government transport. For a producer or manufacturer to be told that his stock or commodity would be carried when the Public Service got around to it is not a comforting thought. It is ironical that, at the time of the election, the Premier, when trying to hand over country rail services to the Commonwealth, was at the same time in Canberra on his knees pleading with the Prime Minister regarding the serious effects of the State taxing powers handed over to the Commonwealth some years ago. The greatest mistake ever made was when the States handed over these taxing powers. Now the Government has handed over our country rail services and, with them, the right of control over our services. I mention briefly the comparison between our hand-over of the State's rail services and the Medibank issue.

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

Mr. BLACKER: I have been comparing the transfer of country rail services with Medibank. Three weeks

ago I attended the annual meeting of the Eyre Peninsula Hospitals Association, Group 8, at Cowell. The Chairman of Group 8, Mr. McCracken, delivered the annual report, which reflected the feeling of most people on Eyre Peninsula. Mr. McCracken's report was fully approved by all delegates present at the meeting. He said:

Since our last conference we have had Medibank forced upon us. I say "forced" without fear of contradiction (a stronger word could be used). We were invited to apply for recognition but really we had very little choice. Financial assistance from the Hospitals Department under the old system was generally satisfactory. There was no assured financial assistance for country hospitals that did not join Medibank and become a recognised hospital.

A group meeting was held in Wudinna earlier this year to discuss Medibank. We were unable to obtain a representative from either the Hospitals Department or the A.M.A. Mr. J. Bailey, Secretary of the Hospitals Association, kindly made time available to answer questions. We did not gain very much from this meeting. Most speakers voiced their displeasure with Medibank.

What of the future? Will the concept of Medibank bring a change of attitude to board management? Will the status of boards of management and the autonomy remain as before? Will sufficient finance continue to be available for capital works? Our hospitals need to be upgraded continually to keep abreast of modern medicine. The above and many others require very deep thought. It is a very simple matter for a member of the Hospitals Department to answer "yes". History has shown, policy can be changed almost overnight.

Mr. McCracken, in expressing displeasure about security, said:

We do not have a signed agreement. In my opinion an agreement prepared by our association and the Hospitals Department should be standard procedure. The Federal and State Governments have an agreement signed late in June. With such a dramatic change in financing arrangements, which together involves an enormous amount of dollars in capital, buildings and equipment, would not a democratic procedure be to first prepare an agreement? The cost of an agreement? If there is nothing to hide, why not have one?

These questions are being asked repeatedly by those who have in the past been managing country hospitals. Mr. McCracken continued:

Costs and finance. There was a period when Medibank was advertised as being a "free service". Later this was changed. Let us face facts. Who reaps the cost of health services? The taxpayer and ratepayer will be compelled to make an increased contribution. Most ratepayers are not in a financial position to meet increased costs. I have heard the following remark on several occasions, "It's OK. Medibank will pay for it." (It is a very shortsighted remark to make.) There are no incentives for good management (which would result in lower costs). Although Medibank has been in the planning and development process for some years. The recognised hospital is on deficit financing—no profit basis. Therefore, your share of subsidised works must come from the public. Considering the state of the economy, the possibility of cutback in public sector spending in the forthcoming and subsequent Budgets, I strongly advise caution in expending your present funds.

In referring to ladies auxiliaries and the need for public support, Mr. McCracken said:

The financial and physical assistance of these people has been very valuable in the past. This assistance has very often enabled the boards to provide the necessities and balance their budgets. I know these dedicated people will continue to support our hospitals. Their efforts will also lighten the burden of the taxpayers. Local government has made voluntary contributions of quite large amounts. I fear local government will no doubt be called upon to make higher compulsory contributions to health services. This is already a fact in some areas. Therefore, I fear if compulsory contributions are in force, voluntary contributions will naturally decrease and may even be discontinued. I feel we may have to lean more heavily on ladies auxiliary and public supporters if we are to maintain our standard of health care.

The comments made after Mr. McCracken had delivered his report were very much in his favour. No point of criticism was raised by any Government official or any other person present; everyone thought that Mr. McCracken was spot on. Another major problem in my district is the housing problem. At least 50 per cent of all queries reaching my office relate to housing. Only last Friday two constituents came to my office for assistance; one had been served with an eviction notice by court order to vacate a house within 14 days, and the other had been served with an order to vacate a house within 28 days. Naturally, their immediate reaction was that the Housing Trust should provide housing for them, but I know that it is impossible for the trust to provide housing at such short notice.

There is a trend throughout the State for young married couples no longer to have as their primary aim the establishment of a home for themselves. Only a few years ago young married couples had as their primary aim the building or acquiring of a home of their own, on which they could base their future lives. However, under the Labor Government's system and the social services that go with it, the incentive to own one's own home has been undermined. More and more people regard the State as being responsible for providing housing for them. As a result, people who can provide some form of housing, whether it be rental housing or otherwise, have found that the demand has been so great that exorbitant rentals have been charged. The Housing Trust is certainly unable to meet this need for housing; it was never designed to be a centre for providing accommodation for the social service needs of the community. Consequently, in some districts there is a four-year wait or a five-year wait for housing, and in my district there is a two-year wait. The demand is growing. Only a few months ago the waiting period was down to 16 months.

The problem has developed because of the Government's philosophies and because of the development of a social welfare state. We see from the newspapers that similar accommodation problems exist in the metropolitan area. In last Wednesday's newspaper, under the heading "Flats and Rooms to Let", I have found that the exorbitant rents are beyond the means of people on low incomes. There is no possibility of such people renting or owning a house. In fact, I believe that the shortage of accommodation in Adelaide, in regional centres, and particularly in Port Lincoln (I know this applies to other regional cities as well) has meant that the prices being asked or charged for anything that is available have almost reached the stage of being called a racket. The present situation seems to be the worst at any time in the history of South Australia.

Before the last State election, I was looking around, mainly for a friend in Adelaide, but had to suspend my inquiries until after the election. During the time I was looking around, I found middle-class guesthouses available to let at rents of \$40 a week for full board and a single room. Middle-class unfurnished modern flats were available at \$40 a week, with about a month's rent in advance and a \$100 bond, plus the cost to the tenant of providing gas, telephone and electricity connections, making a total of nearly \$500 in cash for a couple to be able to move in. This problem has developed in housing, and I cannot see a ready answer to it, except to return to the people an incentive to own their own houses, to become able to grasp the responsibility of providing for themselves, thus relieving the State of additional accommodation pressures.

Several mentions have been made of the Monarto plan and what is intended for it. I believe it is not a goer: I

believe it has been instituted as a political gimmick. It has been designed with political overtones and initiatives. It will not work, because too many people are being asked and even forced to go out there. If much of this money was spent on upgrading our existing towns and regional cities, the same purpose could be achieved at far less expense to the State. Not only that, but it would revive the towns that over the past two years have become almost ghost towns. I do not believe a satellite town is the answer to South Australia's immediate problems, certainly not until the turn of the century.

During the past three weeks, the Government has offered to the producers on Eyre Peninsula a 75c a head sheep slaughtering scheme, which is being readily used by producers on Eyre Peninsula and particularly those affected in drought-stricken areas. The problem is that the break-even point for the producers would be a radius of about 193 km from Port Lincoln, bearing in mind that the first 97 km from Port Lincoln is having a reasonably good season; so we have only a radial area of between 97 km and 193 km from Port Lincoln where delivery to the Government Produce Department works at Port Lincoln can be economically used. Beyond that point, the freight costs far outweigh the 75c it is possible to obtain; consequently, the offer made by the Government, whilst an advantage to a select few, is of no assistance to producers in the Far North areas, where the drought has really taken hold.

The member for Frome mentioned earlier the possibility of extending the scheme to accommodate beef. The same problems would apply in the freight costs to get the stock to slaughter for a fair return, or at least a return to cover expenses. Consequently, although the offer was much appreciated by those who could take advantage of it, it was of limited value to all concerned. I tie that in with the following comment in the Governor's Speech:

My Government will press on with its plans to improve the quality of the State's livestock by proceeding with the campaign for the eradication of the cattle diseases, bovine tuberculosis and brucellosis.

Most members have mentioned these diseases, but very few of them realise their importance or the magnitude of their effects on Australia's meat exports. The export trade is becoming more selective, and exporters will not purchase from certain countries because they have these diseases. Consequently, the availability of an export market has been considerably reduced because of the selective nature of the buyers. Until South Australia and Australia can be declared free from bovine tuberculosis and brucellosis, our export potential will be severely limited.

Then there are the quarantine measures that must follow. It concerns me that the quarantine provisions in this State, whilst they are tight in some areas will mean that soon (but not too soon, I hope) South Australia, if not Australia, will have to face the problem of having to overcome an outbreak of foot and mouth disease or a disease of that type. Should that happen (and all the so-called experts or the people in the know seem to think that inevitably it will happen), it will have disastrous effects not only on the ability of the country to contain such an outbreak but also on the almost immediate loss of export markets. If, for example, there was an outbreak of foot and mouth disease on Lower Eyre Peninsula, almost certainly at least half the stock on Eyre Peninsula would have to be destroyed and buried, for there is no other means of disposing of it. All that stock would have to be destroyed, and with it goes not only the value of the meat but also the value of the stud stock and the hereditary build-up behind it. It would be a good thing if all members of the House could see the

two films currently available through the Agriculture Department on measures that could be taken to control any outbreak of foot and mouth disease, which, if not controlled, would be disastrous.

I express fear at this measure, because, air travel being the way it is, with people being able virtually to hop from one country to another, the availability of this form of transport magnifies the problems and the risks of bringing into this country such diseases, which must be avoided at all times. As regards the slaughtering of livestock, the Governor's Speech stated:

New meat industry legislation will also be laid before you this session. An important object of this legislation will be to ensure that the slaughtering of livestock for human consumption will take place only in the most hygienic conditions.

That has been foreshadowed several times. No-one so far has been able to get any information on what is meant by those sentences. In fact, I asked a question of the Minister of Works in March of this year, and the Minister said that the matter had not even been considered; yet it came out almost immediately in the press, when the House rose, that the matter was being considered and it was intended to implement legislation to bring it about. The real fear is that local butchers will be forced out of business, which will mean a polarisation of the killing works; and the fear of Eyre Peninsula butchers and consumers is that all stock will have to be delivered to major killing works, such as those at Port Lincoln and Whyalla, and then transhipped back in refrigerated containers.

Mention has been made of local government grants and the drastic way in which they have been cut. Already in the debate several examples have been given of the way in which the grants to certain councils have been reduced. I have a list of the councils in my district, and should like to refer briefly to one, the Tumby Bay District Council. In 1971-72 its grant for main and district roads was \$105 500, and that has been progressively reduced over the five years to a grant of \$54 600 for 1975-76. Although the Australian Government says that it has given great assistance to local government by untied grants through the Grants Commission, this council and many others have been compelled to spend these sums of money on roads to compensate for the large decline in their 1974-75 allocation.

In the case of Eyre Peninsula, it was coincidental that the 1974-75 Grants Commission grant almost equalled the reduction in road grants for the same year. Realignment and reconstruction of the Cummins to Tumby Bay main road (the road which is commonly known on Eyre Peninsula as the Bratton Way) began in 1965-66 and has been plagued by continual setbacks with regard to its sealing programme, mainly because of a shortage of funds and because other works have received a higher priority. The Highways Department stated in 1972 that the sealing would take place in two years, but the Minister of Local Government has now confirmed that it will be at least another five years before the work is undertaken. Over the past 10 years, the condition of the road has deteriorated to such an extent that the council considers that sections have become dangerous and, unless grants are substantially increased soon, the council can foresee similar trends occurring on other roads. Like most other councils, this council is nearing a period in which it is almost impossible to raise additional revenue, especially in rural areas.

I raised the point about the Bratton Way because I have referred to this matter many times in the House, and on each occasion the matter has been delayed. On doing a little research into the matter, I find that the road was

first to be sealed in the fourth year of a five-year programme which was first initiated immediately after the Second World War. So, a programme that was supposed to be implemented in 1949 has still not been completed. One of the major points of dissatisfaction is that this road is one of the main arterial roads on lower Eyre Peninsula which, despite promises to seal it, has never been sealed. That this road is used primarily by a medical syndicate operating between Cummins and Tumby Bay has caused considerable concern among the people in those areas, because the medical practitioners must travel frequently on this road at high speeds. Indeed, between the time I asked the Minister a question in the House and when I received his reply, one of our doctors wrote off his car on this road. Therefore, the very point I raised foreshadowed an event that actually occurred. Let us face it: we cannot afford accidents of this kind.

Also, the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science has a daily run between Port Lincoln, Cummins, and Tumby Bay, and it regularly uses this road. So, in serving the public, those people place themselves in a hazardous situation.

Another reason for raising this matter is that, although Eyre Peninsula has many kilometres of sealed roads, it does not have a road from coast to coast. Only a few days ago a public servant who came to Port Lincoln said that Eyre Peninsula was a good place. He had been from Port Augusta to Port Lincoln and Ceduna and had had, he said, sealed roads all the way. I can tell members, from a comment like that, every town through which he travelled, because it would not have been humanly possible for him to travel on other than one road: he would have had to cover all the main sealed roads on Eyre Peninsula, because there is not one cross road that he could have used.

One of the major industries in my district is the fishing industry, which comprises several parts. One component of the industry about which I should like to speak is abalone fishing, which has been developed by local divers, who found the abalone. They have created their own fishery and have formed an association, which has made recommendations to the Minister to try to implement some form of control. They have also made recommendations to enable relief divers to operate with them. There are many good reasons why these matters should be raised, and I do so knowing that a confrontation is developing between the Abalone Divers Association of South Australia and the Fisheries Department. This confrontation has arisen over the differences (if I can use that word) between the department and the association regarding allowing divers to get out of the industry if they so wish for health or other reasons, and enabling the permit that they hold to be transferred to relief divers. I should like now to refer to submissions made by the association to the Minister, and consequently the department and the Government, requesting consideration of their proposals and the rationale behind them. The following proposals were put forward by the Abalone Divers Association:

We propose:

(1) That the Minister allows an unfit diver, or any diver, concerned with the state of his health, to leave the industry without undue hardship.

(2) That an item of the diver's gear or equipment be licensed.

(3) That a diver be allowed to transfer his licensed equipment to a suitably qualified replacement diver of his choice—either immediately, or after a "phasing in—phasing out" period.

The regulations under the Act presently require a certain standard of medical fitness for renewal of a licence. Divers who fail their medical examination are therefore faced

not only with the termination of their licence but termination of their livelihood.

In other words, a man can be gainfully employed one week and, on taking a medical examination, can be automatically dismissed from the industry. His licence can be cancelled, his equipment can become useless because it cannot be transferred, and he is subsequently left with equipment worth up to \$20 000, for which he has no useful purpose and of which he has no means of adequate disposal. The association's letter continued:

Whilst we realise that an annual medical examination is desirable, it is the termination of livelihood which concerns us most. This regulation, in consequence, creates a disastrous situation. It is evident that this regulation, introduced in good faith, may not have the effect originally intended. This situation should not continue. No such similar legislation has been introduced into the other managed fisheries of South Australia. Nor does it exist in other professions involving singular responsibility in this State. It appears to discriminate against our industry alone. It ignores the undue hardship it places on a diver. It ignores the fact that he is put out of a job without warning, yet still faces the same social and economic commitments; the fact that he is unable to realise anything like the true value of his gear; the fact that he is medically unfit to possibly enter other professions.

It assumes that a permit holder has no entitlement to continue his chosen profession, but rather reflects that the licence renewal is a privilege or special favour endowed annually by the State. Such an argument of right *versus* privilege could be carried on *ad infinitum*. What should be realised, however, is that we pioneered the industry, and have developed it to its present state. We risked life and investment capital; developed a management programme, established markets, and the methodology by tireless thought, effort, and trial and error action. We believe, therefore, that establishing and proving the viability of this industry, apart from the valuable contribution of the department of the fishery, is much to our credit, and should not be overlooked in this context. Psychologically, it saps a diver's drive, and sense of security while in the industry—

that is, knowing that he could be dismissed immediately—Economically, it reduces his incentive to invest in safer and more specialised equipment; it weakens his ability to raise finance. More importantly, though, the diver has been allowed (even induced) to expand his investment and ties in the industry over the last seven years to the point that the average diver's investment presently exceeds \$20 000. The present legislation denies him the chance to recoup anything like the true value of this investment. Socially, it threatens to disrupt his whole life-style, along with that of his family; deny his continuing in his chosen profession, and disallow him the phase-out period he needs to acquire the skills of another profession. The psychological traumas these uncertainties create are equally damaging. They only help lower the morale further in an industry in which an exploding shark problem is already creating havoc and mental stress.

Such a situation is quite unnecessary. The other three abalone producing States of Australia have been quick to see the necessity for change. Under changing circumstances, Western Australia and Tasmania were both prompted to review their approach to the health problems in the fishery and amend their policy. Victoria has framed similar legislation ready to implement when catch rates stabilise. All three States have expressed their concern over the special health risks faced by commercial abalone divers, and have approved the very measures we need in our industry.

No policy can remain static forever. It must change, along with changing circumstances. The health problems evident in our industry show close similarities with those that have caused policy changes interstate. They reflect the need for a change in policy. In an industry with a stable catch rate, and a proven sustainable yield; in an industry in which a closed shop situation has developed with its inherent undesirable hampering of opportunities; and in an industry in which health problems are causing increasing concern, both mentally as well as physically, it is unnecessary that a situation such as this should exist.

It calls for bold, enlightened, action by the Minister along the lines we have proposed. The proposals for change are clear; and thankfully the means of change are within the Minister's power. Awareness by a diver of his state of health is a desirable thing, but equally as important to a diver is the means of leaving the industry without undue hardship, if he finds himself unable to continue. An item of equipment used by the diver could be registered and licensed, this licensed item could be phased over, along with the other necessary equipment, to a newcomer in the industry, or to a trainee diver from the relief pool in the industry.

The Minister has already shown his concern for our wellbeing by introducing this regulation concerned with health, and by introducing an enlightened relief diver policy. The medical examination has created an awareness in divers which did not exist when they entered the industry. The relief diver policy has undoubtedly led to less decompression accidents from overstaying, and therefore less chance of aseptic necrosis amongst divers. We ask the Minister to continue reforms within the industry and we cannot stress too strongly the urgent need that exists for our proposed measures.

These measures have been put forward by the divers association, but there has been some indication that they will not be taken up by the department. The indication has been that the trial period of 12 months for relief divers that has existed will cease at the end of this month, placing added burdens on the divers. First, they will be compelled to stay under water for longer periods than in the past when they were able to use a relief diver; secondly, on the one hand, they will be compelled to stay down and, on the other hand, they have been asked to submit themselves to far more stringent medical examinations.

A circular posted to most abalone divers only in the past week, and received by one diver on Tuesday last, contained an application for renewal of the licence together with the annual and initial medical examination under Standards Association CZ18. That medical examination involves a most comprehensive report, and certainly goes through most aspects concerned with physical wellbeing. The divers intend to take a stand against this. They feel that, by having to submit to such a medical examination and having those records available in the Fisheries Department, the confidentiality of doctor-patient relationships is being undermined. Certainly, the divers do not believe that their standard of health should be determined as a means of saying, "Get out of the industry."

I think it would be fair to ask any Minister (or even the Minister of Transport, as he is present) whether it is intended to introduce such measures in relation to applications for drivers' licences, because the health of drivers could have a far more disastrous effect on other members of the community than the health of the divers could have on anyone else. The diver maintains that he is dealing with his own health; he has no-one else to worry about. He sometimes has one companion. He does not have to have a man in the dinghy ("upstairs", as it is often called), and this is creating problems. Unless the diver can train a man in the industry and bring him in in the phasing-in and phasing-out periods, he will find that immediately one man is taken out of the industry there will be no trained man to take his place.

The fact that the relief diver suggestion is not to be continued means that these divers will have to spend longer periods on the seabed. The overall effect will be that they will put themselves at far greater risk in relation to their own health. They will be in greater danger of bone necrosis, but the part that has concerned us most is that if these men do not spend additional time at the bottom of the sea they cannot afford to pay a man to sit in the

dinghy and watch the equipment. At the moment, divers cannot afford to pay much more than the dole for their men; they are competing with the unemployment office for employees to sit in the dinghy and shell for them. These employees are engaged on a share basis, and at present one honestly cannot ask a man to sit out there unless he can earn at least \$4 000 or \$5 000 for shelling. When people can readily do this ashore they will not put themselves at risk (although I am not saying there is very much risk) in open boats, sometimes kilometres from the shore, just shelling and looking after the diver's equipment. To the diver, it is most important to have a responsible man sitting in the dinghy, because his life could be at stake if the operator in the dinghy were to allow the boat to get too far away from the diver or if the air hose broke. There is no point in my explaining further difficulties that could arise. Unless divers are allowed to engage relief divers to bring new men into the industry thus allowing the older divers to be phased out effectively, the industry as a whole faces havoc.

Many of the aspects referred to in the Governor's Speech will no doubt be dealt with by honourable members as the measures are introduced. Among some of the aspects referred to is the concept of a State water resources council that I support in particular. I believe the Government has a duty to preserve all our water potential, which in the past I will not say has been treated haphazardly, but it has not been researched in a manner in which every available source of water has been utilised effectively for South Australia. South Australia is the driest State in the driest continent and, unless we are prepared to harvest our water supply and put it to good use, our production potential will be severely limited. It is essential that a State resources council or a body of that nature be set up to control effectively water pollution and to maintain generally the husbanding of the State's water resources. It is with much pleasure that I support the Address in Reply.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I express the same regret that has been expressed by other honourable members to the honourable members who have left Parliament, whether they left voluntarily or because insufficient electors voted for them. Whether in retirement or in another field of endeavour (if they are in a younger age group) I wish them all a healthy and happy future. To the families of the late Sir Norman Jude and the Hon. Mr. Densley, I express mine and my family's condolences to their families. Of the members who left voluntarily, I express personal thanks to Mr. McAnaney, the former member for Heysen. He was a friend of mine and our districts adjoined each other. We sometimes had our differences in philosophy, but we were close and stuck together to the end. I thank him for his guidance when I first came into the Chamber, because he was an elder of the House. I also thank him for his guidance when I was learning some of the ropes in this House.

I have stated previously to you, Sir, that I congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker. I know you will attempt to show an independence, because you were elected to Parliament as an Independent. I know that, within the operations of a House of Parliament such as this, it is difficult to know when one is taking the right or the wrong course. I hope that if you set a precedent in any shape or form you set it and realise that it will be available to any later Speaker and that that precedent may be used to the advantage, or perhaps to the disadvantage, of other members of Parliament in future. I hope that the

same independent character that led you to stand as an Independent against an endorsed candidate of the Party to which you belonged before the rules stopped you from being a member of that Party will prevail throughout your term in this Parliament.

I am conscious that there has been considerable discussion in this Address in Reply debate, but I want it recorded publicly that if one looks back over the years one sees that the time spent on the debate this year is not as long as has been spent on average over the past 15 years. If we are to start pushing Parliamentary business through for the sake of Government expediency (and this debate is a good example) it will be a pity. I appreciate that the Government Whip understands this aspect. I will try to be blunt and to the point when emphasising the problems that I have within my own district, because a Government member prompted me to go back over some of those problems which I have been raising year in and year out for the past seven years.

Mr. Slater: I hope you've fixed them up, too.

Mr. EVANS: I thank the member for Gilles who interjected out of his seat because, if he wishes, I will tell him later why those problems have not been fixed up and what has prompted me to take the course I will take this evening. However, before doing that I wish to refer to the problem of housing raised by the member for Flinders. Under Commonwealth and State Australian Labor Party Governments I have no doubt that the housing industry and the opportunity for any young couple or any other age group to buy a house in this State is the worst it has ever been in financial terms. Even in the depression years it was not as bad as it is today. I admit that the supply of goods was worse during the war years, but that was only because of the availability of supplies. We all understand why supplies and materials were not available in those times. After the war we would all remember a group of men who served to save what they thought was democracy, came back to Australia (and we all thanked them for their efforts, because it was through their efforts that we have some freedoms left) and formed a home-builders club.

Although such a concept may not be appreciated by all people in the building industry, we have reached the stage where young people should now be clubbing together to form a home-builders club where the man who is a clerk by occupation will labour on a building site, where the carpenter, the plumber, the electrician, the bricklayer and everyone else is paid the same rate for each hour worked. Those people could construct their own houses in a club spirit. I think it is now possible to establish that sort of club again. That concept worked effectively after the war, and it would work now because socialism has killed the opportunity for a young person to own his own home. Young people would not have to rely on the Government or other people and would avoid high interest commitments because they would cut down their overall costs.

In my opinion that is the only solution for today's house-seekers. The South Australian Housing Trust is becoming so top heavy with bureaucrats that it will become the biggest housing authority in Australia and will build very few houses for the size of its administration if we allow it to continue on the path it is now following. Even people in the trust agree that they are frightened about what is happening. The trust is receiving applications for rental accommodation at the rate of about 12 000 a year but is building only about 1 500 houses a year. The

number of houses now being built is slightly more than a third of the number of houses that was built by the trust under a Liberal Government at the peak of trust construction. We are falling behind each year and are now at least seven years behind in terms of supplying houses for people requiring rental accommodation. To me, that is frightening. I believe that the Honourable Frank Walsh, who was a prominent Labor Party member, a true working man brought up in the building industry, would be ashamed to belong to the A.L.P. today, if he were fortunate enough to be still with us. In 1962 he said that the house, the home, was a cornerstone of our democracy. He said that each and every person should own his home; that it was not for the individual to rely upon the State. Those were the words of an important member of the Labor Party organisation.

There will be other opportunities to further bring home the point about housing, but I believe that a home-builders club would be one way in which people could be organised. I hope that, if a group is started now in such a venture, it will receive some Government assistance in being established with a constitution and, perhaps, a small secretariat in the initial stages until it gets off the ground and becomes better organised.

The member for Playford in his contribution in this debate made points that had some appeal to me. True, I did not agree with all that he advanced, but there were some aspects with which I agreed and I know, by interjection, that he agreed with me on one or two aspects. The member for Playford suggested that the Commonwealth Constitution should be changed in some areas to give more control to the Commonwealth Government and in other areas more control to the States.

I do not disagree with that view, although I might not agree about what changes should be made in certain areas. Nevertheless, I believe that political Parties have started to take a keen interest in the Constitution for their own political ends. Our founding fathers did not set out to provide for political Parties in the Constitution. The Constitution allows for the election of individuals to Parliament; not politically affiliated at all with any organisation and there is no mention of political Parties in our Constitution.

Individuals are elected to represent people, and the purpose of the Constitution, in the main, is to set down the rules for government of the country. The Constitution seeks to make it impossible for a dictator or some power-hungry group to destroy the democracy in which we live. The Constitution has not been created to be fiddled with by Parliamentarians or political Parties. The honourable member suggested that he had a distrust of political Parties and their motives, and I make it clear that that is the reason why the man in the street does not like, by referendum or any other means, to change the Constitution.

Each honourable member can talk to his own constituents, who will often say that they trust him, that he is satisfactory as an individual, but that once he joins his Party colleagues they no longer trust him or his Party as a group. That appears true and I do not blame constituents for thinking like this because, over the years, I have come to believe that, regardless of what political Party is in power, there have been attempts to alter the Constitution, not for the sake of the people but for the sake of the philosophy of the Party, often to give that Party or another future Party an opportunity to govern more easily.

If it becomes easier to govern in the future there is also a risk that it becomes easier to manipulate society. Society must never forget that possibility and, to give a good example, I refer all honourable members to the situation now occurring in India under Mrs. Gandhi. It is strange, in view of all the attacks that have been made by Labor Party members, that there has not been one comment from honourable members about the actions in recent weeks taken by Mrs. Gandhi. Honourable members opposite receive copies of the *Indian News*, and I hope some of them, at least, have read this paper if only to see what Mrs. Gandhi has said and how she has tried to justify her actions.

Dr. Eastick: It's not unlike the situation that has taken place in Australia.

Mr. EVANS: That is true, and that is why I have attempted to draw a comparison in this instance. In referring to my own district, I recall the member for Tea Tree Gully referring to a small sewerage problem existing in her district. By way of interjection I suggested that she had had all her problems solved, and the honourable member agreed that she had, in the main, and that this was through strong representation. Her comment prompted me to wonder what the honourable member meant by "strong representation". Is strong representation to a Labor member something different from any form of representation by a Liberal member?

The electorate of Fisher, which I am proud to serve, has more unsewered allotments in it than there are in the remainder of the Adelaide metropolitan area put together. In fact, it has twice as many unsewered allotments. Furthermore, some of the divisions in the district have been subdivided and developed over 50 years; they are not new. This problem to which I refer is not a new problem. Moneys have been available in recent times to attempt to catch up with the sewerage backlog and, if any honourable member wishes to make the point that there was a Liberal Government in power before I came to represent my district and it should have made up that leeway, I hasten to point out that, if Sir Thomas Playford and his Liberal colleagues had acted in the same way as it appears that this Government has acted, there would be no sewerage problem in my area, because Liberal-held seats would have been cleaned up first.

However, Sir Thomas Playford did not do that, and I am proud to know that he did not do it. In Eden Hills it is fair to say that sewage effluent runs down the street from the septic tanks. It actually erodes the road, which incurs an additional cost for the Mitcham council. Forget about the stench, forget about the aroma that circulates every minute of every hour of every day, forget about the children walking through it, the pets running through it, and the eroded footpaths. No matter how it is looked at, it is bad for a community to live in such an environment. The situation in Coromandel Valley West is no better. The situation in Hawthorndene is even worse, and I was interested to hear the member for Florey today make an attack on a newspaper, which, carried the following headline:

School protest over "health hazard" drains.

I do not know whether that article is true or not in respect of conditions in the district of Florey, but that same statement can be written and accepted as being totally accurate in my district, especially adjacent to Hawthorndene Primary School, where effluent flows in the street still green in colour.

I believe that some honourable members could not go into my area on a summer evening for a barbecue meal

and enjoy it, yet people living there and their children growing up in the district must accept this situation as the norm; the children know no different, because this situation has existed since they were born. The children play in it, they run in it, their pets run in it, and it is even adjacent to the primary school.

The kindergarten is built along the edge of a creek, and the creek flows with it. If honourable members want to know about raw sewage, I can tell them that it flowed from the pumping station beside Hawthorndene oval into the creek last year, so that the report to which I have just referred is totally accurate in relation to my district in more than one part of it. Glenalta is another area which has a small section to be completed, and Blackwood similarly has a small section to be completed. Belair has a large section to be completed that is just as bad as Hawthorndene, Eden Hills or any other part. I am not talking about Stirling or Crafers, because the problem is not as great there now, but let us talk about effort.

Regarding a strong representation, the Monalta people employed their own engineer, drew up their own scheme, got a price on it, asked the Government to back them for \$300 000 only as a guarantee until such time as the Government had the money, and the Glenalta people would have paid the interest on the \$300 000, but the Government refused to back them. What does the Government mean by strong representation? What does the Government call strong effort? Every Government member in the House at the time backed the member for Tea Tree Gully, who said it was the result of a strong representation. Every area in the Mitcham Hills has presented petitions to the Government through this Parliament, and some directly to the Minister.

Dr. Eastick: They're in a Liberal seat.

Mr. EVANS: It becomes difficult to say that all the time, and I do not want to say that all the time. It worries me that this is happening, and I have a long way to go to show how serious the situation is. I introduced this matter in debate in the House over seven years ago and letters have passed back and forth between the Minister and me. I will not set out to itemise them, because there are hundreds of them. Sometimes when we try to have an area considered, a reply to which the Mitcham council and I object comes regularly from the Minister of Works through his departmental officers, namely, that if we want area B considered, we will have to change the priorities for area A. In other words, the department says to the Mitcham council, "You change the priorities and we will change the programme." The council and the people are not asking that Blackwood miss out for the sake of Belair or that Hawthorndene miss out for the sake of Monalta. What they are asking for is the upgrading of the overall effort in that area.

We are spending about \$8 500 000 a year on sewerage works in the metropolitan area and four years ago the Commonwealth Government gave us nothing. We were still spending large sums then. Now the Commonwealth Government is giving us \$5 700 000 of the \$8 500 000 required; so, what the State Government is really doing is not using up its State funds at all but is walking away and saying, "We will use Commonwealth grant and Loan money in the main." I make the point that my area, in relation to sewerage, is a disgrace to any community and any Government that it should stay as it is, with little real effort being made to catch up the leeway.

I turn now to schools, because the same argument may be used. In my area, I would go close to having the largest demand for schools, in an electorate of 21 000 electors.

Bellevue Heights waits patiently for a school that was promised would be begun by the end of this year. It has not been begun yet, and it does not look like getting off the ground for some time. The people of Coromandel Valley have been waiting for many years, and a move was made at the beginning of the year to build Coromandel Valley South. I made representations and said I thought that that school should not be proceeded with but that Coromandel Valley should be built or that the existing school be rebuilt. I received a reply saying that Coromandel Valley South had been scrapped about a month previously and that Coromandel Valley would be upgraded. However, Flagstaff Hill will be built, and that is on the border of my district and will serve a part of it. This school, which is in the district of the Minister of Education, will be built of brick, whereas all the schools to be built in my area will be Demac. I do not object to Demac, but I wonder how the priorities are drawn. Now we are told that the plans for Coromandel Valley South have been presented to the Meadows council for approval; yet, I have a letter written within the last month saying that the school was not to be proceeded with.

The Crafers school, which is on the border of my district but in the Heysen District, is waiting for classrooms. The Ironbank Rural School needs new buildings. The Belair Primary School is waiting for new classrooms. This school is the most haphazard as regards temporary permanent buildings of any primary school in the metropolitan area. The people there are waiting. The people at Bridgewater are still waiting patiently for the playing fields that were promised to be developed for them five years ago. Heathfield is waiting for drains, which will cost more later than if the work was completed immediately. The Bridgewater community also lacked a kindergarten, but the people there have received a grant of money. I believe that the kindergarten is well under way, because a replacement was needed. We are most grateful for that. The Happy Valley kindergarten is in a hall supper-room, the roof of which leaks, the windows do not close properly, and there are no proper heating facilities within the building. The group there is waiting for money.

The Coromandel Valley kindergarten is in the Baptist church hall, which the community appreciates being able to use, but the kindergarten is waiting for money and has been saving its own funds for a long time. The Hills kindergarten, which is using a room supplied by the local Catholic church (Mount St. Catherine School), needs a new kindergarten. Every other kindergarten in the area is overloaded and we need seven new kindergartens in Fisher at least to provide pre-school education for part of the year. So, an important need exists in that area.

A recent report in the *Advertiser* deals with another aspect of Belair Recreation Park. The report comments that machines had been damaged, areas had been cut up by motor bikes, and that considerable damage had been caused by vandals. I do not condone that action, but point out that the gates on the south of the golf course have been left open for months during all hours of the night, and the local people have had to contend with young men (and possibly young women) riding motor bikes in there and tearing around. So, to a degree the vandals have been encouraged to enter the park through lack of initiative on the part of those who control it. The golf course was to cost \$90 000 and was to be completed 18 months ago, but it is still nowhere near completed. All they did was to move in quickly and knock down the trees and the bush so that the conservationists could not stop them.

All that has been done since then is play around, and any member who disbelieves that can go and see for himself. They have tried to plant the greens and put soil on, but the heavy rains have washed it away. It has been a waste of money, because the work has not been proceeded with. It is no good worrying about what has been destroyed, but the golf club should be made useful to the community. We must be aware of the problems created by trail bikes that are ridden in the Hills areas. Some young people and others regard riding trail bikes as a sport. We provide sporting facilities for virtually every other section of the community. Indeed, we have even set aside a beach for nudists, so we should at least cater for trail bike riders. One of my constituents wrote the following letter to the Minister for the Environment on June 4, 1975:

Dear Mr. Broomhill, Some time ago my wife drew to your attention the fact that motor cycles were being driven in the Shepherd's Hill Reserve. While you expressed concern and sympathy at the problem, there appears to be no material effect in lessening the presence of these motor cycles.

I am not aware as to just what steps were taken by your department, but daily motor cycles are seen in the reserve and on weekends children of primary school and junior high school are regularly seen riding mini-bikes. On numerous occasions I have spoken with the offenders and explained the fact that they were on a reserve. What effect this has had on the individuals is hard to tell. On two occasions I have phoned the police because of the danger posed by youths riding motor cycles at high speeds.

It becomes time consuming and personally expensive going out of my way either to phone authorities or go and mention to young people the fact that they are violating the reserve. It is not difficult to foresee that trail riding in the reserve will become a problem if something is not done about it. Obviously the regulations need policing if the reserve is to be kept free of damage to vegetation, etc. In addition, one must bear in mind the potential bodily harm which might occur with inexperienced young children driving vehicles along paths taken by people out for a pleasant walk.

All members, particularly Government members, should consider a system of voluntary rangers. The letter continues:

Perhaps a system of voluntary rangers would be helpful in the early stages of establishing the function and purpose of the Shepherd's Hill Reserve. It would be appreciated if you would give this matter your consideration.

In some other parts of the world, volunteers have the power to warn offenders and even to say that offenders will be reported, but the volunteers cannot lay a charge. If the accused person denies the offence when he is interviewed by the police, nothing can be done but, if he admits the offence, the police can decide what action should be taken. If that system was implemented and if a person was reported two or three times, it would be necessary to ensure that he got the message. An area should be set aside for trail bike riders and they should be told to stay there; if they observed the rules, they would offend no-one. They should also be told that, if they ride their bikes outside the area, strong action would be taken against them.

I turn now to the effect of rural land tax and to high valuations of land. I refer particularly to areas where we would like to see people remaining on rural land. I have already started to move out of this field in connection with any interests I may have had related to open-space areas, because the cost is becoming too great. It has reached the stage where, if society wishes to retain that type of land, it must give concessions or acquire the land. Yesterday I read that the Minister of Local Government had said that the Govern-

ment was willing to give rate reimbursement to residential properties in the Adelaide City Council area. If the Government is willing to do that, surely there is just as great a need to give rural landowners a rate reimbursement through their councils. If it is fair for one section of the community, it is fair for another. I cannot see why people in the Adelaide City Council area have any greater reason to complain than do rural landowners near the metropolitan area. In 1939, a bush fire went from Brownhill Creek to Macclesfield; the peak of it reached Strathalbyn. In 1955 we had Black Sunday. I have lived in the Hills all of my life, and in the last three years I have seen horticultural and grazing areas with a mass of undergrowth, dry grass and noxious weeds; those areas belong to old families and new families. If we get a day like Black Sunday and if the fire starts at about 11 a.m. or 12 noon, this State will have the worst disaster in its history.

Some people have scrub right up to their door, but others have taken precautions. Some people do not realise how severe the heat of a bush fire is and how impossible it is to fight a fire unless one gives oneself a fair area in which to move between one's house and the area one wishes to retain in its natural state. There is no way that the Emergency Fire Services or the Army can fight the most severe fires, because the fires move so rapidly that vehicles cannot be moved fast enough to go from house to house. E.F.S. personnel in the area will have to think of their own houses. I hope some people get the message that we can preserve the things we would like to preserve, but at the same time we must realise that fires bring intense heat and an immense capacity to devour anything in their path on a day like Black Sunday. I hope it never happens again in the Hills but, as long as there are cranks and careless people, the potential is there.

The Minister of Transport knows about the shortage of public transport in my district, and I have the opportunity to discuss the matter with the Director-General of Transport. There is also a need in the area for youth clubs and swimming pools. In a district comprising 21 000 people, there is no public swimming pool. There is no suitable building for a complete new community complex. There are two applications before the Commonwealth and State Governments, one for a complex to be built at Heathfield High School, the other to be built on the Blackwood Youth Club property. I hope the Government can give these projects the consideration they deserve.

We now have Medibank operating in South Australia, and earlier this year I raised in a grievance debate a matter concerning the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the lack of attention given to an 86-year-old patient. On June 5, her daughter wrote a letter to the Director-General of Medical Services, the reply to which (dated July 22) is as follows:

The delay in replying to your letter of June 5, 1975, is largely due to the difficulty in obtaining reports—

and I emphasise that, because it amazes me—

from the various medical and nursing staff concerned with the treatment of your mother. I am informed that patients are seen by a doctor in the order of time in which they register at the casualty desk. However, when patients are admitted to casualty with injuries requiring immediate attention these obviously are given first priority. Mondays are the busiest days in casualty and, whilst the delay is regrettable, in the circumstances it was unavoidable. I understand that whilst your mother was waiting to be seen by a doctor she was under nursing supervision and was not in undue distress.

This 86-year-old lady was injured just before 2 p.m. and taken to the Royal Adelaide Hospital by ambulance with suspected broken ribs. Although she was suffering some pain, she was not, it seems, considered by the authorities to be an urgent case, and left the hospital after 10 p.m., eight hours later. And we talk about a public hospital giving service! The letter continues:

Problems do exist when X-ray films appear to have been mislaid and steps are being taken to overcome them.

It took a letter relating to the suffering of an elderly lady for steps to be taken to ascertain why X-ray films were supposedly lost. Under what sort of a system do we live? The letter continues:

The casualty department at the Royal Adelaide Hospital is always under pressure and discussions are at present being held with a view to reducing the pressure and so eliminating distressing delays in patient treatment. I thank you for drawing this matter to my attention and assure you that any inconvenience and distress caused to your mother is regretted.

Those who have experienced national health services operating in other countries have said that they do slow down treatment in public hospitals. I say, "God help our injured or suffering people in the future if the system can be slowed down even more than it is at present."

The last point I wish to raise relates to the effect that socialism has had on our society. I do not blame people for voting for the Australian Labor Party in 1970, as they had had almost 35 years under a Liberal Government. In 1972 they voted for a Commonwealth Labor Government; having had 23 years of a Liberal and Country Party Government in Canberra with a private enterprise philosophy they thought that the other side of the fence would be good. But, effectively, the people of Australia have learnt that socialism destroys the soul of the individual. There is no incentive in our society to save. What good is the superannuation that a person who retired, say, five to nine years ago now receives? The only person who is guaranteed a future under socialism is the parasite, the person who is willing to bludge. He will always get a handout and survive under the socialist system. Unfortunately in one sense, although fortunately in another, those who really work and produce, whether they run a small or large business or whether they are employed by others (and I admit there are plenty of hard workers in both categories), have woken up and realised that they cannot carry the burden. It is fortunate that this has happened. I just hope that it has happened soon enough to stop our country reaching rock bottom in economic terms.

The Australian Labor Party has successfully destroyed all confidence in the future. It has unsettled and disturbed society. What is the future for the young or the elderly, the family man, or the employer or employee? What security do people have at present to enable them to continue in private enterprise? What security do men have for their jobs, or what hope does the family man have of buying his own house? I can go right through the field, referring, for instance, to the schoolchildren whom we are now trying to educate. What future do they see? They see a world in which they will need \$50 000 to buy a house in five years, if we continue along the path we are now following. Who would have dreamt that the Party which says it is for the working man could, in five or 10 years, put the value of an average house up to \$50 000? That is the path we are following.

You, Sir, used to belong to that Party and adhere to that philosophy, and I ask you now to sit down at times and think about what has happened to Australia and this State as a result of that philosophy. Because you were divorced

from the political stream in your service to local government, you perhaps could not see what had happened to our country. However, it has been soul-destroying, and the high interest rates have done nothing to help the situation. I hope that those Government members who really believe in helping society progress see the pitfalls and that they will lean heavily on the arms of their Left wing.

Australia is in an unsound position but it can recover. We will need to be a dedicated society. We need people in politics and business, and those people who are on the lowest wage structure, to work. If we all work 40 hours a week, forget about salary rises (except perhaps where there are real injustices) and get our country out of the hole it is in, we could still end up being one of the most progressive countries with one of the most buoyant economies in the world. However, if we do not take up the challenge now, we shall find that those who follow us will have the real suffering while we have lived through the golden years, because most of the people of my age in this Chamber have lived through some golden years. I support the motion.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I guess from many points of view it is not very encouraging to be the last speaker in the line but, having been alphabetically at the end of the line for eight years, at least I have become accustomed to being last. After all, it could be said that the good Book does say that the last shall be first. However, perhaps it is not wise to make any further exegetical comment on that statement at present. Someone has to be in this position.

First, I have not so far had an opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election both as a member of this House and as Speaker of this House. I offer my congratulations to you on both those things, first for having the initiative to grasp an opportunity that you believed you were entitled to, it being a free country to the extent that, whoever may be selected by the political Parties to stand for a seat, in your case you believed you had a real claim to stand for the seat of Port Pirie and you showed your electors and the people of this State that the claim you believed you had to it was a real one. You were successful in winning that seat. So, for your initiative and the work you must have done, not only for the last few weeks but long before that, I offer my congratulations.

In my opinion, elections are never won in the last few weeks of a campaign. In fact, one wonders what it is that ticks within people for them to believe that they can come up with a nomination in the last few weeks. Yet some people earnestly believe they can win an election like that. It is an incredible situation and, unless one has been involved in politics or in a community at local government level and in all the community's affairs, unless one has been steeped in its problems and difficulties, and unless one knows by some means the people of the area, it is most difficult to come to an election with any sense of confidence that one has an opportunity to win. So, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate you on the initiative you must have taken and the work you must have put into your area to be in the position of being before the public at Port Pirie sufficiently to win the seat of Pirie.

Then I should like to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker. There was much consternation, and no doubt you heard of it. People were saying, "What a difficult job it will be for a man who has not sat in this House and has not got to grips with the atmosphere that exists on occasions when members are not co-operating with the Speaker or with each other!" It was believed it

would be a difficult job. But you have given the lie to much of that prediction that it would be a difficult job, because you have already shown your willingness to co-operate with members of this House. In turn, it has been good for members on both sides of the House to have someone brand new in the Speaker's Chair. It has brought forth from members on both sides of the House a better understanding of what their sensible obligations are to each other and to you. So I hope you will enjoy, as I believe you have done already to a degree, disregarding the strain and newness of the job, your position in this House and I trust you will continue to do so for the remaining three years of life of this Parliament.

I add my congratulations, too, to the member for Unley, who has been elected Chairman of Committees. I turn for a brief moment to the newly elected members of this House, first the member for Spence and the member for Price. I am sure that those of us who have been here for some years appreciated the company and friendship of the members who represented those electoral districts before the new members came into Parliament. We regarded those honourable members as men who contributed much to this House, and I trust that the new members on the Government side of the House will enjoy their opportunity to serve the people they represent, and that they will find being a member of Parliament a stimulating and challenging experience.

I congratulate also the new members on this side of the House—the member for Millicent and the member for Mount Gambier. I recall the days in 1968 when Millicent became a cliff-hanger and how many of us, especially those eight of us newly elected to this side of the House, went into the Millicent area and assisted in the by-election that followed the normal election in early March, 1968. So, many of us have had experience of door-knocking in the Millicent area. Particularly in the case of the member for Mount Gambier, who was perhaps, to a degree, an unexpected new member in this place, I understand perfectly how he must have felt, having passed through a similar campaign myself and how it was necessary in the end to have such a close contest in the counting of the preferences. Like him, I came into this place by winning a similar cliff-hanger by 42 votes; I am not sure of the final result yet in Mount Gambier. I congratulate him on what must have been a very hard campaign, which needed all the energy, guidance and expertise that he possessed. I trust that all new members will enjoy their years in this House.

Following each election, we are always grateful to those members who willingly retire for the services they have given to this Parliament and the people of this State. I am thinking particularly of two people who played an important part in my election in Murray in 1968 and in my consequently coming to this House—the retiring member for Heyesen (Mr. McAnaney) and the Hon. V. G. Springett, M.L.C., who was a member for Southern. Both those gentlemen were members of this Parliament prior to my own election; both came into my district and worked hard. Dr. Springett was, of course, a resident of Murray Bridge for some years. He was a prominent surgeon in that town and was well known there prior to his own election to the Legislative Council. It was largely through him and his wife that Liberalism reorganised itself, began to get active, and started promoting the Liberal point of view. I believe that it was through the hard work of these two people that much interest was raised and that my district became active and pursued the 1968 election with the eagerness and thoroughness which it did. Mr. McAnaney

door-knocked a great deal for me in Murray before 1968 and worked quite hard outside of his own district for the benefit of Liberalism in Murray. I am very grateful to these two men who have just retired, who have given good service to my district and to their own districts, as well as to the people of South Australia generally.

With other members, I express my sympathy to the families of the two members mentioned in the Speech of His Excellency the Governor. I refer to the families of the late Sir Norman Jude and the late Hon. Mr. Densley. I knew "Judy" quite well. He came from an area in which I lived for some years. He was a well-known member of this Parliament, a member who was a Minister of Local Government and one who travelled around the State a great deal. Also, I was Secretary of the Liberal organisation in the part of the State where the Hon. Mr. Densley lived, and I knew the respect in which he was held in that South-Eastern area. Finally in these preliminary remarks, I want to thank my electors for the opportunity of coming back to this place to represent them. Personally, I believe they showed good judgment on July 12. I did all I could to advise them correctly so that they would make a good judgment, and in fact greater and greater numbers of them showed good judgment in my election, as my support increased to quite some degree. There had been fears in my mind that, perhaps with the difficulties of the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Bill and the problem of Monarto, as some had said, the poor member for Murray would be squeezed out of his district. I thought these matters may have posed problems, but they did not; in fact, this was the only time I have ever won a box at an election without a vote going to an opponent, and oddly enough that was the Monarto box.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Not Monarto South.

Mr. WARDLE: I did much better at Monarto South than I had expected and, for the Minister's benefit, perhaps I should read the figures from that box as well.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Read them out. It will do him good.

Mr. WARDLE: Getting back to the box at Monarto, my four opponents had returns of nil, nil, nil, and nil, while I gained the only 18 votes cast in that box. In Monarto South, my main opponent, the A.L.P. candidate, received 18 votes, the Liberal Movement candidate received two, the Country Party one, the Independent one, and I received 21. By the time one takes the preferences out of the four other votes cast amongst the three Parties other than the A.L.P. and myself, I may have had a margin of three or 3½. However, it was quite nice to win even the Monarto South box. I should like to predict that I will go on for many years into the future winning the Monarto and the Monarto South boxes. I became the first member representing Monarto in 1973, so I am not worried about anyone taking that honour and glory from me.

Having thanked the electors for showing such good judgment in returning me to this place, I can say that I am enjoying my life here in this Parliament. I always have enjoyed it. There were times when I had wished I was back enjoying the company of my electors, I must confess, rather than that of some of the people who were here at that time in this House in the mood they were in on occasions, although only on rare occasions. But we have had our moments in this place in the past eight years. I think it must be largely due to your influence, Mr. Speaker, that we have been reasonably

well behaved in the past three or four weeks. I hope that your influence continues to be as good for the rest of the term of this Parliament.

This is a vastly different House, and the mood of the people of South Australia is different from the mood of eight years ago. To a large degree, one would have to say that this mood is different because of some differences within the attitude of the State and some things the State Government has done, but probably the greatest difference comes in the mood and the mind of the Australian people as a whole because of what the Commonwealth Government has done and says it will do. Probably the greatest of the problems that has come to this country in the past four or five years has been that of unemployment, coupled with inflation. I know it is said, and can be proved, that inflation is a problem that has come not only to Australia; it is world wide. I believe better attempts have been made in most countries on a world-wide basis to control the problem than have been made in this country. Perhaps tonight in the Commonwealth Budget some solutions were advanced. I have not heard, but probably other members have: it is hoped that many of our inflationary and unemployment problems may tend to be cured after tonight.

I had thought at one stage, because of the absence from the Chamber of members listening to the Budget, that, if I had typed my speech and moved to have it inserted in *Hansard*, that might have been a much greater service to this House than honourable members having to bear with me. I see the member for Peake is listening. If members present are enjoying my speech, it pleases me that I did not type it but that I am here to give it. Now that the Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee has come in, it pleases me more than ever to be able to give my speech rather than to submit it to the House for printing. Not only relating to matters of unemployment and inflation have we this lack of confidence in life in general and in development in Australia at the moment, but this attitude is expressing itself very greatly in primary and secondary fields.

In primary industry there is no confidence. I have never known in my lifetime such a sad, disillusioned, downhearted attitude on the part of primary producers to life itself and to what the future holds for them as that I notice at present. Primary industry people are battling in every sense of the word. I was with a group yesterday and a gentleman said, "We are shearing and crutching the flock ourselves within the family. Mum is picking the wool and the kids are helping with the yarding. We can get by provided we do not employ." That is a tremendous tragedy, because this country has been built on the fact that private enterprise has been able to afford to employ, and it is a good thing economically for the country when people are able to spend money on providing employment.

Surely one of the biggest difficulties we have right now is that fewer people in private enterprise and in business are able to employ. Consequently, so many persons have been brought on to the employment market. It must be a torture and disturbing for a man who is willing to work but is unable to find suitable employment to suit his experience and talents. Surely, nothing is more demoralising than a person's being unable to find employment when he wishes to get a job. The member for Gouger spent much time in his speech establishing what I believe are the fundamental fears now held by local government. I would be one of the first to admit that, for several years, the Liberal-Country Party coalition Government neglected local government finance. I believe for the

past 10 or 12 years such finance has been running down. Mr. Speaker, as Mayor of Port Pirie, you would be aware of the critical situation facing councils and of their need for funds over a number of years. Local government has reached a stage now where it cannot rate and tax further its own ratepayers.

To enable local government to perform the tasks it must perform it must have additional outside capital and must get a slice of Commonwealth income in order to remain viable. I hope that councils will not shut the door to the possibility of amalgamations. I hope that councils will see that they are helping themselves by amalgamating and making the best use of the expertise available. Thereby, by the combination of functions, becoming more viable. Councils should not close their minds and have nothing to do with councils to the east, west, south or north of them, but will look at every possibility of making their areas more workable. Councils could benefit not necessarily by grouping together on a regional basis (which the Commonwealth Government would like them to do in order to receive grant moneys), but primarily for employing engineers and planners. If councils grouped together they could employ to their advantage expert weed officers, building officers, health officers, etc.

Your own council, Mr. Speaker, was a good example of the advantages that can be achieved by councils employing an engineer. I do not know whether Port Pirie council is the sole employer of the engineer concerned, but if it is to its credit. On a recent visit to Port Pirie with the Public Works Committee, I saw what a tremendous asset your engineer was to your town. All councils should have the opportunity to employ such expertise, whether they be employed through their own finances or through the combination of council areas. From the viewpoint of planning as well as engineering it is important that councils are advised by experts. It is sad to note that negotiations in relation to Monarto involved Mobilong council and Murray Bridge council but, because these councils did not have their own planning officers, all planning is being done by the State Planning Authority, which does not always understand and appreciate the difficulties faced by local organisations.

When I was overseas investigating the matter of planning of new cities, I found sufficient evidence to show that the people responsible for planning should be residents of the new city. In other words, like charity, the best planning begins at home. It is a shame that local government in many country areas does not have the financial capacity to employ expert planners. Before dealing with Monarto, I wish to refer to the matter of a school at Fraser Park. That school is situated in the south-western section of Murray Bridge, but is a school in name only because it has no playgrounds and the students are housed in borrowed classrooms. The school itself, the staff and its organisation (including the parent group), is situated in an existing school. The principal of Fraser Park, his staff, 200 students, and the welfare committee use the existing school site of Murray Bridge South School that houses 500 students. One can imagine the congestion and how the sports fields, playing space, toilet areas and other facilities are taxed.

Murray Bridge South School was set up for 500 students. That number has not been changed, but several classrooms have been erected to house the additional 200 students. Therefore, each day the school has a regular attendance of 700 students. Facilities were so congested that afternoon recess has been cut out completely. Students

cannot take part in organised sport because the playing field areas are used by children to run about at morning recess and at lunch time. The parent body and teaching staff co-operated so well to make the present arrangement work, but they are now wondering whether they tried too hard and were too conscientious in making the schools work together. The Fraser Park school was supposed to be ready for occupation in February, 1975. When the project came before the Public Works Committee about 18 months ago it was marked down clearly for occupation in February. The date was then pushed back to May, 1975, and that is where the matter rests. We are now in mid-August and no site-works have been started.

Mr. Coumbe: Why?

Mr. WARDLE: That is the burning question. It is not for the want of asking, nor for the want of sending letters requesting information.

Mr. Evans: Did you make strong representations?

Mr. WARDLE: Representations have been as strong as we know how to make them. What one has to do to make them stronger, I do not know. What frustrates the people involved is that no-one will say that money is not available to build this school. If money is not available, we should be told it is not available. No-one will say whether tenders have been called, or why the siteworks have not begun; no-one will give a clear indication about the project other than to say it will be built in the future. Early last week a member of the school council was talking to a branch employee of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and was told that the department had a complete set of plans relating to the school, but the school committee has never seen those plans. They are there in the town as a complete set. Surely the whole project could have been better organised. Surely the department could have provided more detailed information on the project earlier to those concerned. The department has let down its regional officers, and it has badly let down this parent organisation as well as the students. If only someone would say why the new school has not been built and when it will be built, I am sure members of the parent organisation would feel much happier. I now refer to the subject of Monarto, which was to be the important and largely the only issue in the election in my district. In fact, an Independent candidate joined in solely on the basis—

Mr. Evans: That is in the District of Murray.

Mr. WARDLE: Yes; he campaigned solely on the basis that Monarto was his first and only platform. That candidate secured 179 votes.

Mr. Goldsworthy: All told?

Mr. WARDLE: Yes. The Monarto issue did not prove to be of any electoral significance at all in the District of Murray, because although many of the people in the district are conscious of the fact that Monarto could be a money-spinner for them and could bring large financial returns in the long term to their organisations and businesses, I believe many of them are sufficiently sensible to know that, if Monarto is not a success and does not immediately take on and snowball, there could be serious repercussions in the district at large. From experience in other parts of the world, it is essential for a new city, once it has begun, to continue to progress at its planned rate to ensure that the project does not deteriorate or lapse.

I believe it is much better for a new city not to begin than to begin poorly. I have just learnt that only \$500 000 has been provided this evening in the Common-

wealth Budget for the Monarto project. This news is most disappointing, especially as I understand that the State Government was seeking at least \$10 000 000 now and an assurance of \$125 000 000 over the next five years, as I understand that the project over the next 20 years will cost between \$500 000 000 and \$1 000 000 000. If Monarto is to be proceeded with correctly and properly, if it is to be built on the same basis as have other towns and cities throughout the world, then not only must the infrastructure be provided: because of the social difficulties that have been experienced over the years, many other requirements must be included in the infrastructure, which comprises roads, water, power, sewerage and other services. It is most disappointing if this sum represents the total amount that has been allocated in the Commonwealth Budget for Monarto in this financial year. In fact, this means that the Commonwealth Government is doing exactly what we suggested should be done over the last 12 months, that is, that there should be a reappraisal and a reassessment of this project. The sum provided now is merely a holding figure to retain a skeleton staff and to keep the show together for the next 12 months in the hope that the next Commonwealth Budget will be bigger and better so that the project can proceed.

Why build new cities at all? It is interesting that in the year 1800 it was believed that the world's population was about 900 000 000 people. In the intervening 175 years that figure has increased seven-fold, and the world population is now about 6 000 000 000. It is expected that the world population today will double in the next 23 years. Although the world's population has increased by seven times since 1800, the population of the cities of the world has increased 20 times. This figure clearly shows the population drift from country areas to the cities. Many statistics have been compiled showing the movement of population in most Western countries from country areas to the cities. There have also been huge natural increases in city populations, which are 20 times greater now than they were in 1800. Britain was in an ideal position after the Second World War to create new cities and growth areas.

One question that is often asked regarding Monarto concerns its siting. Many people say that the location is not satisfactory because it should be located about 240 km from Adelaide, or in the green triangle or the iron triangle. However, I find that I have to defend the choice of this site, even though the member for Gouger may believe that it should be in the Wallaroo, Kadina and Moonta area (the copper triangle). I defend the Monarto site because I believe that it fulfils an important fundamental principle. True decentralisation is activated by the finding of ore, or some other raw material, or through, say, the creation of a port. It can occur only when there is a basic reason for such a move. However, I do not believe that one can syphon off the additional growth of a parent city by going much further than about 70 km from that city.

By pinpointing new growth cities in the world, one finds that they are all from about 8 km to 72 km from the city they are designed to assist. Therefore, if Monarto is needed in order to syphon off some proportion of Adelaide's future population, then in relation to the distance between the two cities the right location has been chosen. Another important aspect in the choice of the Monarto site is that there is currently \$125 000 000 worth of infrastructure virtually on the site. No doubt many members are surprised (most people are surprised when they hear that statement), but I do not believe there is another site in

South Australia that is so ideally suited from the point of view of an existing infrastructure.

The cost of building a railway line, which would be necessary for many of the other sites I could name, as well as the costs of building a freeway, supplying water to the site, and providing power are great, but at Monarto these facilities already exist. There is one other important factor: the site is between two capital cities. I could mention many other sites on an arc from Gawler right around to Mannum or on another arc from Victor Harbor right through Strathalbyn to Murray Bridge but, in effect, those places, do not go anywhere: they are dead-ends, but not because they are backward or outmoded. The advantage, particularly to industry, in the case of Monarto will be that, in the case of manufactured goods at least, the manufacturer will be situated between two capital cities and, therefore, some of his manufactured goods will go east and some west.

So, I believe it important for the site of a new growth centre to be not too far away, although certainly not too close to the parent city. I believe it important that the Hills area be maintained as a green belt and that there should always be the separation of the two growth centres, that is, Monarto and Adelaide. It is interesting to note in connection with the British system that the Government must publicise the site it has chosen as a new growth centre, that it must give the local authority every opportunity to comment, and that it must hear all the objections raised against the project. After all that procedure has taken place, the Minister concerned may drop the whole venture. That is totally different from the procedure we have followed in the case of Monarto, and I am satisfied that we were not nearly so democratic as regards the people concerned. I hope that, in developing Monarto, the Government will agree that land tenure should be at least part Government and part private enterprise.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to resume his seat for a moment.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) moved:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. WARDLE: I hope that there will be a real private enterprise element in the development of Monarto if and when, after this evening's news, this new growth centre ever gets going again, because I fear for its future. I believe that the money which the State Government intends putting towards the project is only a means of killing time and that the \$500 000 coming from the Commonwealth's Budget will not give Monarto the injection it needs to go ahead as planned; it seems to be only holding the situation. If there is a lack of enthusiasm by industry or any loss of incentive on the part of industry, the position will be serious. Surely the creation of industry in Monarto is the crux of the whole project. If the Government cannot be assured by private enterprise or industry at large that it has a keen desire to establish at Monarto, surely now is not the time to promote the growth of this area. Also, I am not sure that the Government is now absolutely satisfied that it will be able to attract a sufficient population in Monarto. The present figures indicate that there will be between 150 000 and 200 000 people living in the Monarto area by the year 2000.

I believe it is necessary to try to achieve the building of a balanced city. During my visit overseas, I saw cities which lacked this balance: in some cities there was insufficient housing but sufficient industry established and

wanting to come to the area, whereas other cities lacked the industry but had sufficient housing. The ideal situation in a new town is to have both these elements evenly balanced: houses for employees, as well as factories for them. When one talks about the balanced development of a new growth centre, one really means three things: first, that the level of population should be supported by a roughly equivalent level of employment. A serious shortage of houses or jobs could cause a town to fail, and towns have had serious reverses because of this factor. Secondly, the employment structure should not be dominated by single industries. Several examples of that situation can be found in this State—one in my district, where a single industry organisation is not a good thing for the regular employment of people in a town, and certainly not a good thing for its growth. I believe it is essential to have a multi-industry growth centre so that, when one industry flourishes and another may be in the doldrums, one helps cancel out the other.

The third requirement for a balanced community is that it should be socially balanced with people from all income groups and, the well-balanced new growth centres in other parts of the world have these three elements. I have seen some interesting experiments with regard to this: people are not necessarily housed (a) in an area for executive types; (b) in an area for the middle class; or (c) in an area for the so-called working class. I believe that the social strata, as it were, in the form of class housing, is being forgotten, and I hope that we are rid of it forever. People with all kinds of jobs and opportunities and in all wage brackets should be encouraged to live together in the same suburb, all making their own contribution to the various organisations in that locality. Planning the building of new cities in most parts of the world must provide for work and recreation to be in the same locality. Many large cities in other parts of the world have slum conditions, so one can understand what a tremendous relief it must be for people from such cities to move to fresh growth centres and to work in modern buildings. From this viewpoint, new growth centres represent an exciting project.

There is only one aspect of the development of Adelaide that is really appropriate when we are talking about siphoning off population to a new growth centre. I am not referring to the question of whether Adelaide is cluttered up with traffic or whether Adelaide is difficult to service from the infrastructure viewpoint, nor am I referring to the question of getting water into Adelaide or sewage out of Adelaide. The only real basis for the creation of a new growth centre is related to Adelaide's sprawl; eventually this city will be one of the longest and narrowest cities in the world. I did not see any other city that was quite like Adelaide in this respect. Because of the sea-board on the west and the hills on the east, this city has had to develop in the form of a long strip. This is a sad aspect of our development, and it is the one basic reason why there is a case to be put for a new growth centre. The site chosen is good.

I refer again to the miserable sum of \$500 000 for Monarto that was announced tonight in the Commonwealth Budget. This allocation will not help Monarto to get off the ground; it is purely a matter of keeping the land. Perhaps that is the attitude that the Government ought to be taking: that this is not the time to go ahead with this project if we do not have the population or the industrial enthusiasm; there certainly is not any money about. If we do not have these three things, should we

not postpone this venture for five years or 10 years? Should we reconsider it when we recommence an immigration programme? In the future it will not be possible to hold this country with 13 000 000 people. We must bear in mind that there are large populations to our north, and we have an enormous coastline to defend. So, there are good reasons why the whole project should be postponed.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're having 20c each way.

Mr. WARDLE: I have never had 20c each way. All sorts of interpretation have been put on my attitude, because some people thought it was politically expedient that I should take that sort of attitude. If any member is honest and if he reads what I actually said (not necessarily what the media reported that I said) he will realise that I have never had 20c each way. Until this time it was not possible to say that the Government was reassessing the situation, but it is now obvious that the Government has reassessed the situation. The Government has never honestly said to the people of South Australia, "We have now reassessed the situation at Monarto, and we can now see that there will not be the necessary population by the turn of the century. There is not the money in the country at present for the Commonwealth Government to be generous in connection with the establishment of this new growth centre." I am told that tonight in the Commonwealth Budget Albury-Wodonga has been allocated \$30 000 000, a Sydney suburban area has been allocated \$20 000 000, and Monarto has been allocated \$500 000, when we needed at least \$10 000 000 if the city was to go ahead. Even the Special Minister of State for Monarto and Redcliff would have to say that it is a totally different project now, on this financial basis, from what it would have been had the original plan been carried out.

It is interesting to note the difference between United Kingdom growth centres and the American situation. Only recently the American central Government has had to assist the financing of new growth centres. Until recently the development of new growth centres in America has largely been on an individual basis; a man may have had an area of land; he may have had oil wells, and some have spent millions of dollars on new growth centres as a financial investment. This contrasts with growth centres to which many people have moved for health reasons. The American Housing and Urban Development Organisation (H.U.D.) is making a grant of up to \$50 000 000 for each new growth centre, and the American central Government is spending up to \$500 000 000 on such centres.

New growth centres appeal to various parts of the world in different ways. It is estimated that 24 000 000 people moved into American cities from rural areas between 1940 and 1970. America has 220 000 000 people, who exist on about 2 per cent of the American land mass, which is not very much larger than the Australian land mass. The situation is vastly different in Great Britain, where 55 000 000 people live in an area equivalent to the area between Adelaide and Melbourne; we would have about 55 000 people in that area, compared to Britain's 55 000 000. So, in America there is sufficient land to spread the people out. In American growth centres there are about four families to each acre, but in Great Britain there are between 12 and 17 families to each acre. I therefore return to the matter of Monarto. It will be disturbing indeed if more money is not allowed for this city, if it is to be a growth centre. I have already given my

reasons why I believe the whole project ought to stand still because of the lack of funds properly to promote it. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending June 30, 1976.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to apply out of the general revenue a further sum of \$130 000 000 to the Public Service for the financial year ending June 30, 1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN; J move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for a further \$13 0 000 000 to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until Assent is received to the Appropriation Bill which, together with the detailed Estimates of Expenditure, I expect to present to the House later this month. Members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. It is expected that the authority provided by the first Bill will be exhausted early in September and the amount of this second Bill is estimated to be sufficient to cover expenditure until debate on the Appropriation Bill is complete and Assent received. This short Bill, which contains no details of expenditures to be made, nevertheless does not leave the Government or individual departments with a free hand to spend. Clause 3 ensures that no payments may be made from the appropriation sought in excess of those individual items approved by Parliament in last year's Appropriation Acts and other appropriation authorities.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SEX DISCRIMINATION BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to render unlawful certain kinds of discrimination on the grounds of sex or marital status; to provide effective remedies against such discrimination and promote equality of opportunity between men and women generally; and to deal with other related matters. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it. This Bill is identical with the Sex Discrimination Bill that was introduced and fully explained in the previous session.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It is identical with the Sex Discrimination Bill that was introduced during the last session of Parliament. I need not recapitulate all that I said when last introducing the Bill. I repeat, however, that the Government regards the enactment of this Bill as a major step forward in the implementation of its social policies directed at achieving and maintaining a just society. For the convenience of members, I will reproduce my explanation of the clauses of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 sets out a number of definitions necessary for the purposes of the new Act. I draw attention particularly to the extended meaning assigned to the phrase "marital status". Clause 5 provides that the new Act will bind the Crown. Clause

6 establishes the office of Commissioner for Equal Opportunity. The Commissioner is to hold office subject to the Public Service Act. Clause 7 establishes the Sex Discrimination Board. The board is to consist of a Chairman who has extensive legal experience and two other members appointed by the Governor. Clauses 8 to 12 are the normal provisions dealing with procedure of the board. Clause 13 provides that, before the board embarks on a hearing, it must give reasonable notice to the parties affected by the proceedings and afford them a reasonable opportunity to call or give evidence, to examine or cross-examine witnesses, and to make submissions to the board.

Clause 14 gives the board various procedural powers. Clause 15 provides for the appointment of a Registrar to the board. Clause 16 sets out the criteria necessary to establish discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status. A person discriminates for the purpose of the Bill if he discriminates either on the ground of sex or marital status or on the ground of a characteristic that appertains generally to persons of the one sex or marital status or a presumed characteristic that is generally imputed to persons of the one sex or marital status. Clause 17 defines an "act of victimisation". If a person treats another adversely because he pursues his rights under the new Act, then that adverse treatment, in general, constitutes victimisation for the purposes of the new Act.

Clause 18 deals with discrimination in the ordinary employer-employee relationship. It renders unlawful discrimination by an employer in determining who should be offered employment, or in the terms of which employment is offered. It is also unlawful for an employer to deny an employee access to opportunities for promotion, transfer or training on the ground of his sex or marital status. The new Act does not apply to employment of persons within a private household, or in cases where the employer does not have more than five employees. Clause 19 is a similar provision dealing with discrimination in the engagement of commission agents. Clause 20 deals with the case where a person has control of workers by virtue of a contract between him and an employer of the workers. Provisions are inserted making it unlawful for the person who has effective control of the workers to discriminate against them.

Clause 21 deals with discrimination by partnership firms. Clause 22 renders discrimination by employee or employer organisations unlawful. Clause 23 renders unlawful discrimination by bodies that have power to confer authorisations or qualifications that are needed for or facilitate the practice of a profession or the carrying on of a trade. Clause 24 renders unlawful discrimination by employment agencies. Clause 25 renders unlawful discrimination by educational authorities. The provision does not, however, apply in relation to a school, college or institution established wholly or mainly for students of the one sex. Clause 26 renders unlawful discrimination in the supply of certain services, including banking, the provision of credit, insurance, entertainment, recreation, refreshment, services connected with transportation or travel and the services of a profession or trade.

Clause 27 prohibits discrimination in the provision of accommodation. However, the clause does not apply to a case where the person who provides the accommodation, or a near relative of that person, resides on the premises and accommodation is provided for no more than six other persons. Clauses 28 and 29 deal with ancillary matters. They render unlawful acts of aiding and abetting discrimination, and make an employer vicariously liable

for the acts of his employee. Clause 30 makes it unlawful for a person to commit an act of victimisation.

Clause 31 provides that the new Act will not affect discriminatory rates of remuneration. In this connection I refer to the corresponding amendment that is proposed to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act which provides that there will, in effect, be no further discrimination in rates of pay prescribed by any industrial award. Clause 32 provides that the new Act does not affect charitable instruments. Clause 33 provides that the new Act will not render unlawful the exclusion of persons of the one sex from participation in any sporting activity in which the strength, stamina or physique of the competitor is relevant. Clause 34 provides that an insurance company may act on the normal actuarial tables in assessing premiums for insurance policies.

Clause 35 provides that the new Act does not render discrimination unlawful if the discrimination is based on some other act, or an instrument made or approved under any Act (such as, for example, an industrial award). Clause 36 provides that the new Act does not affect the practices of a religious order. Clause 37 empowers the board to grant exemptions for periods of up to three years from the provisions of the new Act. It is intended that these exemptions should be reviewed from time to time so that they conform to changing social mores. Clause 38 empowers the board to make non-discrimination orders; this is an essential feature of the new Act. Much of the criticism that has been levelled at the British Race Relations Board results from the difficulty of establishing discrimination in an individual case. However, clause 38 will enable the board to take an overall view of what is taking place in a particular area of commerce or industry. The board could, for example, establish how many males and how many females are available for employment in a certain area of employment and require an employer to achieve within a reasonable period of time a reasonable male-female ratio amongst his employees.

Division II of Part VIII deals with the enforcement of personal remedies. A person who claims that some other person has discriminated against him may lodge a complaint with the Commissioner or with the Registrar of the board. Where a complaint is lodged with the Commissioner, and he believes that it may be resolved by conciliation, he is required to make all reasonable endeavours to resolve the matter by conciliation. However if, in the opinion of the Commissioner, a complaint has substance and he fails to resolve it by conciliation, he is required to refer the complaint to the board. The conciliation proceedings will be conducted in a confidential manner and no evidence of anything said or done in the course of those proceedings will be subsequently admissible.

Clause 41 deals with the hearing of a complaint by the board. A complaint may reach the board either through the Commissioner, or where the complaint does not seek the assistance of the Commissioner, through the Registrar. The board, after hearing any evidence and representations that the complainant and the respondent desire to adduce or make, may order that the respondent refrain from committing further acts of discrimination or victimisation, it may order the respondent to do anything that is required to redress any act of discrimination or victimisation, or it may order the respondent to pay damages for loss or damage suffered by the complainant in consequence of an act of discrimination or victimisation. Clause 42 provides that the board shall, if so required by a party to proceedings under the new Part, state its reasons for a decision or order that it makes

in those proceedings. Clause 43 provides that a right of appeal lies against a decision of the board.

Clause 44 provides that a contravention of the new Act will attract no sanction or consequence (whether civil or criminal) except to the extent expressly provided by the new Act. Clause 45 makes it illegal for a person to publish an advertisement that indicates an intention to contravene the Act. Clause 46 requires the Commissioner to make an annual report. The report is to be on the administration of the Act during the period preceding the preparation of the report and on research undertaken by the Commissioner during that period and any recommendations that he considers appropriate for the elimination or modification of discriminatory legislative provisions. Clause 47 provides for the summary disposal of offences. Clause 48 is a financial provision. Clause 49 provides that the Governor has power to make regulations for the purposes of the new Act.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1974. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it. This Bill is in identical form to a similar Bill introduced in the previous session and about which the second reading explanation has already been given.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

Its purpose (and the Bill is identical to the one that lapsed at the end of the last session of Parliament) is to prevent loss of revenue through a device that is becoming increasingly common. It is possible, where land is sold or otherwise transferred, to split the transfer into a number of separate instruments, each relating to a proportionate part of the total interest to be conveyed. For example, a transfer of land valued at \$60 000 could be split into 10 separate transfers, each for a one-tenth interest in the land. Because of the progressive scale of stamp duties, the 10 separate transfers would be stamped for substantially less than a single transfer based on a consideration of \$60 000. The Bill inserts a provision designed to rectify this matter and thus prevent substantial loss of revenue to the State.

The opportunity is also taken to deal with a number of minor matters that require attention in the principal Act. In particular the Bill brings the provision relating to stamping of bills of exchange (other than bills payable on demand) into conformity with the present provisions of New South Wales and Victoria. The effect upon revenue of this amendment will be very small: the amendment is proposed merely for the purpose of the commercial convenience of those who deal in this kind of bill. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 31f of the principal Act. This section relates to duty on loan and rental transactions. The amendment raises the rate of duty in respect of rental business of 1.5 per cent to 1.8 per cent. The effect upon revenue of this amendment will be slight. However, there seems no justification in the differential between the rate of duty prescribed under subsection (2) relating to rental business and that prescribed in subsection (1).

Clause 4 makes a formal amendment to the principal Act. Clause 5 enacts section 47a of the principal Act. This new section is to be read in conjunction with the new provisions in the schedule relating to duty on bills of exchange. The new section deals mainly with the case where a bill is endorsed in a manner that alters the original effect of the bill. Clause 6 enacts new section 60b of the principal Act. This new section deals with the case where a Real Property Act instrument is stamped but the transaction subsequently miscarries. In such a case there is at present no provision for refund of the duty that has been paid. The new section provides for such a refund.

Clauses 7 and 8 amend section 66a and enact new section 66ab respectively. The intention of new section 66ab is to prevent loss of revenue through splitting land transfers. The amendments to section 66a merely bring the terminology of that section into line with that of new section 66ab. Clauses 9 and 10 makes consequential amendments. Clause 11 amends the schedule. Apart from some formal amendments to the schedule, these amendments merely bring the South Australian provisions relating to stamping of bills of exchange into line with those of New South Wales and Victoria.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for the Environment) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it, and point out to the House that a Bill in identical terms was introduced and lapsed in the previous session.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This Bill (which is identical with the Bill which lapsed at the end of the last session of Parliament) relates to planning regulations whose validity has been thrown into doubt by the decision of the Honourable Mr. Justice Wells in the Myer Queenstown case. It was decided in that case that any significant discrepancy between planning regulations and the recommendation of the authority or council on which they are based would be sufficient to invalidate the whole of the regulations. In fact, for some time the policy of the State Planning Office has been to amend regulations that are recommended by councils in order to bring them into substantial conformity with the most recent models. If, as appears to be the case, these editorial amendments are sufficient to throw the validity of the regulations into doubt, there must be many planning regulations, in addition to those promulgated for the Port Adelaide area, whose validity could be questioned.

Mr. Justice Wells further decided that interim development control under Part V of the principal Act cannot subsist concurrently with planning regulations. He held that, if at the time the Government purported to make planning regulations, interim development control was in force, the regulations would be suspended until the expiry of interim development control. In fact, planning authorities have, until now acted on the assumption that interim

development control can subsist concurrently with planning regulations. There is therefore an urgent necessity to validate what has occurred in the past. Clause 2 of the Bill therefore provides that, where the Governor has, before the commencement of the new amending Act, made or purported to make planning regulations, the regulations shall not be regarded as invalid by reason only of a difference or discrepancy between those regulations and a recommendation of the authority or a council, and no suspension in the operation of the regulations shall be deemed to have taken place by virtue of Part V or Part VA

of the principal Act; the regulations are to be deemed capable of operating in relation to the same land concurrently with interim development control. This is a retrospective amendment and accordingly a new subsection is inserted preserving the interest of Myers in the judgment given in action No. 1017 of 1975 in the Supreme Court.

Mr. RUSSACK secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.35 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 20, at 2 p.m.