

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 10, 1976

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

PETITIONS: SEXUAL OFFENCES

Mr. EVANS presented a petition signed by 33 electors of South Australia, praying that the House would reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest or to lower the age of consent in respect of sexual offences.

Mr. VENNING presented a similar petition signed by 27 electors of South Australia.

Petitions received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PROSTITUTION

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Allegations have been made in newspapers concerning the attitude of the Police Force towards the prosecution of the crime of procuring for prostitution. I have obtained the following report from the Police Force on this matter:

Members of the Vice Squad interviewed Mr. Walters of Mansfield Park who was quoted in the newspaper as saying that his daughter was approached by a massage parlour operation, offering a position which required the girl to make herself available for prostitution. Mr. Walters claimed that the press report did not accurately report what he said. His daughter placed an advertisement in the newspaper seeking a job. As a result a massage parlour operation rang offering a position. On the basis of the police interview with Mr. Walters and his daughter, there was no evidence of procuring for the purpose of prostitution, and no further action was taken. The police have had no other recent complaints of this nature.

The crime of procuring for prostitution is a crime on the Statute Book. If there is a complaint to the Police Force that provides information that could lead properly to a prosecution for this matter, that prosecution will be undertaken. It is not the case that it is the policy of the Police Force not to prosecute in matters of this kind. If anyone has any information on this matter that could lead to a prosecution of someone procuring or attempting to procure for prostitution the services of any woman in this community, the police should be informed. It should not be a matter of utterly unspecified allegations taking place in a newspaper that are not supported by information to the police.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CONTAINER MOVEMENTS

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Last week, the member for Davenport raised in the House the problems of container movement from the port of Port Adelaide, and the Minister of Works, in replying to that question, and having referred to the Ministers concerned on the front bench, said that this matter had not come to the Government's attention.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I said as far as I knew.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Later that day a file on the matter came to my desk with a letter to be sent to Mr. Branson, the General Manager of the Chamber of

Commerce and Industry. The letter was sent: it read as follows:

Thank you for your letter of July 29, 1976, headed containerisation. I have noted the points raised in your letter, and share your concern that delays in container movements may disadvantage industry in this State. You may be aware that early next year, South Australia expects to have its own container terminal at Outer Harbor, Adelaide. It is my understanding that this terminal will assist not only in improving the transit time of containers loaded and unloaded in Adelaide, but should also facilitate the land link between Adelaide and Melbourne. I suggest that further discussion of the problems you raised in your letter would be best directed to the Trade and Development Division, and, to this end, have requested one of their officers to contact you.

Yours sincerely,

As the matter had been raised in the House before the letter had come to my desk, I wrote the following letter to Mr. Branson on that afternoon:

On July 29 when you came to my office to talk with Mr. Bakewell, I am informed—

because I had inquired after Mr. Brown had raised the matter in the House—

that you handed in at the front desk a letter concerning containerisation. That letter was sent by the staff in my front office immediately to the Trade and Development Division for examination and the preparation of a report and reply. That report and reply came to hand today, and I enclose the relevant letter for you. However, I am occasioned considerable surprise by the fact that the Government was questioned on this matter in the House this afternoon by Mr. Dean Brown.

At the time that your letter was handed in at my front office my staff did not, as is the normal requirement of them, provide me with a xeroxed copy, and I had not seen your letter. While that admittedly was a mistake in my office, if in fact you were seeking a response from the Government, it seems to me very strange when you are aware that on any urgent matter you have access to me, you should provide copies of the correspondence to the Opposition for the purpose of their use politically against the Government in the House. If in fact you propose to send material to the Government on matters concerning the chamber, and we welcome your doing so, it would seem to me the normal course that an opportunity be given to the Government to reply.

If we are to accept that whatever requests you make of us for investigation, co-operation, and action are supplied for political purposes to the Opposition, then it will be very difficult for us to proceed in the normal way which we do with other organisations, and would certainly wish to do with yourself.

I received from Mr. Branson the following reply, which I accept:

Dear Sir,

Your letter written from Parliament House on August 5, re Mr. Dean Brown's question on containerisation, was a shock to me.

Some of the chamber members who had raised the question of delays in the receipt of imported goods, had indicated in their complaints to the chamber, that they had been in touch with members of Parliament. These complaints had led to investigations by chamber officers, and hence, my letter to you dated July 29. When officers who had prepared the submission were aware that it had been signed and sent to you, they should have, and I believe did, advise the member of the action that we had taken. This must have been the source of the information which caused Mr. Brown to raise this question in the House.

I have been careful to treat with the confidence appropriate, information which I have received from the Government and I hope with the appropriate courtesy, submissions made to the Government. It is not my intention to undo what I hope is a good record, in the last year or so of my service with the chamber. I can understand the reason for your writing the letter, and believe, if I were in your place, I probably would have done the same. It happens that the conclusions you have drawn were not accurate.

I look forward to continuing to work with the Government in all matters that will be of benefit to industry and commerce in South Australia.

Kindest regards.

Yours sincerely,

QUESTIONS

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

BRIGHTON ROAD ACCIDENTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice): How many motor vehicle accidents have occurred at the junction of Brighton Road and Anzac Highway, Glenelg, during the last three years and in respect of these accidents—

- (a) what was the cause;
- (b) what was the total number of persons injured; and
- (c) what was the total amount of vehicle and property damage?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows: 88.

- (a) Rear end 51
- Failed to stand 10
- Overtaking—side swipe 9
- Changing lanes 8
- Failed to kept left 2
- Inattention—hit traffic signals 2
- Evasive action 2
- Incorrect turn 1
- Disobeyed traffic signals 1
- Failing to give way leaving private property 1
- Excessive speed 1
- (b) 16.
- (c) Estimated \$25 000.

BRIGHTON ROAD JUNCTION

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Are there any plans to upgrade the traffic lights at the junction of Brighton Road and Anzac Highway, Glenelg and, if so, when; if not, why not?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes. Subject to the availability of funds and resources, it is intended to co-ordinate their operation with traffic signals at the Anzac Highway, Tapleys Hill Road and Gordon Street intersection during 1976-77. The provision of a left-turn lane from Anzac Highway into Brighton Road is also being investigated.

SOUTH PARA RESERVOIR

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

- 1. What Government directives currently apply in respect of the management of the Warren and South Para reservoirs to ensure the safety of persons, properties, livestock and crops in the vicinity of the South Para and Gawler Rivers?
- 2. To whom is entrusted the day-to-day management of these facilities and in respect of these persons:

- (a) what specific access do they have to senior staff regarding decisions of management; and
- (b) what is the period of employment of each of them:
 - (i) within the Engineering and Water Supply Department;
 - (ii) on their current appointments; and
 - (iii) in situations, if applicable, which would have provided them with experience of flood control management of these or similar reservoirs?

3. What additional protection by way of alarm systems or management directives is currently under consideration?

4. Were the lessons learnt from the 1971 and 1974 floods involving the South Para and Warren reservoirs given due consideration in decisions taken on the design and future management policy of the Little Para reservoir?

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

1. In accordance with Government policy, the South Para and Warren reservoirs are operated as water available from natural intake is retained in the reservoir. When full, it is necessary to pass floodwaters through the reservoir. The spillway gates are operated in such a manner as to achieve this objective. The Regional Engineer Central, whose headquarters are at Elizabeth, is responsible for the overall management of the South Para and Warren reservoirs. At Elizabeth, the Regional Engineer has at his disposal adequate technical, administrative and workshop and other support facilities to effectively carry out these tasks. The Assistant Regional Engineer shares after hours and weekend duties with the Regional Engineer and deputises for him, when he is absent. Both these officers are professional engineers. The local day-to-day managements of these reservoirs is entrusted to the District Foreman, located at South Para. He is assisted by the following personnel:

- South Para—*
- Reservoir Keeper 1.
- Reservoir Keeper 2.
- Warren—*
- Reservoir Keeper 1.

These employees are required to be available for duty seven days a week. When absent on recreation or sick leave, acting appointments are made to each position.

The District Superintendent at Gawler provides additional manpower and other support facilities as and when required.

2. (a) The Regional Engineer, Central, has full access at all times to the Engineer for Water Supply and other senior staff of the department on all matters affecting the operation and management of these reservoirs. Other staff officers and employees have full access at all times through the normal channels to the Regional Engineer and other senior staff of the department.

(b) The period of employment of the personnel is as follows:

	Length of service within department	Length of service in present position	Remarks
Regional Engineer, Central	33 years	2 years	
Assistant Regional Engineer, Central	17 years	12 years	
District Superintendent, Gawler	42 years	5 years	
District Foreman, South Para	22 years	6 months	
Reservoir Keeper 1, South Para	19 years	1 year	Previously Reservoir Keeper 2 for 16 years.
Reservoir Keeper 2, South Para	vacant	—	
Reservoir Keeper 1, Warren	28 years	16 years	

3. A flood-warning system is being investigated by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in consultation with the Bureau of Meteorology for the whole of the Gawler River catchment, and components of such a system have already been implemented. Flood-height monitors, which can be interrogated by telephone, have been installed at five locations, including Warren Reservoir. The system will be additionally alerted by rainfall reports sent in by E. and W.S. Dept. staff on 24-hour standby at three locations.

4. Particular attention has been devoted in the design of Little Para reservoir with the objective of ensuring that it can perform and be managed in an optimum manner in regard to the discharge of floodwaters, consistent with the basic purpose of the reservoir as a water supply storage. The spillway has been designed to enable floods of small to medium magnitude up to one in 20-year return period to be contained in the stream channel as far as possible. This has been done both by the provision of an overfall spillway without gates but of a special design, and by the provision of low-level outlet valves of capacity less than that of the stream channel.

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What progress has been made towards the settlement of claims made by persons downstream from the South Para reservoir, for damage suffered following the 1971 flood?

2. If this matter is not finalised when is it expected it will be?

3. What is the expected cost relative to this flood and have any other claims been made relative to subsequent flooding?

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

1. Negotiations between the Crown Solicitor and the solicitors for the claimants are nearing finality.

2. Early settlement is expected.

3. Final costs have yet to be determined by negotiated settlement. Complaints were received arising from the 1974 flood, but liability has been denied in all instances.

BOLIVAR ENVIRONMENT

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Does the Environment Department hold fears for the ecology of the swamp land and sea meadows within a 16 kilometre radius of the Bolivar effluent discharge?

2. Has any departmental investigation revealed any change in the area since the commencement of the discharge?

3. In view of the likely continuance of the discharge as stated by the Minister of Works on July 27, what further action does the department intend to take relative to any damage which may be occurring?

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

1. The Environment Department is generally concerned for the ecology of coastal swamp lands and seagrass meadows throughout the State, including those within a 10-mile radius of the Bolivar effluent discharge, where the death of small areas of mangroves between St. Kilda and Port Gawler and some seagrass degradation have occurred. However, it is considered to be unlikely that such mangrove recession is directly related to the Bolivar effluent, nor have indirect associations been established. In the case of the seagrasses, studies by the Engineering and Water Supply Department suggest that this is part of a general pattern of degradation between Brighton in the south and Middle Beach in the north, and no association with the Bolivar effluent discharge has yet been established.

2. No specific investigations in relation to the Bolivar effluent outfall have been carried out by the Environment Department because the current study by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, in relation to which the Environment Department has been and continues to be consulted, will fulfil the same purpose. From the study of the E. & W.S. Dept. it is evident that widespread alteration to the pattern of sediment movement along the metropolitan coastline has caused changes in the physical characteristics of the sea bed and associated marine growths. These changes have been occurring gradually since 1954.

3. The Environment Department is monitoring the mangrove systems between St. Kilda and Middle Beach in an effort to establish whether any long or short-term changes occur in these areas and, if such changes do occur, what action may best be taken to remedy them, if they are due to man's actions. The study of seagrass meadows in the area by the E. and W.S. Dept. is continuing, in relation to which the Environment Department will maintain close liaison.

SUBSIDY PAYMENTS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What subsidy payments, normally distributed prior to June 30 each year, were withheld from distribution this year, and why?

2. Was the District Council of Freeling the only E.F.S. applicant for subsidy which was not paid by June 30, 1976, and, if so, why?

3. What was the estimated sum of subsidy payments outstanding as at June 30, 1976?

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

1. Subsidy payments from the Bush Fires Equipment Subsidies Fund, normally distributed late in June, were approved later than usual this year by the Bush Fires Equipment Subsidies Committee, whose meeting was delayed due to sickness of committee members, and no subsidy cheques were posted until mid-July.

2. No.

3. The total amount of subsidy payments made in July, 1976, was \$188 000.

FISHERIES COMMITTEE

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. What policy decisions were taken by the South-Eastern Australian Fisheries Committee at its meeting on May 24, 1976, with respect to South Australian fisheries?

2. Will a report of this meeting be tabled in Parliament?

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

1. The function of the South-Eastern (Australian) Fisheries Committee is to make recommendations to the Standing Committee on Fisheries. It does not make executive decisions on policy.

2. No; but any recommendation of the South-Eastern Fisheries Committee which is approved by the Standing Committee and the Australian Fisheries Council would be incorporated in the record of proceedings of the council which are tabled in Parliament.

RAILWAY BRIDGES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What was the completed cost of:
 - (a) the Christie Downs railway bridge at Port Stanvac, and
 - (b) each of the two railway bridges built at Parkholme?
2. By what factors should these figures be modified to provide properly comparable cost figures?
3. Which organisation built each of these bridges?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:
1. (a) \$501 000; (b) \$436 050 for Daws Road; \$536 000 for Marion Road. The above costs do not include any earthworks.

2. The only common factor in the bridges is that the steelwork was fabricated at Islington. Other aspects are hardly comparable.

3. Engineering and Water Supply Department (Port Stanvac Bridge); A. W. Baulderstone (Parkholme bridges).

EQUIPMENT TENDERS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): For what departments and projects were the various items of heavy machinery and equipment required, for which tenders were called by the State Supply Department in advertisements on page 30 of the *Advertiser* of March 8, 1976?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The heavy machinery and equipment for which tenders were called in the *Advertiser* on Monday, March 8, 1976, are primarily replacements for worn-out equipment and machinery required for normal departmental operations. Attached is the list of equipment and departments concerned with the tenders.

TENDERS CALLED FOR HEAVY MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT IN THE *Advertiser* ON MARCH 8, 1976

Closing Date—March 8

Tender No.	No.	Item	User Department
363	2	Motor graders	Highways Department
365	5	Tipping trucks	Highways Department

Closing Date—March 15

Tender No.	No.	Item	User Department
345	3	Prime movers	Highways Department
378	6	Front end loaders	Highways Department
379	7	Front end loaders	Highways Department
382	1	Tractor	Agriculture and Fisheries
408	2	Tip trucks	Marine and Harbors
429	1	Front end loader	Engineering and Water Supply
431	3	Front End loader back hoes	Engineering and Water Supply
432	2	Front end loaders	Engineering and Water Supply
435	1	Tractor crawler dozer	Engineering and Water Supply
436	3	Excavators	Engineering and Water Supply
441	5	Air hoists	Engineering and Water Supply
442	4	Vans	Engineering and Water Supply
443	1	Road sweeper	Engineering and Water Supply
444	1	Compressor	Engineering and Water Supply
445	6	Pumps	Engineering and Water Supply
446	1	Welding unit	Engineering and Water Supply
447	1	Heavy duty trailer	Engineering and Water Supply
448	1	Profile cutting machine	Engineering and Water Supply
449	1	Trenching machine	Engineering and Water Supply
450	4	Trailers	Engineering and Water Supply
461	2	Hydraulic cranes	Engineering and Water Supply
463	1	Tipper	Engineering and Water Supply
464	1	Tip truck	Engineering and Water Supply
465	2	Prime movers and two trailers	Engineering and Water Supply
466	1	Slewing crane	Engineering and Water Supply
467	1	Trailer	Engineering and Water Supply
468	1	Truck mounted crane	Engineering and Water Supply
469	1	Engine	Engineering and Water Supply
470	1	Milling machine	Engineering and Water Supply
471	1	Fork lift truck	Engineering and Water Supply
472	5	Vibrating road rollers	Engineering and Water Supply
475	1	Crawler excavator	Engineering and Water Supply
476	1	Tractor	Engineering and Water Supply
477	1	Tractor	Engineering and Water Supply
478	1	Graveley tractor	Engineering and Water Supply
479	6	Front end loaders/back hoe	Engineering and Water Supply
480	1	Tractor mounted front end loader	Engineering and Water Supply
481	1	Angle dozer	Engineering and Water Supply
482	1	Front end loader	Engineering and Water Supply
483	1	Tractor mounted front end loader	Engineering and Water Supply
484	2	Front end loaders	Engineering and Water Supply
485	1	Front end loader	Engineering and Water Supply
486	1	Tractor with front end loader	Engineering and Water Supply
487	1	Front end loader back hoe	Engineering and Water Supply

Closing Date—March 22

Tender No.	No.	Item	User Department
438	1	Prime mover	Public Buildings Department
439	1	Front end loader/back hoe	Further Education

PORT LINCOLN WHARF

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. When were tenders first called for construction of the new wharf and associated facilities at Port Lincoln?
2. What was the estimated cost of the project at that time?
3. How many tenders were received?
4. Who was the successful tenderer, and how was he selected?
5. How much has construction of this wharf and associated facilities cost to date?
6. Have any construction difficulties been encountered and, if so, what are they?
7. What is the present estimate of time and cost of completion?

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

1. No tenders were called. The project was managed by the Department of Marine and Harbors and sub-contracts were let to private industry for portions of the work for approximately \$3 724 000, and to the South Australian Railways and other Government departments for approximately \$850 000.
2. The estimated cost of the whole scheme as at July, 1970, was \$7 050 000.
3. Vide 1.
4. Vide 1.
5. \$11 000 000.
6. No major construction difficulties have been encountered. The civil construction works were completed on schedule. However, a number of minor difficulties have delayed completion of the mechanical loading plant, the most significant of which are: (1) limitation of loan funds available during the financial years 1972-73 and 1973-74; (2) heavy structural sections, supplied under subcontract, were delivered approximately six months late; and (3) a delay in completion of the ship-loader because of minor structural problems.
7. The wharf and the first loader are expected to be completed in November, 1976. The second loader is due for completion in April, 1977. The final cost is estimated to be \$12 300 000.

SCHOOL DENTAL SERVICES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): Will the Government undertake to review its current policy on school dental services in country centres, with particular reference to utilising the services of private dental practitioners where they are available, and report the results of such review to the Parliament in due course?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Government has reviewed its policy on school dental services in country areas. It will continue to supply wherever practicable services within schools by dental therapists operating under the supervision of regional dental officers. Where this is not feasible consideration is being given to the practicability of utilising the services of private dental practitioners.

CORPORATE AFFAIRS COMMISSION

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): Has the Government, as a matter of policy, determined an attitude to the Interstate Corporate Affairs Commission and, if so, what is it, and, if not, is it a matter which the Government is still considering?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has not yet determined its attitude to the control of companies or the securities industry in Australia. When proposals from the Federal Minister of Business and Consumer Affairs are evaluated, a decision can be made.

BABY-SITTING AGENCIES

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Is legislation being prepared to licence and control baby-sitting agencies and, if so: (a) what controls and regulations are envisaged; (b) what is the reason for such legislation; (c) who will be affected, and why; and (d) when will the legislation be introduced?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows: Legislation is being prepared.

(a) It is proposed to amend the Community Welfare Act to require that all agencies that provide baby-sitting services for monetary or other consideration must be licensed. A community welfare advisory committee will be asked to draft regulations.

(b) Licensing was requested by the agencies at a meeting held on March 15, 1976.

(c) See (a) and (b) above.

(d) During the current session.

GERIATRIC CARE

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the total number of beds provided for geriatric patients in South Australia by the State Government, and where?

2. What was the total cost to the State of providing such accommodation during the last financial year?

3. Are patients required to contribute to such cost and, if so, how much a week?

4. Is there a waiting list for those requiring accommodation and, if so, what is the total number and expected waiting time?

5. What is the estimated shortage of geriatric beds in South Australia for pensioners and other aged citizens?

6. Is it expected that the demand for these beds will increase in the next 15 years and, if so, by how much?

7. What action is the Government taking to overcome such a shortage now and in the future?

8. What assistance does the State Government provide for the establishment of geriatric homes?

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

1. In South Australia, dependent old people are located in hostels, nursing homes and hospitals. The following beds are provided for geriatric patients in State Government nursing homes:

Hospitals Department—	
Royal Adelaide Hospital—Northfield Wards ..	122
Ru Rua Nursing Home*	45

Total Hospitals Department 167

*Facilities for multiply handicapped, intellectually retarded patients.

Department for Community Welfare—	
Magill Home	114

In addition, the Hospitals Department provides full deficit financing (Minister of Health, Miscellaneous) for the following State nursing homes (non-government):

Home for Incurables	Beds 413
Kalyra Nursing Home	31

Total non-government State 444

2. The net cost to the State of providing such accommodation during 1975-76 is \$5 079 465.

3. All patients are required to contribute towards the cost of the provision to them of nursing home accommodation and care, and are assessed individually on the basis of income levels.

4. Yes. In institutions directly controlled by the State Government the figure is 47. Many individuals have placed their names on more than one waiting list. Whilst priority for entry into State geriatric accommodation is allocated on the basis of clinical need and not the length of time that a person's name has been on a waiting list, other organisations (being independent) vary in the fashion whereby waiting lists are compiled.

5. For Australia as a whole, the Hospitals and Health Services Commission has established a figure of 50 nursing home beds per 1 000 population aged 65 and over as a guideline for future development. As at February 29, 1976, the total number of nursing home beds in South Australia approved by the Commonwealth Government for the payment of nursing home benefits was 4 813. Using figures derived from 1971 census, the estimated population aged 65 and over in South Australia is 1 111 224. It can be estimated that this would leave a shortfall of about 800 beds in order to achieve the average figure referred to above. A Federal-State Nursing Home Co-ordinating Committee has approved an additional 798 beds. When these become available, the overall nursing home bed to aged population ratio for South Australia will be 50.5 beds per 1 000 aged population. There are considerable geographical variations in the distribution of nursing home and hostel beds which include those in the private sector, the non-profit religious and charitable sector, and facilities provided by both State and Commonwealth Governments. In general terms, the major deficiency in the supply of geriatric accommodation in South Australia relates more to hostel accommodation than to nursing home accommodation. Being aware that demographic factors will produce both numerically and absolutely increasing numbers of aged people requiring these services, studies are being conducted to define the future requirements. It is important to appreciate that the provision of nursing home accommodation cannot be looked at in isolation and that this element represents only one part of a total extended care service.

6. Yes. No specific figures can be given.

7. Apart from the 798 beds mentioned above, the former Windanna Home has been transferred from the Department for Community Welfare to the Hospitals Department with the intention that it should be converted as soon as possible to provide hostel and nursing home accommodation for psycho-geriatric patients. The total number of beds available is expected to be 93. The demand for geriatric accommodation must be placed in the context of a total extended care service. For this reason, consolidated planning is under way embracing activities of several departments. A group representing State and Commonwealth departments and voluntary agencies has been established to advise the Government on ways to enhance and co-ordinate extended care services in South Australia. It is intended to achieve both central and regional co-ordination. Advisory committees on geriatric and rehabilitation services have been established on a regional basis in metropolitan Adelaide with representation from institutions, voluntary organisations, professional groups, Federal, State and local government authorities. Their work in co-ordinating the developments has been supported by the provision of secretarial and similar services. Geriatric

assessment services are being established and are strongly supported by the State Government, which employs specialist medical officers whose work is devoted to the fields of geriatrics and rehabilitation. Regional rehabilitation services are being established under the Community Health Programme including progressive expansion of visiting multi-disciplinary assessment teams to rural areas. Domiciliary care services (providing services mainly to the elderly) now extend over the entire metropolitan area and many rural areas.

8. Departmental services are provided through the Hospitals, Public Health and Community Welfare Departments in order to give guidance to organisations interested in establishing geriatric homes. State Government financial support has been made available to the Home for Incurables, where bed establishment is 413, and this figure will rise to 800 when the present building programme is completed in 1978. The State Government assists with the establishment of nursing homes by the provision of a \$2 for \$1 subsidy towards the cost of approved furnishings and equipment.

EXEMPTED SHOPS

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Is the Minister aware that there are shops selling exempt goods only, and that these shops are not on the list of exempted shops under the Industrial Code, 1967-1972 and, if so, what action does the Government propose to take to rectify the situation, particularly in those shops selling fishing gear, tackle and bait, and when will this action be taken?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am aware that there are instances where an item appears on a list of exempt goods, but a shop selling that item exclusively cannot open outside of normal closing times. An examination is being undertaken into the goods shown on the list of goods exempted under the Industrial Code, 1967-1972, which may be sold from exempted shops at any time. I am also examining the "exempt shop" classification in the Code.

RAILWAYS VANDALISM

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the South Australian Railways been subject to attacks of vandalism during the past 12 months and, if so:

(a) what damage and incidence of nuisance has occurred;

(b) what was the cost of damage to property; and

(c) what effect has this had on railways operations?

2. How do these figures compare with previous trends, and is the incidence of vandalism on the increase?

3. What action is being taken to curb vandalism and protect the safety of railway operations and vehicles?

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

1. Yes.

(a) Objects placed on/over lines; signalling or communications equipment damaged; level crossing warning devices damaged; arson; damage to rollingstock; objects thrown/fired at trains; damage to buildings, etc.; forced entry; assault (staff and other passengers); indecent exposure; unlawful use of staff communication equipment; unruly behaviour; passengers under influence of liquor; altercations.

(b) Detailed records are not kept but costs run into many thousands of dollars each year.

- (c) Besides being a nuisance some acts could lead to serious consequences.
- 2. The number of occurrences are about the same as last year but serious incidents have increased.
- 3. The railway police force in co-operation with the Police Department take appropriate action to minimise vandalism.

ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

- 1. What progress has been made on the redevelopment of the Adelaide Railway Station and surrounding land?
- 2. Has the original plan been amended and, if so, what are the variations?
- 3. What are the main benefits of the project?
- 4. What is the estimated cost, commencement date, and completion date, respectively, of this project?
- 5. What has been the total cost of the project to date?
- 6. How will the project be funded?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Since the concept plan was produced by Hassell and Partners Pty. Ltd., it has not been possible, due to financial restraints, to proceed further.

HOUSING FOR ABORIGINES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

- 1. What is the current situation for housing of Aborigines in this State?
- 2. Is there a waiting list and, if so, how many applications are pending and what is the present waiting time?

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

- 1. The problems concerning the housing of Aborigines are expected to become more difficult due to the lesser funds being made available in this fiscal year by the Federal Government.
- 2. There is a normal waiting time and at present it is 18 months to two years but this is expected to lengthen. Where there are grounds that warrant special priority these cases are treated separately and housed in accordance with the circumstances of the family. Depending on the varying degree of need, the waiting time ranges from one to six months. There are currently 498 applications pending.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Has the Government adopted the principle of the United Nations Environmental Organisation in relation to acquisition of land for national parks and, if so:

- (a) what percentage of land in South Australia is declared national parks;
- (b) what was the total cost of acquisition;
- (c) what is the estimated annual cost of their maintenance; and
- (d) how many persons are employed in our national parks and what are their duties?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Neither the Government nor its advisers know to which principle of the United Nations Environmental Organisation this question refers. If the honourable member can clarify the question I might be able to give him a more satisfactory reply. Although the remainder of the question is worded as contingent upon the first, answers can be given, and are:

(a) The percentage of 3.7 per cent has been dedicated as reserves under the provisions of the National Parks and Wildlife Act at June 30, 1976. This percentage is increasing each year in line with the Government's proclaimed policy of dedicating at least 5 per cent of the State's land as national park or equivalent.

(b) It is impossible to give an answer to this question as land has been dedicated as national parks or other equivalent reserves since 1891. In 1975-76, \$1 475 997 was spent on land acquisition, including funds recouped from the Federal Government. The severe cutback in funds from the present Federal Government for this and other worthy purposes will considerably reduce this expenditure from now on.

(c) The cost was about \$1 700 000 in 1975-76.

(d) There were 143 (at 6/8/76) within the National Parks and Wildlife Division of the Department for the Environment. The division obtains services from other divisions of the department which cannot be easily summarised as person years.

The second part of this question is extremely wide and is best summarised by classifications, as follows:

Administrative (Including the Director of National Parks and Wildlife)	4
Clerical	17
Scientific management	5
Rangers	38
Park keepers	26
Fauna inspectors	4
Technical and maintenance staff	37
Camp supervisors, cave guides, etc.	12

143

HYPERACTIVENESS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

- 1. What investigations and research are being undertaken by the Government in South Australia into hyperactiveness and the alleged connection of artificially coloured and flavoured foods?
- 2. If investigations and research are not being undertaken, why not, and will the Government undertake such research?

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

- 1. Several hyperactive children in South Australia are being given modified diets in an effort to determine whether this has a beneficial effect on the hyperactive state in these children.
- 2. A full research programme is not being mounted in South Australia because it would duplicate extensive research already underway in overseas countries.

POVERTY

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Is the Minister aware of the incidence of poverty in South Australia and, if so, what action is the Government taking for its reduction?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Government is concerned about people in South Australia who are in financial need. While income-maintenance programmes for people in these circumstances are the clear responsibility of the Commonwealth Government, through the Department of Social Security, the State Government has provided substantial amounts for financial assistance to deserted wives, supporting parents and other eligible persons in need, including rebates on property taxes for pensioners and grants to community welfare organisations. The

VACANT BLOCKS

Mr. WOTTON (on notice): How many vacant blocks of land are there in the Outer Metropolitan Planning Area which are suitable for immediate house building and of these blocks how many are:

- (a) in the course of preparation as building blocks;
- (b) larger than the current 30-hectare limit;
- (c) smaller than the current 30-hectare limit;
- (d) within township boundaries; and
- (e) within rural areas?

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

- (a) There are applications to create about 2 200 allotments in the Outer Metropolitan Planning Areas.
- (b) The information required is not readily available.
- (c) The information required is not readily available.
- (d) There are about 9 000 allotments within township boundaries.
- (e) The information required is not readily available.

RAILWAYS TRANSFER

Mr. RUSSACK (on notice): Have the South Australian Railways officers and employees been kept informed of current negotiations in the implementation of the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Act, 1975, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes. Discussions have been held with the South Australian Railways representatives on no less than 15 occasions during the past four months.

RAILWAYS SUPERANNUATION

Mr. RUSSACK (on notice): What will be the amount transferred by the trustees of the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust to the Superannuation Board of Australia or any substituted body, in compliance with section 15 of the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Act, 1975?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The superannuation arrangements for State employees who transfer to the Australian National Railways Commission are still the subject of negotiation between the parties. Until such arrangements have been finalised there will be no basis upon which an appropriate figure can be calculated.

HIDES EXPORT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. During his recent visit to Poland, did the Premier discuss the export of hides from South Australia to that country and, if so, what proposals were discussed and what was the outcome of these discussions?

2. If hides are to be exported to Poland, how will the export price be determined, and in what way will the hides be treated before export?

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

1. I discussed the export of hides from South Australia to Poland, and further discussed the possibility of there being a joint venture between the Polish export group Skorimpex and an Australian partner in the provision of hides at the wet blue level from South Australia. Following these earlier discussions, the Director-General for Trade and Development, on his return to Adelaide, met with executives of an interested company. These gentlemen had nominated their interest in such a deal before the Premier's

party left South Australia. Following Mr. Davies' discussions in Adelaide with them on his return, he received a visit by a Polish delegation led by Mr. E. Mlynarz, Deputy Director, Development and Planning Division, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Marine Economy. Mr. Mlynarz and the Polish Commercial Consul, Mr. H. Cieslik, were introduced to executives of the interested company.

2. The export price of hides which may be exported to Poland is a matter of discussion between any joint venture company which might be formed and the Polish buyers. It is intended that the hides will be exported in the wet blue condition.

FLOWERS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many signatures to letters and petitions has the Minister received from citizens objecting to the staging of the play *Flowers* and objecting to the use of blasphemy in this play?

2. Has the Minister reconsidered his decision towards such productions and, if so, why, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government has received a number of petitions and letters both in favour of and objecting to the staging of the play *Flowers*.

2. No. The general policy of the Government has been clearly stated.

SHACK SITES

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. How many shack sites are licensed in South Australia?

2. What limitations are imposed on occupiers of shacks in the construction of car ports on sites they occupy?

3. Does the Government propose any time limit for the removal of shacks in any locations now used for shack sites?

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

1. About 3 000 licensed shack sites, about 50 per cent of which are licensed directly by the Lands Department and the remainder licensed by district councils under authority from that department.

2. Construction of car ports is not permitted on shack sites in areas designated non-acceptable for holiday home development. In areas designated acceptable, the limitations are:

(a) Council approval under the Building Act where applicable, or approval of the Minister of Lands where the Building Act is not applicable.

(b) No solid construction is permitted.

3. There are no current proposals for removal of existing shacks.

SHUTTLEWORTH RETRIAL

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has a decision yet been made as to whether there should be a retrial of Wendy Shuttleworth and, if so, what is that decision?

2. If a decision has not been made when will it be made?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. A decision will be made this week.

BRIGHTON CYCLISTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Does the Government expect that the use by cyclists of King George Avenue, Brighton, as a route alternative to the Brighton Road, will protect them and, if so, how?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If cyclists can be encouraged to use King George Avenue, Brighton, they will be in a safer environment than if they used Brighton Road because motor traffic volumes are less on King George Avenue than on Brighton Road, motor traffic speeds are less on King George Avenue, and conflicting traffic movements are lower on King George Avenue.

OVERSEA TRIPS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What oversea trips are proposed for Ministers of the present Government and their entourages during this financial year, and what is the estimated total cost of such trips?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Decisions have not yet been made. Funds for these purposes will be shown in the Estimates of Expenditure shortly to be introduced.

MOBILE LIBRARIES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it intended to provide a mobile library in those parts of the State in which the provisions of the Libraries (Subsidies) Act have not yet been used and, if so:

- (a) has a former Metropolitan Tramways Trust bus been fitted out and a collection of books made for this purpose;
- (b) why has the service not yet begun to operate; and
- (c) when will it begin to operate?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Libraries Board intends providing a demonstration mobile library in local government council areas where a public library under the provisions of the Libraries (Subsidies) Act has not yet been established, with the consent and co-operation of the councils concerned. It is intended that the mobile library be made available for a limited period in each council area to give the councils concerned an opportunity to assess the likely demand for public library services in their areas. At present under the direction of the Road Traffic Control Board, operation of the vehicle will be limited to that part of the metropolitan area within the 60 km/h zone on routes approved by that board.

(a) A former M.T.T. bus is being fitted out for the purpose, and a collection of books has been purchased for the purposes of the mobile library.

(b) The service has not yet begun to operate because of much greater difficulties being encountered in the conversion of the vehicle than were indicated in advice received by the Libraries Board at the time the service was proposed. The conversion has now reached the stage where nearly all of the necessary electrical fittings and parts have been received, and they are being installed by the Public Buildings Department.

(c) It is estimated that subject to the completion of the conversion by the Public Buildings Department and the installation of the necessary shelving being completed on schedule, the vehicle should be ready for service within two months. The Libraries Board has not yet made a decision on the council area(s) in which the vehicle

should first provide service. Several councils have expressed an interest in having the demonstration unit operate within their council areas.

DENTAL TECHNICIANS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What is the policy of the Government on the registering of dental technicians and their dealing directly with the public?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Government currently has this matter under consideration, but at this stage no policy decision has been made.

PUBLIC ACTUARY

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it expected that the present Public Actuary will resign in the near future, and if so:

- (a) why;
- (b) when; and
- (c) has his successor been appointed, and who is he?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Public Actuary is presently absent on extended sick leave. At this stage, I am not able to comment on whether his state of health may lead to his retirement or resignation.

BRUSH-TAILED POSSUMS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it proposed to establish facilities for the collection and subsequent relocating of brush-tailed possums trapped in the metropolitan area and, if so:

- (a) when;
- (b) where; and
- (c) of what will the facilities consist?

2. If facilities are not proposed, why not?

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

1. No.

2. In my reply given on July 27, 1976, to a Question on Notice, I took great pains to explain why the brush-tailed possum population in the Adelaide metropolitan area was maintained at its present high level by biological and man-induced factors, and why trapping and relocation of brush-tailed possums was not an answer to the problems being caused by this high population level. The only effective method whereby the population level can be limited is by blocking possible den sites. The responsibility for this must rest with the individual property owner.

SCHOOL CANTEENS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): When is it expected that the committee set up to examine the management of school canteens will report, and will such report be made public; if not, why not?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The committee has just commenced its task and as the two members nominated by S.A.A.S.S.O. are employed outside the Public Service and are therefore unable to attend meetings more frequently than about one afternoon a fortnight, the report may not be available before December, 1976. Whether the committee's recommendations will be made public is a matter for Government decision at that time.

SPECIAL MAGISTRATES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it intended that special magistrates should not be members of the Public Service and, if so, when are they to cease being members of it; and, if not, why not?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The question of removing Stipendiary Magistrates from the Public Service is still under consideration.

CHRISTIE DOWNS RAILWAY

Mr. RUSSACK (on notice):

1. What is the intended voltage and frequency of the power supply for the Christie Downs railway?
2. On what basis were such characteristics selected?
3. Does this power supply conform with accepted world practice for railway systems of similar length?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The electrification project has been deferred indefinitely because of the lack of Federal financial support.

CYCLISTS

In reply to Mr. OLSON (June 10):

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The national code recommendation is to permit cyclists to ride two abreast. An examination of accident records does not indicate that cyclists riding two abreast are contributing to an increase in accidents involving them. It is considered that the policing of a law requiring cyclists who ride in single file would be difficult. The situation for police, cyclists, and other road users would be even more confusing and difficult if such a law was applied only to main or priority roads and not to all public roads. This matter will be kept under review, but no change in the existing law is considered necessary at the present time.

MODBURY COMMUNITY CENTRE

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (August 4):

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Purchase of the site for the community welfare centre has been completed and planning for the development of the centre has commenced. There has been exploratory consultation with local government, local organisations and the Community Council for Social Development. Current planning is for the building of the community welfare centre to commence during the 1977-78 year, but this will be subject to the availability of funds.

VIOLENCE

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say whether the Government has decided to proceed with a major investigation into crime, with particular reference to the alarming increase in crimes of violence in our community, and what action is being taken to protect the community? A steady increase in vandalism has taken place, and in recent days there have been reports of crimes of violence against the public and people who perform a service to the public, such as taxi drivers and, most recently, the crew of a suburban train. Recently, too, there has been a widely reported spate of sex crimes. Public concern over the matter, which has been high, is increasing. In some oversea countries,

violence against the person is regarded as being a way of life. There is evidence that such crimes are increasing rapidly in South Australia, and it has been said that we are closely following the American trend. It is important that everything possible is being done to reduce this crime rate. The members of the Police Force are obviously most concerned, and are doing everything they can to enforce the law and protect our citizens. There is an obligation on Governments to support law enforcement bodies to ensure that the strongest possible measures are taken to combat crime in the community; especially crimes of violence.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I find some difficulty in understanding quite what this tirade is about. The Leader asks whether there is an inquiry into crime in South Australia. For his information, there is; it has been proceeding for a considerable period. It was set up after the 1973 election and, in fact, has continued now for some years. The Mitchell committee has produced a whole series of reports, and is continuing to do so. It is the most thorough investigation of the law and its administration in criminal and penal matters that Australia has seen in its whole history. The simple answer to the Leader's question regarding investigation of crime is that South Australia is already doing more than any other part of the Commonwealth about this matter. As far as the administration of criminal law is concerned, the Police Force in South Australia is the best regarded Police Force in this country, and is provided with facilities by this Government very extensively. In the Budget discussions that have just taken place I had no complaints whatever from the area of the Police Force about the provision that had been made for it; it was extensive. The police have had constant support from the Government in the matter of law enforcement.

The Leader refers to a couple of occasions just recently where there has been a report of some gang violence. He seems to suggest that this is a new departure in South Australia. If he looks at criminal reports of 100 years ago, he will find exactly the same kind of report occurring. As to the incidence of crime within the community, South Australia is standing up rather well on statistics on this matter. I point out to the Leader that a widespread factor of increased urbanisation has been an increase in crimes arising from the fact that, in large urban conglomerations, there is some alienation of people within society from the enforcement of society norms by the peer groups within society. No criminologist has come up with any effective suggestions about countering that tendency. If the Leader has any constructive suggestions as to what else we should be doing beyond what we are doing in the community, I should be very interested to hear them. The law enforcement agencies in this State are the best in Australia, and they have the support of the Government. The position of inquiry is by far the most extensive that Australia has seen in its history by people competent in this area, and it is properly serviced by criminologists. If the Leader has something constructive to put, I should like to hear it, but there is not much use his getting up and saying, "Woe, woe, will the Government please do something that we can't specify?"

RAILWAY SECURITY

Mr. ABBOTT: Can the Minister of Transport say what action is being taken, or is intended to be taken, to provide greater security for train crews against the incidence of hooliganism and vandalism on trains?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ABBOTT: I refer to the alleged claim that incidents of this nature are increasing and to Friday evening's attack by hooligans on a train driver and guard on a suburban train.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am disturbed that members opposite can find anything to laugh about in what happened Friday evening to a train crew: it is an indication of their attitude to society. The matter raised by the honourable member was the subject of a lengthy discussion yesterday between the union and the State Transport Authority. I expect to receive a report soon as a result of that discussion, and it will give me much pleasure to tell the honourable member what is happening when I have the information.

RAPE PENALTY

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Attorney-General intend to increase penalties for crimes of violence, such as rape? The opinions of Mr. Elliott, S.M., recently retired, are probably known to most people: he believes that penalties should be increased, even to the extent of reintroducing corporal punishment. I think Mr. Beerworth, S.M., expressed a similar opinion some time ago on his retirement.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Are you suggesting that?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The public is quite uneasy about the increase in crimes, especially against women, and would support stiffer penalties. Therefore, has the Attorney anything in mind, because of statements made by people such as those to whom I have referred?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am somewhat surprised to hear the honourable member ask such a question, because I would have thought, if he believes such increased penalties are necessary, he would advocate them. This Government considers rape penalties to be quite sufficient. The Premier referred earlier this afternoon to the Mitchell committee, which had reported on this matter. In the opinion of that committee of experts it was considered that rape penalties were satisfactory. The Government considers that that advice is proper and correct, and intends to follow the advice by not increasing penalties for rape.

GENETIC RESEARCH

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health to provide a report about safety precautions being taken in conjunction with experiments on genetic engineering? My question flows from a report I read this morning in the *Australian* that dealt with comments made yesterday at a seminar by Sir Mark Oliphant, at which he said:

... there was justified fear that research into genetic engineering could produce bacteria of great virulence, which could escape and cause uncontrollable epidemics in humans or animals. This is probably an area of experimental genetic research which should be viewed with the utmost caution and suspicion until far more is known.

Later it is reported in the same article that the Australian Academy of Science sent scientists to the United States, where biologists have called for a moratorium. These scientists reported that research should continue in Australia, provided it was monitored strictly. They added that United States researchers have created a "fail-safe" bacteria for experiments that they say will counter the cries of

opponents. Because of fears that have been expressed so widely by the public following Sir Mark's comments, I believe it is in the public's interest that we should have some comment from the Minister of Health about whether he is satisfied that means are available to conduct safely experiments of this kind.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I saw the report in the *Advertiser* to which the honourable member has referred, and I agree that it is an important matter. I am sure that the Minister of Health will be pleased to do whatever he can to alleviate any fears in the minds of the public. I will undertake to bring this matter to his attention and to obtain a report for the honourable member.

DROUGHT

Mr. GUNN: Can the Deputy Premier say how primary producers will be able to obtain assistance as a result of the Government's announcement today that it intends to provide help to those owners of properties affected by drought who wish to slaughter stock on their properties? At the weekend, I visited and spoke to some of my constituents in the west of the State, and was told that primary producers had already started to slaughter stock, particularly sheep, on their properties. They were concerned that they were unable at that stage to avail themselves of the South Australian Meat Corporation's offer of 40c a head at the Gepps Cross or Port Lincoln abattoirs, because of freight problems. Can the Deputy Premier say what action those people should take, not only in the west of the State but in other areas? I know of farmers who wish to dispose of surplus stock but whose stock would not weigh the 18 kilogrammes required before it could be processed by Samcor.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government is concerned to ensure that farmers who are carrying stock on their properties in these circumstances are treated as equally as possible. It is not, as the honourable member has pointed out, fair or reasonable to expect farmers located many kilometres from the Gepps Cross or Port Lincoln abattoirs to freight sheep in order to take advantage of the offer. It was decided that the Government would seek the co-operation of councils in the areas worse affected, or in any area that could show the need for this service, and ask them to supervise and, if necessary, carry out the slaughtering and burial at points nominated by the councils or on the properties of the people concerned. It may be that the council will engage the services of the farmers' machinery, etc., to bury the stock. The cost of doing that will not be borne by the primary producer, but will be assessed and paid for by the Government on receipt of a certificate from the council; the document may take any form, stating that so much money was spent. It will have to be a sensible and flexible scheme that will involve councils in some effort as well, but the Government believes that councils covering the worst affected areas will be only too pleased to co-operate with the primary producers and the Government to solve what could be a real problem.

Mr. Gunn: Will you adopt the Victorian scheme of \$10 a head for cattle?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, that scheme will not be adopted. The scheme outlined by the Government provides that the full cost of slaughtering and burial will be met by the Government. I will not state the reasons for that now, but the honourable member may be aware of some of them. The Government considers that this

is a fair and reasonable way in which to operate the scheme. We are certain that councils will co-operate wherever required, and the two Ministers involved (the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Lands) will do everything possible to ensure that the scheme works as effectively as the Government wants it to work. One of the dangers of not having a scheme of any kind is that stock could die in paddocks and not be buried, thus leading to an outbreak of disease. The Government, which is keen to ensure that the scheme works, will do everything in its power to assist those in necessitous circumstances.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister ask the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries to consider subsidising freight on stock suitable for processing for slaughter, so that farmers who are compelled to dispose of stock by this means will have some chance to obtain compensation, even though it may be as little as 40 cents a head, for their stock? The policy announced by the Government relates basically to the disposal of carcasses for health reasons: the Government is to subsidise councils or pay for the necessary slaughter and disposal. Many stock in remote areas would be quite suitable for processing but would have to be slaughtered with no return to the producer, because it would cost more than 40 cents to bring them either to the Port Lincoln or to the Adelaide abattoir. As the Government is paying a subsidy for agistment of animals, would it consider subsidising freight to avoid unnecessary wastage, so that the best use can be made of unfortunately expendable stock by processing into meat meal or other saleable products, and at the same time allowing the producer a modest return for stock that must be disposed of?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: So far as I am aware, consideration has been given to the matters raised by the honourable member by the Minister of Lands, in consultation with the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries. I think various organisations representing primary producers (and I will not single them out for individual mention) have made submissions of this type to the Government, but I am not aware whether any finality has been reached regarding the position. Day to day appreciation has to be made of a situation of this kind, but I will ask my colleague to examine the point raised, and will bring down a report as soon as possible.

RAILWAY SLEEPERS

Mr. WHITTEN: Has the attention of the Minister of Transport been drawn to the report in this morning's *Advertiser* concerning the supply of sleepers for railway purposes? The report quoted Mr. Cree, of the Forestry and Timber Department in Canberra, who said that Western Australia would not be able to meet the demand in the next 15 years for railway sleepers. He said that South Australia, which estimated it could keep up supplies of some hardwoods, increasingly would have to use treated radiata pine. Has the Minister considered the use of concrete sleepers in South Australia as well as sleepers of radiata pine?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We are well aware of the difficulty of obtaining sufficient timber sleepers. About four years ago I pressed the Federal Minister for Transport to use concrete sleepers for Commonwealth lines. We were able to get them on the Port Augusta to Whyalla line, and the fact that we were able to get them there resulted in the establishment of an additional industry. We have been pressing for their use on the standardisation project on the Adelaide to Crystal Brook line, but no

final determination has been made. In 1972, the Federal Minister gave an unqualified guarantee to the electors of Forrest that, if his Government were elected, timber sleepers would be used: that was in the interests of gaining that seat for the Country Party. I believe they successfully gained the seat, but lost Government. I am sure we will have to use more and more concrete sleepers, because the timber industry will not be able to meet the demand. We will be surveying the position in relation to the South-East.

Mr. Nankivell: What about steel?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know of any steel sleepers that are available or are satisfactory. Some years ago steel sleepers were used, and I understand that in Mallee, the area the honourable member represents, a few steel sleepers are lying on the sand, but I doubt whether they are in good condition.

RIDGEHAVEN SECONDARY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education say whether the department still has plans to erect a secondary school on the land owned by the department that faces Golden Grove Road, Ridgehaven? I will also be pleased to receive any other information available on this project.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will get the information for the honourable member.

STUART HIGHWAY

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Transport say whether a final decision has been made on the route for the new Stuart Highway and, if so, when will work commence? Pak-Poy and Associates investigated alternative routes for this highway, and some members made submissions in relation to their districts. I understand the Government has now received the report. It is well known that the most suitable route for this new highway is through the Woomera Research Establishment which I understand would save 96 kilometres of road and \$6 000 000, but unfortunately the research establishment is still operating. As many submissions were made by people in my district, they are now asking when a decision will be made on this matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I was given an advance draft copy of the report last week, and I understand it is now being printed. It is not true to say that we have received the report.

Mr. Gunn: Will we all get a copy of it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If it has not been printed, we cannot give copies to honourable members: he asks some foolish questions. When the report is printed, the first action will be to refer a copy of it to the Federal Minister of Transport (Mr. Nixon) and, if he is still talking to me, we will have to decide which route to follow.

BAKING HOURS

Mr. COUMBE: Now that the Government has decided not to alter legislation relating to weekend baking of bread, can the Minister of Labour and Industry say how many dispensations are in force permitting bakeries to bake bread at weekends and to sell that bread providing the bakery is attached to the shop from which the bread is sold, and where are the dispensations located?

Can the Minister also say what is the position relating to Mr. Heidt and whether his dispensation has been withdrawn?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not know exactly how many dispensations are operating but I will get the figures for the honourable member. To the best of my knowledge one only has been operating as long as I have been the Minister, and that was granted to Mr. Heidt by my predecessor, Mr. McKee, some time ago, but that was subsequently withdrawn because he was not acting in accordance with the terms of the dispensation. When I was overseas recently, he had a deputation to the Premier, and I understand he was told that, if he acted in good conscience and with commonsense, consideration would be given for it to be reinstated. However, I have written to Mr. Heidt and told him that I will not consider any dispensation for him irrespective of how good is his conduct now or in the future, until he apologises to me publicly for the lies emanating from an Industrial Court action that took place when he was being prosecuted in relation to his dispensation.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you saying he told lies in court?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am telling the honourable member, the House and the public of South Australia that he told lies about me in the Industrial Court.

Mr. Coumbe: In court?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: In court, there is no question about that.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Has he been charged with perjury?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: No, because we cannot do so, although we have examined that situation. Mr. Heidt will not be given back his dispensation until he withdraws the statements he made about me. He has been told that officially, and his own member of Parliament was told that only two days ago.

CORBETT REPORT

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier publish the report referred to on page 130 of the Corbett report into the Public Service wherein reference is made to the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau? The Corbett committee was set up to investigate the Public Service, and on page 130 of its report it stated it should not waste its time investigating the tourist bureau because another committee was considering the affairs of that department. The inference from that statement is that the committee believed that the evidence would be made available through the subsequent report. I believe Mr. Tattersall chaired the committee, and the report was given to the Government during the latter part of last year. I believe also that some people in the trade have seen the report. It is important that the Opposition, people in the trade and the media should know what is contained in that report, as it is really part of the Corbett report. Will the Premier make that report available, so that we can understand what were the conclusions in relation to the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will examine the matter. It was not part of the Corbett report, in fact it was a different investigation, under the Public Service Act ordered by the Public Service Board. There is a slight problem in that some personalities are involved in some parts of the report and, in consequence, some of the material may normally be considered to be privileged, because in relation to some matters it is distressingly frank: not frank from the point of view of the Government in any way, but

perhaps distressing from the point of view of certain individuals. I would certainly not want in any way to conceal the conclusions of the report from the public or from members opposite. If we can release the whole report I will do so: if I cannot, I will certainly release the report confidentially to members opposite, giving them reasons why those parts of it should be confidential.

Mr. Evans: Some people in the industry have seen it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think that some people in the industry have seen it because they were consulted as to various aspects of it. I will examine the matter and ascertain what I can do for the honourable member.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. BOUNDY: Will the Premier consider granting further relief of succession duties as it applies to rebate on rural land when held by a partnership as tenants in common? When the amendments to the Succession Duties Act were before the House last November, it was understood by members on this side at least that rural rebate would apply equally whether rural land was owned singly or in partnership. On November 11, when replying to a question from the Hon. J. C. Burdett, the Hon. D. H. L. Banfield is reported on p. 1770 of *Hansard* as having said:

The Government is prepared to give an assurance that where land is owned in this way the rural rebate provisions will be applied in respect of the interest of the deceased in that land in the same way as would apply if the land were not a partnership asset.

The Succession Duties Branch is interpreting the relevant clause of this Act as meaning that a partnership's total rebate after the death of both parties is half of the rebate applying to a single owner. The Premier, in a Ministerial statement last Wednesday, promised further relief for surviving spouses in relation to the matrimonial home. The anomaly regarding the rural rebate should also be resolved.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will examine the matter.

AUSTRALIAN FISHING INDUSTRY COUNCIL

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries a report on the availability of Government assistance for the administration of the South Australian branch of the Australian Fishing Industry Council? For some time the South Australian branch of A.F.I.C. has been seeking Government assistance to offset expenses incurred as a result of the extra work requested of it by the industry and of compiling reports for the Government. I understand that the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries has indicated sympathy with the proposal, but at this stage no indication has been given of the extent of that assistance and when it will be available. I should appreciate a statement from the Minister on the Government's policy on this matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do that for the honourable member.

ADOPTION OF VIETNAMESE BABIES

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say what is the situation with regard to the adoption of babies that came from Vietnam? Members of a family in my district are extremely distressed at the delay that

is taking place in getting into court to finalise the adoption of this child. They were pinning their hopes on a case that I believe was to come before the court, which they understood would be in the form of a test case. I believe the hearing was to have been on July 21, but I understand that, for one or more reasons, one of the parties had to seek an adjournment. Statements have been made in recent times relating to this and other matters concerning the adoption of such children, and these people are desirous of hearing from the Minister what will be the situation with regard to this adoption.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I appreciate the honourable member's concern for his constituent's worry. I think everybody involved has much sympathy with regard to the worries of the parents concerned. I refer the honourable member to the answer given by the then Attorney-General (page 237 of *Hansard* of August 3, 1976), although the Attorney dealt with the matter in a general way rather than in relation to a specific case. I hope the honourable member will convey to the people concerned that there is no problem with regard to the custody of the children. What is involved is a problem not only in South Australia but also in other States with respect to the adoption of some of these children. It is for this reason that the answer provided by the Attorney-General will, I think, also apply to the case the honourable member has raised. That answer was that officers of the departments in the respective States concerned with the legal aspects of adoptions, together with Commonwealth officers, are to meet soon (if they have not already met) to try to work out a uniform approach to the problem so that, if any amendments are needed, contemplated or to be drafted to the respective adoption Acts, they will be done on a formal basis. That answers the question generally.

Regarding the specific case referred to by the honourable member as being a test case, my memory agrees with his that the hearing date was July 21 and that the adjournment was sought by the legal representatives of the prospective parents. I remind the honourable member that I have spoken on this matter earlier stating that we have sympathy for the people concerned. There is no problem regarding custody of the children: they will remain with the people they are now with, and every effort will be made to provide for their adoption. However, it would be doing less than a service to all of those people collectively if in some hurried way amendments were drafted which were then found to be faulty in some respect, because some of the children come from places other than Vietnam. For this reason, I ask the honourable member to convey to the people concerned that the precautionary approach adopted here is real and necessary. Although I know it is a hackneyed phrase, in the long run it will be beneficial to all the prospective parents.

MARINE GROWTH

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister for the Environment, following the reply he gave me to a Question on Notice this afternoon, say whether his department has determined why there has been a considerable change in the physical characteristics of the seabed and associated marine growth offshore from Adelaide beaches since 1954, and what action has been taken, since then, to determine positively and, if need be, correct the changes that have occurred?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I will get a report for the honourable member on this matter; I am not aware of the technical details.

MURRAY RIVER POLLUTION

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government has considered the possibility of further pollution of the Murray River as a result of the proposed newsprint industry, which I believe will be the employment base for the new Albury-Wodonga complex? I have no intention of knocking any proposed new industry, but the Minister would be well aware, from his experience in the South-East, of the highly pollutent effect of the newsprint industry. Has the Government received guarantees from the Governments concerned that the project will in no way affect or increase pollution of the Murray River?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This complex has been mooted and is being examined. Some little while ago I wrote to New South Wales Minister for Environment and sent a copy of that letter to my counterpart in Victoria (Mr. Granter) asking to be informed whether this complex was to be developed and expressing concern on behalf of the South Australian Government (and therefore on behalf of the people likely to be affected by anything like this on the Murray if it was to be proceeded with). I have had a reply to this letter giving me an assurance that every possible step will be taken to protect the Murray River from any pollution that may arise if this project proceeds. I believe it is in the formative stages only and, therefore, a firm decision has not been made. The honourable member can rest assured that we will watch this development closely. I have asked the Minister concerned to keep me informed of any advance made from the present stage so that we can watch at each stage to ensure the people on the Murray and South Australians generally will not be in any way affected if this development proceeds.

SCHOOL FINANCE

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Education say what increased allocations will be made to denominational schools in this State and what sums will be made available to schools in the Unley District? Schools in the Unley District have benefited several times in this regard over the years. I am sure the schools concerned are keen to know what their extra allocations will be this year.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will get for the honourable member specific information on allocations to schools in the Unley District. Of course, that information will be available to him when the Cook committee report is printed. Regarding general disbursements to the private sector through the Cook committee, it is perhaps important to tell the House (if members are not already aware of this) that, because of the change in the system of making money available through the Cook committee, non-government schools will benefit by an amount of \$540 000 over and above what would normally have flowed to them. The increase is possible because of the adoption of a formula to take into account current costs rather than costs that were impinging on the fortunes of those schools at the time when information was collected for the six-monthly payment. In inflationary times, this is not an inconsiderable factor with which schools must live. By the adoption of the new method, we have been able to lift general payments to the non-government sector to a new plateau by \$540 000. That is the general situation. I will obtain information on specific grants to schools in the honourable member's district.

JUVENILE OFFENDERS

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether there is any evidence that the present treatment of juvenile offenders charged with the crime of rape and other serious crimes is not having the desired effect? I understand there is a lack of assessment facilities available in this regard and that these criminals are given free time and allowed to go on leave from institutions even though they are regarded as hard, dangerous criminals.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I believe the honourable member asked me whether there was any evidence that the present treatment of juvenile offenders charged with these crimes—

Mr. Mathwin: Whether it is not having the desired effect.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: What I think the honourable member probably means is whether it is having the desired effect.

Mr. Chapman: He means, "Is there any evidence to suggest it is not having the desired effect?"

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I now understand. The honourable member adopted his usual negative approach, so I was not quite sure about what was happening. The honourable member may be unaware that the Community Welfare Advisory Committee is examining the total question of treating juvenile offenders. It is investigating the total situation rather than dealing with specific areas, as outlined by the honourable member. There is still some time left before the committee is due to report back. In fact, I believe the committee started advertising publicly only last weekend and invited submissions on the matter. If the honourable member has anything worth while to put forward in this area, no doubt he will take advantage of the advertisement and make available to the committee any expertise he has in this field. I do not believe that the other statements made by the honourable member are accurate or that it is strictly correct to suggest that people are released from the training centre to which he referred in the simple way outlined by him.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the one at the hospital?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is certainly less than fair to the offenders concerned and to those much maligned people at McNally who are doing their level best to look after people who are sent there for treatment. Those people are trying to carry out that treatment in a way that will benefit offenders and benefit the people of South Australia, despite the constant efforts of the honourable member and others in the community to denigrate every attempt made by people in this field. I wish he would lay off and stop attacking the staff in that area—

Mr. Mathwin: You know very well I'm not attacking the staff.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: —of treatment without having a firm base on which to work and without accurate information. To make such wide assertions is entirely unfair and should not be done in such an important area. If the honourable member would listen, his own Leader could explain, from his personal experience and service in this area in trying to help young people who are in trouble, that constantly attacking people who are facing this problem is not the way to get results. It is all very well for the honourable member, when he is running short of material for a question, to pick on McNally.

Mr. Chapman: Fair go!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: That attitude will be of no use to the people of this State, to the staff concerned, or to the juveniles who need treatment. I have given the lie

direct to what the honourable member has said. The honourable member has an opportunity to make a submission to the committee charged with the important duty of reviewing the situation.

Mr. Mathwin: Answer the question.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am, and I am sure the honourable member did not expect to get this kind of reply. The people concerned are competent, thoughtful people who do not rush into print or make allegations. They have accepted the serious responsibility involved in this area and are trying to review the treatment method. I can only suggest that the information being supplied to the honourable member (although I accept his motives and that he means well in raising the matter) is not correct. The question of granting leave or otherwise in relation to the serious crimes to which he referred is a responsibility of the Director-General and the Minister. Instructions have been issued in relation to leave for these people. I suggest that the honourable member has been misled. In general, I appeal to members on both sides when dealing with this matter to bear in mind the effect of what they could generate by what might seem to them to be a simple question about such an institution. I am sure the honourable member agrees that the staff in these institutions face a difficult job (it is perhaps one of the few areas where the honourable member and I might agree), and it does not help them or the offenders concerned one whit if we are not careful about the questions and statements we make about such matters.

INDUSTRY NOISE

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what steps, if any, his department is taking to control noise levels in industry? It is only in recent years that industrial deafness has assumed such importance. I ask the question because I know of many hundreds of workers in South Australia who are walking the streets completely deaf. They are completely ignored and neglected by employer forces, because employers did not recognise that deafness could be a compensatable injury. As the trade union movement is vitally concerned about industrial deafness, I hope that the Minister will be able to give me some information.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I welcome the honourable member's question, as much is being done in relation to noise control measures in both the public and private sectors of industry. For some years an engineering group in the Labour and Industry Department has been investigating noise problems in the public sector. This has led to framing new regulations under the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act to take effect from September 1 this year. The regulations will require employers to ensure that their workers are not exposed to excessive noise levels. The upper limit has been set at 90 decibels, which is the standard applying in most oversea countries. I am pleased to say that employers generally have shown considerable interest in the new regulations. I take this opportunity to announce publicly Cabinet's decision that it has approved a grant of \$50 000 for the 1976-77 financial year to the Adelaide University, and for the two following financial years, for its investigation of and research into industrial deafness. The Government will keep some control over this project, because it will set standards and designs on how the money will be spent. The Government has made a \$50 000 grant for further research.

SOLOMONTOWN BRIDGE

Mr. VENNING: Can the Premier say how he was able to make an announcement about expediting the building of a bridge or causeway over the water at the Solomontown beach at a time when, because of the planning, designing and soil testing, it will be 18 months before any visible means of reconstruction is expected to appear on the Wirrabara road bridge? Mr. Speaker, you well know the story relating to the bridge at Solomontown. The Premier visited the district and announced prior to the last election that he would build a bridge over the beach. People at Port Pirie commented on the proposal, such as, "A bridge to where?" It was to nowhere, but, within a few days, 100 tonnes of steel was deposited on site. Can the Premier say why there has been such a delay in proceeding with work on the road bridge at Wirrabara? About 18 months has elapsed since the floods there, and it will be about April, 1977, before a start is made on the bridge there.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: These bridges are built under entirely different schemes, as the honourable member is aware. The bridge at Port Pirie was built as a result of unemployment relief funds being provided to local government.

Mr. Venning: They didn't want it, though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The council would not have got it if it had not applied for it. The honourable member says that they did not want it, so perhaps he will take up the matter with the Port Pirie council, because no proposals of this kind are made without the relevant authority having applied for the proposal. Perhaps the honourable member knows better than the Port Pirie council knows. I do not doubt that he would take that attitude. Regarding any delay concerning the Wirrabara bridge, I will consult my colleague.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He was given that information at a deputation last week.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As the honourable member has the information, he is obviously asking his question in order to stir.

At 3.10 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

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 1976-77 and the Public Purposes Loan Bill, 1976.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to authorise the Treasurer to borrow and expend money for public purposes, and to enact other provisions incidental thereto. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In so doing, it is my pleasure to explain the proposals in the Loan Estimates which accompany the Bill and which set out in more detail the appropriations listed in the first

schedule to the Bill. The expenditure proposals in that schedule aggregate nearly \$262 600 000 compared to \$271 600 000 of actual payments in 1975-76. The 1975-76 payments included a special appropriation from Revenue Account of \$20 000 000 allocated for housing. Because of the necessity in recent years to look at the State's overall financial situation and to have regard to whether or not there may be revenue deficits on record or in prospect and, accordingly, whether or not there may be a need to reserve Loan funds to cover such deficits, it has been the practice for the Treasurer to give a brief review of the two accounts before dealing with the details of Loan Account as proposed in the Loan Estimates. The situation has changed now and the pressures on Loan Account are greater than those on Revenue Account, so that it is more appropriate to think of allocations from revenue to support capital programmes. Accordingly, it remains desirable that I should make a brief comment on the two main accounts.

The Revenue Budget for 1975-76, as introduced to Parliament on August 28 last, forecast a balanced result for the year. It took into account a possible increase of 21 per cent in the level of average wages which was based on the assessment made by the Commonwealth Government in determining the level of the financial assistance grants to the States for 1975-76. It also took into account that increased salary and wage rates could be expected to be accompanied by higher prices for supplies and services. Accordingly, after taking into consideration the provisions built into departmental estimates of payments as a result of the carry-over effect of wages and salary awards which became operative in 1974-75, it was estimated that round sum allowances of \$82 000 000 and \$16 000 000 would give safe cover against future salary and wage rate increases and price increases respectively. Towards the end of 1975 it became apparent that the Revenue Budget was progressing towards a more favourable result than had been forecast originally. There was evidence that wage indexation was starting to have a moderating influence on wage increases, some revenues were improving and departments generally were exercising a tight control over their expenditures.

In February, when it became necessary to ask Parliament to consider Supplementary Estimates, I gave an explanation of the main financial trends which had occurred and indicated that a surplus of as much as \$25 000 000 could result from the year's operations. The situation continued to improve, despite a rather large wage indexation movement for the March quarter, and this enabled the Government, in an endeavour to assist the employment situation, to increase the loan allocations for the capital works programmes of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Public Buildings Department, and the subsidised hospitals. Shortly after that action was taken, the Commonwealth Treasurer issued a statement on the restraints that his Government was about to exercise, and this had serious implications for the States in respect to specific purpose loans and grants. The Prime Minister's letter to me made it clear that there would be a major reduction in the funds for urban public transport and, while the letter was less explicit about other areas, it seemed that support for schools, hospitals, housing and several other programmes was likely to be much less than was required to meet urgent and increasing demands.

The Supplementary Estimates introduced to Parliament last June sought to relieve the pressures in some of these areas by appropriating \$20 000 000 to Loan Account and \$20 000 000 for urban public transport. They also provided for an appropriation of \$10 000 000 to assist employment, and some other smaller appropriations for specific

capital works. The sum of \$20 000 000 transferred to Loan Account was allocated subsequently for housing purposes. I am pleased to say that, after making those appropriations, the Government was able to finish the year with a small surplus of \$2 300 000 on Revenue Account. As to the cumulative situation on Revenue Account at June 30, 1976, the Government has a surplus of \$27 600 000 on hand; that is, in reserves. Because of the uncertainties facing the Government at this stage, particularly in the area of specific purpose loans and grants where Commonwealth funds are likely to be held to a low level, I believe that, in planning our Budget strategy for 1976-77, it would be prudent to retain that surplus. It would then be available to help us cushion the adverse effects if new funds were inadequate in 1977-78.

I turn now to Loan Account. In August last, I reported to the House that the allocation of new moneys determined for South Australia by the Australian Loan Council was about \$169 400 000, that repayments and recoveries of expenditure becoming available for respending in 1975-76 were expected to amount to about \$71 600 000, that borrowings to cover discounts would be about \$500 000, that a capital expenditure programme of almost \$241 500 000 was proposed, and that, accordingly, a balanced result was estimated on the year's activities. In the event, new capital funds were as estimated, both repayments and payments were well above estimate, and a deficit of \$10 800 000 was incurred on the year's activities. In respect to repayments and recoveries, whereas the original estimate for 1975-76 was \$71 600 000, the actual receipts were \$91 300 000. This net increase of \$19 700 000 was the end result of several variations above and below estimate. The main variation was the special revenue appropriation of \$20 000 000, allocated for housing, which was recorded as a repayment in Loan Account and then transferred by way of a payment to the State Bank (\$10 000 000) and the South Australian Housing Trust (\$10 000 000).

As to payments, the original estimate for 1975-76 was \$241 500 000, whereas actual payments amounted to \$271 600 000. The net increase of \$30 100 000 was the product of several variations above and below estimate. The main factor in that increase was the special revenue appropriation of \$20 000 000 allocated for housing through the State Bank and the Housing Trust. Then, the special allocations I mentioned earlier, together with accelerated progress on the new Education Building, resulted in increased payments for waterworks and sewers (\$2 900 000), non-government hospitals (\$3 500 000) and other government buildings (\$3 500 000). Finally, it was necessary to make a supplementary allocation of \$3 000 000 to the Housing Trust when funds available for 1975-76 under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement became known shortly after the Loan Estimates had been introduced. As a result of all those factors, the balance of \$1 900 000 of Loan Funds held at June 30, 1975, was run down by \$10 800 000 to an accumulated deficit at June 30, 1976, of \$8 900 000.

At the meeting of the Australian Loan Council in June, 1976, the Commonwealth Government agreed to support a total programme of \$1 356 000 000 for State works and services. South Australia's share of this programme is almost \$178 000 000 of which \$118 700 000 is to become available by way of loan subject to repayment and to interest, and \$59 300 000 by way of capital grant. In addition to the new funds of \$178 000 000, the Government expects to receive various repayments and recoveries of about \$69 000 000. Certain discounts and premiums on loan issues and redemptions, which form part of our Loan

programme and are expected to amount to some \$600 000, will not have to be paid in cash by us, as further loans will be arranged through Loan Council to cover them. Therefore, the Government expects to have a total of about \$247 600 000 becoming available during the course of the year.

If one has regard to the facts that the total of payments on Loan Account in 1975-76 was \$271 600 000, that there remains an urgent need for further school and hospital buildings, for public transport facilities, for water and sewer extensions, and a host of other capital works, that there is a tragically high level of unemployment in the community, and that reductions in real capital expenditure by Governments must add to that national and personal problem of unemployment, then it can be seen readily that the planning by this Government of a capital programme limited to the new funds expected to become available, that is to say \$247 600 000, would be woefully inadequate. If we tried to hold expenditures to recoup some of the Loan deficit at June 30, 1976, the problem would be so much the worse. The Federal Government is urging us on a course of that kind. I shall explain how and why we do not intend to accept the course urged on us by the Federal Government.

This doleful picture is a direct result of two actions on the part of the Commonwealth Government: first, the decision to cut back on specific purpose loans and grants and, secondly, the decision to support an increase of only 5 per cent in general Loan Council programmes, despite increases in cost levels approaching 15 per cent a year. At the meeting of Loan Council, all Premiers made strong submissions on the need for a more realistic approach by the Commonwealth to the capital works area, but to no avail. Since that time, they have been repeated by Premiers, including Liberal Premiers, from all States, pointing to the inadequacy of the provision of Loan funds for construction expenditure. The Prime Minister made much of the new tax-sharing arrangements and of the estimates which had been made, indicating that the States as a whole would be about \$55 000 000 better off in 1976-77 than they would have been under a continuation of the existing formula.

I pointed out that, if those estimates were reliable, and even if the States took the whole of the \$55 000 000 to support Loan programmes, the rate of increase over 1975-76 would still be only about 9 per cent. That kind of increase would not be sufficient to cover the rises in wages and prices and would mean fewer real programmes. The Commonwealth relented in only one respect and agreed reluctantly to a further increase in the proposed semi-government borrowing programme, for which the approved total is now about 18 per cent above that for 1975-76. Unfortunately, South Australia gained very little from this increase because our share of the semi-government programme is relatively small. We rely more heavily than other States on the main State Loan programme which, as I said, was increased by only 5 per cent. South Australia historically has borrowed more heavily in the State Loan programme and much less heavily than the other States in the larger government authorities programme, the semi-government programme. That has been of great benefit to the State in the past. Other States have been financing sewerage and water supply programmes, for instance, out of semi-government loans. They have been paying a higher interest rate and doing it by independent authorities rather than by a Government department, as we have. We are very much better served and watered in consequence of having taken this attitude towards the general Loan programme historically.

Dr. Tonkin: We still have to pay the interest.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course we do.

Dr. Tonkin: We are actually paying for what we get.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course, but we are paying a lower rate of interest than are the other States. If the honourable member wants to transfer our Loan raisings for this purpose to the semi-government programme, we would be paying a higher interest rate. If the honourable member does not understand the difference between the two programmes, I suggest he should pay some attention to the history of the Playford Government in this regard. If for South Australia we take the total of the State Loan and semi-government allocations, take into account the reduced specific purpose grants and loans for capital purposes, and even throw in our share of the estimated benefit of the new tax-sharing arrangements, the funds available in 1976-77 would be only some 3 per cent above the aggregate for 1975-76, in an inflation situation of 15 per cent a year. That assessment does not include housing. For welfare housing the Commonwealth was prepared to provide only the same cash amount as the 1975-76 allocation which was, itself, only the same cash amount as in 1974-75. If you add that in, it comes to less than 3 per cent.

I believe that the building and construction industry in this State is operating at only about 75 per cent of its capacity. Spokesmen, including architects and builders, have arranged deputations to me to point out the grim outlook for the major construction industry. To cut public expenditure in this area so that less work is done in real terms must accentuate the problem, add to unemployment, and contribute to further economic downturn. This, however, seems to be the specific policy of the Commonwealth Government. The South Australian Government considers that it must act to cushion the adverse effects and, in particular, to minimise the effects in human terms if it can. We believe that the most effective approach in present circumstances is to allow the Loan deficit of \$8 900 000 at June 30, 1976, to remain unrecouped during 1976-77, while planning to make it good over the succeeding two years, and also to look for some support from Revenue Account in 1976-77 in the way which was achieved in 1975-76. At the moment, my assessment is that, given a firm control of expenditure through Revenue Account in 1976-77, it should be possible to transfer some \$15 000 000 to assist in financing essential capital works.

Accordingly, the Loan Budget proposes total payments of \$262 600 000, and a balance on the year's operations. The relevant figures and a comparison with the transactions of 1975-76 are set out on page 4 of the Loan Estimates. I should add that, even now, we have not received firm advice on the levels of specific purpose loans and grants in some areas. There are still some uncertainties and risks and the Government will keep these areas under close review. Of the total semi-government programme of \$960 000 000, South Australia's share is \$45 200 000. Within that total of \$45 200 000 the allocations proposed for the individual statutory borrowers are \$12 500 000 to the Electricity Trust, \$12 200 000 to the Housing Trust, \$5 000 000 to the Pipelines Authority, \$2 500 000 to the Meat Corporation, \$4 100 000 to the Land Commission, \$2 300 000 to the Monarto Development Commission, and \$2 300 000 to the Festival Centre Trust. The sum of \$4 300 000 has been allocated to meet the needs of the larger local government bodies.

In 1975-76, the maximum limit up to which individual statutory and local government bodies could borrow, without that borrowing counting against the State's semi-government allocation, was \$700 000. For 1976-77, Loan Council has approved an increase in the individual limit to \$800 000. This will be very useful to a number of authorities. The widening of the powers of borrowing by separate corporations will be the subject of legislation during this session. I point out again that for both the larger and smaller semi-government authorities it is a borrowing programme which has been approved. The raising of the funds depends on the liquidity of the institutional lenders and on the willingness of other lenders to advance moneys at the interest rates determined by the Loan Council from time to time. Nevertheless, we have succeeded in raising the full programme in other years and I believe that we will continue to receive the support from lenders to enable us to raise the total sums approved. The Government is grateful for their support. As the rest of the explanation refers to details of departmental estimates and the clauses of the Bill, I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

REMAINDER OF EXPLANATION OF BILL

HOUSING—Funds made available under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement are advanced to the State at concessional rates of interest of 4½ per cent in respect of advances to the State Bank and 4 per cent in respect of advances to the Housing Trust. In each case the Housing Agreement provides for the funds to be used for welfare housing. This means that the approval of a loan is granted or the allocation of a house is made primarily to an applicant who falls within the limit of a defined means test on income. The rate of interest charged by the State Bank on loans to persons who comply with the means test is 5½ per cent. The bank makes advances also to persons who do not comply with this primary means test, but who comply with a secondary and somewhat less stringent test. The interest rate to these persons is 6½ per cent. The maximum loan available to applicants within each of these categories is \$18 000.

For Housing Trust activities, the Housing Agreement lays emphasis on the construction of rental housing and restricts to 30 per cent the proportion of family dwellings which may be built for sale out of the welfare housing funds. Even in these cases the sales may be made only to persons who meet the means test specified for eligibility for a rental home. At the time the Loan Estimates were presented to Parliament last year, the Commonwealth Government had not indicated the amount it would allocate for welfare housing in 1975-76. It did indicate, however, that the States could expect housing funds in that year to be not less than the amounts advanced in 1974-75. In the event, funds made available to the States in 1975-76 under the Housing Agreement were at the same money level as in 1974-75. South Australia's share was \$56 360 000 of which \$22 800 000 was allocated to the State Bank and \$33 560 000 to the Housing Trust. This distribution was the same as that for 1974-75. Strong submissions were made to the Commonwealth Government pointing out that the State's welfare housing programme would be reduced seriously unless additional funds were made available at least to meet increasing costs. As no further support was forthcoming, it was necessary to re-examine the State's Loan programme, and the Government decided to make \$3 000 000 of Loan

funds and a further \$800 000 of semi-government borrowing authority available to the Housing Trust for its housing programme.

At the June, 1976, Premiers' Conference the Commonwealth Government made known that the total funds for all States under the Housing Agreement and the shares to individual States would be the same as for 1975-76. This meant that the States were to receive no increase in money terms beyond the 1974-75 money level and had to accept the consequences that increasing costs over the three-year period would have on their welfare housing programmes. The adverse effects of that Commonwealth decision become all the more apparent when it is realised that at present there is a waiting list of over two years for a State Bank loan and, with the exception of a few country areas, a waiting list in excess of three years for a trust rental home. As a consequence of that decision, I arranged for the special revenue allocation of \$20 000 000 made available early in June, 1976, to support capital works to be transferred to the State Bank to the extent of \$10 000 000 and the Housing Trust to the extent of \$10 000 000. During 1975-76 the State Bank advanced \$29 913 000 to 1 721 applicants who complied with the primary means test and qualified for a loan at the lowest concessional interest rate. The bank also advanced \$15 102 000 to 969 applicants who complied with the secondary means test and qualified for loans at the higher concessional rate.

As to the programme of the Housing Trust, dwellings completed during 1975-76 totalled 2 276, while 2 004 dwellings were under construction at June 30, 1976. In 1976-77, in spite of the lack of support from the Commonwealth, the Government hopes to at least maintain its physical effort in the welfare housing area. The trust programme provides for the completion of a similar number of houses in 1976-77 as were completed in 1975-76 and authority has been given to the State Bank to make a small increase in its weekly quota of approvals for housing loans. Finally, I would mention that the trust builds houses for people who do not meet the means test, and it constructs industrial and commercial buildings. In carrying out these activities, the trust will have available in 1976-77 some \$10 000 000 of circulating funds and \$12 200 000 of semi-government borrowings.

LOAN TO PRODUCERS, \$2 950 000—Advances by the State Bank under the Loans to Producers Act in 1975-76 totalled about \$3 044 000. About \$1 962 000 was made available to wineries and distilleries, \$734 000 to fish handling enterprises, \$230 000 to canneries, and \$118 000 to cold stores and packing houses. Of the total amount advanced, \$2 790 000 came from State Loan funds, while the remainder was financed from semi-government borrowings and the bank's internal sources. An allocation of \$2 950 000 of State Loan funds is proposed for 1976-77. This will enable the bank to meet commitments, which at June 30, 1976, totalled over \$2 400 000, and allow it to assist producer co-operatives in financing further capital replacement and expansion programmes. This allocation will be augmented by semi-government borrowings of up to \$800 000 and by the bank's internal funds.

ADVANCES TO STATE BANK, \$2 800 000—In 1975-76, a total of \$13 500 000 was advanced to the State Bank, comprising \$3 500 000 of normal support for the bank's housing finance services and traditional banking activities, and a special allocation of \$10 000 000 from Revenue Account to provide further support to the housing programme. This special allocation was required to meet future problems arising from inadequate allocations of Commonwealth welfare housing funds. A further advance of \$2 800 000 is proposed for 1976-77. These funds will be used mainly

for housing loans in cases where applicants fall outside the means test under the Housing Agreement, and for the provision of working funds to the bank's customers, including those in wine and fruit processing industries.

STORMWATER DRAINAGE, \$1 450 000—Dollar for dollar subsidies to assist councils in the disposal of floodwaters amounted to \$1 094 000 in 1975-76. Payments were made to 21 councils and two drainage constructing authorities. There are still several projects under construction: they include the Campbelltown drainage scheme at Felixstow and a major drainage system from Hindmarsh through Woodville, Enfield and Port Adelaide council areas, to the North Arm Creek. It is proposed to make \$1 450 000 available in 1976-77 to subsidise local government expenditure on stormwater drainage. Councils will have semi-government borrowings available to them in order to meet their share of the cost of approved schemes.

LANDS DEPARTMENT—BUILDINGS, PLANT, ETC., \$1 510 000—A total of \$905 000 was expended in 1975-76 on buildings, plant, and equipment for the Lands Department. It is proposed to increase the Loan allocation for these purposes in 1976-77 to \$1 510 000. This amount includes a payment of \$380 000 for an aircraft which is being purchased for surveys and aerial photography. It also makes provision for certain equipment and motor vehicles which were previously financed under several other estimate lines.

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF SWAMP LANDS, \$3 650 000—In 1975-76, Loan expenditure on rehabilitation of pumping and water distribution facilities in irrigated areas was \$3 548 000. In the Waikerie area the laying of mains is almost completed, and work on the installation of metered outlets and pumping equipment is in progress. Rehabilitation work has commenced at Berri, where construction is expected to accelerate throughout 1976-77 as works at Waikerie approach completion. Construction will also continue in the Chaffey area where the irrigation scheme is operative, although the completion of embankments has been delayed by three successive high river levels. The proposed Loan allocation of \$3 650 000 in 1976-77 will enable the continuation of works in progress and allow a limited number of smaller new projects to be carried out.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST, \$600 000—A total of \$600 000 was advanced to the Renmark Irrigation Trust last year by way of grants and repayable loans towards rehabilitation of the irrigation system in the trust's area. The construction of new pumping facilities was completed at a cost of \$1 650 000, and about 70 per cent of the new pipe mains have been laid. The domestic water supply scheme and drainage works are in an advanced stage of construction. It is proposed to allocate a further \$600 000 for this purpose in 1976-77.

AFFORESTATION AND TIMBER MILLING, \$7 550 000—Loan expenditure by the State forestry undertaking in 1975-76 reached almost \$5 800 000. Chipping and debarking equipment was commissioned and the upgrading of the log yard was completed at the Nangwarry sawmill. Several other improvement projects were commenced and will be continued this year so that the sawmills can work at a high level of technical and operating efficiency. The total area of land purchased in 1975-76 for afforestation purposes exceeded 1 300 hectares. Establishment of the 1976 forest plantation comprising 1 500 hectares is now in progress, and about 1 040 hectares is being cleared in preparation for planting in 1977. The proposed allocation of \$7 550 000 will enable the Woods and Forests Department to maintain its forestry works, and commence a major programme to improve the efficiency and profitability of the Mount Gambier State Mill.

HARBORS ACCOMMODATION, \$8 350 000—Loan expenditure on harbor facilities and equipment in 1975-76 amounted to \$8 617 000. Considerable progress was made on the construction and equipping of the new bulk-loading berths for grain and phosphate rock at Port Lincoln. This project is expected to be completed during the present financial year. The container terminal at Outer Harbor is also nearing completion and progress is being made on the deepening of the channel from St. Vincent Gulf to the Outer Harbor wharves to allow the entry of large vessels without hinderance from tides. It is proposed to allocate \$8 350 000 for the continuation of these works in 1976-77.

FISHING HAVENS, \$1 200 000—A total of \$660 000 was expended on fishing havens last financial year. Progress has been made on two major projects. One is the construction of a breakwater at Port MacDonnell which will provide much needed protection for the foreshore and the fishing fleet at its existing moorings. The other is the fishing boat harbor at North Arm in the Port Adelaide River. An allocation of \$1 200 000 is proposed for these and other works in 1976-77.

WATERWORKS AND SEWERS, \$65 800 000—A total of \$62 175 000 was expended on waterworks and sewerage services in 1975-76. Included in that amount were specific grants and loans from the Commonwealth Government of \$8 400 000 towards the Adelaide water treatment scheme and \$5 700 000 towards sewerage projects. During the year 24 large projects were completed. They included the pipeline from Darlington to Port Adelaide, a 10 000 000-litre tank at O'Halloran Hill, the water pumping station at Blackwood, eight country water supply schemes, sewerage projects at Athelstone, Hahndorf, Morphett Vale, Port Adelaide, Seaford and Tea Tree Gully and extensions to sewage treatment plants at Glenelg and Whyalla. Considerable progress was also made during the year on 42 other major projects, some of which I shall refer to.

The provision of waterworks and sewerage services continues to receive high priority. To finance the continuation of a major programme of works designed to meet the present and prospective needs of the State, we had contemplated the allocation of funds aggregating \$70 500 000 in 1976-77. This was in the expectation of receiving special Commonwealth grants and loans of \$9 400 000 for water treatment and \$5 700 000 for sewerage works. The Prime Minister has now informed me that, of the \$50 000 000 to be available for sewerage works in Australia, only \$1 000 000 has been allocated to South Australia. This shortfall of \$4 700 000, a major setback to our expectations, has made necessary a recasting and reduction of our whole programme for water and sewerage works, so that in this Bill and in the Loan Estimates only \$65 800 000 is provided. I shall now comment on some larger allocations planned for 1976-77.

METROPOLITAN WATERWORKS, \$23 981 000—A provision of \$9 400 000 has been included for work to continue on the construction of water treatment and filtration plants in the metropolitan area. A sum of \$8 880 000 has been allotted so that construction of the Little Para dam may proceed. The reservoir will have an 18 000 million litre capacity and will meet the demand for water in the northern suburbs. It will also act as a balancing storage for the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline system.

COUNTRY WATERWORKS, \$13 278 000—About \$6 165 000 was expended last year on the urgent replacement of a section of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline. A further \$2 473 000 is required so that replacement work may be

completed later this year. An amount of \$1 465 000 will be made available for modifications of the spillway at Baroota reservoir to prevent problems arising from the overflow of the reservoir. A further provision of \$627 000 is needed for the completion of the South Coast water supply scheme this year, and \$3 089 000 will be required for the extension of services.

METROPOLITAN SEWERAGE, \$13 119 000—A total of \$1 053 000 is proposed to be allocated to projects at Bolivar, where the engineering and biology building is under construction and work is about to start on repairs to plant foundations to avoid the potential risk of damage to engines. Work is proceeding on the reconstruction of the trunk sewer system in the north-eastern suburbs to eliminate flooding and overflows of sewage into the Torrens River. A further provision of \$1 065 000 for 1976-77 is proposed. Almost \$5 000 000 is proposed for the construction of sewers in new areas at Blackwood, Belair, Bellevue Heights, Christies Beach, Hackham, Noarlunga, O'Sullivan Beach, Highbury, Modbury, Elizabeth and Parafield Gardens.

COUNTRY SEWERS, \$4 896 000—Work commenced in 1975-76 on the construction of sewerage services at Port Augusta West in order to overcome problems in the disposal of effluent and to eliminate water pollution and potential health hazards. A sum of \$1 296 000 is proposed for the continuation of this scheme. A further amount of \$926 000 is also proposed for the construction of sewers at Port Pirie.

RIVER MURRAY WEIRS, DAMS, LOCKS, ETC., \$7 070 000—South Australia made a contribution of \$2 923 000 in 1975-76 towards capital works carried out under the River Murray Waters Agreement. For 1976-77 our share of expenditure on the Dartmouth dam has been estimated at \$8 709 000. In the past, half of the expected payments for capital works on the dam has been advanced by the Commonwealth while half has been financed from State Loan funds. The Commonwealth has now advised that it will not provide financial assistance beyond the previously approved total amount of \$8 800 000 for the State. As the Commonwealth has already advanced \$6 925 000, it may be expected to provide only \$1 875 000 in 1976-77. Therefore, the State will have to provide \$6 834 000 from its own funds so that this important work may proceed. The State is also providing \$236 000 for other capital works undertaken under the agreement, bringing its total allocation for 1976-77 to \$7 070 000.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, LAND AND SERVICES, \$111 400 000.

HOSPITAL BUILDINGS, \$33 000 000—Expenditure from Loan Account in 1975-76 was \$31 875 000. Included in this amount was a sum of \$12 900 000 received from the Commonwealth under the hospitals development programme. Works completed during 1975-76 included the nurses' home and training school at Mount Gambier and the first phase of the redevelopment of the Port Pirie Hospital comprising a children's and maternity ward complex, extensions to the administration section, mortuary, nurses' training centre and a bulk store. The sub-acute wards at the Glenside Hospital and a new admission ward at Hillcrest were also completed. The proposed allocation of \$33 000 000 for 1976-77 provides for commitments on existing works in progress and for a large number of minor works. It also makes an allowance of about \$5 000 000 for the commencement of a number of new projects. Some of the major proposals for 1976-77 are as follows:

Flinders Medical Centre—A sum of \$12 640 000 has been provided for further work on the development of this major scheme.

Frozen Food Factory—A sum of \$6 000 000 is required for further work on a frozen food factory which will have a capacity to provide 25 000 pre-cooked meals per day to hospitals and institutions.

Royal Adelaide Hospital—A sum of \$4 272 000 is required for the Royal Adelaide Hospital, including \$3 900 000 to continue redevelopment of the Northfield Wards.

Port Pirie Hospital—A sum of \$1 295 000 will be expended at Port Pirie mainly on the geriatric ward block.

Glenside Hospital—A sum of \$1 578 000 is proposed for further works at Glenside Hospital, including psycho-geriatric and maximum care wards.

The Commonwealth grants towards the hospital works programme in 1976-77 are expected to be about \$13 000 000.

Primary and secondary schools, \$40 500 000—A total of \$38 850 000 was expended in 1975-76 on primary and secondary school buildings and facilities, of which \$9 706 000 was provided by the Commonwealth Government. Details of that expenditure are as follows:

	\$
The completion of 60 major projects with a total value of \$37 100 000	13 864 000
Work in progress on 27 major projects with an estimated total cost of \$32 669 000	10 780 000
Prefabricated classrooms and transportable units	1 849 000
Purchase of land, buildings and residences	3 216 000
Minor works and buildings, and final payments on contracts	6 326 000
Furniture	1 804 000
Preliminary investigations and design	1 011 000
	\$38 850 000

The tight situation created by the Commonwealth Government's lack of support for new capital funds has forced the Government to re-examine its school building programme for 1976-77. I regret to say that it will now not be possible to proceed with such urgent works as the Thebarton Community Centre, new primary schools at Richmond, Narrung and Whyalla West, and the continued development of the LeFevre, Dover, Seaton and Kidman Park High Schools.

The proposed allocation of \$40 500 000 is expected to include an amount of \$11 300 000 from the Commonwealth Government. These funds are intended to be applied to work as follows:

	\$
The continuation of work on 27 major projects in progress at the beginning of the financial year with a total cost of \$32 669 000	19 339 000
The commencement of 36 major projects estimated to cost \$30 007 000 when completed	7 905 000
Prefabricated classrooms and transportable units	3 000 000
Purchase of land and buildings	1 250 000
Minor works and buildings, and final payments on completed contracts	5 706 000
Furniture	1 800 000
Preliminary investigations and design	1 500 000
	\$40 500 000

Further Education, \$10 400 000—Loan payments for further education in 1975-76 totalled nearly \$9 200 000, of which \$1 617 000 was provided by the Commonwealth Government. The payments were made as follows:

	\$
The completion of two major projects with a total value of \$3 851 000	1 058 000
Work in progress on four major projects with an estimated total cost of \$13 244 000	6 600 000
Land, property and residences	817 000
Minor works and final payments on completed contracts	416 000
Furniture and equipment	221 000
Preliminary investigations and design	88 000
	\$9 200 000

An allocation of \$10 400 000 is proposed for 1976-77, and includes an expected contribution from the Commonwealth Government of \$2 300 000. The expenditure of these funds has been planned as follows:

	\$
The continuation of work on four projects in progress at the beginning of the financial year with a total cost of \$13 244 000	3 781 000
The commencement of nine major projects estimated to cost \$14 519 000 when completed	4 944 000
Prefabricated classrooms and transportable units	50 000
Purchase of land and property	575 000
Minor works and final payments on completed contracts	575 000
Furniture and equipment	275 000
Preliminary investigations and design	200 000
	\$10 400 000

OTHER GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, \$27 500 000—A total of \$30 076 000 was expended from Loan Account in 1975-76. Projects completed during the year include the courthouse at Mount Gambier, the Adelaide Juvenile Court, a new community welfare centre at Port Augusta, the Norwood Project Centre, additions to Port Lincoln Gaol, dental clinics at 14 schools, additions to Somerton Park Dental Training School and the relocation of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department in Grenfell Centre and Mines Department at Greenhill Road.

A sum of \$27 500 000 is proposed to be allocated for Government buildings in 1976-77. Some of the larger provisions are:

Flinders Street Office Block—An amount of \$2 771 000 has been provided to continue construction of the 18-floor building to accommodate the Education Department and other Government departments.

Forensic Science Building—A sum of \$3 920 000 has been provided for work to proceed further.

Department of Transport—A sum of \$2 955 000 has been included to continue construction of a new office block for this department.

Department of Marine and Harbours—A sum of \$700 000 is proposed to commence construction of a new office building at Port Adelaide.

Dental Clinics—A sum of \$1 000 000 is to be expended on 16 new dental clinics in 1976-77.

Over \$1 500 000 was made available by the Commonwealth Government for capital expenditure on dental clinics and training facilities for dental therapists in 1975-76. Further grants of \$900 000 are expected in 1976-77.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA, \$6 000 000—In 1975-76 the capital expenditure of the trust totalled \$34 695 000, of which \$5 000 000 was advanced from Loan Account and \$10 000 000 was raised under the semi-government borrowing programme. A special allocation of \$3 000 000 was made available from Revenue Account late in the financial year for capital works in the western

areas of Eyre Peninsula, including Streaky Bay and Ceduna. A capital works programme of \$39 600 000 has been planned for 1976-77, of which \$6 000 000 is to be financed from State Loan funds and \$12 500 000 from the semi-government borrowing programme. The balance of \$21 100 000 will be made available from the trust's internal funds.

The 1976-77 programme provides for over \$13 000 000 to be spent on further works at the Torrens Island Power Station, where the second power generating unit is expected to be ready for commercial use later this year. Further development of the trust's distribution system provides for the commencement of a 66 000 volt transmission line and associated transformer stations to supply the Streaky Bay-Ceduna area and the establishment of a 132 000 volt supply to Hawker. At Leigh Creek work will continue on the final stages of the development of Lobe "B" and the installation of mining machinery and facilities.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY, \$16 800 000—The authority now incorporates the activities previously undertaken by the Municipal Tramways Trust (now Bus and Tram Division) and the South Australian Railways (now Rail Division). The Loan Estimates are presented for the first time in this amalgamated form.

Bus and Tram Division—During 1975-76 an amount of \$5 000 000 was advanced from Loan Account towards the capital works programme of the division. That programme included the purchase of buses, acquisition of land for depots and the construction of depot buildings. A contract for the supply of 310 Volvo buses was the division's major commitment in 1975-76. Because of the Commonwealth Government's lack of support for urban public transport a special appropriation from Revenue Account was made to the division late in the financial year so that it would be in a position to meet its contractual commitments. It is expected that, with the completion of its present major contracts, there will be a gradual reduction in the division's capital works programme and consequently its need for annual allocations from Loan Account. The proposed advance of \$1 000 000 from State Loan funds during 1976-77 recognises this trend.

Rail Division—Payments amounting to \$11 292 000 were made by the Rail Division during 1975-76. Those payments were made in respect to:

	\$
Metropolitan works	4 932 000
Non-metropolitan works	6 360 000
	\$11 292 000

In accordance with the Railways Transfer Agreement all expenditure in respect of non-metropolitan works is authorised and met by the Commonwealth Government. Their contribution is reflected as a receipt in the Loan Account. The State made available \$1 963 000 from Loan funds for metropolitan works in 1975-76. The Commonwealth Government contributed \$2 969 000 in respect to the Brighton-Christie Downs railway. The proposed allocation for metropolitan works in 1976-77 is \$6 800 000 and includes a Commonwealth contribution of \$1 300 000. That allocation provides for the resignalling of the Adelaide railway yards and the commencement of a programme to improve the division's rolling stock. It is expected that the Commonwealth Government will make \$9 000 000 available for non-metropolitan works in 1976-77.

NON-GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL AND INSTITUTION BUILDINGS, \$9 500 000—Nearly \$12 000 000 was contributed last year towards capital programmes of non-government hospitals and institutions, including \$2 658 000 to the Adelaide Children's Hospital and \$6 908 000 to the Home for

Incurables. Many smaller projects at about 30 hospitals were completed during the year. The proposed allocation of \$9 500 000 will assist 29 institutions in financing their capital works programmes in 1976-77. It includes further grants of \$3 815 000 to the Adelaide Children's Hospital, and \$4 270 000 to the Home for Incurables.

COMMUNITY HEALTH AND ASSOCIATED PROJECTS, \$990 000—Grants totalling \$2 011 000 were made in 1975-76 to health centres and similar institutions for the construction of buildings and the purchase of equipment, motor vehicles and furniture. The Commonwealth Government contributed \$1 718 000 towards these works. In 1976-77 it is proposed to make an amount of \$990 000 available for these purposes. A contribution of \$740 000 is expected from the Commonwealth Government.

MONARTO DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION, \$1 400 000—During 1975-76 the commission spent about \$4 851 000 on its programme of land acquisition, design and development. The main contributions to the commission were \$1 200 000 of State Loan funds, \$2 000 000 raised by way of semi-government borrowing and \$500 000 advanced by the Commonwealth Government. The commission's programme for 1976-77 cannot be drawn up in detail because of uncertainty about the extent of support to be received from the Commonwealth Government. At this stage the allocations proposed are \$1 400 000 from Loan Account and \$2 300 000 of semi-government borrowing authority.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LAND COMMISSION, \$1 900 000—Actual expenditure in 1975-76 totalled about \$20 100 000. Of this amount \$7 400 000 was for the purchase of land in urban areas, \$1 200 000 for public open spaces, and \$9 700 000 for the development of land. Funds from the Commonwealth Government towards that expenditure amounted to \$14 930 000, an amount of \$700 000 was obtained from semi-government borrowings and the balance was financed from the commission's internal funds, including recoveries from sales of developed land. The commission's programme for 1976-77 foresees expenditure of about \$23 600 000, of which \$16 300 000 is proposed for land development, and \$6 000 000 for land acquisition. To meet that programme it is proposed to allocate \$1 900 000 from State Loan funds and to provide the commission with a further \$4 100 000 under the semi-government borrowing programme. Those allocations are made in the expectation that the Commonwealth Government will meet its minimum obligations of \$6 000 000 under the agreement and provide some additional support for the commission's operations. The remainder of the 1976-77 programme is to be financed with recoveries from sales.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TEACHER HOUSING AUTHORITY, \$1 000 000—In previous years, housing for teachers was financed from the school building programmes of both the Education and Further Education Departments. An Act to make provision for suitable housing accommodation for teachers and to provide for the establishment of the South Australian Teacher Housing Authority came into operation on May 22, 1975. The Act enables the authority to borrow money from the Treasurer or, with the consent of the Treasurer, from any other source. It is proposed to make \$1 000 000 available from State Loan funds in 1976-77, which the authority may supplement from the smaller semi-government borrowing programme.

EFFLUENT DRAINAGE, \$1 450 000—Payment of subsidies towards effluent drainage in 1975-76 totalled almost \$1 300 000. Ten district councils received assistance of varying amounts, including \$554 000 to Penola, \$433 000 to Loxton and \$111 000 to Clare. It is intended to make \$1 450 000 available for subsidies in 1976-77.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

Appendix I
PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS
Major Works Completed in 1975-76

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
Primary and Junior Primary Schools—		
New Schools—		
Fairview Park Primary—Stage I	801 000	Demac
Frazer Park Primary—Stage I	846 000	Demac
Hallett Cove South Primary—Stage I	1 201 000	Brick
Holden Hill North Primary	985 000	Samcon
Para Heights Primary	1 018 000	Brick
Port Noarlunga South Primary—Stage I	1 160 000	Brick
St. Agnes Primary	1 102 000	Brick
Salisbury South-East Primary	968 000	Brick
Major Additions—		
Beachport Primary	141 000	Demac
Brompton Primary	100 000	Demac
Burnside Primary—Library Resource Centre	62 000	Demac
Carlton Primary—Open Unit	295 000	Brick
Christies Beach Primary—Library Resource Centre	62 000	Demac
Croydon Primary—Library Resource Centre	65 000	Demac
Croydon Park Primary—Library Resource Centre	52 000	Demac
Forbes Primary—Library Resource Centre	60 000	Demac
Goodwood Primary	833 000	Brick
Hincks Avenue Primary—Library Resource Centre	73 000	Demac
Kilkenny Primary	676 000	Brick
Madison Park Primary—Library Resource Centre	184 000	Samcon
Mannum Primary—Library Resource Centre	64 000	Demac
Mitchell Park Primary—Library Resource Centre	54 000	Demac
Mount Barker Primary—Open Unit	230 000	Samcon
Murray Bridge Primary	1 457 000	Brick
Murray Bridge South Primary—Library Resource Centre	72 000	Demac
Para Hills Primary—Library Resource Centre	67 000	Demac
Peterborough Primary	842 000	Brick
Risdon Park Primary	1 073 000	Brick
Salisbury Primary—Library Resource Centre	65 000	Demac
Stanvac Primary	101 000	Samcon
Waikerie Primary—Library Resource Centre	76 000	Demac
Willunga Primary—Library Resource Centre	44 000	Demac
High Schools—		
New Schools—		
Ingle Farm	2 733 000	Brick
Morialta	2 817 000	Brick
Major Additions—		
Blackwood	1 354 000	Brick
Glossop—Stages I and II	1 224 000	Brick
Grant	1 991 000	Mount Gambier Stone
Kidman Park Co-ed—Stage II	392 000	Brick
Mitchell Park Co-ed—Stage III	809 000	Brick
Naracoorte	630 000	Brick
Nuriootpa	899 000	Brick
Port Pirie	675 000	Brick
Seaton Co-ed—Stage II	174 000	Brick
Taperoo	350 000	Brick
Woodville	1 046 000	Brick
Area Schools—		
Major Additions—		
Coober Pedy	161 000	Samcon
Streaky Bay Area	916 000	Brick
Yorketown	1 857 000	Samcon
Special Schools—		
Elizabeth—Stages I and II	504 000	Brick
Kidman Park Guidance Centre	144 000	Demac
Modbury South	1 044 000	Brick
Murray Bridge	334 000	Brick
Riverland	337 000	Demac
General—		
Marryatville High—Music Suite	63 000	Brick
Mount Gambier High—Art/Craft Block	334 000	Brick
Thorndon High—Civil Works	59 000	
Subsidised Projects—		
Fremont High—Multipurpose Hall	164 000	Concrete Block
Loxton High—Assembly Hall	426 000	Brick
Salisbury High—Multipurpose Hall	143 000	Brick
Other Project—		
Arbury Park Outdoor School	691 000	Timber

Appendix I—continued
PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS—continued
Major Works in Progress at June 30, 1976

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
Primary and Junior Primary Schools—		
New Schools—		
Bellevue Heights Primary—Stage I	767 000	Demac
Direk Primary—Stage I	1 065 000	Brick
Flagstaff Hill Primary—Stage I	1 200 000	Brick
Highbury Junior Primary	671 000	Brick
Lonsdale Heights Primary	1 460 000	Brick
Modbury South Junior Primary	671 000	Brick
Modbury West Junior Primary	631 000	Brick
Major Additions—		
Hindmarsh Primary—Library Resource Centre	60 000	Brick
Magill Junior Primary	831 000	Brick
Millicent North Primary	165 000	Samcon
Nuriootpa Primary	1 345 000	Brick
Paringa Park Primary—Stage I	770 000	Brick
Salisbury North Primary	1 115 000	Brick
Strathalbyn Primary	320 000	Demac
High Schools—		
New Schools—		
Modbury Heights	5 045 000	Brick
Morphett Vale East	4 494 000	Brick
Parafield Gardens	4 584 000	Brick
Major Additions—		
Dover—Stage II	335 000	Brick
Kadina	855 000	Brick
Mawson—Stage II	648 000	Brick
Nailsworth—Stages I and II	2 065 000	Brick
Salisbury East	668 000	Brick
Area Schools—		
New School—		
Karcultaby Area	1 871 000	Samcon
General—		
Kidman Park High—Playing Fields	63 000	—
Subsidised Project—		
Findon High—Multipurpose Hall	319 000	Brick
Other Projects—		
Wattle Park Teachers Centre—Stage I	161 000	Brick
Western Regional Centre (Whyalla)	490 000	Brick

Major Works to be Commenced During 1976-77

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
Primary and Junior Primary Schools—		
New Schools—		
Paradise	1 350 000	Brick
Redwood Park	1 300 000	Brick
Major Additions—		
Augusta Park	283 000	Samcon
Black Forest	150 000	Brick
Braeview—Stage II	350 000	Brick
Camden	762 000	Demac
Coromandel Valley	950 000	Demac
Croydon Junior—Stage II	520 000	Brick
Frazer Park—Stage II	134 000	Demac
Hackham East	140 000	Demac
Lobethal	170 000	Brick
Port Noarlunga South—Stage II	350 000	Brick
Salisbury Downs—Stage II	490 000	Brick
Woodside	110 000	Brick
High Schools—		
New School—		
The Parks Community Centre	12 180 000	Brick
Major Additions—		
Brighton—Music Suite	84 000	Brick
Burra Community School	2 900 000	Brick
Gawler	1 250 000	Brick
Glossop—Metalwork Building	200 000	Brick
Le Fevre—Stage II	140 000	Brick
Marryatville	1 920 000	Brick
Modbury	700 000	Brick
Port Pirie—Stage II	1 150 000	Brick
Area Schools—		
Major Addition—		
Kingston	152 000	Demac
Special Schools—		
Ashford House	71 000	
Barton Terrace Special Educational Facilities	30 000	
Kings Park Special Educational Facilities	30 000	
Whyalla	315 000	Demac

Appendix I—continued

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS—continued

Major Works to be Commenced During 1976-77—continued

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
General—		
Christies Beach High—Overpass	66 000	—
Mawson High—Civil Works	85 000	—
Port Noarlunga Primary—Civil Works	70 000	—
Seacliff Primary—Civil Works	108 000	—
Subsidised Projects—		
Campbelltown High—Multipurpose Hall	696 000	Brick
Enfield High—Multipurpose Hall	596 000	Brick
Stradbroke Primary—Activity Hall	122 000	Brick
Other Project—		
Wattle Park Teachers Centre—Stage II	83 000	Brick

Major Projects for which Planning and Design is Proposed During 1976-77

Primary and Junior Primary Schools—	Two Wells Primary
Aldgate Primary	West Lakes Shore Primary
Barmera Primary—Stage I	Whyalla West Primary
Campbelltown Junior Primary	Woodville Primary
Crafers Primary	Yetto Primary
Croydon Junior Primary—Stage II	Area Schools—
East Adelaide Primary	Ceduna Area
East Marden Primary	Kingscote Area
Fairview Park Primary—Stage II	Meningie Area
Fulham North Junior Primary	High Schools—
Kidman Park Junior Primary	Elizabeth High—Multipurpose Hall
Marryatville Primary	Enfield High—Additions
Morphett Vale South Primary	Glenunga High—Multipurpose Hall
Morphett Vale South-West Primary	Heathfield High—Additions
Narrung Primary	Millicent High—Multipurpose Hall
Osborne Primary	Renmark High
Plmpton Primary	Strathmont High
Richmond Primary	Thebarton Community Centre
Rose Park Primary	

Appendix II

FURTHER EDUCATION BUILDINGS

Major Works Completed in 1975-76

Locality	Total Cost \$	Type of Construction
Major Additions—		
Port Augusta Technical College—Stage II	2 015 000	Concrete Block
South-East College of Further Education	1 836 000	Brick

Major Works in Progress at June 30, 1976

New Building—		
Regency Park Community College—Phase IA	12 767 000	Precast Concrete Panels

Major Additions—		
Croydon Park Technical College—General Studies	79 000	Demac
Elizabeth Technical College—Car Park	110 000	—
Marleston Technical College—School of Wool	288 000	Demac

Major Works to be Commenced During 1976-77

New Building—		
Regency Park Community College—Contract B	4 300 000	Precast Concrete Panels

Major Additions—		
Croydon Park Technical College—Extensions to School of Automotive Engineering	1 100 000	—
Currie Street College of Further Education—Alterations	100 000	—
Elizabeth Technical College—General Studies	68 000	Demac
Kensington/Norwood College of Further Education—Alterations	200 000	—
Port Augusta Technical College—Car Park	121 000	—
South-East College of Further Education—Store	40 000	—
Yarrabee—Alterations	70 000	—
Whyalla Technical College—Stage II	8 520 000	—

Major Projects for which Planning and Design is Proposed during 1976-77

Elizabeth Technical College—Resource Centre
Gilles Plains Community College
Noarlunga Community College
Regency Park Community College—Further Stages

Appendix III

STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATION AUTHORITIES FOR ACTUAL PAYMENTS FROM THE LOAN ACCOUNT 1975-76

Loan Undertaking	Appropriation Authorities						Actual Payments
	Pursuant to the Public Purposes Loan Act, 1975				Pursuant to Section 32b, Public Finance Act	Total Appropriation Authorities	
	Schedule to the Act	Variations Made Pursuant to Section 6 (3) of the Act		Total Appropriation Authorities as Varied			
	Increase	Decrease					
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
State Bank	20 000	—	60 000	20 000	—	20 000	16 059
Loans to Producers	2 850 000	—	—	2 790 000	—	2 790 000	2 790 000
Advances to Settlers	80 000	100 000	—	180 000	—	180 000	116 554
Loans for Fencing and Water Piping	10 000	—	—	10 000	—	10 000	4 908
Advances to State Bank	2 500 000	—	—	2 500 000	11 000 000	13 500 000	13 500 000
Student Hostels	40 000	—	40 000	—	—	—	—
Highways and Local Government	75 000	100 000	—	175 000	—	175 000	175 000
Other Urban Drainage	4 100 000	—	1 500 000	2 600 000	—	2 600 000	2 393 675
Public Parks	300 000	—	—	300 000	—	300 000	300 000
Lands, Irrigation and Drainage	965 000	—	50 000	915 000	—	915 000	904 555
Lands Department—Buildings, Plant, etc.	3 700 000	—	150 000	3 550 000	—	3 550 000	3 547 928
Irrigation and Reclamation of Swamp Lands ..	110 000	—	—	110 000	—	110 000	53 861
South-Eastern Drainage	525 000	75 000	—	600 000	—	600 000	600 000
Renmark Irrigation Trust	6 200 000	—	300 000	5 900 000	—	5 900 000	5 796 673
Afforestation and Timber Milling	11 000 000	390 000	—	11 390 000	—	11 390 000	11 291 797
Railway Accommodation	7 800 000	10 000	—	7 810 000	808 000	8 618 000	8 617 442
Harbors Accommodation	10 000	—	—	10 000	—	10 000	—
Marine and Harbors	40 000	—	—	40 000	—	40 000	—
West Lakes Development	930 000	—	—	930 000	—	930 000	659 712
Engineering and Water Supply	59 300 000	—	—	59 300 000	2 900 000	62 200 000	62 175 486
Waterworks and Sewers	3 600 000	—	465 000	3 135 000	—	3 135 000	2 922 968
River Murray Weirs, Dams, Locks, etc.	107 500 000	619 000	—	108 119 000	1 881 000	110 000 000	109 999 950
Public Buildings	100 000	—	10 000	90 000	—	90 000	90 000
Environment and Conservation	620 000	—	—	620 000	1 208 000	1 828 000	1 827 583
Coast Protection Board	100 000	—	—	100 000	—	100 000	100 000
National Reserves	5 000 000	—	—	5 000 000	—	5 000 000	5 000 000
State Planning Authority	5 000 000	—	—	5 000 000	—	5 000 000	5 000 000
Other Capital Advances and Provisions ..	800 000	—	—	800 000	—	800 000	—
Electricity Trust of South Australia	8 500 000	1 100 000	—	9 600 000	2 400 000	12 000 000	11 998 214
State Transport Authority, Bus and Tram Division ..	2 500 000	—	—	2 500 000	—	2 500 000	2 011 497
South Australian Industries Assistance Corporation ..	—	—	—	—	13 000 000	13 000 000	13 000 000
Non-Government Hospital and Institution Buildings ..	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Community Health and Associated Projects	1 200 000	—	—	1 200 000	—	1 200 000	1 200 000
South Australian Housing Trust	690 000	—	—	690 000	—	690 000	171 030
Monarto Development Commission	700 000	—	—	700 000	420 000	1 120 000	1 119 807
Miscellaneous	400 000	25 000	—	425 000	—	425 000	424 833
Expenses and Discounts of Floating Conversion and Public Loans	500 000	—	—	500 000	—	500 000	470 000
Department of Transport—Research and Development ..	400 000	—	—	400 000	—	400 000	323 172
Mines Department—Buildings, Plant, etc.	300 000	—	89 000	211 000	—	211 000	100 000
Government Printing Department—Plant, Machinery, Stores, etc.	900 000	245 000	—	1 145 000	—	1 145 000	1 143 579
State Supply Department—Buildings, Plant, etc.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Supply Department—Stores	1 000 000	—	—	1 000 000	—	1 000 000	799 293
State Supply Department—Equipment	160 000	—	—	160 000	—	160 000	511
Education Department—School Buses	950 000	—	—	950 000	—	950 000	945 979
Department of the Public Service Board—Data Processing	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Equipment	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Department of Agriculture and Fisheries—Boats and Facilities, etc.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport—Recreational and Sporting Facilities etc.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	241 475 000	2 664 000	2 664 000	241 475 000	33 617 000	275 092 000	271 592 066*

*Includes \$139 734 discount on loan raisings.

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, 1977.

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 \$160 000 000 to the Public Service for the financial year ending June 30, 1977. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides \$160 000 000 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 for 1976-77, I expect to present to the House early next month.

Members will recall that it is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill, also for \$160 000 000, was designed to cover expenditure for about the first two months of the year. The Bill now before the House is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until the latter part of October, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is usually complete and assent received. The Bill provides the same kind of authority as has been granted in the Supply Acts in previous years and is in the same terms.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. As the Treasurer has said, it provides the expenditure that will be needed to keep the State Public Service running until the Appropriation Bill is passed later this year. One of the major factors that comes out of a consideration of the terms of the Bill is the increase in the sums provided for in the two Supply Bills each year. In 1974-75 it was \$200 000 000, in 1975-76 it was \$290 000 000, an increase of 45 per cent, and in 1976-77 it is \$320 000 000, which is a further increase of 10 per cent. Those figures reflect the large increases in wages and costs over the past two or three years.

In supporting the Bill, I must say that I am surprised and, to some extent, pleased to see that the Government has finally taken the advice of the Opposition yet again on this matter. I do not think we have often seen the Appropriation Bill, for which we will be awaiting and for which this measure is a stopgap, come in after the Federal Budget. Certainly, it has always been introduced before the Auditor-General's Report has been made available. I understand that this year the Budget will be brought in on September 7, by which time the Federal Government's Budget will have been announced and we will also have available to us the Auditor-General's Report. I can assure the Government we will give the Auditor-General's Report and associated documents our closest attention.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Once again it is the traditional right of the Opposition to raise matters of grievance on the motion. Members on this side have many matters which require ventilation in the public's interest. It is difficult to decide which matters

should be debated first, because so many matters concern the community at present. I intend to deal with three matters, two briefly and the third in more detail.

I refer first to compulsory unionism or preference to unionists as it applies to the unemployment relief scheme administered by local government authorities. This matter has been raised in this House before, and I assure members that it will be raised again. For the Government in this State to subscribe to the International Declaration of Human Rights (or it says it does) for it to subscribe to International Labour Organisation Conventions (or it says it does) and then support deliberate attempts to make certain that people who wish to undertake unemployment relief scheme work administered by local government authorities should become members of trade unions, is scandalous. It is disgraceful. I think all members are familiar with the directives issued by the Government through the Public Service Board. I refer to Industrial Instruction No. 464 reissued on April 20, 1976. In June, 1976, the following directive went out to councils:

Unemployment Relief Scheme—Preference for Unionists

Councils are advised that the State Government has implemented a policy of preference in employment with Government departments and authorities to members of unions as set out in the attached Industrial Instruction No. 464. It is pointed out that if State Government funds, now allocated to local government authorities for unemployment relief, etc., were used in departments, preference would be given to the employment of union members. The Government has therefore determined that future allocations of money be made to councils on the condition that they conform with the policy of the State Government, as set out in the attached industrial instruction, as far as expenditure of such moneys is concerned. Several local government bodies, to my knowledge, have made their protests known to the Government. I was in Tumby Bay at a time when the local union organiser had been visiting and when there was a stoppage because one of the casual workers, who had been taken on for the relief programme administered by the council, chose not to join the union. Not only is pressure being applied by the union officials against those very declarations and conventions to which I have referred but it is being compounded by the attitude of this Government. It is a despicable and disgraceful state of affairs.

The second item, although I refer to it only briefly, is none the less important, relates to the Public Service of this State and the remarks made about it by the Attorney-General in a speech on July 9, 1976. The Attorney-General, in a paper that he contributed to a meeting held in Adelaide on that day, stated, among other things:

I am personally committed to the idea of open Government.

That was something of a paradox, I found, and rather hard to understand. He went on further and ventilated the matter by describing the Public Service as follows:

... burdened with a structure that is overly bureaucratic, inefficient, and, worst of all, clothes its operations in secrecy and seems to take a delight, when dealing with the public, in reducing them to unbearable levels of frustration.

That remark, in the circumstances, was not fair at the time and is not fair now, particularly when it was made about a body of dedicated public servants who are not easily able to defend themselves. I noticed that the Treasurer took the only course open to him and authorised the Chairman of the Public Service Board to make a statement in defence of the Public Service. It was unfortunate, to say the least, that the Attorney-General should ever have made those remarks, and certainly most

unfortunate, as well as embarrassing, for the Treasurer to have had to correct him in that way publicly, but it was right that he should. The Attorney-General has made other embarrassing remarks—embarrassing not only to the Government but also to the State as a whole. I wonder, as do many people in the community, just exactly how long he can continue to hold that portfolio.

The Public Service regulations possibly do require looking at again. Perhaps they should be revised. Certainly, many public servants find some aspects of the regulations rather inhibiting to initiative and incentive. If that happens, they may have good reason for putting suggestions to the Public Service Board. Perhaps a few public servants are off-hand in their attitude, but they would be a minority; the majority of public servants in this State give the State fine service. They have had every reason in recent years, to lose their dedication and incentive, because there has been a relatively high number of appointments from outside the Public Service to top positions. Nothing is more calculated to destroy the morale of these people than making appointments from outside the Public Service when people inside the Public Service have been working in a dedicated fashion to reach the top of their department, only to find that they are passed over and relegated to a secondary position by someone from outside the service.

On occasion, when there is need for an expert to be appointed, such an appointment is justified, but it is happening far too frequently. When appointments are made to the Public Service for political reasons, the situation becomes even more dangerous. I know that I can rely on the Public Service of South Australia to retain at all times its integrity and independence. We are very fortunate indeed in this State to have servants of the calibre we have.

The final matter I wish to ventilate is a more serious one from the point of view of community concern: it relates to what I have called the health of society. Today I asked the following question in this House:

Can the Premier say whether the Government has decided to proceed with a major investigation into crime, with particular reference to the alarming increase in crimes of violence in our community, and what action is being taken to protect the community?

I recall to honourable members the answer the Treasurer gave. He said:

I find some difficulty in understanding quite what this tirade is about.

I was not asking that question in any sense of criticism: I was simply trying to find out, as is the community of this State, exactly what is the Government's attitude towards the increasing incidence of violence in this State. The Treasurer stood up, talked around the problem, and would not come to grips with it. In fact, he tried to brush aside the question, and in his first sentence accused me of making a tirade. I did not do so at the time, but now I will attack, because it was totally unworthy of him.

Somewhere along the line there is a breakdown in communication; that is all I can say. I was referring in that question to the announcement that was made last May, I think by the Treasurer, although it was reported as coming from the Attorney-General's Department. I will read from the press report of May 10, 1976, for the benefit of honourable members and particularly of the Treasurer, who obviously does not know what is going on in his own departments. Once again, this is evidence of a total breakdown in communication between the Treasurer and his Attorney-General. The report states:

Government plans major study into city crime. The State Government is planning a major study into crime in

Adelaide. The project will be the first of its kind undertaken in a city of comparable size in the world. The Attorney-General, Mr. Duncan, confirmed today the Government was looking at the feasibility of the study.

That was why I asked whether the Treasurer and the Government were prepared to go on with it, because the report said that the Government was considering the feasibility of it. I suspect that, just as this Government has put on one side and shelved the questions of age of consent and incest (because they might just be a little too hot by way of political potatoes), it has done exactly the same about violence and crime. The report continues:

Mr. Duncan said, "We hope to learn what sort of conditions are conducive to the increase in crime, and what preventative measures the Government can take. We may be able to anticipate areas where crime could build up in the future." The Australian Institute of Criminology, which is prepared to back the study, believes it is the most important project it has been involved in. The State Government suggested to the institute that it participate in the scheme.

This is the matter the Treasurer did not know about. This is the matter he apparently considers of such little importance that he is not concerned to find out exactly what is going on. The report continues:

Plans for the study are being co-ordinated by the criminologist in the Attorney-General's Department, Mr. Doug Claessen. Mr. Claessen said today it would cover nine municipal districts involving a population of more than 200 000 people. Mr. Claessen has written to community welfare groups, police, councils, the courts department, the Environment Department and the Prisons Department asking if they would co-operate in the study. The scope of the study would include:

Detailed maps of the city and surrounding areas, with areas clearly delineated and problem districts shown. This would include any plans proposed for the next 10 or 15 years.

A study of crime over the past 10 years in Adelaide showing the types of crimes, the age groups of offenders, their socio-economic backgrounds, the places they live, the dates and times the offences were committed, the relationship of any of these to local difficulties in recreational and work problems.

Analyses of building types in relation to crimes committed in areas.

Problems encountered by crime prevention services caused by the physical layout of the district and suburb.

Problems of social welfare or crime correctional services in meeting their objectives with present facilities and present community liaison.

Problems in court hearings, delays, procedures, effects on families and analyses of sentencing policies.

An account of the employment situation and the survey areas over the past 10 years and projected into the future, housing policies, problems with welfare and special groups such as Aborigines.

Typical case studies of the life histories of offenders.

In a letter to the Government, the institute's director, Mr. W. Clifford, said the material to be produced could be used in a special book which would become a guide for other cities and areas in Australia.

Mr. Duncan said a major seminar would be held at the end of the study among national crime, social welfare and planning experts. Papers on various aspects of information which had emerged would be prepared. The seminar would recommend ways of overcoming problems which had emerged. Mr. Duncan said South Australia was concerned to see that proper planning took place in areas of crime control, ensuring that in the future the city was not faced with a crime epidemic.

That was the full report: it is a report that the Treasurer has apparently forgotten about, if ever he knew about it. Why he did not face up to the problem I do not know. Perhaps he believes the Government could be embarrassed by it. Certainly, the scope and terms of reference of that inquiry should be supported by all members of Parliament, who should welcome and support it, yet the Treasurer ignored completely the scope and terms of reference of the inquiry.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I didn't do anything of the kind. What are you worried about in our getting on with the job?

Dr. TONKIN: I suggest that the Premier have a good look at his reply, because he did not reply to the question at all. I suggest to him that he look at *Hansard* tomorrow, because he has made a fool of himself.

Mr. Allison: He was side-tracked.

Dr. TONKIN: I think he tried to avoid it; he is embarrassed about it. Crimes of violence have increased in our community. As I said in the explanation to my question, crime has almost become a way of life. That attitude is reflected in the concern of the member for Spence, who asked a question this afternoon; the concern of union employees, who met to discuss the matter; in the concern of the community at large; and in the concern of the many reports and letters appearing in the daily press. This matter cannot be shrugged off; it is one of the most vital matters facing our community today.

Some years ago a Bill (it is now an Act) was introduced into this House that dealt with the treatment of young offenders. It was a significant Bill and was the result of much work and research by the Social Welfare Advisory Council, of which I was a member at the time. The Bill broke new ground and set the pattern for many other countries in the world to follow, because it set up an early warning system—juvenile aid panels, which took young offenders, warned them, impressed on them the significance of their act against society, and gave them another chance.

It is significant that about 60 per cent of those young offenders who were warned first did not offend again. Recidivists were brought back to the juvenile court, dealt with and assessed. In a sense the new system relieved the load on the juvenile court because it did not have to see each young offender, but the court's load was made more onerous in another aspect. The juvenile court and the judges of that court have done a remarkably fine job in putting into effect the provisions of the Bill we passed.

I have always been enthusiastic about the scheme, as were many other people in the community. Many people also had reservations, because of uncertainty, about the scheme. They did not understand exactly the principles of the legislation. It was impressed on the Government at the time the report was given to it that the scheme should be implemented and assessed continually to ensure that it achieved what it was hoped that it would achieve. It was considered essential that an assessment report be made within 12 or 18 months. It was also hoped that a public inquiry would be held. Perhaps the Treasurer has forgotten that, too.

An inquiry is to be held, as stated by the Minister of Community Welfare today. The scheme must be reassessed. A cardinal feature of the scheme is to decide what should be done with young offenders, to ascertain what stage they have reached and whether they are ready to go out into the community. Juvenile offenders must be assessed by experts. The Minister, in replying today to a question asked by the member for Glenelg, tried to twist the honourable member's question into a criticism of Community Welfare Department staff, particularly the staff of the institutions concerned. The question did no such thing.

Staff at McNally Training Centre, Vaughan House, Brookway Park and other similar places, are doing the best possible job they can do. I admire them for doing that job. In fact, the Opposition supports what they are doing. However, they are being asked to do the impossible—to assess each child, and that is impossible for them to

do. Without detailed assessments it is impossible to determine what stage a juvenile offender has reached. We have seen the results of the increased work load in the repeated abscondings that have occurred in the past 12 or 18 months from McNally Training Centre and Vaughan House, especially McNally Training Centre.

Mr. Jennings: It's a little bit longer than that.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, it has been going on for a considerable time. I thank the member for Ross Smith for that interjection. If the scheme is to be successful in rehabilitating young offenders, it is important that two actions be taken. First, adequate and full assessment services must be available for each child and offender and, secondly, the Government must take the people of South Australia into its confidence on these matters. The Government must not be afraid or ashamed of letting people know what is happening. It must explain the principles behind the scheme, hold a public inquiry, and make the present inquiry open to the public (certainly release the findings to the public). If the public understood exactly what was intended by the scheme and how it was to work, I believe it would be supported universally.

By the same token, young people who are released and who abscond are decidedly disadvantaged because they are allowed to abscond again. They are given chances for which they are not yet ready. Certainly, mistakes will occur; no-one can make absolutely correct diagnoses. The Government has backed off from this subject at every opportunity. It should come clean and tell the public of South Australia exactly what has happened. As I have said, the Treasurer has shown a marked lack of understanding and concern in this matter. He has shown a decided lack of communication or desire to communicate.

Violence, I repeat, is becoming very much a part of our way of life, as is the acceptance of violence. Acts are portrayed on television, on films or actually happen in our society which, a few years ago, would have horrified everyone. Now, people do not turn a hair when such acts occur. Generally, it reflects the attitude of society today. Far too much emphasis is placed on material things, on a desire for material things and a desire to measure success through material things. The Treasurer does not help the situation by saying that the record 100 years ago was worse. That does not get us anywhere. I would have hoped that civilisation had advanced a little since those days.

Some weeks ago a report by Dr. Glew, a psychologist or psychiatrist (I am not sure which) appeared in the *Sunday Mail*. The press cutting, which refers to increases in sex crimes, states:

But is evidence from countries such as these applicable here—

he is referring to the position in Sweden, where there has been a reduction in minor sex offences but the incidence of rape has remained the same, following the increasing permissiveness of that society—

unless it can be shown that psychosexual development and pressures of urbanisation are similar. At the moment, there seems to be no research available for Australian cities.

Perhaps, after this major Government inquiry, of which the Treasurer knew nothing, that study may be available here. The report continues:

Significantly, Dr. Glew took the reasons for the two main groups of sex assailant back to childhood. Possibly, it is time for a booklet to be simply written on what is needed to rear a child to be mentally healthy and be distributed to women as they leave maternity wards. Certainly there is literature, but it is not readily available to the woman in the lower socio-economic group and it is most probably

beyond her comprehension. For too long we have been told only what must be put into children's stomachs and not enough about what must be put into their hearts.

I totally and absolutely agree with the last statement. The basis for our lack of respect in every sphere of our everyday life, our lack of respect for people and for their feelings, the lack of respect for people's property, and the lack of respect for society and for one's place in it, comes back to the family unit and the fact that the family unit is being broken down. That respect implies a responsibility for one member of society to another and from one member to society as a whole, and it is a matter that has been broken down continually. Certainly, there are many increases in the pressures that young people face nowadays, but families themselves, which, in the past, provided the support and love necessary to maintain those young people in a way in which they could battle against the pressures of society are all too frequently now lacking.

I have said in the House before that many people in juvenile courts have said when their children have appeared there, "I cannot understand why this happened. We have given him everything he desires." What they really mean is that they have given money, but not time, love, or even interest, and that is what is going wrong. It is a sad reflection (as I have said also many times before in the House) that we need the services of as many social workers as we do today. The only way in which we will strengthen family life and bring back that respect people should have for each other is to start when people are young when in pre-school, and to help the family, the mother with her baby, pre-school centres, and primary schools, because there may well lie the key to our problems of juvenile delinquency, larrikinism, and a breakdown in society generally. Primary schoolteachers deserve far more help than they are now getting and the kind of support that will provide psychological back-up and time to ask why, with training as social workers, if necessary, in a situation when they see that a child is being deprived or suffers from lack of parental or family help.

I believe that just as the community welfare delivery point should be as close as possible to the people and, therefore, based on a local government area, so help for the family should be based through mothers and babies' clinics, pre-school kindergartens, and primary schools. We have neglected primary school education far too much, and have tended to forget that children suffer from being deprived of love and concern, and that they could be helped through the activities of primary schoolteachers, provided the teachers are given help, time, support, in order to do it: certainly, they have the incentive to do it, but what they lack now is the time. It is often said that prevention is more important than cure, but in this case prevention is far better than rehabilitation, and the money that could be spent on expanding primary school facilities and helping our primary schoolteachers would be more than adequately repaid in the saving of money in replacing damage from vandalism and from not having to face the problems in adolescence of juvenile delinquency and drug dependency. The Party which I have the honour to lead has developed a real policy on this matter, and we intend to ensure that primary schoolteachers get all the help they need in this matter, because in the long term we believe that all the community will benefit.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I refer to two matters, the first of which relates to the Deputy Premier's refusal to answer a reasonable question I asked of him last week, I think, in the House. Statements were made in the public press by the Federal Minister for Construction

(Mr. John McLeay) regarding the use of contract work in Government undertakings, in which he stated that a survey that had been done in his department had proved that up to one-third of the cost of a project could be saved if the work was let out to tender rather than being done by day labour. The Deputy Premier was scathing in his retort to the Federal Minister's statement and, among other things, he said that Mr. McLeay's comments were ill-informed and irresponsible. The Minister went on to say that any decision taken by South Australian Government about the use of day labour and private industry was on the basis of economics and that whichever sector offered the cheapest and most efficient service would get the job. I asked the Minister a fairly simple question, by any standards, as follows:

Can the Minister of Works say what economic studies are undertaken into including Government works and construction in order to compare the cost of a project done by day labour or by private industry?

It was a forthright statement the Minister of Works had made publicly in seeking to refute what the Federal Minister had said, and it was a straightforward question that I asked of him. However, he refused, in effect, to reply to me. In a verbose reply the Deputy Premier tried to take me to task about newspaper reports that Mr. Eric Franklin had written about a week previously.

Mr. Coumbe: He was bellicose.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister was verbose and bellicose. From time to time the Minister criticises statements made by the member for Fisher in the House, generally, I think, in connection with the laying of new sewers. He took the member for Fisher to task, then said that he did not intend to rise to the bait. There was no bait; it was a simple direct question to the Minister, asking what economic studies had been undertaken. This was the very point the Minister had made in refuting what Mr. McLeay had said. All the Minister said was that, if I liked I could go into Government departments and look around; that indicates a most unsatisfactory state of affairs. If a Minister of the Crown is willing to go to the press and say, "We make decisions on the basis of economics", when he cannot substantiate that statement in reply to a direct question in this House, the only conclusion can be that the Minister knows of no economic studies. If he knew of any such studies he would be willing to give the results to the House: in other words, the Minister is bluffing. It is not good enough for him to shrug off such a question, and it is an unsatisfactory performance.

I do not know how members of the public, or indeed members of the Opposition, can get information from Ministers if they will not reply to questions in Parliament. The question was direct, and so was the Minister's statement: he refused, in effect, to reply. How ludicrous the situation would be if other Ministers were to say, "If you want to find answers to your questions, go to the departments and look around." What a stupid suggestion to make, as though members have the time to go to Government departments and fossick out information. What a ludicrous suggestion, if this should be the stock answer from Ministers.

Mr. Dean Brown: That is an indication of the sort of twits we have as Ministers.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It also indicates gross incompetence. If a Minister wants to make assertions in the press without information to back them up, he is obviously bluffing, and he is incompetent. I do not believe the Minister has had any economic studies undertaken, otherwise he would have given details to the House

instead of going on with the tirade of bravado in reply to my question. This is a source of great concern to Opposition members. Ministers cannot shrug off responsibility and fob off reasonable questions.

Mr. Dean Brown: Do they reply to questions?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Most of them go into the too-hard basket. That performance in this House indicated that the Minister was prevaricating when he made his statements to the press. I turn now to another matter. I make no apology for raising it; it has been raised in this place many times, and we will continue to raise it until we reach a satisfactory conclusion. I refer to land tax. I have a copy, sent to me for my information, of a recent letter from the District Council of Angaston to the Treasurer. The council would not object to these matters being raised in the House. We have raised them previously, and we will continue to raise them until we can penetrate the thick hides or the armour, or whatever it is, that insulates Government members from reality. The letter states:

On behalf of the members of the District Council of Angaston, I am directed to lodge a very strong protest with you regarding the very steep increase in the amount of land tax being levied, in particular against the rural landowners. It is feared by many such landowners in this area that what in their view is an iniquitous tax, will eventually force them off the land. These landowners are devoted to their vocation of primary production and in many instances are direct descendants of the original settlers. The possible loss to this area—and to the State's agricultural fraternity—of such landowners is regarded by this council as being of a serious magnitude. It is also understood that such views are held State-wide.

Regarding much of the land in this area affected by the big increase in land tax, it will be appreciated that such land is used for intensive agriculture in many fields. Possibly this council area may be unique in that the range of agriculture extends through: (1) grazing ((a) sheep for fat lamb, wool production and stud stock, (b) cattle for beef, dairying and stud stock); (2) grain growing—wheat, barley and oats; (3) pig raising; (4) poultry (for both eggs and meat); (5) orchards (fresh fruit as well as dried fruit); (6) vineyards (mainly wine grapes); (7) market gardens; (8) horse breeding and race training; and (9) because of all the above—tourism.

It is greatly feared by this council that because of (a) the amount payable by way of land tax and (b) the close proximity of this council area to the metropolitan area, the pressures being placed on the present landowners will result in much of this highly productive agricultural land being lost for all time to agriculture. For these reasons which are apparent to the members of this council, you are urged to follow the lead of other State Governments in Australia, and remove this tax altogether from the Statutes of this State.

As all of that council area falls within my district, I again voice those sentiments. The Government has said that it intends to make changes, but I hope that real relief will be announced shortly. The Government refers to problems in the Adelaide Hills with hobby farmers, but what is driving farmers off the land more than anything else is the high rate of taxation levied by the Government and by councils which, in many cases, are forced into this situation because of their limited taxing powers.

Mr. Evans: And they are not collecting taxes on Government-owned land.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No. The Government does not pay tax on the land to councils. I have quoted previously the case of the Gumeracha council, in which a third of its area is taken up by Government operations from which the council does not get a cent in rates. I have raised these matters previously.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Light.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I direct my thoughts to the situation that has unfolded in local government in relation to the ability of a council to seek to take over the area of another council. This matter has been to the fore in the public mind recently with the move made by the Elizabeth council upon the District Council of Munno Para. It is history now, but the result of the poll of ratepayers held subsequently was beyond the expectation of anyone who had been watching from the sidelines, and certainly a complete reversal of the expectations of many people. The provision to which I refer allows a district council or a corporation to make a move against another council almost at will, having no regard to the problems existing to the council being challenged, to the morale of its staff, to its budgeting, and to the cost of defending itself against the attacks made upon it.

Apart from the merits or demerits of the case put forward by the Elizabeth council, and apart from the attitude expressed in the results of the Royal Commission in relation to local government boundaries, Munno Para council has been called upon to take into the requirements of expenditure for 1975-76 a cost of \$11 000 to \$12 000 in defending itself. Certainly, there is nothing in the Act, as it left this House, which prevents Elizabeth or any other council making a move against Munno Para council later this year, early next year, and again the year after, if the necessary ratepayers' poll were to be defeated on each occasion.

It is urgent for the Government, and indeed for this Parliament, to correct the situation, so that it would be impossible for a council, which has moved against another, to make a similar move within a three-year to five-year period following the defeat of that move. Unless we make that arrangement or introduce a suitable provision into the Local Government Act, council after council will find themselves losing the value of large sums of taxpayers' money in defending themselves, when it is quite obvious that the desire within the defending council area is one of remaining as is, in spite of the greed of the adjacent council. I do not want to level a charge of greed against Elizabeth in this context. Let us consider a hypothetical situation. That could be one in which a council attacked another, that council would have no cost and all the advantages, whereas the council that had to defend itself would have all the cost and none of the advantages, and its staff and programmes would be under constant pressure. Representatives of the District Council of Munno Para were introduced last week to the Minister by the member for Elizabeth who was supported by the Hon. M. B. Dawkins from another place. I hope the Minister will consider seriously this matter.

I discussed this matter with the Minister when I wanted to introduce an amendment to a local government Bill that was before the House last session, and the Minister indicated he was willing to have the matter canvassed in this House. He would not accept an amendment when that Bill was passing through the House, because it was outside the general purpose of its provisions, and I accepted that situation. I suggest, however, that we do not allow the situation to exist, because it will disadvantage the management of the council under attack. I believe that the information given to the Minister during the deputation clearly indicated the validity of my argument, and I hope the Minister will submit this opinion to his colleagues in Cabinet with all due haste, and that the House will consider urgently the passage of these alterations without further amendment, so that a council may plan its future and proceed to act in the best interests of the community it represents.

From a reply to a question last week by the member for Heysen, I was pleased to receive information relating to the Water Resources Council of South Australia, which was set up on July 1, 1976. In the list of members of the council, I was pleased to see the names of many people who had made a contribution to the use of underground waters and other water resources in this State for a long time, and I am pleased to know that their expertise can be used for the benefit of the State. Other authorities are to be set up under the Water Resources Act, one of which is an appeal board. The names of the two people who are to represent growers are being bandied about freely in the Northern Adelaide Plains area. They are residents of the Virginia and Two Wells area, and I understand they happen to be executives of the Virginia and Two Wells Australian Labor Party. I believe one of them is a brother-in-law of the Australian Labor Party candidate who stood for the seat of Goyder and who is the same person who stood for the seat of Wakefield for the Australian Labor Party.

Why are these two executives suddenly the only two grower representatives on the appeal board? Why has no consideration been given to growers involved in dry land farming, to growers in the Riverland, or to those in the South-East? Why are these persons nominated as members of the appeal board: they have relatively limited experience of irrigation and the use of water but, fortuitously, are particular friends of members opposite and are executives of one of their branches?

Mr. Evans: Do you think it is jobs for the boys?

Dr. EASTICK: It sounds as if it is a tremendous pay-off, certainly jobs for the boys. I would not criticise the appointments if I believed that the persons nominated had a genuine expertise to bring to the position and would represent water users in any appeal against the directions of the Water Resources Council. I am not suggesting that the council is going to make untoward decisions, but it is inevitable that decisions will be made from time to time that will go against the best interests of growers. I am eager to ensure that the interests of all growers are to be considered, and that reconsideration will be given to the validity of the appointments and the expertise they can bring to the position.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): The Government's policy on industrial democracy has been soundly rejected by the public throughout Australia and within this State according to the latest Gallup poll figures released this morning. According to the poll only 25 per cent of the people surveyed (almost 2 000 throughout Australia) were in favour of worker representatives being given positions on company boards. That is only one aspect of the Government's policy I wish to discuss. The Government's policy of worker control or, as I have referred to it correctly, nationalisation through the boardroom has apparently frightened the public in South Australia away more than it has done in any other State, and the great fear is that the Government's policy is now doing more to hinder the adoption of improved management technique involving worker participation than it is doing to encourage it. According to the Gallup poll only 47 per cent of the people surveyed in South Australia were in favour of the adoption of any such scheme of worker participation. That was the lowest figure for any State in Australia. That clearly indicates two aspects: first, that the Government's policy has frightened people away from any scheme of worker participation, and that will lead to the long-term detriment of industrial relations in

South Australia; and, secondly, I think it indicates that apparently there is already good industrial relations within the State. To a certain extent that is reflected by the number of days lost through industrial disputes in South Australia, and I think it is a reflection on the style of management in South Australia and also on the nature of industries here with many smaller companies compared to the size of industries in Victoria and New South Wales.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: And of the State Government.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I said that it was good management by the State companies, certainly not by the State, because it has been Government policy that has done more apparently to frighten people away from the adoption of worker participation than anything else has done. The public has apparently rejected the Government's policy, because 25 per cent only of the people surveyed were in favour of workers being members of boards. I refer to a letter to the *Australian Financial Review* on April 6 this year written by the Premier of South Australia, in which he indicated that his Government was opposed to legislation being introduced for the adoption of worker participation. He said:

My Government does not intend to legislate for industrial democracy.

He also said:

I have consistently rejected the need for legislation to achieve this aim.

That is a downright lie by the Treasurer. I shall prove to the House the number of occasions on which he has clearly indicated to the people of South Australia that his Government is in favour of legislation for the adoption of his dictatorial policy on worker participation, or industrial democracy, as he prefers to call it. He is reported as follows:

On September 26, 1974, he said to the Institute of Directors that unless worker participation was adopted he would legislate to involve the unions and industry. On October 28, 1974, he said to the International Institute for Labour Studies that unless he received voluntary co-operation then "the Government must look to the obvious alternative."

That is, of course, legislation. A press statement released by the Premier's Department on May 5, 1975, stated:

We intend to legislate to ensure that all firms and employee organisations recognise the democratic principles involved.

I repeat:

We intend to legislate.

That clearly indicates that the Government of this State intends to legislate and is in favour of legislation. In an election speech on June 24, 1975, in relation to community participation in industry, the Treasurer said:

. . . from the lessons of the next three years we should be able to lay down rules . . .

For any Government to lay down rules, it must lay down those rules through legislation, which is the only means by which a Government can lay down appropriate rules. Regulations may follow that legislation, but legislation is required. The policy report on industrial democracy, which was adopted at the 1975 Annual State Conference of the Australian Labor Party, states:

From the experience so gained, the Government should then be able to frame legislation of general application in the following Parliament.

That, again, clearly indicates that the Government intends to legislate for worker participation. On August 26, 1975, in answer to a Question on Notice, the Treasurer said:

A decision will be taken with respect to legislation after a trial period of three years.

Those statements by the Treasurer clearly indicate that his Government has always been in favour of legislation for industrial democracy. That completely puts the lie to the statements made in a letter to the *Financial Review* of April 6, 1976. I quote from that report, as follows:

While the South Australian Government is committed to the implementation of the policy of worker participation I have consistently rejected the need for legislation to achieve this aim.

With great regret I point out that the State Government has threatened to impose on the community its policy of industrial democracy. Worker participation requires the greatest degree of co-operation and understanding and, therefore, must be done on a voluntary basis. Unless it is on that basis, companies will adopt it with regret and employees will accept it, equally, with regret.

Unless it is done in the spirit of co-operation and trying to improve the communication within the organisation and involve all people in a company in the decisions that affect that company, unfortunately there will be a greater antagonism between the so-called bosses and the so-called workers. That will not improve industrial relations in South Australia. It will, in fact, worsen the situation. I again plead with the Government of this State not to proceed with legislation. I hope that the letter the Treasurer wrote in April indicates that the Government has now rethought this policy. However, I do not believe that is the case. I believe that the Government has now decided to have 10c each way: when it suits the Government it will say, "We will not legislate", and when it suits it, it will say, "We will legislate". So, irrespective of what line the Opposition takes, the Government will say that it has made appropriate statements to support its stand. It is unfortunate that the Government has not consulted with industry more on industrial democracy. That is why the Government has had industrial democracy rejected through the Gallup polls and throughout industry in this State. That policy will worsen rather than improve industrial relations in this State.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I take this opportunity to speak briefly about the Government's relief scheme for drought-stricken farmers and about the disposal of drought-affected stock. Last Thursday I asked a question of the Minister of Works representing the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, about involvement of the Port Lincoln abattoir in the disposal of stock. I asked whether this would apply in the same way as the Samcor proposal. Since that time the Minister has given a reply, which was printed in the *Port Lincoln Times*. The reply is basically the same as that given in relation to Samcor, but one factor about it disturbs me. Although the same criteria apply (the sheep have to be bare-shorn and of a minimum weight of 18 kilograms, and they must be delivered to the abattoir and deliveries must be regulated by consumer organisations), there was the further criteria that this scheme would only apply for this month. I raised this question because in the Port Lincoln area the land within a radius of 70 to 80 miles of the abattoir is not adversely affected by drought conditions: it is the areas outside the 80 mile radius that are affected. Consequently, the drought provisions offered by the Government will be of little benefit to those farmers close to the abattoir. However, those most in need (those in the devastated area whose properties are drifting) cannot take advantage of this scheme. The reason for this is that 40c allowed for drought-affected stock ex abattoirs will not cover freight. Consequently, disposal of the stock becomes a problem.

An announcement was made today that the Government would pay the cost of disposal. While this may help in some way, I see considerable difficulty in implementing this scheme. It is questionable how the scheme will be carried out. Can local government arrange for all farmers to deliver surplus stock to a given area or are we to see stock still dying in the paddocks, as would possibly happen in any case? It has been suggested that farmers should be given some additional incentive to avoid the loss of stock by starvation. I fear that many farmers in many areas will allow stock to die along the fences and make very little effort to dispose of the carcasses. This has happened in the past. While the slaughter scheme may, to some extent, assist in some selected areas, it will be of little overall benefit to the producer. The emotion regarding the whole issue was brought to light last evening in a segment on *This Day Tonight* that showed stock dying in Samcor stockyards. It is difficult to take sides on this issue, but I believe Samcor has made a genuine attempt to dispose of stock in a reasonable way. In no way do I cast reflection on Samcor's management in this instance. Many telephone callers said that that segment was terrible, that starving stock should never be shown on television. I believe it is good that it was shown. There probably should be more of that sort of thing.

Metropolitan people should be shown what sort of conditions prevail in country areas; they should be shown the hardships that primary producers living in outlying areas are forced to endure during droughts. I believe that the people involved with *This Day Tonight* were correct to show that segment. I do not completely agree that they were correct in highlighting the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, though, because Samcor is making genuine attempts to dispose of stock.

Dr. Eastick: It gives a reality to the point.

Mr. BLACKER: Yes. Each farmer faces having starving stock sometimes. When drought conditions prevail, the situation is worse. It is now August 10, and we have no reasonable feed prospects for the coming year. Even if good rains fall in the next week or two it is unlikely that an abundance of feed will be available. It is reasonable to assume that farmers are facing a nine-month period before good feed growth can reasonably be expected. With nine months to go one must consider what will happen to stock. Can they be fed? How can they be fed? Can the breeding nucleus be maintained? What will happen in future?

The Government's offer of slaughter relief schemes is a minor assistance. I say "minor" because I believe that a more concentrated effort is necessary. Everything other than the breeding nucleus should be heavily culled and disposed of as soon as possible. In this context, the Government should offer to get rid of stock as soon as possible, rather than hang on until the stock dies or reaches an extremely poor condition and feed prospects for the future are lost.

I was interested in what the member for Mallee said about the available grain in our system. At present there are only 385 000 tonnes of wheat, 155 000 tonnes of barley, and 4 400 tonnes of oats. Although this tonnage seems to be massive, the quantity available for feed and seed for the next harvest is small. Immediate action should be taken to tie up this grain to maintain the breeding nucleus. I am not aware of any action that has been taken since the member for Mallee made his comments in the House. I support strongly his recommendation that the grain be held, even if it means the

withdrawal or breaking of contracts. I cannot help but believe that, if we have nine months of drought ahead of us, it is absolutely essential, in order to maintain a breeding nucleus, that grain be made available. Hay is not available and grain supplies are limited; consequently, we must overstock our paddocks, with the result that the condition of stock will be extremely poor if they survive, and the whole of the farming areas will suffer.

Dr. Eastick: We don't want to be caught carrying coal to Newcastle, do we?

Mr. BLACKER: That is dead right. We cannot do anything except tie up the grain and fodder supplies in order to prevent the destruction of our breeding nucleus.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I rise, in what one could call a grievance debate, to talk first about the Land Commission. The Government, especially the Treasurer, seems to take great delight in saying how marvellous the Land Commission is and how wonderful it is that it is putting cheap blocks on the market. In the initial stages the commission could make cheap blocks available because of the money, at a low interest rate of about 4 per cent, that it was given to spend at will and because of the power it had to acquire compulsorily land that was partly developed or, because of zoning laws, could be developed. In fact, the commission could even buy future development land outside zoned areas. Because of the Government's philosophy, one could not object to that. Because of the Government's inactivity before the commission was established in ensuring that sufficient allotments were available, it was able to exploit the situation by saying that land was highly priced. That happened not because of the situation created by free enterprise but because of restrictions and control the Labor Government forced on the industry.

We are now in the situation that the commission is facing the same problems. These problems are arising because of all the departmental activity that is essential for a subdivision to be approved. Sewer and water mains must be laid, power must be installed underground, and roads must be built to a certain standard. Some people question whether those standards are too high. It is costing about \$3 500 to \$4 000 an allotment to install such services, and that represents more than half the total cost of the allotment. The raw land is worth only about \$2 000 an allotment, but about \$1 000 is involved in overheads, administration and profit, because even the Land Commission works on that basis.

The next parcel of allotments that comes on to the market from the Land Commission will sell for more than \$7 000 each in many cases. In 12 months the price will be more than \$8 000, so South Australia is rapidly catching up to the other States.

The South Australian Housing Trust and the Land Commission (two semi-government organisations financed from State and Federal money) between them control the largest proportion of the land that will ever be available for housing construction in the metropolitan area. That has happened not by accident but by design. In the next 12 to 15 months any young couple wishing to buy a block of land will have to go on bended knees to the Land Commission to get a block, thus reducing the freedom of choice, or the Housing Trust will have it tied up and it will not be available at all. The alternative for these people will be to go to Monarto. By tying up all land, slowing down its availability in the metropolitan area and giving a little more money to the Monarto commission to let it provide a few allotments there, the Government will make it possible for the commission to say to young people,

"You have a choice of allotments only at Monarto." There will be no choice of locality in which to live: it will be there, or nowhere.

The other aspect is the Monarto commission's carrying out a study into the Adelaide Hills and the Government's saying that it is an independent survey. No organisation in South Australia has a greater interest in what happens to the Hills area than has the commission: It has a monetary interest in restricting any development in the township areas in the Hills and a direct financial interest in saying (to the small Hills town that might still have some land left in the defined township area for subdivision) by way of a report that the townfolk would not be able to subdivide it. I say that because, the more the commission can stop anyone living in townships in the Adelaide Hills, the greater the opportunity it will have of forcing people to live at Monarto; yet, the Government says that it is an independent inquiry.

Mr. Coumbe: From Caesar to Caesar.

Mr. EVANS: The commission has the greatest monetary interest of any organisation, perhaps other than the Government as a philosophy, to bring down a biased report on the Hills.

Mr. Coumbe: Do you think it will declare its interest?

Mr. EVANS: No organisation should be placed in that situation. We know that the commission is short of work, has little to do, has little money with which to do anything, and that the \$140 000 made available by the Government will be handy for it to keep a few people employed. I want to know where the organisation's independence is supposed to be. We cannot have any trust, regardless of how the report is brought down or what its recommendations are. We can never have any trust that it is an unbiased opinion. I do not know what personnel will work on the study. The commission's and the Government's goal is to ensure that Monarto gets off the ground. It is a deliberate manipulation of an organisation to place people in an unsatisfactory position in order to allow the Government to push ahead with a policy it knows is disastrous and unwarranted.

The electoral roll indicates that there has been a reduction in the number of people living in the metropolitan area during the past six to eight months. I know from figures now available to us that the census shows that the overall growth of our community is much slower than many people expected. If the land available for subdivision and development in what is now known as the Adelaide metropolitan area was taken out of the hands of the Land Commission by forcing it to get the land on to the market more quickly, we would have sufficient land to cater for our population until after the year 2000. These figures show that spending money at Monarto now is unjustified. This Government has bragged many times about its great record in housing, whereas it has lowered the standard of housing more than has any other South Australian Government since Federation.

Mr. Boudy: It has reduced the number.

Mr. Langley: Who brought in subletting? Your Government did.

Mr. EVANS: During the past year, the size of the average house in South Australia dropped by 10 per cent—from about 144 square metres to about 130 square metres. Any Government that has caused the lowering of the size of an average house by 10 per cent in a year should be ashamed of itself. At the same time, this Government with its Federal colleagues pushed up the cost of a square metre for the average house in this State to the highest of any mainland Australian capital. That is the record on which the

Australian Labor Party stands federally and State-wise, and it should be ashamed of it. It should stand up and say that it is ashamed of it. We should be proud that we now have a Federal Government that will pull the State Government into line.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I take this opportunity to raise two matters, the first of which deals with the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau, which has been the subject of other comments from Opposition members. The member for Hanson raised this matter last week and the member for Fisher sought information from the Treasurer today regarding a special report that was a section of the Corbett committee's report. Today, I asked a Question on Notice in two parts, as follows:

How long has the position of the Director of the South Australian Tourist Bureau been vacant?

I received the following reply:

The position of Director of Tourism has been vacant since January 22, 1976.

That is, vacant for nearly eight months. The second part of my question was as follows:

What steps are being taken to appoint a new Director, and when is it expected that this position will be filled?

The reply I received was as follows:

The Board—

the Public Service Board—

is not taking steps currently to appoint a new Director. The position is presently filled in an acting capacity, and it is not known when it will be filled in a permanent capacity.

That is a nice how-d'ye-do regarding an important Government department. I have a high opinion of the bureau's personnel, including the Acting Director, and I have had nothing but first-rate service from the bureau's members. I think that most members have had the opportunity of seeing the bureau's offices in Melbourne and Sydney. I think the bureau does a fine job, but I do not think it good enough that this position has not been filled for so long. We all recall the announcement on February 20 when the Treasurer made great play of having found a first-rate man from the industry from another State (Mr. Beresford), who was to be brought in under contract to take charge of the bureau. He was experienced in the travel agency business. Something went wrong, and I believe that he withdrew. Surely, after seven or eight months it is time that a Director was appointed to this important position. We all know the wonderful work that Perc Pollnitz (now retired) did for so many years. He ably represented this State overseas and in other States and did a fine job of administration. For the benefit of the people of South Australia, I hope that a new appointment is made soon.

The member for Davenport referred in this debate to worker participation, employee participation, or industrial democracy. On June 9, I asked a question of the Treasurer. I was prompted to ask it, because of statements he had made in the February sitting of the first session of this present Parliament. The question was as follows:

Does the Premier recall announcing during the past session that a model for industrial democracy or worker participation had been established in the South Australian Housing Trust? Can he now say what stage has been reached in the scheme? Has it been completed, or is it to be modified as a result of his overseas visit? Further, can the Premier say whether it is intended that other semi-government bodies will be involved in such schemes at Government insistence?

You will recall, Sir, that, during the interregnum between February and June, the Treasurer had been on a fairly extensive visit abroad. He went to some European countries

with the stated intention of investigating the operation in those countries of worker participation schemes. That was one reason why I phrased the question in that way: to ascertain what experience the Treasurer had had and what we were to be faced with in South Australia and whether it would be the Yugoslav system, the German two-tier system, or some other system. The Treasurer replied, as follows:

The proposed model for the trust has not been circulated to all of its employees, and we expect to reach finality on this matter soon. The matter had been held up for some time because of representations by representatives of the unions involved in the trust, but it was decided by Government that the best way to proceed was to circulate the proposed model to all employees so that they might be fully apprised of the proposals (and that has been done). The Industrial Democracy Unit is working with a number of other semi-government authorities on the preparation of models.

That question was asked on June 9, and it is now August 10, two months later. The cold, hard facts are that the Housing Trust, with its model for industrial democracy, is now back to square one. I am sure the Treasurer and the Minister for Planning, under whose control the Housing Trust now comes, knew what was going on. We all learned with considerable interest that the scheme met with great general resistance from most employees of the trust. There was solid resistance from some sections of employees, including certain members of the Public Service Association. I believe the Public Service Association Secretary at that time made a worthwhile and proper response in the newspaper when the result of the disputation came out.

I believe the Government is covering up and glossing over the ineptitude of its programme. It is general knowledge in South Australia, especially in the city, that everyone is getting tired of hearing the Premier talk on this subject. People are sick and tired of hearing it, because of the theory involved, with insufficient practice. It is becoming a phobia with the Treasurer: he is almost paranoid on this aspect of industry. The matter raised, quite properly, by the member for Davenport has a great deal of substance. If it wishes to go on with this matter (and I have expressed some support for the principle in the past), the Government must consider more closely where it is going and how it is going about it, otherwise it will get nowhere. Like the Housing Trust, it will be back to square one after all these months.

Mr. ALLISON (Mt. Gambier): I refer to two much related topics: primary schools and libraries. In primary schools, we set the standards, here and at home, and it is possible for the best type of indoctrination to take place in primary schools. The standards of decency and the early standards of communication in numbers and in language take place in primary schools. Some years ago, I studied an Auckland, New Zealand, children's public library report, which stated that children between the ages of eight years and 14 years would read about a book a week, and they would be on the right track by the time they were 13 years of age. If they were not on the right track, they would go backwards.

Unfortunately, for many years it has been the practice for the weakest matriculants to enter primary school service. I am pleased to say that this is no longer the pattern, because there is a crying need for the best teachers, those with the best Matriculation certificates, to enter the primary school service and take on the education of our younger children. We seem to have had the expert teachers, those with the highest qualifications, for an almost indefinite period entering secondary schools, and this situation has

been tied to several factors, including salaries and the salary structures for secondary and primary branches. I am pleased to note that that, too, is undergoing considerable amendment, and that the amalgamation of secondary and primary branches will go a long way to removing the stigma that may have been attached to being a primary schoolteacher and looking after the youngest children.

A tremendous need exists for remedial teaching in secondary schools, and probably the imbalance of expert teachers has been largely responsible for this situation. About 15 per cent to 20 per cent of children need remedial work in mathematics or English in secondary schools, and this is not peculiar to Australia: it is probably worse in other European countries in Western civilisation. However, remedial teaching in secondary schools is a matter of shutting the stable door after the horse has gone: if the kids are not reading properly and if they do not have the number and language communication skills by the time they get to secondary school, it is already too late. The critical periods are from eight years onwards, and we have either got them for education or we have lost them by the time they are eight years of age.

It is possible that some youngsters are rather precocious and others are retarded, but generally by the time they are eight years of age they are ours for education or they are going to go progressively backwards. The need for remedial education with highly concentrated teaching is there, among the very young in our primary schools. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition, who said that there was a need for more primary schoolteachers to be given additional time to mark lessons and to prepare lessons away from direct contact with children. I also point out that advanced students as well as retarded students need considerable attention. There does not seem to be the scope for the advanced student to make fast progress, because there is a tendency to teach at the pace of the middle of the class, neglecting the two ends. This is only because of a lack of support. Primary schoolteachers have far more students an hour than most secondary schoolteachers have, and therefore they have to give their attention to the average student.

Original Commonwealth funding to secondary schools for resource centres and libraries was experimental. The Australian Government adopted very high standards, above those of the United States of America, in setting standards for Australian secondary schools, but I believe that in 1969-70 (and I said so several times), it was approaching the problem from the middle and it would have been better to have approached the problem from either end, by which primary schoolchildren would get the best resource centres so that they could be trained and equipped for work at secondary schools, or for teachers colleges to obtain initial help so that at least there would be adequate staff available for schools. There was a tremendous dearth of librarians in those early years when resource centres were being established in South Australian schools. Obviously there is a need for continuing finance, especially for primary schools. Our secondary schools are well-equipped by Australian standards and possibly by world standards from what I saw during a trip overseas last year.

It is necessary for State and Federal Governments to co-operate in providing advanced communication systems not only in schools but also throughout the library systems in Australia. We need to be able to disseminate this tremendously rapid burgeoning of information: literally thousands of books alone are published every year, and

people need to have rapid access to that information, if they are to gain benefit from modern publications. The Statutes alone in Parliaments are a maze of confused information—

Mr. Gunn: Particularly with a socialist Government passing legislation.

Mr. ALLISON: I do not make that comment. Which-ever Government passes legislation does not matter, because it has to be related to past legislation. In the South Australian Parliament recently a video film was shown of how European and American Parliaments had equipped themselves with electronic rapid retrieval aids, making legislative decisions quickly available not only to Parliamentarians but to the public, a move towards more open Government, and that is desirable. It is possible now for a doctor in Mount Gambier to apply to the Australian National Library for a Medlars report from the medical centre in Chicago, which co-ordinates medical reports from all over the world. That doctor in Mount Gambier can obtain expertise quickly from Chicago to Canberra, but once the information reaches Canberra there is sometimes a backlog of work of several months. As a result, one Mount Gambier doctor who applied for information on a complex leg operation had to wait only 48 hours for the information to reach Canberra from Chicago, but he then had to wait several weeks for the typist to type the report and send it to him at Mount Gambier. There is need for an integrated communications system in the libraries throughout Australia, and each State needs to co-operate with the Federal Government. The Federal Government needs to be made much more aware of the fact that the communications system is an integral part of modern living, and an important part too.

Underprivileged people in particular are suffering in Australia, and I would commend to all members the Report to the Nation by Pickering and Modra, 1973, commissioned by the Australian Library Promotion Council, on *Library Services to the Disadvantaged*. Librarians are increasingly aware of the need for better library services, but they need Parliamentary help to ensure that the public gets the sort of assistance it needs in libraries and communications. The Pickering and Modra report commented on underprivileged children, Aborigines, migrants, aged who cannot leave home, the blind, the hospitalised, prisoners, and many groups of people who need assistance apart from the man in the street. The librarians are well aware of the needs, and I hope all Parliamentarians at State and Federal level will ensure that assistance is given to them in their good work.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): Last week, in speaking in the Address in Reply debate, I referred to the need for a water reticulation service in the Watervale area, and publicity has been given to this need in the press recently. For 30 years, without success, people in this area have been seeking such a service. A report in the *Advertiser* of August 7, 1976, states:

The town rallied to a meeting on Wednesday night to plan ways to "force" water into itself following the latest refusal by the South Australian Government to connect it to a reticulated system.

"We've been trying for 30 years to get water to Watervale," said Councillor W. G. Parker, a Watervale grazier. He is the local representative on the Saddleworth and Auburn District Council.

"Only six kilometres away from Watervale is a collector tank for the Auburn water supply—it is big enough for our town as well if only they would put in the pipes," Mr. Parker said.

"You know, the letter we get back from the Minister of Works (Mr. Corcoran) looks like a photostat copy of the ones we've been getting all these years—only the figures and dates are different."

It is because of this that I bring this matter before the House. It is a grapegrowing region, with increasing areas being planted to vines. The Quelltaler winery, for example, has 347 hectares in this area, of which 242 ha is under vines: 48 ha of the remainder would be useful for this purpose and when planting is completed more land will be sought for vines.

This industry has 45 permanent employees. During the pruning period an additional 20 persons are employed for rod tying etc., and in the picking season up to 200 people are employed for 7 days a week. Often, the services of members of sporting clubs in the area are called on at times convenient to them to assist with picking. The *Advertiser* report continues:

The town's biggest industry, the Quelltaler Winery, has shelved plans for a \$1 000 000 expansion until water is piped to the town.

"We can't spend that kind of money if the Government will not guarantee us suitable supplies of water," the winery secretary (Mr. F. A. Osborne) said yesterday.

The organisation intends to develop, or to double the existing industry in the next ten years. Without water I am sure it will be reluctant to implement the proposed plans; in fact, without water it would be difficult for the company to consider this extension. The winery has acquired the only hotel in Watervale. Until recently water had to be carted by tractor and tanker some considerable distance: about 72 368 litres a week was used, and it was almost a constant job for one man to cart water. A bore was sunk at a cost of \$3 500, but water from that bore is unsuitable for drinking although suitable for showering. In addition, a local storekeeper has approached me and stressed the need for a water supply, not only for his personal use, but for the potential development of the town. Many other growers are located in the area, and the seasonal employment situation would be similar to that applying to the Quelltaler organisation.

Last Wednesday evening a public meeting was held and attended by 52 people representing most families in the area, and there was unanimous acceptance that there should be a reticulated water service in the Watervale area. This has not always been the case. During the years some people would not have approved of such a service, but today people in the area are unanimous, especially as in this year of drought, there is a greater need for such a supply. I thank the Government for conducting a survey on this matter. The Minister has written to me and to organisations in the area stating that a service would cost \$550 000; that maintenance costs would be \$7 650 a year; and that revenue would fall short of expenditure by \$4 670. The Minister finishes his letter with this sentence:

Therefore I am sure you will appreciate that a supply of water to Watervale cannot economically be justified and, consequently, cannot be considered at this time.

I again stress that this country area would develop, and I am sure the Housing Trust would be interested in it if there were a reticulated water service. It is an area to which people would come, and there is potential to develop existing industries, one of which would at least double in the next ten years. Yet the Government states that for economic reasons, it is not justified in introducing this service. The Government is more interested in Monarto, to which no industry has indicated it will move, and to which few people are interested in going. It would be better if the Government was interested in country areas, and in decentralisation, where there is established industry and the potential for expansion, and where houses could be built and people would come to

live. It is not a matter of considering money for present purposes; it is the long-term future that must be considered. In my opinion, money would be far better spent in this area than being wasted on a scheme such as Monarto.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I welcome the opportunity to take part in this debate. Principally, I want to speak about the Commonwealth's takeover of non-metropolitan South Australian railways. As recently as this morning the *Advertiser's* headlines highlight the possibility that the agreement may not proceed. People would view that statement with mixed feelings. In the Address in Reply debate I had much to say about the agreement. Today, I read with much interest that Mr. Nixon (Commonwealth Minister for Transport) has almost copied the words I used in that debate when he described the agreement with South Australia as "crook" and said that Tasmania was "bad eggs" because that railway system was the worst in Australia.

Why did South Australia want to get rid of its railways? It was because the railways were running at a deficit of about \$40 000 000. We all know that the Treasurer has stated that the deal would be worth \$800 000 000 to South Australia over 10 years. When he announced that he also said that if South Australia could bring off this deal, we would almost be set for life and would not have to go to the Commonwealth Government for funds, would be severed from the Grants Commission, and that South Australia would be on the road to recovery.

Mr. Arnold: Didn't he say they sold off the paddocks?

Mr. VENNING: Yes. It was highlighted at the time the South Australian Government sold a back paddock for political purposes, and that next week or next year another paddock would be sold so that, paddock by paddock, the South Australian Government would hand over South Australia's assets to the Commonwealth Government. The deal was shonky from beginning to end, and that is just being highlighted now. Much concern in the northern areas of the State has been expressed about the rumour that the Gladstone to Wilmington and the Peterborough to Quorn railway lines are to be closed. That rumour was the outcome of a report undertaken by a Commonwealth Government employee, who came to South Australia to examine the economic situation of those two services. He recommended in his report to Mr. Nixon they should be closed but the social aspects associated with closing the two services were not considered. I believe that all aspects involved with the closing of those services should have been considered before a statement was made.

Last week I attended a meeting at Murraytown in relation to this matter. A similar meeting will be held at Booleroo Centre on Wednesday evening of this week. Another meeting was held at Orroroo. People in the northern parts of the State are concerned about the possibility of these services being closed. I was interested to hear the suggestion that the services should be standardised because, it was stated, that with narrow gauge, the services are isolated from the remainder of the South Australian Railways system. It has been said that, if the line were standardised, stock could be put on the train at Wilmington and would have a straight through run to the metropolitan abattoir. Grain movements from Wilmington and Quorn on standard gauge could go to the terminal port at Port Pirie without being held up for transshipping at Peterborough and Gladstone.

On July 28, I asked the Minister of Transport a question about this matter. After about five minutes of hoo-hah, the Minister replied to the question, which

related to the position of the South Australian Government if the Commonwealth wished to close the services knowing that the transfer agreement provided that, before any railway line could be closed, the State Minister must be consulted. If he were not satisfied and it was not agreed, the matter must go to arbitration. In his reply, the Minister finally stated:

As far as the South Australian Government was concerned the line would stay open.

Since then the member for Semaphore has asked a question of the Minister about the progress on the Commonwealth agreement, particularly in relation to employees' superannuation, etc. The Minister had much to say, as follows:

I regret that I am unable to advise the honourable member of the actual date of transfer. Regrettably, I do not think as much effort as should have been put into the matter has been applied in order to resolve outstanding problems. When the transfer was being negotiated, principally between the former Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam) and the Premier (Mr. Dunstan), and to a lesser extent between the former Minister for Transport (Mr. Jones) and me, several safeguards were demanded by South Australia.

That is another aspect of the shonky deal. Something is sold to someone, but it is tied up with so many strings that it is not a deal at all. The Minister's reply continued:

Amongst those safeguards was a provision that no employee of the South Australian Railways would be disadvantaged as a result of the transfer. This is a simple matter that should have been understood by everyone, and one that the South Australian Government not only insisted on, but has since demanded should be honoured.

It amazes me that, in an agreement between friends at that time—the South Australian Labor Government and the Federal A.L.P.—this matter was not included. With a change of Federal Government, South Australia is really bitching about the whole matter. The South Australian Government had the opportunity to straighten out the matter and to sign the agreement when its Commonwealth colleagues were in power, yet the agreement has not been signed.

The report in today's newspaper indicates that there are difficulties about whether the agreement will continue. I wonder what the people of South Australia will think and say if it does not continue. If there is any truth in what the Treasurer had to say about the value of the deal to South Australia, if what he said were true, I am sure South Australians will be concerned. The sum of \$800 000 000 is just so much poppycock. We believe it was a book entry of about \$10 000 000 initially, and that the \$790 000 000 is still to be considered. Last year I asked the Treasurer how he arrived at this remarkable sum. It is interesting, when one considers what has happened, to note that the Treasurer could make up the figure by transferring to the Commonwealth the railway's losses over a period. He believed that that transfer was worth \$800 000 000 to South Australia.

What a method of financing the State when the State's income is worked out by the money saved by selling something to someone else to which so many strings are attached! It is just wanting the best of both worlds. I told the Minister last week that the scheme will not work. I will watch with much interest to see how the transfer agreement will finish up between the A.L.P. Government in this State and a responsible Liberal Federal Government.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): When one reads in today's *News* headlines such as "Slaughter relief scheme by the Government", one must read between the words of journalism to ascertain what is actually involved in the scheme, but one does not find much at all. The report states:

A Government-financed scheme to allow farmers to slaughter and dispose of drought-affected stock in their own districts was announced today by the Agriculture Minister, Mr. Chatterton. This means hundreds of thousands of sheep and cattle in drought-affected areas of South Australia will be slaughtered and the carcasses either buried or burnt.

How can anyone be so presumptuous as to make that statement?

Dr. Eastick: You never find any body in his statements.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have taken the trouble to contact councils in my area and, although this proposal requires that they be the active agent in the scheme, it does not seem that they have been consulted. They are asking, "Are we going to be paid to dig holes? Do we dig one big hole in the district? Do we go on each farmer's property and dig holes? It will cost a lot more if we do that. On what basis will we be paid? How do we apply for reimbursement?" It seems that this is a scheme, like many others, of plenty of window dressing without much in it, or a puff of wind without any substance. The assistance asked for by the growers' association is not this scheme. The Minister, in replying to my question, said that the scheme had been arranged by agreement with the grower organisations, but that is not true. They discussed it with the Minister last Friday afternoon, put forward certain proposals, and were told that the Government would need further assurances before it could agree to them. One assurance was from the Stock Salesmen's Association to the effect that, in the event of there being a slaughter bounty, the stock salesmen would be responsible for counting the heads; another agreement was that local government would be willing to undertake the scheme.

What the Government should have done to show its sincerity in this matter was agree to pay a token bounty of 50c for sheep and \$5 for cattle, as put to it by the grower organisations. This would give the producers the incentive to take some action and it would indicate (and I put this seriously) to the producers how seriously the Government viewed the whole situation. To ask people to dispose of their stock under this system is so much wasted paper as far as the press headlines are concerned. I cannot see farmers taking advantage of a scheme such as this, because there is nothing in it for them. They might as well let the cattle and sheep die in the paddocks and take their chances, thereby breeding not only disease but also crows, foxes, and other pests.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: You would rather do that than have them shot and buried, would you?

Mr. NANKIVELL: They will not be shot and buried. If the Minister thinks the scheme will work, he is fooling himself. It will not work unless people are induced to take action; unless inducements are given, the Government will be seen to be not serious about the matter. I quote briefly from the *Agriculture Report*, the official monthly publication of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department, as follows:

Agricultural production in South Australia has reached a state of crisis with the continuation of the dry seasonal conditions during July . . . Crop area down: only about 55 per cent of the original total anticipated crop area for the State has been sown to date . . . If good rains are not received early in August, the drought may well be one of the worst rural disasters in South Australia's history.

It inevitably will be, if we look ahead and see what are the prospects. On the law of averages, this season will finish about the end of October or in November; in a good season, that would be the case, and that is what we normally expect. Unless there were abnormal periods of summer rainfall, it would be normal to expect no break

in the season until next year. There is little feed in the best grazing areas of the State, and what there is is being hard bitten. There is no hay, and the State's grain reserves are down. The member for Flinders drew attention to this matter earlier today, and I support his view. I understand that no discussions were held between the organisations and the Government about the retention of grain in the case of emergency. We have a national problem as well as a farmer problem. The Minister for the Environment should know that, if we allow our stock to continue moving around as they are doing (eating every blade of grass and even causing soil erosion), the situation will be very critical when we reach our normal dry summer period.

There is not only the problem we see at present of dealing with this situation but the problem of what will happen in this period beyond what we now see as the normal season. Unless something is done now to encourage people to get rid of surplus stock (stock which is other than breeding stock and which is not fit enough for market in the foreseeable future), we will find ourselves in a critical situation as regards breeding stock in the country owing to the short supply of feed and, inevitably, we will suffer next year from low lambing returns (they were low enough this year) and from having few surplus stock available for sale in the community. There is money in Government departments' funds, because less than about 50 per cent of the beef aid money is being used. About \$3 000 000 is virtually untouched and about \$1 000 000 that has been provided for the transport subsidy on fodder and agistment of stock delivered is unused. Also, rural reconstruction money is allocated to the State on an annual basis, and matching money from the Federal Government, after we have spent \$1 500 000 from State funds, is available. So, we can take some action now. Let us not pretend that the scheme will be effective, because it is only the tip of the iceberg to introduce a stock disposal scheme.

Once the stock are destroyed (one has to remember that there is the problem of re-establishing and restocking if stock are available), there will be a need for massive financial assistance for drought rehabilitation. I suggest that the damage could be reduced and considerable alleviation given to the problem if action were taken now. It is no good worrying about it when it is too late. There is a crisis situation. We are almost past the point of no return and, unless some action is taken quickly to encourage producers to dispose of their surplus stock and unless action is taken by the Government to prove that it is sincere about this exercise and is not just playing politics, there will be serious repercussions not only for the primary producers but for the State as a whole, including people who live in the metropolitan area, for whose sake I hope it rains; otherwise, we will hear problems raised by Government members about someone having to stop using a hose because of water restrictions.

This is a serious situation. Nine months led up to this present dry situation, and we could be faced with another nine dry months before any prospects of a normal break in the season that would give us some hope for the future.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I shall continue from where the member for Mallee left off in relation to the problem of water shortages. On April 8, under the headline "South Australia must use Murray more" a report in the *Advertiser* stated:

One of Australia's leading authorities on water resources yesterday called for an unrelenting campaign to increase the allocation of River Murray water to South Australia. Professor J. W. Holmes, a professor of earth sciences at

Flinders University, said the River Murray would continue to be South Australia's main source of water. "That South Australia, through which runs the largest river in Australia, is short of water is a political statement," he said.

I fully agree: it is a political statement. In most years, a vast quantity of water flows through South Australia. We have a guaranteed entitlement under the River Murray Waters Act, and unfortunately the development of this State is limited by that entitlement. Professor Holmes said that South Australia should proceed with an unrelenting campaign to increase its entitlement. Since the decision to proceed with the Dartmouth storage, we have heard little from the Government about further storages on the Murray River system to increase our entitlement.

There is no doubt that this is South Australia's greatest water resource and that we depend on it, at times, for up to 80 per cent of our total water requirements. It is the responsibility of the State Government to continue an unrelenting campaign; unfortunately, in the past five or six years, we have heard little of it from the Government. The Minister has said at times that the matter is continually under consideration by the River Murray Commission, but it is the Government of South Australia that must initiate and forge ahead with this campaign, because South Australia has the greatest benefits to be derived from increased water storages and entitlements. Victoria and New South Wales have other rivers and tributaries flowing into the Murray River which are the sovereign right of the States concerned. Consequently, those States are assured of far greater quantities of water than is South Australia. The article is pertinent in that we must continue this campaign for additional storages to increase our entitlement.

Under the Water Resources Act and the regulations made under the Act, provision is made for the diversion of water from the Murray River. In the main, the regulations have been designed for ease of administration. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is more a department of engineers than of administrators. Whilst it is extremely important to have an engineering department with the ability to provide water resources and to build the necessary diversion works and dams, it is vitally important to have administration of those resources equal in expertise to the engineering section. Under the regulations, a divertee is granted a permit to divert a given quantity of water in a 12-month period. We have had numerous examples in the past two or three years of the river's having been in flood for six months of the year, but by the end of the year the Minister has prosecuted divertees for using more than their allocation of water.

In periods of free flow, the prosecution of a divertee for using more than his allocation of water is nonsensical and unjust. There is no way in which the Government can justify prosecuting such a person if the State has had more than its allocation and if at no time during the 12-month period has it been on its allocated flow for a given month. This can be overcome, but it needs greater administration. If the divertee's allocation of water could be divided into the 12 months of the year on the same basis as the South Australian allocation is divided, giving a monthly allocation, he should be held to that monthly allocation of water only in months of restricted flow.

If, for example, South Australia was on its entitlement for the month of July, the divertee would be held to his quota for that month. The imposition of the monthly allocation would be for the Minister to determine from month to month. The divertee should be held to his monthly quota, plus a percentage of that quota determined

by the Minister after considering the total diversion demands as against the State's allocation for the month only in months of declared restricted flow. This would go a long way to overcoming the problems and making the utmost use of the water available in this State. To prosecute someone for using more than his permitted quota of water when the river is in flood or when the State has not been on a restricted flow is without justice.

Putting this proposal into effect would require much more administration, and this is something the Minister must face. The department has the capability to carry out this programme and, if put into effect, it would make the diversion of water for all purposes far more equitable. The benefits that would be derived would be seen in many directions, in horticulture, in agriculture, or simply in water use in the metropolitan area or country towns. No matter to what use water may be put, there is undoubtedly a method by which we can make greater use of the water available.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I have a great interest in the subject dealt with by the member for Mallee, and I will take it up in another debate. I also have a keen interest in the subject dealt with by the member for Chaffey, but I want to refer in this debate to the Swanport Road bridge and the problem that has arisen in relation to it. Members will recall that about 18 months or two years ago the Public Works Committee recommended the construction of the bridge. The new Swanport Road bridge is about 5 kilometres downstream from Murray Bridge. It will be the longest bridge in South Australia and, at a cost of about \$9 000 000, it will probably be the most expensive.

The bridge consists of earthen approaches, abutments, and nine piers. A contract for \$1 750 000 was let almost a year ago for the abutments and the piers. The completion of the bridge and of six or seven kilometres of new freeway will result in the road by-passing Murray Bridge. However, a problem of subsidence has occurred on this project, and this problem has not previously been encountered by the constructing authority or the Highways Department.

I am indebted to the member for Gouger, who has drawn to my attention the schedule for the 1976-77 National Road Construction Programme wherein it is stated that expenditure of \$3 130 000 for the Swanport deviation, including about 9.5 kilometres of freeway, is apparently sanctioned. Certainly, that allocation will be important for the construction and completion of that section of freeway.

The subsidence problem, which has not previously been encountered by the Highways Department, concerns the swamp at the edge of the Murray River in this area. Leading to the spans across the water there is an approach of about .4 km over which there is some land-fill and the remaining piers for the bridge. At least five piers will be built before the water's edge is reached. It has been necessary to pump surplus water from this area where the piers are to be constructed in order to drive in the piles and prepare the large 2.4 m circumference piles, constructed of 1.9 cm thick steel. The water is pumped from the piles, which will be finally filled with concrete. A basic problem that is encountered is finding a suitable base for these piers, which will go down 18 m, 21 m or 24 m. In some instances the granite boulders have not been sufficiently large or stable enough, or have been too scattered or not grouped together sufficiently under the black mud to take the pressures and weights that will be

expected of them to hold the bridge. With the pumping of water 18 m down since about last February or March, land up to .8 km away has subsided.

In order for swamps to be irrigated, they must be reasonably level. Water is let into the swamps from the edge of the river and it floods at an even depth across the whole swamp. Any surplus water runs into a salt channel, flows to a pumping station, and is pumped back into the Murray River. Unlike what most honourable members believe, the water is not pumped across the swamp flats but flows across naturally, because the ground at the river bank is higher than the ground at the back of the swamp.

Dr. Eastick: It is a reverse flow.

Mr. WARDLE: Yes. Because of subsidence resulting from the pumping out of water for the piles (the subsidence is up to .5 m) it is impossible for dairy farmers to irrigate their swamps, because the water merely congregates and forms large dams. In one instance 7 ha is affected out of 18 ha, and in another instance 16 ha is affected out of 32 ha or 36 ha. This is a serious problem. The local paper reports that two dairy farmers are facing bankruptcy because of this problem.

I have been working on this problem for long enough to know how many public servants, assessors, and representatives of insurance companies (even as far away as London) have worked diligently to solve this problem. I would like to see the Treasurer and Minister of Transport take a personal interest in this problem to assist and speed up further assistance for these two dairy farmers. The press report that mentions their near bankruptcy goes on to say that one of the farmers has lost \$13 600 of actual income in the last financial year, and his costs have increased by \$8 000, making a total loss of about \$22 000. In the other instance there has been a loss of about half this sum.

The two people concerned have put all their life's savings into their farms, and they and their wives and families have worked hard to pay for the properties. They have sought to improve them and now find this unexpected situation. I appreciate what has been done and the interest shown by public servants in this problem, but this situation requires the special interest of the Treasurer and the Minister because of the special decisions required from Treasury, as it is only such decisions that can provide support for these farmers.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I wish to raise two matters. First, I wish to reply to the misleading information given to this House by the Minister of Transport recently in reply to a Question on Notice. I had intended to direct my question to the Minister for the Environment, who was making silly statements about environmental impact studies on the Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway line. In his reply, the Minister of Transport made outrageous statements based on rumour without any facts at all. One would expect a Minister at least to contact his Canberra counterpart, Mr. Nixon. Obviously, the Minister does not know how to use a telephone or write a letter.

Dr. Eastick: He should have rung Charlie Jones.

Mr. GUNN: Yes.

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

Mr. GUNN: The Minister replied to my question about the Tarcoola railway line on August 3. On July 29, I received the following letter from the Commonwealth Minister for Transport, the Hon. Peter Nixon:

You will be aware that the Treasurer announced on May 20, that a review would be carried out of the construction . . . of the standard gauge Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway. In the meantime work on the project is continuing. In fact a major contract was recently let for construction of earthworks, bridges, and culverts for the second stage of this railway, from Robin Rise to Marla Bore.

If the Minister was aware of the situation, he would know that the contract was let to two South Australian construction companies. If the Minister were to take the trouble to go to Tarcoola and look at the railway line himself, he would know that tremendous progress has been made on that line, and that it is a credit to the people building it. It ill behoves the South Australian Minister to try to make cheap political capital out of this project by telling untruths and by failing properly to inform himself of the exact position. What he is trying to do is put fear in the minds of my constituents. I have properly informed them about the situation, and intend to keep in contact with Mr. Nixon, because it is obvious there is no point in contacting the South Australian Minister, because he does not know, does not want to know, or is interested only in making cheap political capital out of this important project.

Mr. Whitten: Did you watch television this evening?

Mr. GUNN: I am not interested. We all know that the member for Price hates farmers, but I will deal with him in my Address in Reply speech. I now refer to the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, Mr. Chatterton.

Mr. Becker: The farmers' friend!

Mr. GUNN: Yes, the collective farmer. Recently, I placed a Question on Notice to the Minister in relation to the problems being experienced by the Abalone Divers Association. I do not know whether members opposite are aware that several deputations have met the Minister, that letters have been written to him asking him to adopt a far more reasonable attitude towards this section of our managed fisheries.

Mr. Whitten: Allowing them to make a profit out of selling their licences.

Mr. GUNN: They want the right as anyone else has in managed fisheries—to sell their licences. They are entitled to that right. It is not unfair or unjust: it is only proper that they be given that right. It is a most dangerous industry. Divers have spent much money, and are entitled to that right. Divers in Tasmania are allowed to transfer their licences when they sell their equipment.

Mr. Evans: Tasmania has an A.L.P. Government, too.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, but it is not quite under the control of the same left wing element that runs the Labor Party in this State—the Trades and Labor Council.

Mr. Whitten: Do you want to be able to sell your driver's licence?

Mr. GUNN: Your friends Mr. Apap, John Scott, and other people who are dedicated socialists dictate to this Government—

Mr. Rodda: Are they the bosses?

Mr. GUNN: Yes. I have written to the Tasmanian Minister, and look forward to receiving his reply. I also wrote to the Western Australian Minister for Fisheries and Wildlife, Mr. P. V. Jones, a far more reasonable gentleman than the South Australian Minister: this is what he stated in his reply:

In your letter of July 19, you asked me if holders of abalone licences are permitted to sell their permits with their equipment when they leave the industry. The abalone fishery in this State is a limited entry fishery.

It is the same in South Australia. The letter continues:

A person wishing to leave the industry may propose a prospective buyer for his equipment as a person to take over his licence. Subject to that prospective buyer meeting criteria for entry into the industry and expressing satisfaction with the price being asked for the equipment the department will give approval to the transaction. There is no definition of the value of the licence as such but obviously there is some loading in the price of the equipment.

Two Governments in this country are willing to be realistic towards these people. The reason is that only a small number of people is involved, and this Government has set out to penalise them. The Government is not giving them a fair go. I can assure the House—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: How do you reckon—

Mr. GUNN: —that, with the election of a Liberal Government, these—

Mr. Whitten: When?

Mr. GUNN: —people will receive justice.

Mr. Slater: Hope springs eternal.

Mr. GUNN: I am not surprised at the attitude of the immediate past Secretary of the Australian Labor Party. We know the sort of gentleman he is. He expelled Mr. Harradine, who is now laughing at the Labor Party. Who will the honourable member expel next? That was his crowning glory. However, Mr. Harradine was elected to the Senate over Senator Everett, a previous Deputy Premier of Tasmania. I now refer to the problems faced by a constituent who is conducting a medical practice at Elliston.

Mr. Slater: Can you sell medical practitioners' licences.

Mr. GUNN: The practitioner to whom I refer provides an excellent service to constituents in my area, but there is not a resident chemist in the area. A chemist shop is located at Port Lincoln, about 170 kilometres south of Elliston, and another at Streaky Bay, about 145 kilometres west of Elliston. If anyone is prescribed drugs by the doctor, he must take his prescription to Port Lincoln or Streaky Bay, and that situation is unsatisfactory.

The Leader of the Opposition and I have written to the Federal Minister for Health (Mr. Hunt). I hope sincerely that the South Australian Government will also contact the Federal Minister to add support to the problems faced by my constituent. I have raised the matter, because I believe it is a matter that should be aired. In his reply to Dr. Tonkin—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Why didn't you write to our Minister?

Mr. GUNN: I did, and I intend to send him a copy of this letter.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You didn't say so.

Mr. GUNN: Mr. Hunt stated:

I refer again to your personal representations on behalf of Dr. D. M. Pritchard of Elliston . . . in respect of her application for approval under section 92 of the National Health Act to supply pharmaceutical benefits in the Elliston area. In view of your representations, I have arranged for Dr. Pritchard's case to be re-examined . . . Obviously, the South Australian Minister of Health's officers are aware of the problem, and I hope sincerely that they will support the representations made by Dr. Tonkin and me in this matter, because it is a matter that is worrying the doctor. The doctor is providing an excellent service to the people in the area. A problem we in country areas face is attracting doctors to these areas. Elliston has an excellent new hospital and an excellent doctor. If the facilities requested could be made available,

it would be a great assistance to the doctor concerned and my constituents. I will have one or two other comments to make about this Government when I speak in the Address in Reply debate.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The two points I raise relate mainly to the obvious red herring that has been created in some sections of the media, aided and abetted no doubt by Mr. Laurie Oakes of the *Age* in Melbourne and by the man who is trying to re-establish his credibility as Leader of the Australian Labor Party, none other than Whitlam.

Mr. Gunn: Gorgeous Gough!

Mr. BECKER: Call him what you like. He has just returned from his last trip to the ruins overseas. Whilst he was away his colleagues had to put up with a fair bit of trouble on the home front and carry the day for the Party. Now Mr. Whitlam is back, he has decided that it is about time he should get on with belting the Liberals. We are experiencing this belting of the Liberals, and obviously what has happened regarding the South Australian railways transfer agreement is that Whitlam and Oakes have put this red herring up to try to discredit the Federal Government, including, of course, the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon).

We know that our Minister of Transport does not like Mr. Nixon, because Mr. Nixon does not pull punches and he has shown that certain statements by the State Minister of Transport regarding my district are completely untrue. We find old news being revamped by a flagging Whitlam image, and Mr. Whitlam would have been better to stay overseas looking at the ruins or to try to patch up the earthquake in China.

Mr. Dean Brown: He could have been part of it.

Mr. BECKER: We would not want that to happen to him, but he could have done Australia a better service there. We are concerned about employees of what was the South Australian Railways. A letter that I received this morning from a constituent states:

Re the transfer of the South Australian Railways to the Commonwealth.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You left that subject fairly quickly.

Mr. BECKER: I can go on if the Minister wishes, but I am referring now to the real crux of the issue.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You've put yourself in the noose.

Mr. BECKER: A red herring has been used to stir up the history of the railways transfer agreement. This evening's *News* explains the whole issue. I am dealing with employment conditions in the railways, and my constituent's letter states:

I refer to the attached photograph, copies of items appearing in the *News* of August 4, 1976, and the *Advertiser* of August 5, 1976. I am a salaried officer and have been employed by the South Australian Railways continuously since 1940 and I have fully contributed to the South Australian Superannuation Fund during my 36 years service. It is vital to me and my family that I am not disadvantaged as a result of the proposed rail transfer, and I am most concerned that I will be, especially in regard to superannuation entitlement for which I presently contribute. I particularly refer to the last paragraphs of the newspaper reports attached. As a member of your constituency will you please advise me your viewpoint on this subject, and will you also indicate what action the Liberal Party in South Australia is prepared to take to ensure that no South Australian railway worker will be disadvantaged by the transfer to the Commonwealth.

This afternoon the member for Gouger received replies to questions that he had asked of the Minister of Transport on this matter. One question was:

What will be the amount transferred by the trustees of the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust to the Superannuation Board of Australia or any substituted body, in compliance with section 15 of the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Act, 1975?

The Minister replied:

The superannuation arrangements for the State employees who transfer to the Australian National Railways Commission are still the subject of negotiation between the parties. Until such arrangement has been finalised, there will be no basis upon which an appropriate figure can be calculated.

It is 12 months since the debate on the transfer was dealt with in this Parliament and the railways transferred, and employees who have given many years of service (in my constituent's case, 36 years) do not know their position regarding superannuation. That is deplorable, and obviously the Minister of Transport is not doing what he promised us during that debate that he would do, because members on this side, including members of my Party, were concerned that employees would not lose and that their superannuation entitlements would be at least improved. What happens in free enterprise when there is a merger or an amalgamation is obvious. A new fund is started and employees either start in the new fund or are credited for their membership of the previous fund: no employee loses. Obviously, this State Government is trying to duck the issue.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Those agreements were made by Labor Governments.

Mr. BECKER: Yes, and, unfortunately, they were not any good. If the Labor Government in Canberra stood up for the worker, it would have done something for the people employed in the South Australian Railways, but nothing was done when the Labor Government was in office. Now the Labor Party is trying to use a red herring about the transfer so as to bring discredit on the Liberal Federal Government, which is doing a good job. The people know that it is, and Whitlam knows that it is. We are trying to clean up the mess that he caused, but the Labor Party is throwing stories around and getting journalists to leak information to try to discredit Mr. Fraser, and it is not being successful.

In the meantime, railway employees are suffering, and they have every right to know now where they stand regarding their superannuation fund. They should have known about 12 months ago what would be the effect on their families. I fully support my constituent in regard to what he states in his letter. He has been let down badly by all the promises made leading up to the transfer agreement, which brought about the need for an election about 12 months ago. That election was brought forward, because the Government knew that it would not survive nine months later, in March, 1976. There would have been a change of Party on the Government benches here if an election was held then. The whole thing is a discredit to the Minister of Transport and the previous Labor Government in Canberra. Mr. Whitlam and the Labor Party should suffer the backlash. Another question that the member for Gouger asked the Minister of Transport in relation to this matter was:

Have the South Australian Railways officers and employees been kept informed of current negotiations in the implementation of the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Act, 1975, and, if not, why not?

The reply was:

Yes, discussions have been held with the South Australian representative on no less than 15 occasions during the past four months.

Still we have this uncertainty and the question mark over the heads of those employed in the South Australian Railways, the country section of which is to come under the control of the Australian National Railways Commission. I appeal to this Government to do all it can (and I will be appealing to the Federal Government) to ensure that those affected by this transfer agreement will have their superannuation entitlement settled as soon as possible, with no employee being disadvantaged. I hope that we can expedite the negotiations and get a proper deal for the employees.

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): I refer to a matter that I raised by way of question on June 9 this year, regarding insurance. I asked the Treasurer:

Can the Premier say why it is required that, before State Bank and Savings Bank loans are approved, house and contents and/or farm buildings must be insured with the State Government Insurance Commission, and whether this constitutes a breach of the Trade Practices Act?

Dr. Eastick: It's all part of the Big Brother movement.

Mr. BOUNDY: That is right. Later, I referred to part of a letter that a constituent had shown me regarding an application for a mortgage loan from the Savings Bank of South Australia, on the credit foncier system. Part of the letter states:

Important: prior to the first advance on the loan the buildings must be insured with the State Government Insurance Commission in the names of the bank and yourself for at least \$X under a policy covering houseowner's and householder's risk and the certificate of insurance lodged with the bank.

I emphasise two things: first, the word used in the clause marked "Important" is "must"; and secondly, the certificate of insurance must be lodged with the bank. The owner of the house cannot hold the certificate of insurance, even if he owns most of the asset. My question was replied to by the Deputy Premier (in the absence of the Treasurer), who said that he did not believe that he could give me an off-the-cuff reply. The Minister said that the Treasurer would reply to me by letter, possibly before the House rose, but he did not think that it constituted a breach of the Trade Practices Act. That was on June 9. On July 12, I received a letter from the Treasurer.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Were you a member of the Liberal Party or the Liberal Movement?

Mr. BOUNDY: I was in the Liberal Party then. I believe that the Treasurer replied by letter so that the reply would not find its way into *Hansard*. The Treasurer's letter states:

I refer to a question you asked of the Premier in the House of Assembly on June 9, 1976, concerning the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia requiring borrowers to insure with the State Government Insurance Commission.

The State Bank does not require buildings, erected or to be erected, on a property against the security of which it approves a loan, to be insured with the State Government Insurance Commission. However, except in cases involving commercial and industrial buildings, it is a condition of approval of term loans under the State Bank Act and the Advances to Settlers Act and from Home Builders Account funds that all buildings and other erections on the relevant properties be insured with the Bank's Insurance Fund constituted under section 78 of the State Bank Act, 1925-1975.

There is similar provision in section 85 of the Advances for Homes Act for cover to be effected in relation to advances made under that Act.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: But you voted for that legislation, didn't you?

Mr. BOUNDY: The Treasurer's letter continues:

Premium rates in respect to both insurance funds are closely related to those charged by the State Government Insurance Commission, which compare favourably with rates applied by other insurers.

In the case of overdraft advances a free choice of companies is available but, as a matter of policy, the attention of borrowers is drawn to the facilities provided by the State Government Insurance Commission.

Mr. Abbott: And very good facilities they are.

Mr. BOUNDY: The word is "must" in the letter, and that really draws my constituent's attention to the commission. The letter continues:

The bank advised the Trade Practices Commission of its procedures in respect to insurance requirements, and no objection has been raised.

So, the bank thinks that it is in the clear. The Treasurer's letter continues:

Following the announcement by the Commonwealth Banking Corporation that it was introducing its own insurance scheme covering homes mortgaged to that bank at substantially lower rates than those normally available to the general public, an insurance offer was made to the trustees of the Savings Bank of South Australia by the State Government Insurance Commission.

That sounds like a restrictive trade practice to me. The letter continues:

The main basis of the offer was that, if the bank would make insurance with the commission a condition of all future mortgages, the commission would provide conditions of insurance to mortgagors at least comparable to those offered by the Commonwealth Banking Corporation.

That is meeting the competition. The Treasurer's letter continues:

It was realised by the bank's trustees that, if the bank were to retain its competitive position in the savings market, which is influenced to some degree by comparative mortgage loan conditions, it should accept the offer. The proposal offered substantial advantages to the bank's borrowing customers.

The decision to accept the State Government Insurance Commission's offer was made by the bank's trustees. The Savings Bank is free to act in the same way as any other lending institution in requiring borrowers to insure with a nominated insurer. This is a widely accepted practice which has been given interim authorisation by the Trade Practices Commission.

There was a report in the *Advertiser* on July 1, which suggested that the commission may have changed its position on this matter. However, no official advice has been received to confirm this.

This is the punch line, because the letter concludes:

The Government supports the arrangement which has been entered into by the Savings Bank and the State Government Insurance Commission which passes no commission to the bank but charges a special low premium rate to borrowers. This is possible because of the very large volume of insurance business involved.

That is all very well for the borrowers, but it is difficult for those who would operate in competition. In the *Advertiser* of July 1, a report of the matter referred to in the Treasurer's letter stated:

The Trade Practices Commission has ruled that permanent building societies must not require borrowers to insure their houses with an insurer nominated by a society. The new ruling will operate from January 1 next year. . . . A commission spokesman said the ruling was a major decision and would have implications for other applications before the commission. "There are applications from about another 50 permanent building societies in all States yet to be considered by the commission," he said.

It seems to me that the Government is making fish of one and flesh of the other and that, to be consistent, the State Bank and Savings Bank will not be able to continue the practice of channelling their insurance to the State Government Insurance Commission.

Dr. Eastick: Nor should they.

Mr. BOUNDY: Nor they should, because it upsets completely the competitive position of the private sector, and that is to be deplored by any responsible Government.

A Liberal Government would ensure that the competitive position was retained.

Mr. Langley: What about life insurance?

Mr. BOUNDY: This situation applies not only in connection with the insurance companies themselves: it is exacerbated by the fact that the Federation Insurance Company offers discounts of 22½ per cent to farmers, I understand. The ruling of the State Bank and Savings Bank precludes a farmer from borrowing money from the Federation Insurance Company, for example, at the same rate as he could get from the State Government Insurance Commission. This matter is to be deplored, and this anomaly should be rectified forthwith.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I will say something about triangulation.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I am surprised that you can even say it!

Mr. RODDA: Triangulation has altered slightly recently, and the announcement made last Thursday has put a different slant on it. Perhaps it should be called the iron triangle, because it has had its representation clipped somewhat. That is in keeping with what has taken place in the green triangle, which is significant, because nothing has taken place down there for some time despite all the promises that were made about this part of the State. I do not want to do anyone an injustice by saying that they were promises, but we had rosy discussions to the effect that there would be about 100 000 people in that part of South Australia by 1985, I think, and that would have been significant, had we made the progress with the count of heads we had expected.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: How are you going to go down there?

Mr. RODDA: The stark fact is how well we will go. However, we have gone. What an elementary question for a former Minister to ask. In that part of the State, there is an enormous potential; it has the resources and it has a commodity that is more important than gold: plenty of water. That is the first ingredient that makes for the establishment of a city. The Government has spent much time at Monarto. Indeed, it seems to be falling into some form of disrepute in this respect.

In the few minutes available to me, I should like to raise the question of the green triangle. I remember the Treasurer's making loud pronouncements in Melbourne in conjunction with that State's former Premier, Sir Henry Bolte; in unison they would convert the green triangle into the green square, a development that would take in Portland. This is that part of the State that could make a real contribution to the productivity that Australia and the whole world sorely need. All the promises that we have heard regarding the green triangle, namely, that we would see existing towns developing further or even new towns springing up like mushrooms, have not eventuated.

I now refer to water resources, a matter to which the member for Light referred this afternoon. Members opposite are not unacquainted with this matter. Recently, the Government announced the names of some of the people who would sit in judgment on the preservation of this State's water resources. The advisory committees have been set up, and one can foresee severe restrictions being placed on the water supplies in a prominent part of my district.

I am not complaining about this, as the new water resources legislation will ensure that water is used efficiently. There will be much argument regarding the use of water, as there are many people who must sit on

their land; because of the lack of finance, they have had to put off the day when they would sink wells and bores for irrigation. They have looked hopefully to the introduction of the water resources legislation, after which the Government could ensure that these resources were shared fairly.

I notice from the August 5 issue of the *Government Gazette* that the people who will settle these arguments have been named. However, I ask why the Water Resources Appeal Tribunal must be content at this stage with an Acting Chairman, who is to be Mr. Gary Frances Hiskey, LL.B., J.P. Has the Government got someone in cold storage to act as Chairman, as a result of which it has appointed an Acting Chairman only? We have seen what happened in the Fisheries Department when we had an acting head of department. The standing members of this committee are to be Mr. Harold Leigh Beaney, a former director of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and Professor Martin Fritz Glaessner. The names of the panel members make interesting reading. I refer, for instance, to Mr. Stephan Oulianoff, Mr. Spiridon Cosmidis, Mr. Frank Walsh and Mr. Ernest Melville Schroeder. I understand that Mr. Walsh is a driller. When one examines the Act, one sees that it provides for the appointment of a person who is a member of the Drilling Examination Committee. I presume that Mr. Schroeder is a representative of industry. Mr. Stephan Oulianoff and Mr. Cosmidis are, I believe, members of the Virginia and Two Wells branch of the Labor Party. Of course, that should not disqualify them. However, those people interested in water conservation and the lodging of appeals are saying that these gentlemen do not have much experience in the wide area of land with which they will be dealing.

I ask the Government what was the panel of names from which these members were drawn. This gives rise to questions regarding the representation on this committee, which is probably one of the most important tribunals that the Government has appointed. It is dealing not only with the States but also with Australia's most limited and valuable resource. The Opposition will want to know the qualifications of these two people. I have been given to understand that they are tomato growers, so they will obviously know something about that aspect of agriculture. However, it is fairly cold comfort to people right throughout the grazing and agricultural areas of the State when the Government appoints two persons who are members of a branch of the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Whitten: What about the other people on the tribunal?

Mr. RODDA: I am referring to the people who represent this State's rural areas. Their qualifications are spelt out in the Act. Both standing members are well qualified, and I understand that the driller, Mr. Walsh, is qualified in his profession. Of course, Mr. Schroeder is a captain of industry. Surely, the Government has some questions to answer about having picked these two persons to whom I have referred to represent landholders from that area.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Recently, the first settled part of South Australia has been involved in great festivity and, amongst other things, Kangaroo Island enjoyed the company of our Treasurer, Mr. Dunstan, who was invited to the island by the local festival organising committee to open re-enactment week and to celebrate the 140th anniversary festivities. It was indeed an interesting evening. About

600 local people congregated on the evening of July 24, to celebrate the beginning of this week of festivities and to hear the Treasurer on one of his few visits to the island. I listened with interest to what the Treasurer had to say. He was introduced by the local mayor, he mounted the platform, and he spoke to the gathering on two subjects; first, the possibility of Kangaroo Island's becoming if not the most attractive tourist venue in South Australia at least one of the most attractive venues; and, secondly, the aesthetic value of Kangaroo Island in the eyes of other South Australians.

The Hon. Mr. Dunstan said that Kangaroo Island was well preserved, that its environment had been well managed and cared for over the 140 years of its occupation, and that it was a great place where hassled and cluttered city dwellers could get away from it all. We had heard such remarks before from mainland visitors and, as islanders, we recognise that it is a great place to live, even though at times it may be a bitch of a place to make a living. But it was disappointing that the Treasurer should come to a highly productive area like Kangaroo Island and fail, in an 18-minute address, to mention the island's primary products. He failed to refer at all to the people who had worked their guts out to produce food and other necessary products for the rest of South Australia and, indeed, the rest of the nation. It was disappointing not only to me but also to most people in the gathering that the Treasurer totally overlooked the real assets that the Kangaroo Island community provides. Admittedly, the island has a few problems. Unfortunately, the media in South Australia have irresponsibly and destructively written up those problems and pulled down the Kangaroo Island community in recent weeks.

Following an episode of tragic incidents, the media unfairly took advantage of the situation and blasted the Kangaroo Island community. As a result of the position of some war service land settlers on the island, the media have again lambasted the community and in the process, intentionally or otherwise, have grossly destroyed our asset valuations and property valuations in the area. It was like a breath of fresh air when I saw that at least one journalist, Stewart Cockburn, had done his homework and stated what it was really like to live on Kangaroo Island. I pay a tribute to Mr. Cockburn for his carefully prepared article in today's *Advertiser*. The well presented article obviously required much research, and it goes a considerable way toward lifting the image of the Kangaroo Island community in the eyes of South Australians generally.

Members will appreciate that I must be careful in connection with the subject of the war service land settlers. Apart from being the member for the area, I am a member of the Land Settlement Committee, which is investigating the position of some of these settlers with a view to reporting on their financial viability. I therefore do not intend to venture too far into this subject, but I pay a tribute to the other members of the committee for the attitude they have adopted during the investigation. Irrespective of their political colour, all members of the Land Settlement Committee, while collecting evidence and inspecting farms, have done their very best, so that, collectively, the committee can present a well researched report. In the meantime, it is essential that a message, hopefully from Ministerial level, be directed to the settlers involved.

During our visit to Kangaroo Island last week it became patently clear that some war service land settlers had ceased to proceed with their ordinary management programmes. We saw large quantities of superphosphate in

sheds on properties, and cattle and sheep requiring urgent attention. It was apparent from the remarks of some settlers that, as a result of no guidance and no confidence, they were not willing to continue working and managing their farms in the ordinary course of their responsibility. A letter from the appropriate Minister to those settlers is indeed overdue. The letter should direct that the management of the farms shall continue and that, in return for the living allowance and other advances under the ordinary budget system, those settlers are obliged to carry on the ordinary course of management of their farms. I hope the Minister will point out in the letter that it must be in the long-term interests of the settlers to carry out that work. I look forward to the company of other members of the Land Settlement Committee as we continue to carry out our duties and investigations, with the aim of reporting to the House in due course.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): Last Friday I had the pleasure of attending the Southern Districts Hills Local Government Association's annual conference at Mount Barker, where many of the problems experienced by local government in this State were discussed. This afternoon, I had the pleasure of attending a reception to His Excellency the Governor at Strathalbyn to mark the amalgamation of the district council and the corporation of the town of Strathalbyn. Again, the same problems were raised during discussions between councillors past and present. Local government in this State today has completely lost its teeth; indeed, they have been pulled out one by one.

Mr. Chapman: With no false ones to replace them.

Mr. WOTTON: That is right. The power that local government has had in the past has been eroded step by step.

Mr. Chapman: It is part of the Government's centralist philosophy.

Mr. WOTTON: Yes, it is.

Mr. Chapman: You don't agree with that, do you?

Mr. WOTTON: I do not agree with the centralist philosophy.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Why don't you leave him alone? He's making a good speech.

Mr. WOTTON: I thank the Minister for his support.
Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen has the floor.

Mr. WOTTON: For some time, local government, State Government, and Federal Government have been regarded as the three tiers of government, local government having been recognised as being the government at the grass roots level.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much interjecting from both sides.

Mr. WOTTON: Because local government has been regarded as the tier of government most closely associated with the people, it must be the most important tier of government, and it is extremely important that this form of government be effective.

Mr. Chapman: Do you think those councillors should go on working for nothing, or should they be paid?

Mr. WOTTON: I do not wish to go into that at this stage; I have more important things to talk about. The lack of authority that local government now suffers, and the lack of incentive, have led to the community's becoming less involved in or less concerned about local government.

Mr. Chapman: Do you think there should be full franchise?

Mr. WOTTON: The main evidence of this lack of interest is obvious in council elections, when people do not come out to vote or to take any active part in local government at that level.

Mr. Chapman: What sort of percentages do you have coming out to vote on polling days in Heysen?

Mr. WOTTON: In the last council elections in my area, in one ward 4 per cent of those entitled to vote actually voted; the situation is serious. People in the community have lost interest in local government because it has lost so much of its authority. This has been apparent in my district and in the Mount Barker area, where the extent to which the Government is willing to override local authority has been most noticeable.

Mr. Chapman: Would you say that local government is a better training ground for members of Parliament than are trade unions?

Mr. WOTTON: I believe it is, because local government has more association with local people; that is the point I am trying to make. On previous occasions in this House I have mentioned Childs Road, in the Mount Barker area. The local people believed very strongly that that road should have been left open, but it was closed because of the South-Eastern Freeway. The Mount Barker people signed petitions presented in this House and organised public meetings, a deputation to the Minister of Transport, and a deputation to the Commissioner of Highways, but still the Government went ahead with the decision to keep the road closed, virtually giving the local people no hearing.

Mr. Chapman: Would you say that this Government tends to ignore petitions lodged in this place from the public?

Mr. WOTTON: I believe that is the case, because I know of several examples of such a situation. Petitions have been presented, and that has been the last we have heard of them. Some months ago the member for Chaffey and I visited Western Australia, where we were able to see that State's local government at work. It was obvious from our first contacts with various councils that local government and those involved were treated in a manner completely different from that in South Australia. People in local government were given more responsibility, they had more authority, and they were proud of the role they were playing. We found great competition among people who wished to become involved, and it was obvious that those who were involved were proud of their efforts and thought they were doing a good job. That is a completely different situation from the one in which we find ourselves.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible chatter in the Chamber.

Mr. WOTTON: The member for Chaffey showed me a letter this evening from the Mayor of the City of Stirling, in Western Australia. We are pleased to know that two members of that council will be visiting this city, and we will be able to show them something of the situation in which local government finds itself.

Mr. Chapman: They will get a shock.

Mr. WOTTON: I am sure they will get a shock. It will be interesting to hear their comments. For the benefit of the people to whom I have spoken in my area and of all the people of South Australia, it is important that the Government should put back the teeth in local

government so that it can be once again regarded as the major tier of government. Only with the involvement of the local people, through the local people, and through their government, will this State get back on the rails.

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): I congratulate you, Sir, on your self-control. I would not have blamed you if by now you had told some members in this place to sit down and shut up. However, such unparliamentary language, I am sure, would not be heard from the Chair, Sir, but I sympathise with you greatly. Some stronger language or some stronger direction from the Chair would be most desirable.

I wish to draw attention to unemployment in Millicent and also to the age of many of the young people who are unemployed. Some young people of 16 years, 17 years, 18 years and even 15 years of age are unable to obtain work. They are completely lost and do not know where they are going. This has been brought home to me quite recently. On Monday, a 16 year-old lad came to my office. He was not at that time receiving unemployment benefits. He had his rent to pay, food to buy, and other expenses, and he did not know where the money would come from. When there are young people of about 16 years of age in such a position, one really wonders where our society is going.

The Government could do more in this direction. Young lads who were willing to work and to learn a trade have not received enough direction in how to learn a trade. The Further Education Department was not really known to them, and they did not know what training they could obtain in further education classes at Millicent. Millicent needs a relief programme, as well as more welfare workers in the town.

Plans have been mapped out for work programmes for these people. We know that such plans will cost money and we have had many discussions not only today but over the past month concerning finance. It is necessary to get our priorities in order, making sure that those sections of the community who need finance are given it. I believe that work could be provided in the Millicent District for such young people in pine pruning in the forests. True, we are not keen about giving such work to young people, but there is also work that could be done in coastal areas where the sand dune problem is great and where work could be undertaken planting marram grass, thus keeping these lads occupied. This programme, too, would require finance, but these boys would be satisfied with a sum equal to that paid to them through unemployment benefits. However, as soon as we consider providing such work, we run into the problem of union regulations stipulating the payment of full adult rates for such work.

It would be much better if these boys were kept occupied while receiving payment equal to the unemployment rate. At the same time a training programme involving the teaching of a trade through further education classes could be arranged. Such programmes have been blocked in several areas by the high costs involved, such as in the Regional Employment Development scheme, under which everyone is paid \$120 a week. Many people would be satisfied with less.

Mr. Slater: How do you know that?

Mr. VANDEPEER: That question is not worth answering.

Mr. Jennings: Why don't you answer him?

Mr. VANDEPEER: We know that \$120 a week is paid to RED scheme workers. These boys would like to do something, as they are sick of doing nothing. Such

a programme would be beneficial to the community in the long run. Finance would be required for the programme, which would be mapped out in consultation with welfare workers, with a meeting centre and job hunters club established for these boys. A meeting and recreation area would provide a place for them to discuss their problems in a warm and dry place. Currently, these lads meet on the street and in motor cars, and that is not good for the youth of our community.

Much of the unemployment of youth in Millicent has resulted from the influx of single-parent families. The last information provided me showed about 55 single parents living in Millicent. This situation has developed as a result of a surplus of double-unit Housing Trust houses that families would not accept. Over several years there were always one or two empty units. The Government then had the brilliant idea that single-parent families looking for a house anywhere in South Australia could be housed at Millicent. Subsequently, we have had a huge influx (for a town like Millicent) of single-parent families housed in these units, including supporting mothers, divorced women and other people all falling within the single-parent category. A large number of children are associated with these 55 single-parent families. This situation has added to the community welfare problem in Millicent.

A town can deal with some of these problems, especially if it is a growing industrial town. However, in a small town the effect of the problems is multiplied 10 or 20 times. Therefore, I bring to the Government's attention the need for this works programme, a meeting centre and more welfare workers in this area to try to assist the young people of Millicent. I would like to support my colleagues in their remarks about the effects of the dry season on our State and the rural community.

Mr. Wardle: Is there a drought in your area?

Mr. VANDEPEER: No, people in my district are fortunate and they will come through the season with sufficient feed, provided we have normal or, at least some, spring rain. However, we will not have sufficient feed to assist farmers in the remainder of the State with agistment, although we will probably have sufficient to get our own stock through the crisis. There will be no surplus of feed because, like much of the State, many of the farms in my district are heavily stocked.

I point out to the Government that the drought will not have any effect on rural areas in my district, but could affect industries in the State that manufacture agricultural products. The effect of the drought is felt throughout the State as time goes on. I criticise the Government severely for having no programme to help the rural community before the problems encountered by that community move throughout the whole State, and this will happen in the next eight months or so.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I take part in this grievance debate mainly to bring to the attention of this Parliament the sad and sorry state of public transport in South Australia. The Minister had one feather in his cap when he boasted (and he often does) that he was trying to provide mini-buses and dial-a-bus services in South Australia, but all honourable members know the fate of that project. I am especially concerned that no public transport or bus service is provided to the new: Flinders Medical Centre. This hospital will be the pride of South Australia when it is completed; indeed, it is already a good hospital. It is impossible for people from Glenelg, Warradale, Oaklands

Park, and Brighton who are not fortunate enough to own their own transport to get to the hospital by public transport.

The land adjacent to the present hospital site was originally purchased by a former South Australian Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh). When he purchased that area as a hospital site, it was discovered that the soil was unsuitable for such a building. As long ago as that there has been no thought about providing a transport service for that area. Flinders Medical Centre is an excellent hospital, but visitors and outpatients attending for treatment cannot get to it by public transport. I do not exaggerate when I say that the position of these people is desperate. Many people are well aware that 20 per cent of the people in my area are above pensionable age. In fact, it is the largest group of that age anywhere in Australia, and these people find it impossible to visit relatives and friends at Flinders.

These people can get to the Marion shopping centre by using a bus service and other forms of transport, but to go further by these means is impossible. The same situation would apply to people living at Christies Beach. St. John Ambulance Brigade runs a clinic car in the area at 8.15 a.m., and provides a similar service in the afternoon. Unfortunately, that service is not always convenient for people. The St. John service is doing the best it can, but it is impossible to cater for the number of people attending Flinders Medical Centre. It is difficult for some people to go to Flinders at 8.15 a.m. Many general practitioners in my area send patients to Flinders, and these patients do not receive many visitors because of the transport difficulty involved. The alternative for people visiting the hospital is to go by taxi, but what pensioner can afford a taxi, even from Oaklands Park, when the fare one way is \$1.75? How can pensioners possibly afford that sum? The Government has fallen down on this matter and should do something about it, because the situation is desperate.

Mr. Slater: It will be all right when we get the new bus depot down there.

Mr. MATHWIN: We know the sordid past and the overriding factors concerning that project. We know what happened with the Minister of Transport and how he was so well assisted by the Minister for the Environment when, between them, they were able to do something about the environmental impact statement conducted by one department and assessed by another. I hope that sort of thing will not happen again. It certainly will not happen if the Bill I will introduce is supported by all members. Departmental interaction is a reason for the failure of environmental impact statement laws, which are a Federal matter.

A shocking state of affairs has occurred on the beach at Somerton and South Glenelg, where the Engineering and Water Supply Department has returned to install rip rap for beach protection after many months of not working there. The work was started last March, and resembles an assault course set up specifically to train commandos in the art of assaulting a beach with the aid of the Navy. Three satellite islands were placed between Somerton and South Glenelg and were left there for several months. I wonder what the member for Henley Beach, who probably knows more about the subject of environment than anyone else in this House, would think about people placing those satellite islands there without knowing what the results would be and whether nearby beaches would be scoured or other damage would be caused. No-one seemed to be worried about the satellite islands. The renovation of the rip rap in that

area only is the biggest hospital job ever done in South Australia as far as the Engineering and Water Supply Department is concerned.

I understand that the full programme is to clean up that area to about Yarrum Grove and proceed south to an area between Rossall Road and Repton Road and the Somerton surf lifesavers clubrooms, that has no protection. If a storm and high tide occurred together in that area the entire bank would disappear; indeed, the esplanade would crumble, too. In the resultant emergency there would be great difficulty in protecting houses along the esplanade.

Something must be done about the situation. If the Engineering and Water Supply Department cannot do the job, I suggest that private enterprise should do it. Most people in the area would agree that the job has failed because the Government decided to use the Engineering and Water Supply Department rather than let the job out to private contract. The job would have been completed many months ago had private enterprise been given the chance to do it. A private company would have been given a specific time in which to complete the job. If machinery had broken down, a company would have procured new machinery to do the job. I understand that, as far as the department is concerned, it is a hospital job and the department has been able to direct labour to work on the job when it has been pleased to do so.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Payments not to exceed last year's Estimates except in certain respects."

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy, as the Minister in charge of the Bill, say what increase is expected in salaries and wages for 1976-77 because of the effect of inflation? When referring earlier today to another matter that impinges on this expenditure, the Treasurer indicated that it was expected, on Federal Government predictions for 1975-76, that there would be a 21 per cent increase in wages and salaries and commensurate increase in the cost of services provided. The Government must know what the inflation rate is expected to be for 1976-77.

The Hon. Hugh HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): This clause is in a traditional form and deals with the ability of the Government to pay out more than was paid last year if there have been appropriate changes in wages and salaries. Otherwise, the Parliamentary appropriation would be exceeded. The point is not really relevant, because the clause would be inserted even if the inflation rate was zero, as there may still be changes in certain wages and salaries.

Dr. Eastick: It is relevant.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not think anyone in the Federal Government or the State Government would give a precise prediction of the rate of inflation in this financial year. I think a Government would be inclined to the view that it could be put within a range.

Dr. Eastick: Considerably less than last year.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I would not say that it would be considerably less. I think most people would want to say, regarding prices, that it is likely to be, with the continuation of some form of indexation (at this stage unknown), somewhere in the range of 8 per cent to 13 per cent or 14 per cent. No-one would be quite sure.

Mr. Coumbe: It may be 12½ per cent.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Some people may want to say it will be less than 12½ per cent, because so much depends on the form of indexation adopted by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. If the plateau indexation continues—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the honourable Minister is moving away from the clause.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If I am, the member for Light should have been prevented from raising the issue. He asked me for a prediction and I am explaining why it is not possible to give any precise prediction, and I am explaining—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! This is not a debate on inflation and I hope that the honourable Minister in charge of the Bill and the honourable member for Light will keep rigidly to the clause.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: One normally would expect the rate of increase in money wages to be something more than the rate of increase in prices. If the honourable member guessed a rate of increase in prices and added 2 per cent, he would have an idea of the rate of increase in money wages. I cannot give the Government's view on the matter, although I think the Treasury probably would have an estimate of about 12½ per cent to 14 per cent for wages.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister is acknowledging that under the management of a Commonwealth Liberal and National Country Party coalition the position is better than under Labor.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from August 5. Page 445.)

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support the motion so ably moved by the member for Florey and seconded by the member for Semaphore. I express my sympathy to the families of the late Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Hogben, and Mr. MacGillivray. I did not have the pleasure of knowing any of those three gentlemen, but I have found from discussions with other members that each of them has had a distinguished career.

I take the opportunity to comment at this stage on the service given by the Governor and Lady Oliphant during their term of office, because His Excellency has indicated his intention to retire at the end of his term. When His Excellency came to office he was a man of some controversy, but since then he has earned the respect of every South Australian as a man of distinction and a man who can express his point of view. Although he may sometimes have trodden on the toes of many South Australians, he

has commanded the respect of the people and has been a distinguished citizen in this community. I wish Sir Mark and Lady Oliphant the very best in their retirement.

Paragraph 3 of the Speech refers to the exceptionally dry autumn and early winter season, and when one considers that this Speech was delivered on June 8 and probably compiled some time before that day, one is amazed at the accuracy of His Excellency's prediction. The drought that His Excellency forecast certainly has come about and every South Australian is concerned about the prospects of getting a reasonable season for grain. It is more to the point that most people have given up thinking about the prospects for grain and are hoping for sufficient feed stocks to be able to get our stock, particularly our breeding stock, through to next winter.

His Excellency stated that, at a comparable time in the 1967 drought, the overall feed situation was basically the same, but he also brought under notice the relevant point that the stock numbers are about 40 per cent higher at the beginning of this year than they were in 1967. Even in that year we had good supplies of grain and reasonable supplies of hay, and our position now regarding those two commodities is not as advantageous. His Excellency said that the Government intended to introduce measures dealing with the Fisheries Act, and it is time that the Act was completely overhauled. Many matters drastically need overhauling in the Fisheries Department and, whilst I appreciate that the fishing industry is a difficult industry with which to deal and to try to get together, certain grave anomalies need correcting.

Last weekend, we were fortunate to have the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Ian Sinclair) visit Port Lincoln, and I was able to assist him to organise meetings for him to meet the fishing industry groups. I think the industry itself is grateful that he was able to spend about five hours discussing problems of the industry with the five fishing groups; I refer, in the main, to the tuna, lobster, abalone and prawn industries, and in the afternoon he was able to spend about two hours with the South Australian Branch of the Australian Fishing Industries Council, meeting delegates from throughout the State. I believe that the industry certainly benefited by these discussions. On Saturday, the Minister (Mr. Sinclair), the Assistant Secretary, and Mr. Arthur Bollen were present, so that we had the two top fishery officers of the Commonwealth department available for questioning by fishermen. It was a worthwhile exercise, and I hope that we can arrange something similar with the State Minister and the State Director of Fisheries, so that there may be a closer liaison between fishermen and the administration.

In many cases, as was experienced on Saturday, the breakdown is not necessarily one of confrontation between the two groups (administration and fishermen), but a lack of understanding and appreciation of each other's problems. Mr. Sinclair was the first to admit in these discussions that he was unaware of many of the problems the local fishermen experienced. I hope that this exercise will be to his great advantage. Although I was not present throughout all the meetings, I attended for a period of each session, so I was unable to ascertain the Minister's attitude to the Copes report, or the general outcome of the meetings. I will receive a detailed document from Mr. Sinclair setting out the points raised at the various meetings and any follow on that will ultimately benefit our fishermen.

Mr. Vandeeper: Professor Copes's next visit should be interesting.

Mr. BLACKER: Yes, and the fishing industry is looking forward to his visit. The Governor's Speech also states that a Bill to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act will be placed before Parliament to give effect to the undertaking contained in the policy speech of the Government, when it was returned at the recent election, that civil action for damages should not be taken in industrial disputes but they should be resolved in a tribunal specifically provided for this purpose. I would have refrained from commenting on this matter until the legislation was introduced, but I was somewhat concerned at a statement made by the Hon. Mr. Dunford that I believe might be called an ultimatum, or something stronger. He said:

Let me utter this word of warning to those who foolishly believe that resort to action for damages will cure industrial disputes. The trade union movement will never tolerate the use of tort law in actions arising from industrial disputes. We already know of the case where one South Australian employer was driven out of business by the trade union movement in retaliation for his actions to sue for damages. The same fate will surely await any other employer who allows himself to be used in this manner. Let me tell honourable members that as a word of warning whether they and the people they represent should heed.

I was concerned that words of this nature would be uttered at a time when this Bill had been foreshadowed, and I believe it to be in the interests of South Australians that I reiterate the words spoken by a member of another place. I leave that issue until the legislation is before us, and hope that South Australians will see the issue for what it really is.

I should comment on the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission. I was pleased with the way in which the commission gave a fair hearing to each person who wished to give evidence before it, and I certainly could not in any way be critical. I said that before the commission's findings were brought down, so I could not be accused of being biased over the outcome. I was even more pleased when I found that the commission's findings were similar to the opinions I had expressed to it during the hearings, and I was most grateful. Certain advantages are apparent that I believe my side of politics should heed. It was feasible that there would be only 13 country seats, but we got 14; it was also feasible that there would be three iron triangle seats, whereas there are only two. Therefore, from a non-socialist point of view there are 12 winnable seats left and, despite the available alternatives, we should be thankful that we have the chance to at least try to win and hold 12 country seats. It is a matter of being thankful for small mercies.

Mr. Jennings: What does your neighbouring member think?

Mr. BLACKER: There is one aspect about that, if members want to try to drive a wedge between us: both of us can stay in politics. No doubt it is for individual members to decide whether or not that be the case, but the chance is there, and we cannot ask for anything more.

Last Wednesday, I was fortunate enough to attend a field day at Cleve, and was able to have another look at the barren countryside and the drought areas moving south. I am concerned at the massive way in which machinery is being developed, and the expensive costs involved. At that field day, which was probably the largest to be held in South Australia, more than \$6 000 000 worth of machinery was demonstrated. This disturbed me because, of that machinery (and I refer basically to tractors),

there were more in the over \$50 000 price range than there were in the under \$10 000 price range. Whilst it may appear that some farmers may be able to purchase equipment of this nature (one tractor was priced at \$75 000), is it a feasible proposition that such machinery continue to be developed? It is because of this aspect that I raise the matter, because people are now employed in building such equipment, although I seriously doubt whether there is a market for it. In the present economic climate, I believe any potential market is rapidly diminishing.

When one finds that a small tractor for an average farm cannot be purchased under an average price of \$15 000, one wonders about the future of machinery manufacturers and the employees in those industries who will undoubtedly be without a job unless those manufacturers can diversify. It is humanly impossible in South Australia's agricultural conditions for anyone to expect a manufacturer to sell tractors in the \$50 000 to \$75 000 range.

One of the most massive individual problems I have in my district is the shortage of housing accommodation. An increasing demand is being placed on the Housing Trust, and the waiting time for prospective applicants is more than two years. Regrettably, today's economic situation does not lend itself to house ownership, and places a great demand on rental accommodation.

Mr. Chapman: Minister Hudson was boasting the other day about how well they are doing within the trust.

Mr. BLACKER: I appreciate that the Minister was boasting about the trust's improved figures.

Mr. Chapman: Do you think he had much to boast about?

Mr. BLACKER: The figures were improved, and he must be given credit therefor. But, certainly, the improvement did not match the increase in demand. Although it is nice to say that the figures had improved, the demand had increased at an even greater rate.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Do you think the Federal coalition Government has some responsibility in this field?

Mr. Chapman: I should have thought that it had given the Minister the chance to do what he has done.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Flinders has the floor.

Mr. BLACKER: The ambition of young married couples to own their own house is one that can be achieved by only a few, and it has been estimated that in the past 10 years the ability for one to purchase one's own house has decreased from 90 per cent of potential house owners in 1964 to about 17 per cent at present. The unfortunate aspect is that those most in need, through circumstances beyond their control, are not being given the priorities they deserve. I recently had an approach from a local builder seeking avenues of assistance for the possible development of low-cost multiple housing units. As a result, I contacted the Housing Trust and the Australian Housing Corporation, inquiring about the availability of possible finance. The trust replied that, from the local point of view and the cash availability aspect or guarantees, it was unable to fund this type of construction. The Acting General Manager of the Australian Housing Corporation replied that, because of the Government's decision to achieve more efficient and more economic administration of the programmes of the Commonwealth Government, the Australian Housing Corporation as it existed would be abolished. Consequently, no financial assistance is available through these means.

The builder concerned approached me because he was being constantly asked by potential tenants for housing accommodation, and he could see a real need for a low-cost housing project. The project incorporated plans for architecturally designed self-contained units of about nine squares. Multiple units of this nature can be built on selected sites. However, it is then necessary for finance to be available for bulk buying of materials to complete the project. Because the financing institutions locally consider this as a speculative venture, they will not advance finance for it and, although technically it is a speculative venture (and no-one could expect a builder to commit himself to such a project without some incentive), the prime motive is to provide low-cost housing at a price that can be afforded by those most in need.

Following the approach by this builder, I tried to ascertain what was the real situation in Port Lincoln and similar areas. I contacted local land agents, and found that there was a general shortage of low to middle-price homes for sale in that city or, for that matter, anywhere. Young people are now unable to save enough for a deposit. The average price for a house was \$35 000 to \$40 000, which means that one obtaining a bank loan of \$20 000 must still have a deposit of at least \$15 000, and prices are still escalating. The average price for a new house is now \$2 500 a square. I point out that these prices applied six months ago. On inquiring three weeks ago, I found that that price had increased to \$2 900 a square.

I asked one Port Lincoln land agent whether he could show me a "spec" house, to which he sincerely replied, "No, I cannot show you a 'spec' house. All that is available at Port Lincoln comprises five sites, on one of which is a partly-constructed house the walls of which are only one metre high, two sets of foundations, and two vacant blocks on which 'spec' buildings are to be built." That was the total "spec" house availability in Port Lincoln.

Although members would, I think, agree that that is a rather unusual situation, it is nevertheless a real one in that it illustrates the lack of available housing for potential purchasers. Anything that resembles a "spec" house is certainly sold before the brickwork gets to window height. This is a common occurrence. If a builder is seen to be setting up foundations, he receives numerous inquiries about the house, whom it is for, and whether it is available for sale.

Unfortunately, builders are reluctant to enter into contracts on a completed house basis, because building material prices are rising so rapidly that the builders are unable to say what the final price of a house will be. They would prefer houses to be sold as "spec" houses. Consequently, they start building houses and, immediately they are to be sold, they put a big margin on them to cover themselves, and this practice is, unfortunately, increasing house prices. All builders seem to say that they must turn to "spec" house building, but regrettably they do not seem to build such houses, as they are snapped up before the builder gets a chance to sell them as "spec" houses.

Land prices are steady, although it is feared that they will rise to the \$10 000 to \$12 000 range for good blocks because of the land shortage, which is brought about by the high cost of subdivision. To subdivide land, the owner must provide roads, kerbing, electricity, water and sewerage, and the cost of sewerage one block in Port Lincoln is about \$4 500. The Government will not allow landowners to employ private contractors, who would possibly do the work for about half the cost charged by Government departments.

I should like to elaborate on that statement. In an effort to obtain information on the availability of housing subdivisions and allotments, I contacted one developer who started on a project 2½ years ago. That developer aimed to subdivide an allotment into 88 blocks. He gave me some figures indicating the difficulties for developers. For the same 88 blocks, two figures were quoted. The price applying at January 24, 1975, was given to me, as was a comparative price as at June 8, 1976. Without detailing all the figures, suffice to say that the additional costs involved in developing the blocks ranged from \$493 000 in January, 1975, to \$589 625 in June, 1976, and this increased the price of these allotments to the \$8 000 range. These blocks are average building allotments and, regrettably, because of the massive price increases they are becoming luxury blocks, and are no longer potential home sites for the average house owner.

Mr. Allison: Could the Land Commission do it more cheaply?

Mr. BLACKER: I seriously doubt it, because it is not necessarily the price of the land that is causing the problem: it is the massive increase in development costs and the way in which the developer is being tied up in red tape. For more than two years attempts have been made to develop these allotments, but the developers are not allowed to engage private contractors to lay the sewer mains, which must be laid by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. This would be satisfactory if the department was able to lay the sewer mains now, but there is a delay of at least eight months, and the Engineering and Water Supply Department will not supervise private contractors. This delay creates enormous difficulties for would-be developers.

Mr. Allison: A year's inflation.

Mr. BLACKER: Yes. Also, problems are involved in getting subdivisions through the State Planning Authority promptly. An application was made for a subdivision for an industrial site in Tumby Bay on a normal 0.2 hectare block in a swamp. However, Engineering and Water Supply Department requirements of \$1 200 had to be met before that subdivision could take place; water had to be laid on. In the prime residential area of Tumby Bay, near the seafront, a fully serviced house block at that time was available for \$700.

The industry did not want the prime residential area: it wanted to set up a carpentry shed and a workshop but, because of the subdivision requirements and the Engineering and Water Supply Department's requirements, the people were forced to pay more than \$1 500 for the block. There was an indirect main attached, but it had to be a direct main. This is a grave anomaly in subdivision requirements. The council wanted to direct more industry to the swamp area, and the people concerned were happy to go there but, because of the requirements of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the State Planning Authority, the people were obliged to pay twice as much for a swamp block as for a prime residential block.

A similar example has occurred in Poonindie, near Port Lincoln, where a subdivision was applied for, but it was initially refused, because it was believed that Poonindie would become a prime residential area. People who know the area would agree that nothing could be more ridiculous. There are only four houses in Poonindie, two of which are on the block owned by the Poonindie brickworks. Another house is occupied by the headmaster of the Poonindie school, and there is one other cottage. The applicant requested that two 4.04 ha subdivisions be

annexed off his 15.8 ha block, and he wanted to remain on the remaining 7.7 ha. However, the application was rejected on the pretext that Poonindie would be a prime residential area, but that is ridiculous, because there are no employment opportunities there, the nearest being 24 km away. The housing problem involves more than the questions of availability of land and subdivision problems. We should also ask: why are builders not more active? The high prices should attract builders to capitalise on the buoyant building industry.

In Port Lincoln there are 44 registered builders, but some are not active builders. Some hold two builders licences, one in their own name and one in the name of the partnership. In Port Lincoln there are only 29 active building licensees, of whom two, who employ five men and seven men respectively, build transportable houses, which go to country areas. Therefore, those two builders do not contribute to the building situation in Port Lincoln itself. I doubt whether the remaining 27 builders would engage one employee each, on average. This means that the builders would have an effective building work force of 56 people, a work force quite inadequate to cater for the strong demand. It is therefore necessary to revise the system of issuing builders licences, and this matter should be considered by the Builders Licensing Board.

My inquiries lead me to believe that builders are reluctant to engage men. The first reason they give for their reluctance relates to workmen's compensation. This is probably a hackneyed phrase but, when a builder is obliged to pay 16 per cent of wages in workmen's compensation fees, he thinks twice about engaging an employee. Regrettably, builders will engage only top-class men who are fully known to them. They will not employ apprentices or anyone who would like to be a labourer. Because they select the men carefully, there are not many men in the building trade. So, only the builder and the employee known to the individual builder are staying in the industry. The problem confronting the whole of the building industry is that there are insufficient apprentices, insufficient potential employees.

Some builders expressed reluctance to take on a person who was not a proven worker, and some would not take on young people. Regrettably, they would not consider taking on labour from the unemployment office. That is grossly unfair, because there could well be genuinely unemployed persons available. Unfortunately, the aspect of dole bludgers has come into the matter, and the builders will not even go to the office to look for employees. They believe they will not get experienced personnel, and they are heavily committed for workmen's compensation. There seem to be far too many regulations for a potential employer to embark on an employment programme.

Builders complain of a lack of bricklayers, and there is also a shortage of tilers. Also, there is a three-year wait for State Bank finance for housing, and a wait of six months to eight months for bridging finance, with no certainty of getting it even then. Timber from the South-East is rationed to Port Lincoln, with only monthly allocations. Cement quotas have been introduced and, generally speaking, the industry is in a sad and sorry plight.

People with deposits that were sufficient three years ago have waited another 12 months and saved, say, a further \$2 000, only to find that they are getting farther behind. They cannot catch up in relation to the deposit, because prices are escalating at a rate faster than that at which they can save money. One land agent receives an average of three inquiries daily for rental houses and flats.

Many inquiries are received from out-of-town people with jobs in Port Lincoln, but not one house is available for rental within a 50-kilometre radius of Port Lincoln. It has been suggested that we are not isolated in our problem, and that it is a legacy to society when the ambition of young people to own their houses no longer exists. Recently, I read in the *Australian Quarterly* an article that deals with the problem of distribution of income over the life span, as follows:

Inequalities arising from the life-time cycle of incomes must be increasing on the demand and the supply sides of the housing market. Inflation and (more important) the lenders' expectation that inflation will continue, have pushed up interest rates and the initial costs of buying or renting a house. Meanwhile the real cost of a house built and acquired some years ago has fallen. It is younger married couples who most often suffer from the initially heavy costs of new housing, and the middle-aged who tend to benefit from the decline in housing costs which comes later. As more and more wives return to work when their children go to school or leave home, the middle-aged grow relatively richer and younger families grow relatively poorer.

If these inequalities are to be reduced, it is most important to help young parents and old people—particularly at the expense of those in a relatively affluent middle age who will often be best able to bear the burdens involved. At the moment, arrangements for financing house purchase work in the opposite direction, loading the heaviest burdens on those least able to bear them and letting many of the middle-aged off very lightly. Something similar happens in publicly rented housing where long established tenants often pay lower rents than newcomers to this sector.

That is a general assessment of the situation. Another aspect is the lack of confidence in the financing issue. Money earned on Eyre Peninsula is not being spent on the peninsula. Only a minimal amount is being reinvested, as people are taking their money out of the area. Many financial institutions will not invest in country areas. During my inquiries, I found an article written by Mr. R. H. Carnegie, Chairman of Conzinc Riotinto of Australia Limited, relating to a speech he delivered to the Institute of Directors in Australia, held at the Hotel Southern Cross in March last. The speech was a hard-hitting one entitled, "Wake up, private enterprise", and was a self-analysis of the free enterprise system. The author makes the following six points:

1. The surge forward and transformation of Australia from 1945 to 1965 came from shared aims in the whole community.
2. The success achieved, with other changes in society, created a period of high expectation and demands in the 1966-1975 period.
3. Australia has destroyed its competitive position in the world economy over this period.
4. Most Australians are even yet not aware of the depth of our malaise, nor the time and effort needed to get out of it.
5. Directors bear a heavy responsibility for the lack of community awareness.
6. Australia's economic future depends on re-establishing a vision of our country for the 1980-2000 period which the whole community can support.

Those points are relevant. He goes on to say that Australia is non-competitive, and states:

Australia, however, in this 10-year period, gave up one thing—its competitive position in the world. The world is a competitive place. It doesn't owe us a living. Results have looked good, but the results of 1970-75 were due to plans made in 1960-65, and investments made in 1965-70. Investments have declined in real terms in the 1970-75 period because of growing scepticism about Australia's position. In the mid-1960's Australia started to export processed goods, mineral exports were growing, and dependence on foreign capital to balance payments on international account was dropping. The willingness of Australians to make long-term investments was increasing. Wages were still advancing broadly in line with productivity.

In the last 10 years the whole position has changed—a few illustrations: Australian wage rates are as high as

American. Australian productivity remains low, so our wage costs are among the highest in the world; capital costs in Australia are 30 per cent or more above that of comparable plant in America; marginal tax rates on key supervisory and managerial and skilled tradesmen are higher than in the U.K. They are discouraging initiative by negating rewards for skill and effort; new projects like those of the 1960's—e.g. Hamersley, Kambalda—are not financeable in Australia today; the general attitude to the industrial situation is discouraging all investment. Examples are provided by experience in Queensland project construction, and in coal deliveries to Japan; because there has been no industrial stability, there has been too little rise in productivity; issues of industry structure have been bedevilled by *ad hoc* ideas and changes so uncertainty prevails; depreciation rates allowed for tax have dropped behind those allowed competitors around the world.

It is true many of the symptoms are world wide: the new "stagflation" phenomenon; the uncertainties of more widely fluctuating patterns of world trade and world currencies; the escalation of wages. But Australian inflation of costs are far ahead of most O.E.C.D. countries. Our productivity levels are low and growing slowly. Our investment in new export industries is low (farmers are losing money and fertilizer sales are down). And the outlook for 1980 is poor. And all this despite the inherent advantages of our resource base and skilled work force. Why?

That is a good question. I refer to a submission presented to the Commonwealth Minister for Industry and Commerce and to the following report, headed "Incentives for People", which states:

Just as it is important to establish an adequate level of profits so it is necessary to ensure that incentives are adequate to encourage individual work, study, acceptance of responsibility, willingness to undertake risks and to encourage entrepreneurs. This is essential if the benefits of the free enterprise are to be maximised. Motivated people will be required to implement and progress the changes necessary for manufacturing industry. We will need more people prepared to take risks, to take responsibility, to attain new skills and to be mobile within Australia. The requirements importantly include more skilled tradesmen, supervisors and foremen as well as more skilled managers. In turn people require rewards commensurate with these additional responsibilities and efforts. A higher degree of financial independence should be the aim. Success will mean a very great flow-on of benefits to the community at large.

This philosophy is important in all aspects of industry, not only the building industry but also primary industry. Any free enterprise system requires that sort of incentive.

Two aspects of concern to me in my local area have been dealt with by the Governor in his Speech, and these two aspects are inter-connected. I refer to Emergency Fire Services and the National Parks and Wildlife Division. In the past summer we experienced a series of disastrous fires in my district. Some of those fires were allowed to burn indiscriminately in national parks and caused some concern to neighbouring landholders. I refer especially to three fires occurring in the Hincks National Park. This park comprises about 257 sq. km. in area. Usually, when a fire gets into a national park, it is left to burn out, and this causes me concern. True, I own property near this park and I know the attitude and fears of farmers in the area. My property is on the south-eastern corner of the park and often a fire gets into the park in the north-western corner. One can do nothing but sit and wait for the fire to come through. I think it would be highly desirable if adequate firebreaks were made around the park and, more importantly, if a grid pattern of firebreaks was established across the park.

There have been instances of fires burning for a week and being milled around as the wind dictates. In some cases large portions of a park have been burnt out, causing much destruction of flora and fauna. Although the

National Parks and Wildlife Division seeks to protect these things, no-one seems willing to protect a park in these circumstances. We can list the priorities however we like, that is, whether to protect landholders or to protect the park. However, in either case it is desirable that some effort be made to protect such areas.

In the fires occurring last summer there were many days when it would have been safe to go into the fire area with a tractor and plough, surround the burning area, and let it burn out. Such action would have been highly desirable. I recommend that that reserves be ploughed and that firebreaks be made on a grid fashion, I suggest on a 5-mile sided square, thereby creating a series of 25 square mile blocks that could be burnt out if a fire started in an area. One fire started in farming country and burnt into the reserve, but three fires, which were started by lightning, started in the reserve and neighbouring landholders had to sit outside the park and wait for the fire to come out.

Mr. Vandeeper: Don't you think Australian forests have always been subject to fires from lightning?

Mr. BLACKER: Yes. This aspect needs to be more closely examined. Fires have started on roadsides, and I raise this matter because an approach was made to me by the local E.F.S. unit at Cummins after an approach was made to the E.F.S. by landholders wishing to plough firebreaks on cleared sections of the roadside, especially grassy areas. This would have provided protection for standing roadside scrub as well as for adjacent land. Permission for this was refused by the conservation people, and I believe that this refusal reflected short-sighted understanding on their part. If firebreaks were ploughed, added protection would be provided to natural fauna and flora as well as to neighbouring land.

Among other important issues to be debated in this session are the legislation concerning firearms and that relating to the transfer of the Port Lincoln abattoir to Samcor. These subjects are important to my district, as are marine matters and the matter of secondhand motor vehicles.

I now wish to refer to the controversy surrounding the age of consent. I wish to make my stand clear: I do not believe there should be any alteration of the age. I was grateful that the Attorney-General indicated that the age of consent would not be altered in any way. This matter caused much concern amongst people in my district, and their concern is equal to that of people in other areas, as shown by the many petitions presented to Parliament on this matter. Another issue causing me concern is in respect of drugs. Although it is too big an issue to discuss fully at this stage, I state categorically that I believe there is a serious danger in contemplating legislation for the use of marihuana, especially legislation for any harder drugs. There is conclusive medical evidence that marihuana can be harmful to health and, in most cases, this has been proved beyond doubt.

Dr. Tonkin: Has any evidence been produced that it is being brought into Australia through Port Lincoln?

Mr. BLACKER: There is no evidence of that. It is known that it is used in Port Lincoln. People have been prosecuted for growing marihuana. However, it has not been proved that Port Lincoln has been used as an avenue for shipping drugs. Any accusations that fishermen are involved are, to my knowledge, unfounded.

Some weeks ago I was approached by lobster fishermen about the Rock Lobster Fishing Industry Advisory Committee. The fishermen were inquiring about the Government's intentions in relation to the lobster industry.

They asked what was happening with the Rock Lobster Fishing Industry Advisory Committee and what were the criteria on which it worked. As a result of their inquiry, on August 3, I asked in a Question on Notice who were the members of the committee. Their names were duly given by the Minister. I also asked what were the terms of reference of the committee, to which I received the following reply:

The committee's terms of reference are to:

- (a) Inquire into and report to the Minister upon any matter referred to it by the Minister in relation to the crayfish fisheries.
- (b) Advise the Minister on questions relating to the management, control, protection, regulation and development of these crayfish fisheries, and may make such recommendations as it thinks fit in relation thereto.

Those terms of reference seemed to be in order. They are broad, but it seems that the advisory committee could act in an advisory capacity to the Minister. The third question I asked was when the committee last met, and I was told that the last meeting was held on September 18, 1974. Prior to that it met on an average of twice a year. The lobster fishermen approached me because they wanted to know how that committee was involved in the industry. Even a member of the committee wanted to know, too. When the matter was raised he said, "Look, we just cannot get a meeting together. The Director or the Minister will not call a meeting of the committee."

That concerns me, because the public has been led to believe that an advisory committee exists to assist the Minister and that the industry is fully involved in discussions in this area. That is not the case, because the committee met nearly two years ago. What is the Rock Lobster Fishing Industry Advisory Committee? All we can say is that it is a committee that exists in name only so that the Minister can say that he has such a committee. It is a totally ineffective committee because it is never called together. It is that aspect that concerns lobster fishermen. If any sort of advisory board or committee is set up, surely it is reasonable to expect that it should be involved at least to the stage of occasionally holding meetings.

On August 3, I asked questions relating to the construction of a bulk wharf at Port Lincoln. Concern has been expressed about the delay in completing that wharf because it is almost 20 months now since the four legs of the loading gantry were mounted on the wharf. Still we do not have a gantry. The Minister said that a minor structural problem occurred, but does it take 20 months to fix such a problem? I am concerned that progress on these gantries is not progressing in the proper manner.

Dr. Tonkin: There seems to be a degree of secrecy about it, doesn't there?

Mr. BLACKER: Yes, but I cannot say what is the real reason. People cannot walk along the wharf, because the gates are locked. Some industrial strife involving the Waterside Workers union has occurred. That union tried to halt progress of the completion of the wharf because it thought that jobs would be lost as a result of this construction. I understand and appreciate that concern, because waterside workers could become redundant as a result of the new wharfs loading capacity. Against that, we must realise that Port Lincoln is a deep sea port and has the potential to handle 70 000 tonners to 100 000 tonners. However, it is unlikely that 100 000 tonners will ever go out of Port Lincoln, for two reasons—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): When I spoke earlier this evening I was assisted by my friends and did not say much of what I wanted to say, so I will now take this opportunity to continue where I left off.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What did you say?

Mr. WOTTON: Whatever happens, I will refuse to take notice of any assistance. I was referring to the importance of local government, but I do not intend to say any more about that subject now. About two weeks ago I asked the Premier whether the Government would consider setting up a Parliamentary committee of inquiry to investigate land use in the Adelaide Hills, with such an inquiry considering a cost benefit analysis. The Premier replied that studies had been made of land use in the Adelaide Hills and that the Government was further investigating the matter. He said that he expected an announcement to be made soon. That is the matter I wish to speak about this evening.

Mr. Chapman: Are you—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. WOTTON: Two days after I asked that question in the House, the Premier announced that the Monarto Development Commission would undertake a major study of ways to preserve the Adelaide Hills. I believe the Monarto Development Commission was set up by the present Government to fulfill a purpose, that is, of planning the proposed city of Monarto. I will not argue that point, because members of the commission have the expertise to do that job. Since the setting up of the commission, those people have been involved in several other projects. There was talk about the commission's participating in the reconstruction of Darwin. As a matter of fact, it was mentioned in a report in the *Advertiser* of July 31.

Dr. Tonkin: Do you think Monarto would be better sited at Darwin?

Mr. WOTTON: Some believe that would be a good place for it. In that report, the Minister for Planning said that, besides carrying out this work at Monarto, the commission was involved in studies on the redevelopment of Port Adelaide. I consider that, in the work that the commission has done and will do regarding Port Adelaide, once again being involved in the planning or replanning of a city, the commission would be capable of carrying out that work.

I make clear that the commission has the expertise as far as planning, development or redevelopment of a city is concerned. However, I do not consider that this commission is qualified to carry out a survey or a study of major ways to preserve the Adelaide Hills. I refer also to a question asked in this House a few days later by my colleague, the member for Light. Referring to the task of the Monarto commission, the member for Light stated:

The only project of which I am aware that has been directed to the commission has been referred to publicly as being an internal direction that might not be in the best interests of the people in the Adelaide Hills, in that the Monarto commission is being called on to consider the position of the Adelaide Hills . . .

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that this private conversation between the benches is distracting the honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. WOTTON: What the member for Light said summed up the situation. There is much feeling by people in the Adelaide Hills that the Monarto team is not the right body to be examining problems in the Adelaide Hills area. I refer now to a report which appeared in the *Advertiser* and which was prepared by Mr. Greg Kelton. At this stage, I mention that the reports which refer to the complexity of the problems in the Adelaide Hills and which have been prepared by Mr. Kelton and Mr. Tilbrook have done much to explain the situation and bring knowledge of the problems being experienced in the Hills before the people. Mr. Kelton and Mr. Tilbrook are to be commended for their work. The report to which I have referred states:

The Monarto Development Commission will undertake a major study of ways to preserve the Adelaide Hills. The State Government has hired the commission as an independent consultant to undertake the study.

I query the word "independent", because later in the same report the Minister is quoted as saying:

What happened in the Hills in the future would have a major effect on Monarto and the construction of Monarto would have a major effect on the hills region.

Regardless of what happens regarding Monarto, I do not consider that that city should have anything to do with development in the Adelaide Hills. I consider that the Adelaide Hills are far too valuable and too great an asset to be something that will be dealt with as a result of the planning of the city, if that city eventuates. The report also states:

The Minister for Planning (Mr. Hudson) said yesterday the study was designed to establish the most effective methods of implementing Government policies to conserve the Adelaide Hills and the Mount Lofty Range.

My impression is that this same Government has told the State Planning Authority to carry out many of the policies that the Monarto Development Commission will be considering in future. I refer particularly to the policies to conserve the area for water catchment and to the general State Planning Authority's policies for the development in that area. Local government (I suggest again that local government should be used much more than it is used—the teeth should be put back into local government) should be given more authority and used more effectively in this area. As I have said before, I believe people in local government know more about the Hills than does any outside authority, no matter what its expertise. I believe that the State Planning Authority, working in conjunction with the local councils in that area, would achieve much more than would be achieved by the Monarto team's coming in.

One of the terms of reference of the study is whether a special body is needed to administer the Hills. I believe that this need is generally accepted, but the point that disturbs me is that it is suggested that the report will take 18 months to bring down. Much to disadvantage that area would be achieved in the 18 months before the study is completed by the Monarto team. Mr. Speaker, my time is about to run out, and I suggest that the work the Monarto team intends to carry out could adequately be done by local government in that area in conjunction with the State Planning Authority.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I will speak briefly about juvenile delinquency and the way in which this State has been handling this problem or, on the contrary, has not been handling this problem. I begin by taking the philosophy of one Opposition member who, in a question today,

reflected a most simplistic philosophy. His idea, as I understood it, was that if a punishment was inflicted a result would be obtained. One has only to look back over the centuries to see how punishments have been inflicted and no result obtained. There would be no greater analogy to the juvenile delinquent so-called than the person suffering from some form of mental disorder. I do not have to turn back 100 years or even 50 years: I need go back only 15 years to find a situation in mental hospitals where it was assumed that, because a person had a mental disorder, punishment could in some way remove or cure it. So, people were chained to walls or locked in prison cells in what were euphemistically called "hospitals" in the vain hope that they could be cured: of course, nothing was achieved.

There was no cure, and there was no hope of cure. It was not until those who were rational enough to look for causes found the causes and the remedy for those causes that mental illness was able to be cured in the way in which history has proved it is capable of being cured.

Mr. Vandeppeer: Mental disorder is different from delinquency.

Mr. McRAE: I will deal with that difference. Over the past 20 years we have moved from a situation where it was assumed that the only thing we could do with a mentally ill person was to lock him up for the duration, have a 10ft. wall around him, surround that with cut glass, and warehouse him there indefinitely. We have gone from that philosophy to one which says, "Let us rationally look for a cause; having found a cause, let us find a solution; and, having found that solution, let us put it into effect." The contrast between the two situations has been astounding, so astounding that in many cases whole parts of hospitals have had to be closed down because illnesses that hitherto were thought to be incapable of remedy were found to be well capable of remedy.

I apply that analogy to the juvenile delinquent. The criticism is made that this Government's enactment of the Juvenile Courts Act was in some way a retrograde enactment. That, factually, philosophically, medically and legally, just is not so. It can be criticised on the surface for a number of reasons, although at its central point it cannot be criticised. It has been proved to be right time and time again. Let me contrast with the current situation the situation under the old Juvenile Court establishment, where infant children were brought across King William Street in the tow of policemen into a police court situation. Of course, the criticism can be made that the system has gone overboard in another direction: perhaps we are too kind to some of the people who return again and again to the juvenile courts. But those people, I say, are in a great minority compared to the vast number of our juvenile offenders.

The cause of our juvenile offenders affects us all, because such offenders are, of course, a proportion of this State's children and are entitled to a fair go. What sort of fair go have they had? They have had a fair go through the legislation, but one can never get a fair go until one implements the ideas and the legislation in practical terms. So, on the same analogy, the philosophers who thought of a way of remedying mental ills also sought a way of remedying juvenile delinquency.

The people who looked towards the mentally ill were able over a long time and at tremendous cost to themselves to find practical ways of implementing their philosophy. That, of course, is the demand in the case of the juvenile offenders. In that case it is impossible to say that an overworked probation officer is capable of dealing with so many offenders at the one time; for any one man

to be capable of dealing with any other man's single problems is a difficult enough task, let alone saying that in some cases he should be asked to deal with 80, 90 or more case loads.

So, until we give the system a fair go, it cannot prove itself. Given a fair go, however, the system will prove itself. It is capable of doing so. I assert that the results up to date of this Government's Juvenile Courts Act have been enough to give hope for the reformer and also to give evidence for those who frankly rebut those who hoped that the system would fail and who seemed from time to time to hope that by their questions they would demonstrate that it would fail.

In saying what I have said I am acutely aware that there is one inherent deficiency in the Juvenile Courts Act. That deficiency is that it is, unassailably, marked with the beliefs and philosophies of the behavioural scientists. The behavioural scientists would pinpoint every human wrongdoing to the environment of that human being. I do not accept such a philosophy, nor does modern science accept it. Just as our early Christian forebears accepted that man was born inclined to do wrong things, it is therefore unreal to believe that, if we were to recreate some sort of perfect system for that offender, he would become the perfect man; it is as unreal as to believe that, if we create the perfect society, we will have the perfect citizen. That is wrong, because I believe and modern scientists believe, just as our forebears believed, that man is inherently tending toward evil.

What is the relationship between this gloss on what I said before and what I said before? It is only this: while inherently the Government's legislation is working well, it cannot be forgotten that that stamp of the behavioural scientists is there. That is the stamp of the con man, and that is the stamp that has been disproved by later investigation throughout the world. Therefore, we have to be on our guard. We cannot imagine that, by removing every environmental cause, we will remove every possible criminal. We cannot imagine that, by looking at every conceivable environment, we will remove every conceivable crime. We can, by combining what is the truth of the environmental behaviourist with what is the truth of the person who believes that man has free will, see a way to give the best of the two worlds to those people who are, after all, our children and the children of our society.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Being involved in rural pursuits, I have had my attention drawn, through the media, to an industry of which I have very little knowledge, because I ordinarily concentrate on meat and wool production. I wish to refer to a series of articles in the media dealing with the fruit industry in the Riverland. On April 22 an article in the *Advertiser* was headed "Government will lend \$500 000 to South Australia's citrus industry". On the same day, an article in the *News* was headed "Hint of aid to fruit men". On June 16, a further article was headed "Government fruit decision 'disastrous'". Reference was made to statements by the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries wherein he suggested imposing quotas on the citrus industry.

An article dated July 23 was headed "Squeeze on imports of fruit juice". The next article to which I wish to refer related to the recognition of a fruit crisis and stated that vital talks were being undertaken by the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries. Finally, on August 4 a scheme was promoted in the area. The article in the *Advertiser*

referred to statements made in Canberra; the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Sinclair) said that more money would be available for extension to fruitgrower reconstruction schemes in South Australia, because more applications than expected had been received for the removal of deciduous canning fruit trees; applications would be received up to December 31. That reference to the various articles has produced an interesting but somewhat dismal picture of the fruitgrowing industry in the Riverland area. It is clearly in the territory of my colleague, the member for Chaffey, and, whilst I respect his understanding and appreciation of the industry, it has occurred to me, looking from the outside at this rather dismal picture, that two areas could be further considered.

One is that we could keep out the imports of the product that emerges from that area, and the other is that we should look more seriously at the aid generally available to the underprivileged and starving countries. I come now to the form in which aid is given and how it influences the achievement of the objective of assisting the improvement of social and economic welfare in these poor countries. The traditional forms of project aid, budget support and other aid, food, and technical assistance, will remain important to Australia's aid to underprivileged countries. I do not intend to criticise the principle of aiding those who are in trouble, but it is rather remarkable, when one looks at the other side of the coin, at the funding Australia provides for those undeveloped countries. I have a reference to Australia's official development assistance to less developed countries. Since 1945, Australia has spent \$2 300 000 000 in aid. In the last decade, official development assistance has more than trebled from \$86 000 000 in 1963-64 to \$261 000 000 in 1973-74, and for 1974-75 it was expected to reach \$337 000 000, representing an expenditure of about \$25 a head of population in Australia. Australian aid to those less developed countries was .52 per cent of the gross national product in 1973-74, and I shall seek permission to have incorporated in *Hansard* a table setting out and clearly identifying the countries to which our aid is directed and the respective amounts for the year 1973-74, simply as an example. With your permission, Sir, I seek to have that single-column table, a statistical table, inserted.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member assure me that it is purely statistical?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Yes.

Leave granted.

AUSTRALIA'S OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE TO LESS-DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

	1973-74 (\$'000)
BILATERAL PROGRAMS—	
Commonwealth Co-operation in Education Scheme	1 006
Colombo Plan (b)	30 185
Special Commonwealth African Assistance Plan	1 025
South Pacific Aid Program	2 318
SEATO—Aid Program	—
Indus Waters Scheme	207
Food Aid Convention	28 557
Foreign Exchange Operations Fund—Laos	638
Exchange Support Fund—Khmer Republic .	344
Emergency Food Aid—Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Ethiopia	262
Special Aid—Khmer Republic, South Vietnam, Indo-China	779
Refugee Relief	—
Disaster Relief	78
Rehabilitation and Relief Aid for Bangladesh	—
Aid to Papua New Guinea	177 076
Other Bilateral Aid	313
<i>Total bilateral aid</i>	242 788

MULTILATERAL PROGRAMS—	
Financial Institutions—	
International Development Association	6 870
Asian Development Bank	2 822
Other	—
United Nations Programs—	
United Nations Development Program (d)	1 997
United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund	632
United Nations Relief and Works Agency	199
World Food Program	1 742
United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration	—
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	200
United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency	—
International Refugee Organisation	—
Other	2 032
Other Agencies—	
South Pacific Commission	508
Other	1 673
<i>Total</i>	18 675
<i>Less IBRD Repayments</i>	706
<i>Total multilateral aid</i>	17 969
<i>Total official development assistance</i>	260 757

(a) Includes new items previously not reported as aid. (b) Excludes aid to Papua New Guinea of \$4 479 in 1973-74. This amount included under "Aid to Papua New Guinea". (c) Includes \$420 000 contributed to Exchange Support Fund (Khmer Republic). (d) Includes United Nations Special Fund and United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance.

Mr. CHAPMAN: We have an over-supply of a rural product in a rural community with little other alternative to pursue. On the other hand, our Governments, collectively and no doubt rightly, are providing this aid to our underdeveloped neighbouring nations. Why can we not provide the food in the form of fruit juices or canned fruits to those underdeveloped countries and pay our producers for their fruit at the ordinary market price in lieu of the funds being used as they are? I realise that, generally speaking, this aid is extended on a national basis but, having ventilated this subject in its briefest form, I invite any Minister, at the appropriate time, to provide me with some good answer as to why they, as Ministers of the Crown, with their respective State colleagues across the nation, cannot further pursue this subject of providing food, surplus products of this country, to our starving neighbours in lieu of continual sums of money that can be better used in this country keeping our growers afloat—not providing handouts, not providing subsidies, but buying from them the products which are so grossly over-supplied.

I appreciate that an argument was advanced on this subject some years ago to the effect that perishable products are hard to export to outside countries and hard to distribute on arrival, let alone the education programme that is necessary to teach those people how to cope with such foods. In the case of fruit juice, and even fruit itself, little education would be necessary for these people to learn how to drink or eat it. With the use of preservatives of which are aware, these products would become non-perishable in the highest form, and would be easy to transport, easy to distribute, easy to deliver on site, and easy to consume for the people who really need them. This theory might apply to other products that are over-supplied, but it seems that to assist, if not fully to overcome, the over-supply of fruit in the Riverland area, this subject should be further considered.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Motion carried.

At 10.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 11, at 2 p.m.