

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, September 10, 1974

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Motor Vehicles Act Amendment,
Pay-roll Tax Act Amendment.

PETITION: HILLS ROADS

Mr. EVANS presented a petition signed by 353 persons stating that the development of main roads connecting the Mitcham Hills area with Crafers would be detrimental to the quality of life in these areas, and praying that the House of Assembly would bring to the notice of the Minister of Transport the stupidity of destroying this quality of life by constructing major roads in these areas.

Petition received.

PETITION: SPEED LIMIT

Mr. GROTH presented a petition signed by 26 persons, stating that because of conversion to metrics the speed limit of 30 kilometres an hour past school omnibuses and schools was too high and presented an increased threat to the safety of schoolchildren, and praying that the House of Assembly would support legislation to amend the Road Traffic Act to reduce the speed limit to 25 km/h.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

Dr. EASTICK presented a petition signed by 556 persons stating that they were dissatisfied with the first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, and praying that the House of Assembly would not bring about any change or alteration of boundaries.

The Hon. L. J. KING presented a similar petition signed by 115 persons.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: SODOMY

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL presented a petition signed by 142 persons objecting to the introduction of legislation to legalise sodomy between consenting adults until such time as Parliament had a clear mandate from the people by way of a referendum (to be held at the next periodic South Australian election) to pass such legislation.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO presented a similar petition signed by 81 persons.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

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

SHOW SOCIETIES

Mr. RUSSACK (on notice):

1. What amounts have been granted annually in subsidies to country show societies during each of the past five financial years?

2. Have any other payments by way of grants been made to these societies in this period?

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

	\$
1. 1969-70	24 447
1970-71	23 241
1971-72	18 311
1972-73	22 599
1973-74	22 154
	\$
2. 1973-74	4 800

HILTON PROPERTY

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Whose decision was it compulsorily to acquire Mr. and Mrs. G. S. Elston's property on Burbridge Road?

2. Did any instructions come from the Premier's Department in relation to the acquisition of this property?

3. Has the Highways Department plans to use this site for the widening of Burbridge Road?

4. Will all the documents relating to the acquisition of this property be tabled in this House?

5. Was the decision to compulsorily acquire the property influenced by any other department or Minister and, if so, by which department or Minister?

6. Who has leased this property since the Highways Department compulsorily acquired it?

7. What is the amount of rent charged?

8. What was the date that Mr. Ceruto leased this property, and for how long was he the lessee?

9. Have any negotiations taken place with any of the people leasing this property to increase the rent?

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

1. Minister of Transport.

2. As the property was about to be sold, the Premier discussed with me the desirability of the Highways Department's acquiring the property and, as a result, I requested the Commissioner of Highways to purchase it.

3. Yes.

4. No.

5. See No. 1.

6. Nos. 136-140 Theatre 62 24/4/1971 to 31/12/1971; Nos. 136-138 Theatre 62 1/1/1972 to date; No. 140 J. P. Jones, 1/1/1972 to 21/1/1973; J. J. L. Ceruto, 14/2/1973 to 3/3/1974; P. Edwards, 2/3/1974 to July, 1974; M. Kempster and M. Burgess, July, 1974, to date (reinstatement of lease is taking place at present).

7. Nos. 136-138 \$10 a week; No. 140 \$20 a week.

8. See No. 6.

9. Every effort has been made to obtain the maximum rental that could reasonably be asked. In fact, the rental for Nos. 136-138 is now under review.

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How many properties has the Highways Department acquired on Burbridge Road?

2. How many of these properties have been compulsorily acquired?

3. How many have been acquired by negotiation?

4. How many properties have been only partly acquired?

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

1. Seventeen whole properties and 106 part properties.

2. Two whole properties and three part properties.

3. Fifteen whole properties and 103 part properties.

4. One hundred and six.

PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Was Mr. John Ceruto ever employed in the Premier's Department and, if so, when was he so employed?

2. If he was employed, when did he leave the Premier's Department, and why?

3. If he was so employed—

(a) what were his duties and salary;

(b) was it a Public Service appointment or a Ministerial appointment; and

(c) did he travel overseas whilst in the Premier's Department and, if so, what was the purpose of his travel and who paid the cost?

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

1. Mr. John Ceruto was employed as a temporary clerical assistant in the Hospitals Department from January 18, 1971, at a salary of \$3 555 a year. During his time at the Hospitals Department he was granted leave without pay under section 98 of the Public Service Act to gain experience in catering activities with interstate motels and restaurants. Subsequently, on April 28, 1971, he was appointed to the Premier's Department as a Catering Projects Officer on the Ministerial staff. His salary was determined at \$68.15 a week on the recommendation of the Chairman, Public Service Board, to the Minister for Labour and Industry. This rate included the requirement to work outside normal office hours and some weekends.

2. Mr. Ceruto resigned from the Premier's Department on June 23, 1972. Mr. Ceruto had endeavoured to inculcate a policy of low-cost good food in restaurants. He decided to leave the department in order to demonstrate in practice the policies he had been advocating. Mr. Ceruto was responsible for organising the Restaurant Association, and assisted the consultant to the Government in the feasibility study for the Windy Point Restaurant.

3. (a) Mr. Ceruto's duties at the Premier's Department were "the responsibility of examining and reporting on existing catering facilities in national parks and reserves and making recommendations for improvements. He was also to report on the need for new facilities in all tourist regions and to submit recommendations for their establishment." In making his recommendation that Mr. Ceruto's initial salary be \$68.15 a week, the Chairman of the Public Service Board suggested that, after a probationary period of employment the salary should be further reviewed. Accordingly, on August 6, 1971, his rate of pay was increased to \$80 a week on the same terms and conditions.

(b) During his service with the Premier's Department, Mr. Ceruto was a Ministerial employee.

(c) Mr. Ceruto took leave without pay from February 2, 1972, in order to proceed overseas to the United States of America to gain further experience in the catering industry. The cost of the trip was not paid by the Government. His notional salary was increased to \$82 a week from May 19, 1972. He resigned shortly after his return from overseas.

RUTHVEN MANSIONS

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. What decision has been reached by the Government on the future of Ruthven Mansions in Pulteney Street, Adelaide?

2. Is it intended to demolish this building and, if so, when?

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

1. It is intended to demolish Ruthven Mansions.

2. It is expected that tenders for this demolition will be called in October, 1974.

CURRICULUM CENTRE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. What financial support did the Government give to the National Curriculum Development Centre in the financial year 1973-74?

2. What programmes developed at the centre have been used in South Australian schools?

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

1. None. The Interim Council for the National Curriculum Development Centre was established only recently, and the work of the centre has yet to get fully under way.

2. *Vote 1.*

SCHOOL FIRES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. How many school fires have occurred in each of the years from 1971-72 to 1973-74, inclusive?

2. What was the estimated cost of damage in each of these years?

3. How many fires in each year were considered to have been deliberately started?

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

1.

Year	No. of school fires
1971-72	7
1972-73	14
1973-74	9

2.

Year	Equipment damaged through fire \$	Buildings damaged through fire \$
1971-72	34 700	56 600
1972-73	34 100	119 500
1973-74	45 800	233 400

3.

Year	Number of fires deliberately lit
1971-72	3
1972-73	9
1973-74	4

These fires are known to have been started deliberately. The cause of most of the fires is unknown.

TEACHER AIDES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. What criteria are used to determine the appointment of teacher aides to Government schools?

2. How many teacher aides were appointed in 1973-74?

3. What qualifications are required for appointment?

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

1. Teacher aides are appointed to primary schools on the basis of the enrolment figure at the school for July of the previous year. The current entitlement ranges from 15 to 150 hours a week. The formula is adjusted each year subject to the availability of funds for the purpose. There is not a specific entitlement for teacher aides in secondary schools. Ancillary staff is determined on the basis of points that are allocated according to enrolment. In accordance with the points allocated, a secondary school principal in consultation with staff has the opportunity to vary the number of ancillary staff within each category, for example, teacher aide, office assistant, laboratory assistant, groundsman, etc., according to the needs of the school.

2. 1 282.

3. No specific qualifications are required. The range of duties to be undertaken varies both within a school and from school to school. Heads take the opportunity to select staff accordingly; for example, ability to relate to children, ethnic background, knowledge of audio visual equipment, and music skill.

SECRETARIAL SCHOOL STAFF

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. What criteria are used in deciding to appoint secretarial staff to Government schools?

2. What qualifications are required for appointment?

3. How many additional appointments were made in 1973-74?

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

1. Office assistants are appointed to primary schools on the basis of a school's enrolment figure in July of the previous year. The present entitlement ranges from 7½ hours a week for schools with an enrolment between 51 and 100 pupils to three full-time assistants at schools with 1 301 to 1 600 students. A specific entitlement for office assistants does not apply in secondary schools. Ancillary staff is determined on the basis of points that are allocated according to enrolment. In accordance with the points allocated, a secondary school principal, after consultation with staff, has the opportunity to vary the number of ancillary staff among categories, for example, teacher aide, office assistant, laboratory assistant, groundsman, etc., according to the needs of the school.

2. No specific qualifications are required. Additional allowances are payable to those office assistants who possess qualifications or have satisfied proficiency standards determined by the Public Service Board.

3. 279.

HEALTH CENTRES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. When is it expected community health centres will be completed and in operation at Ingle Farm, St. Agnes, Port Lincoln, Coober Pedy, Ceduna, Cummins, Tumby Bay, and Keith, respectively?

2. What will be the controlling authority responsible for the management of each centre?

3. What part will the State Health Department play in the administration of each centre?

4. What part will the Commonwealth Department of Health play in the administration of each centre?

5. Which department will have the ultimate control of community health centres in South Australia?

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

1. Health centre location	Expected completion date:
Ingle Farm	May, 1975
St. Agnes	Unknown
Port Lincoln	Unknown
Coober Pedy	November, 1974
Ceduna	November, 1974
Cummins	Unknown
Tumby Bay	Unknown
Keith	January, 1975

2. Interim committees of management are being encouraged at each health centre to plan and execute detailed development and control the day-to-day operations. As soon as possible it is intended that these management arrangements will be formalised under enabling legislation. Whilst there is no set pattern as yet, the membership of interim management committees is drawn from any one or each of the following areas: State Hospitals Department, State Public Health Department, State Community Welfare Department, State University, Australian Health Department, Australian Department for Social Security, Local medical practice, and local community.

3. Until appropriate local autonomy is provided through new legislation as referred to in 2. above, the South Australian Hospitals Department will play a major role in the administration of each centre in the following areas: policy direction; financial control including audit; salary and wage payments to appropriate personnel; and purchase of goods and services.

4. It is expected that the Australian Government will be represented on the various interim management committees.

5. The ultimate control of operations at each project will be through the locally based management committees to the State Minister of Health.

HOSPITALS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Has the Government received any proposals from the Commonwealth Government for the building of separate Commonwealth hospitals, as suggested recently by the Prime Minister?

2. Does the State Government intend to agree to any such proposal?

3. Have representations been made to the Commonwealth Government asking that the funds proposed to be expended by that Government on such projects should be given to the State Government for use in the furtherance of the State's hospital building programme?

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

1. No formal proposals have been received.

2. The State would not favour the building of separate hospitals by the Australian Government.

3. Submissions have been made to the Australian Government for additional financial assistance to the State to further its hospital building programme.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Will consideration be given to including in the Redcliff development indenture a compensation clause to protect industries that may be affected by the establishment of the petro-chemical plant?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The chances that the petro-chemical plant will detrimentally affect some industries are remote. In the indenture, clause 4 will contain the provision that the State Planning Authority shall refuse consent to any new development that is likely to be affected by the operation of the petro-chemical complex. Apart from this preventive measure, it is not intended to include a compensation clause in the indenture. Common law action for compensation against the operators of the complex would, of course, be available where industries can prove that they suffered damage as a result of the operation of the complex. The Government may also consider providing assistance to industries that can conclusively prove that they sustained losses (other than from competition) because of the operation of the complex.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): When is it now expected that the indenture concerning the Redcliff petro-chemical project will be signed by the parties thereto?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No precise date has yet been decided or can be set. It is expected that there will be some finality shortly in the prices for the products between the consortium and the producers. Negotiations between the Australian Government and the State Government relating to other aspects of the indenture are proceeding satisfactorily. After the execution of the indenture the drafting of the ratification Bill itself will take some time because of the complexities involved.

COALYARD RESTAURANT

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. When did the property owned by the Commissioners of Charitable Funds, now leased by the Coalyard Restaurant, first become the property of the Commissioners?

2. Who are the Commissioners of Charitable Funds and when were they appointed?

3. How many people have leased the property owned by the Commissioners at 11A Hindmarsh Square, Adelaide, since January, 1972, and who are they?

4. Were any indications given by the Commissioners to Mr. Liebeknecht and Mr. Roderick that their lease of that property would only be for a very short duration?

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

1. The property was bequeathed to Royal Adelaide Hospital by the late Thomas Martin, who died in England on May 21, 1898.

2. (a) Mr. Lloyd Clarence Hughes, 12 Ernest Terrace, Wallaroo: appointed a Commissioner on July 1, 1970, then Chairman of Commissioners on March 1, 1974.

(b) Mr. George Joseph, 1 Angas Street, Kent Town: appointed a Commissioner on November 16, 1972.

(c) Mr. Arthur Reginald Curren, 1 Derrick Street, Berri: appointed a Commissioner on March 1, 1974.

3. Two tenants have leased 11A since January, 1972:

(a) Messrs. Michael John Roderick and John Lewis Liebeknecht;

(b) Coalyard Proprietary Limited.

4. Mr. Loughton, R. W. Swan & Co., acting for Messrs. Roderick and Liebeknecht, approached the Commissioners for a lease to 11A Hindmarsh Square. He was informed that the property would be available for 12 months only and could therefore draw up a lease for 12 months with no right of renewal. R. W. Swan & Co. drew up this lease, dated July 12, 1972, for the period April 28, 1972, to April 27, 1973. It did not give a right of renewal.

Mr. GUNN (on notice): How much was the guarantee given to the proprietors of the Coalyard Restaurant, and did the Industries Development Committee attach any conditions to its recommendations to the Treasurer on this guarantee?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not the practice of Governments to release information of this nature that is considered to be confidential between the applicant and the Government. However, with the consent of the applicant, the Government will make the conditions confidentially known to the member. The Industries Development Committee did attach several conditions to its recommendation, all of which were communicated to the applicant and its bankers as conditions subject to which the guarantee was offered. All of the conditions were accepted by the applicant and, where applicable, by its bankers. The Treasurer cannot give a guarantee without a recommendation of the committee. All members of the committee (which consists of two Government, two Opposition members and a Treasury officer), signed the recommendation, with the exception of Mr. Geddes, M.L.C. On inquiry by me, I was informed that Mr. Geddes had agreed with the recommendation, but had been absent in the country at the time the report to me was signed.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): Why has the South Australian Government acted as a financial guarantor for the Coalyard Restaurant when the Premier has said that restaurant operations in Adelaide are of a very competitive nature?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government guaranteed a loan to the Coalyard after consideration had been given to the company's application by the Industries Development Committee and that committee had made a favourable recommendation to the Treasurer in accordance with the Industries Development Act.

INFECTIOUS DISEASES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Is it considered that the present requirements for the notification of infectious and notifiable diseases are being complied with satisfactorily?

2. When were the lists of diseases in the second and third schedules of the Health Act last revised?

3. Is it intended to revise these lists within the immediate future, and will hepatitis be added?

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

1. Although it is believed that some of the diseases for which notification to health authorities is required are not fully reported, it is difficult to assess the extent to which this applies. However, the biological laboratories notify the results of any positive tests pertaining to an infectious or notifiable disease to the Public Health Department. It is considered that the present dual notification system is working satisfactorily.

2. The last revision of the lists of diseases in the second and third schedules of the Health Act was in 1965.

3. At its meeting in November, 1973, the National Health and Medical Research Council recommended the adoption of revised lists of infectious and notifiable diseases. This recommendation is being studied at present with a view to implementation. Infectious hepatitis has been on the third schedule (notifiable diseases) for more than 20 years.

MONARTO

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Has a comprehensive ecological study been carried out of the area set aside for the new town of Monarto and, if not, why not?

2. If a study has been conducted, who did the study, when was it done and when will the results be made public?

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

1. No. As it is the responsibility of the Monarto Development Commission to undertake such a study, it was not possible to do so until the commission commenced operations (January 17, 1974) and expert staff appointed. The commission is now proceeding with arrangements for an environmental impact statement for Monarto, which is expected to be completed early in 1975.

2. See 1 above.

CONTRACT WORK

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What was the total value of contract work carried out by the Engineering and Water Supply Department during 1973-74?

2. What are the details for each contract, specifically stating the nature of the work, the value of the contract, and whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department made a profit or loss from each contract?

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

1. \$9 266 000.

2. Nature of work

Total estimate
\$

Coast protection 855 000

Christie Downs railway 2 648 000

Waikerie irrigation and reclamation

scheme 4 610 000

Subdivider work Cannot be

determined.

(The value for

1973-74 was

\$6 780 000)

Work carried out by the Engineering and Water Supply Department for other departments is done at full cost and is debited directly against the client department's appropriate Treasury line. Most subdivider work is carried out at full cost, but where quotation agreements have been entered into with subdividers, it is policy not to divulge actual costs.

WARDANG ISLAND

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is the Aboriginal Lands Trust the owner of Wardang Island and, if so, since when?
2. If the trust is not the owner, in whom is ownership vested?
3. To what use is the island being put, and is any change in use intended?
4. If a change is intended, why will it be made and when?

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

1. No. The Aboriginal Lands Trust holds an annual licence for tourist purposes over the island except for two small areas held by the Commonwealth for lighthouse purposes. It is the policy of the Government that the freehold should be vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust, but this has been delayed by certain problems arising out of the Commonwealth's occupancy. It is hoped that these will be speedily resolved so that the transfer can take place.
2. The island is Crown land, except for the two areas held by the Commonwealth.
3. The Aboriginal Lands Trust has operated Wardang Island as a tourist resort for the past two years. The trust and the Point Pearce Community Council are now discussing the future use of the island. At this stage no decisions have been reached.
4. Refer 3 above.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Have any Government moneys been spent on Wardang Island since January 1, 1972, and, if so, how much and for what purpose?
2. If money has been spent, when was it spent?
3. Is it intended to spend further moneys and if so—
 - (a) how much;
 - (b) for what purpose; and
 - (c) when will it be spent?

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

1. Yes.

State funds:		\$
Purchase of perpetual lease and assets from Mr. H. G. Pryce	115 000	
Operation as a tourist resort	23 200	
Commonwealth funds:		
Consultant fees—survey of island with regard to long-term development . .	11 700	
Repair and improve water catchment system	25 000	
2.

	\$	
June, 1972	115 000	State funds
1972-73	23 200	State funds
	11 700	Commonwealth funds
1973-74	25 000	Commonwealth funds
3. Any further expenditure will depend on decisions regarding the future use of the island.

RAILWAY BRIDGES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Were any concrete pouring tests carried out in relation to the contract between the South Australian Railways and Mr. T. Egan between November 3, 1964, and May 9, 1966, and, if so, when and by whom?
2. What were the results of any such tests?
3. Were test certificates prepared showing the results of any tests and, if so, by whom and when?
4. Did any such certificates show deficiencies and, if so, what deficiencies?
5. What comments, if any, were made on any tests and by whom?

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

1. Yes. Test cylinders and cubes were prepared both by railway staff and by the contractor or his employees and tested by the Engineer of Tests, Islington workshops. No records exist of the individuals who prepared and tested each sample. The attached table shows when such tests were performed.
2. The following table shows the results of each test:

Specimen Number	Date Cast	Date Tested	Result	Specimen Type	Adjusted Result	Specified Strength
1F 4	4/12/64	31/12/64	404	6in. x 12in. Cyl	404	2 000
2F 4	5/12/64	31/12/64	719	6in. x 12in. Cyl	719	2 000
3F 4	5/12/64	31/12/64	757	6in. x 12in. Cyl	757	2 000
4F 4	6/12/64	3/1/65	352	6in. x 12in. Cyl	352	2 000
15F 10	*	8/2/65	950	6in. x 12in. Cyl	950	2 000
16F 13	*	8/2/65	1 050	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 050	2 000
17F 14	*	12/2/65	1 500	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 500	2 000
18F 1	*	12/2/65	950	6in. x 12in. Cyl	950	2 000
19F 16	*	15/2/65	2 500	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 500	2 000
20F 17	*	15/2/65	1 700	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 700	2 000
21F 18	*	16/2/65	1 400	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 400	2 000
22P 8	*	17/2/65	2 050	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 050	3 000
23P 9	*	19/2/65	4 500	6in. x 12in. Cyl	4 500	3 000
24P 12	*	19/2/65	2 900	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 900	3 000
25P 7	*	10/3/65	1 550	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 550	3 000
26P 6	*	10/3/65	1 900	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 900	3 000
27P 5	*	12/3/65	2 700	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 700	3 000
28P 4	*	12/3/65	1 350	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 350	3 000
30P 8	*	16/3/65	1 850	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 850	3 000
31P 13	*	16/3/65	1 100	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 100	3 000
32P 13	*	16/3/65	850	6in. x 12in. Cyl	850	3 000
33P 14	*	17/3/65	1 000	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 000	3 000
34P 14	*	17/3/65	1 200	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 200	3 000
35P 15	*	18/3/65	750	6in. x 12in. Cyl	750	3 000
36P 15	*	18/3/65	900	6in. x 12in. Cyl	900	3 000
28P 4	*	26/2/65	1 150	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 150	3 000
37P 1	*	23/3/65	950	6in. x 12in. Cyl	950	3 000
38P 1	*	23/3/65	600	6in. x 12in. Cyl	600	3 000
39B	*	25/3/65	800	6in. x 12in. Cyl	800	3 000
40B	*	25/3/65	1 000	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 000	3 000
41B	*	26/3/65	1 350	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 350	3 000
42B	*	26/3/65	1 400	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 400	3 000
43C	22/6/65	20/7/65	1 750	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 750	2 000
44C	24/6/65	22/7/65	1 450	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 450	2 000

Specimen Number	Date Cast	Date Tested	Result	Specimen Type	Adjusted Result	Specified Strength
45C	25/6/65	23/7/65	1 050	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 050	2 000
46C	25/6/65	3/8/65	900	6in. x 12in. Cyl	900	2 000
47C	26/6/65	3/8/65	1 150	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 150	2 000
48C	30/6/65	3/8/65	1 150	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 150	2 000
49C	30/6/65	3/8/65	1 250	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 250	2 000
50C	1/7/65	3/8/65	850	6in. x 12in. Cyl	850	2 000
51C	3/7/65	3/8/65	1 200	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 200	2 000
52C	4/7/65	3/8/65	1 500	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 500	2 000
53C	4/7/65	3/8/65	1 300	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 300	2 000
54C	5/7/65	3/8/65	1 600	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 600	2 000
55C	9/7/65	6/8/65	2 150	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 150	2 000
56C	9/7/65	6/8/65	1 600	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 600	2 000
57C	10/7/65	6/8/65	700	6in. x 12in. Cyl	700	2 000
58C	12/7/65	9/8/65	550	6in. x 12in. Cyl	550	2 000
59C	12/7/65	9/8/65	1 350	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 350	2 000
60C	13/7/65	10/8/65	1 400	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 400	2 000
61C	14/7/65	11/8/65	1 250	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 250	2 000
62B	16/7/65	13/8/65	3 450	6in. x 12in. Cyl	3 450	3 000
63B	16/7/65	13/8/65	1 750	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 750	3 000
64B	17/7/65	13/8/65	2 700	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 700	3 000
67B	26/7/65	23/8/65	1 450	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 450	3 000
65B	20/7/65	17/8/65	3 250	6in. x 12in. Cyl	3 250	3 000
66B	23/7/65	20/8/65	3 150	6in. x 12in. Cyl	3 150	3 000
68B	30/7/65	30/8/65	3 400	6in. x 12in. Cyl	3 400	3 000
69B	4/8/65	1/9/65	2 600	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 600	3 000
70B	7/8/65	3/9/65	2 900	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 900	3 000
71C	7/8/65	3/9/65	1 400	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 400	2 000
72C	7/8/65	3/9/65	2 900	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 900	2 000
73C	8/8/65	6/9/65	1 950	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 950	2 000
74C	8/8/65	6/9/65	3 300	6in. x 12in. Cyl	3 300	2 000
75B	8/8/65	6/9/65	3 300	6in. x 12in. Cyl	3 300	3 000
76B	10/8/65	7/9/65	2 550	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 550	3 000
77B	10/8/65	7/9/65	3 800	6in. x 12in. Cyl	3 800	3 000
78B	13/8/65	10/9/65	2 100	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 100	3 000
79C	13/8/65	10/9/65	3 150	6in. x 12in. Cyl	3 150	2 000
80C	13/8/65	7/9/65	2 750	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 750	2 000
81C	13/8/65	10/9/65	3 100	6in. x 12in. Cyl	3 100	2 000
82B	18/8/65	15/9/65	2 100	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 100	3 000
83C	19/8/65	16/9/65	1 950	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 950	2 000
84C	19/8/65	16/9/65	2 000	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 000	2 000
85C	19/8/65	16/9/65	1 250	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 250	2 000
86C	19/8/65	16/9/65	1 200	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 200	2 000
87B	21/8/65	17/9/65	2 250	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 250	3 000
88B	23/8/65	20/9/65	2 900	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 900	3 000
89B	25/8/65	22/9/65	1 100	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 100	3 000
90B	26/8/65	23/9/65	2 800	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 800	3 000
91B	26/8/65	23/9/65	4 100	6in. x 12in. Cyl	4 100	3 000
92B	1/9/65	29/9/65	2 300	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 300	3 000
93B	2/9/65	30/9/65	1 850	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 850	3 000
94B	3/9/65	1/10/65	950	6in. x 12in. Cyl	950	3 000
95B	3/9/65	1/10/65	1 000	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 000	3 000
96B	17/9/65	15/10/65	1 050	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 050	3 000
97B	17/9/65	15/10/65	1 200	8in. x 12in. Cyl	1 250	3 000
98B	17/9/65	15/10/65	1 350	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 350	3 000
99B	17/9/65	15/10/65	1 450	8in. x 12in. Cyl	1 510	3 000
100B	18/9/65	15/10/65	1 000	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 000	3 000
101B	18/9/65	15/10/65	1 000	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 000	3 000
102B	18/9/65	15/10/65	1 150	8in. x 12in. Cyl	1 200	3 000
103B	18/9/65	15/10/65	1 150	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 150	3 000
104B	18/9/65	15/10/65	1 350	8in. x 12in. Cyl	1 400	3 000
105B	20/9/65	18/10/65	800	6in. x 12in. Cyl	800	3 000
106B	23/9/65	21/10/65	1 900	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 900	3 000
107B	23/9/65	21/10/65	1 950	8in. x 12in. Cyl	2 030	3 000
108B	24/9/65	22/10/65	2 450	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 450	3 000
109B	24/9/65	22/10/65	2 400	8in. x 12in. Cyl	2 500	3 000
110B	1/10/65	29/10/65	2 150	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 150	3 000
111B	1/10/65	29/10/65	1 950	8in. x 12in. Cyl	2 030	3 000
112B	1/10/65	29/10/65	2 300	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 300	3 000
113B	1/10/65	29/10/65	1 900	8in. x 12in. Cyl	1 980	3 000
114B	2/10/65	29/10/65	1 950	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 950	3 000
115B	2/10/65	29/10/65	2 550	8in. x 12in. Cyl	2 650	3 000
116B	3/10/65	1/11/65	2 300	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 300	3 000
117B	3/10/65	1/11/65	2 350	8in. x 12in. Cyl	2 440	3 000
118B	7/10/65	4/11/65	2 150	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 150	3 000
119B	7/10/65	4/11/65	2 400	8in. x 12in. Cyl	2 500	3 000
120B	7/10/65	4/11/65	1 750	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 750	3 000
121B	7/10/65	4/11/65	2 000	8in. x 12in. Cyl	2 080	3 000
122B	8/10/65	5/11/65	1 950	6in. x 12in. Cyl	1 950	3 000
123B	8/10/65	5/11/65	1 300	8in. x 12in. Cyl	1 350	3 000
124B	12/10/65	9/11/65	2 400	6in. x 12in. Cyl	2 400	3 000
125B	12/10/65	9/11/65	2 450	8in. x 12in. Cyl	2 550	3 000
126C	19/10/65	16/11/65	2 850	8in. x 16in. Cyl	2 960	2 000
127C	19/10/65	16/11/65	3 050	8in. x 16in. Cyl	3 170	2 000

Specimen Number	Date Cast	Date Tested	Result	Specimen Type	Adjusted Result	Specified Strength
128C	19/10/65	16/11/65	3 300	8in. x 16in. Cyl	3 430	2 000
129C	6/11/65	4/12/65	3 100	8in. x 12in. Cyl	3 220	2 000
130C	6/11/65	4/12/65	3 200	6in. Cube	2 460	2 000
131C	7/11/65	6/12/65	1 750	8in. x 12in. Cyl	1 820	2 000
132C	7/11/65	6/12/65	2 950	6in. Cube	2 270	2 000
134C	9/11/65	7/12/65	1 250	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 300	2 000
137C	9/11/65	7/12/65	1 500	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 560	2 000
140C	10/11/65	8/12/65	1 550	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 610	2 000
135C	9/11/65	13/12/65	1 750	6in. Cube	1 350	2 000
136C	9/11/65	13/12/65	1 950	6in. Cube	1 500	2 000
138C	9/11/65	13/12/65	2 400	6in. Cube	1 850	2 000
139C	9/11/65	13/12/65	2 300	6in. Cube	1 770	2 000
141C	10/11/65	13/12/65	2 650	6in. Cube	2 040	2 000
142C	10/11/65	13/12/65	2 500	6in. Cube	1 930	2 000
143C	15/11/65	13/12/65	2 050	8in. x 16in. Cyl	2 130	2 000
144C	15/11/65	13/12/65	2 550	6in. Cube	1 960	2 000
145C	15/11/65	13/12/65	2 500	6in. Cube	1 920	2 000
146C	15/11/65	13/12/65	1 300	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 350	2 000
147C	15/11/65	13/12/65	2 000	6in. Cube	1 540	2 000
148C	15/11/65	13/12/65	1 900	6in. Cube	1 460	2 000
149C	16/11/65	14/12/65	1 400	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 460	2 000
150C	16/11/65	14/12/65	1 900	6in. Cube	1 460	2 000
151C	16/11/65	14/12/65	1 850	6in. Cube	1 420	2 000
152C	17/11/65	15/12/65	1 850	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 920	2 000
155C	17/11/65	15/12/65	2 400	8in. x 16in. Cyl	2 500	2 000
156C	17/11/65	15/12/65	2 750	6in. Cube	2 120	2 000
157B	24/11/65	22/12/65	1 550	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 610	3 000
158B	24/11/65	22/12/65	2 650	6in. Cube	2 040	3 000
159B	24/11/65	22/12/65	2 650	6in. Cube	2 040	3 000
160B	24/11/65	22/12/65	1 450	8in. diam. Cyl	1 510	3 000
161B	26/11/65	24/12/65	2 500	8in. diam. Cyl	2 600	3 000
162B	26/11/65	24/12/65	2 650	6in. Cube	2 040	3 000
163B	26/11/65	24/12/65	2 450	6in. Cube	1 890	3 000
164B	27/11/65	5/1/66	2 700	8in. diam. Cyl	2 810	3 000
165B	27/11/65	5/1/66	3 550	6in. Cube	2 730	3 000
166B	27/11/65	5/1/66	3 550	6in. Cube	2 730	3 000
167B	29/11/65	5/1/66	2 450	6in. Cube	1 890	3 000
168B	29/11/65	5/1/66	2 500	6in. Cube	1 930	3 000
169B	29/11/65	5/1/66	2 000	8in. diam. Cyl	2 080	3 000
170B	1/12/65	5/1/66	3 850	6in. Cube	2 960	3 000
171B	1/12/65	5/1/66	3 700	6in. Cube	2 850	3 000
172B	1/12/65	5/1/66	1 650	8in. diam. Cyl	1 720	3 000
173C	9/12/65	10/1/66	1 650	8in. diam. Cyl	1 720	2 000
174C	9/12/65	10/1/66	2 150	6in. Cube	1 660	2 000
175C	9/12/65	10/1/66	2 050	8in. diam. Cyl	2 130	2 000
176C	9/12/65	10/1/66	2 250	6in. Cube	1 730	2 000
177C	9/12/65	10/1/66	2 200	8in. diam. Cyl	2 290	2 000
178C	9/12/65	10/1/66	2 500	6in. Cube	1 930	2 000
179C	9/12/65	10/1/66	1 300	8in. diam. Cyl	1 350	2 000
180C	9/12/65	10/1/66	1 400	6in. diam. Cyl	1 400	2 000
181C	10/12/65	10/1/66	1 000	8in. diam. Cyl	1 040	2 000
182C	10/12/65	11/1/66	1 800	6in. Cube	1 390	2 000
183C	10/12/65	11/1/66	800	8in. diam. Cyl	830	2 000
184C	10/12/65	11/1/66	1 700	6in. Cube	1 310	2 000
185C	10/12/65	11/1/66	1 350	8in. diam. Cyl	1 400	2 000
186C	10/12/65	11/1/66	1 500	6in. diam. Cyl	1 500	2 000
187C	10/12/65	11/1/66	1 100	6in. diam. Cyl	1 100	2 000
188C	10/12/65	11/1/66	2 200	6in. Cube	1 690	2 000
189C	11/12/65	11/1/66	950	8in. diam. Cyl	990	2 000
190C	11/12/65	11/1/66	950	6in. diam. Cyl	950	2 000
191C	12/12/65	19/1/66	1 650	8in. diam. Cyl	1 720	2 000
192C	12/12/65	19/1/66	1 850	6in. Cube	1 420	2 000
193C	12/12/65	19/1/66	1 450	8in. diam. Cyl	1 460	2 000
194C	12/12/65	19/1/66	1 500	6in. Cube	1 160	2 000
195C	13/12/65	19/1/66	1 150	8in. diam. Cyl	1 200	2 000
196C	13/12/65	19/1/66	1 800	6in. Cube	1 390	2 000
197C	13/12/65	19/1/66	1 200	8in. diam. Cyl	1 250	2 000
198C	13/12/65	19/1/66	2 200	6in. Cube	1 690	2 000
199B	15/12/65	19/1/66	1 650	8in. diam. Cyl	1 720	3 000
200B	15/12/65	19/1/66	1 950	6in. Cube	1 500	3 000
201B	16/12/65	19/1/66	1 700	8in. diam. Cyl	1 770	3 000
202B	16/12/65	19/1/66	2 500	6in. Cube	1 930	3 000
203B	17/12/65	19/1/66	1 650	8in. diam. Cyl	1 720	3 000
204B	17/12/65	19/1/66	3 650	6in. Cube	2 810	3 000
205B	19/12/65	24/1/66	1 950	8in. diam. Cyl	2 030	3 000
206B	19/12/65	24/1/66	2 650	6in. Cube	2 040	3 000
207C	19/12/65	24/1/66	2 800	8in. diam. Cyl	2 910	2 000
208C	19/12/65	24/1/66	1 650	8in. diam. Cyl	1 720	2 000
215C	22/12/65	24/1/66	1 800	8in. diam. Cyl	1 870	2 000
211C	22/12/65	25/1/66	2 500	8in. diam. Cyl	2 600	2 000
213B	22/12/65	25/1/66	1 800	8in. diam. Cyl	1 870	3 000
214B	22/12/65	25/1/66	2 800	6in. Cube	2 160	3 000
209C	23/12/65	25/1/66	1 700	8in. diam. Cyl	1 770	2 000

Specimen Number	Date Cast	Date Tested	Result	Specimen Type	Adjusted Result	Specified Strength
210C	23/12/65	25/1/66	2 700	8in. diam. Cyl	2 810	2 000
217C	29/12/65	26/1/66	1 700	6in. diam. Cyl	1 700	2 000
218B	29/12/65	26/1/66	3 450	6in. diam. Cyl	3 450	3 000
212C	22/12/65	8/2/66	2 700	6in. Cube	2 080	2 000
216C	22/12/65	8/2/66	2 650	6in. Cube	2 040	2 000
219B	20/1/66	23/2/66	2 050	8in. diam. Cyl	2 130	3 000
220C	29/1/66	25/2/66	2 100	8in. diam. Cyl	2 180	2 000
221C	29/1/66	25/2/66	2 350	6in. diam. Cyl	2 350	2 000
223C	30/1/66	1/3/66	1 900	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 980	2 000
224C	30/1/66	1/3/66	1 650	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 720	2 000
225C	30/1/66	1/3/66	2 100	8in. x 16in. Cyl	2 180	2 000
226C	30/1/66	1/3/66	1 450	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 510	2 000
227C	30/1/66	1/3/66	1 050	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 090	2 000
228B	1/2/66	1/3/66	2 300	8in. x 16in. Cyl	2 390	3 000
229B	3/2/66	3/3/66	2 900	8in. x 16in. Cyl	3 020	3 000
230B	5/2/66	5/3/66	2 150	8in. x 16in. Cyl	2 240	3 000
222C	30/1/66	15/3/66	1 400	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 460	2 000
231B	6/2/66	7/3/66	2 750	8in. x 16in. Cyl	2 860	3 000
232B	9/2/66	9/3/66	2 450	8in. x 16in. Cyl	2 550	3 000
233B	10/2/66	10/3/66	1 850	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 920	3 000
234B	25/2/66	25/3/66	1 450	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 510	3 000
235B	26/2/66	25/3/66	2 100	8in. x 16in. Cyl	2 180	3 000
236B	26/2/66	25/3/66	1 900	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 980	3 000
237B	28/2/66	28/3/66	1 800	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 870	3 000
240A	14/3/66	28/3/66	3 650	8in. x 16in. Cyl	3 800	5 000
238B	10/3/66	7/4/66	2 500	8in. x 16in. Cyl	2 600	3 000
239B	12/3/66	9/4/66	2 300	8in. x 16in. Cyl	2 390	3 000
241A	14/3/66	12/4/66	3 350	8in. x 16in. Cyl	3 480	5 000
242B	17/3/66	14/4/66	1 550	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 610	3 000
243B	19/3/66	15/4/66	1 850	8in. x 16in. Cyl	1 920	3 000
244B	21/3/66	18/4/66	2 050	8in. x 16in. Cyl	2 130	3 000
245A	22/3/66	19/4/66	3 800	8in. x 16in. Cyl	3 950	5 000
246A	22/3/66	19/4/66	4 100	8in. x 16in. Cyl	4 260	5 000
247B	23/3/66	20/4/66	2 850	8in. x 16in. Cyl	2 960	3 000
248A	30/3/66	2/5/66	4 400	8in. x 15in. Cyl	4 580	5 000
249A	30/3/66	2/5/66	4 400	8in. x 15in. Cyl	4 580	5 000
250A	1/4/66	2/5/66	3 950	8in. x 15in. Cyl	4 110	5 000
251A	1/4/66	2/5/66	4 100	8in. x 15in. Cyl	4 260	5 000
252A	5/4/66	3/5/66	3 500	8in. x 15in. Cyl	3 740	5 000
253A	5/4/66	3/5/66	3 800	8in. x 15in. Cyl	3 950	5 000
254A	13/4/66	11/5/66	3 600	8in. x 15in. Cyl	3 740	5 000
255A	13/4/66	11/5/66	3 800	8in. x 15in. Cyl	3 950	5 000
256A	18/4/66	17/5/66	3 250	8in. x 15in. Cyl	3 380	5 000
257A	18/4/66	17/5/66	3 750	8in. x 15in. Cyl	3 900	5 000
258B	26/4/66	1/6/66	1 250	8in. x 15in. Cyl	1 300	3 000
259A	27/4/66	1/6/66	2 850	8in. x 15in. Cyl	2 960	5 000
260A	27/4/66	1/6/66	3 400	8in. x 15in. Cyl	3 540	5 000

* Denotes date not known precisely.

Probably 28 days approx. before date of testing.

3. Statements of examination were prepared by the Engineer of Tests following the completion of each test.

4. Yes. The results of tests are related to the appropriate strength specification in the table.

5. The Engineer of Tests has made the following comments in his "Statements of examination":

Date	Specimen Nos.	Reference Sign	Comments	Date	Specimen Nos.	Reference Sign	Comments	
5/1/65	1F4	†	Received at laboratory in dry condition. Curing history not known, tested dry. Top faces of cylinders were very uneven. † Broke by crumbling around creek gravel aggregate.	22/3/65	25P7	†	Curing history not known, received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. † Broke around coarse aggregate.	
	2F4	†				26P6		†
	3F4	†				27P5		†
	4F3	†				29P4		†
22/2/65	15F10	*	Cylinders received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Plywood packing used on top and bottom faces to distribute loading while testing. § Broke partly through and partly around coarse aggregate. * Broke around coarse aggregate. NOTE: Compressive strength correct to nearest 50 p.s.i.		30P8	†		
	16F13	*				31P13		†
	17F14	*				32P13		†
	18F1	*				33P14		†
	19F16	§				34P14		†
	20F17	§				35P15		†
	21F18	*			26/3/65	36P15	†	
	22P8	§				37P1	†	
	23P9	§				38P1	†	
	24P12	§				39B	†	
3/3/65	28P4	†	† Broke mainly around coarse aggregate. Received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry.		40B	†	Curing history not known, received in a dry condition and tested dry. † Broke around coarse aggregate. Strengths to the nearest 50 p.s.i. The density was determined on cylinder 41B and 42B. 41B = 136 lb./ft. ³ 42B = 135 lb./ft. ³ These densities can be compared with other tests conducted at our laboratory where we obtained 140 lb./ft. ³ approx. for concrete of compressive strengths about 3 000 p.s.i.	
					41B	†		
					42B	†		

Date	Specimen Nos.	Reference Sign	Comments	Date	Specimen Nos.	Reference Sign	Comments
26/7/65	43C 44C 45C		All cylinders broke around coarse aggregate along planes of weakness caused by large aggregate. Cement content appeared satisfactory.				† Broke mainly around coarse aggregate. § Broke partly through and partly around coarse aggregate.
9/8/65	46C 47C 48C 49C 50C 51C 52C 53C 54C 55C 56C 57C	† † † † † † † † † † † †	Curing history not known, received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Plywood packing used on top face of cylinders. All cylinders are class "C" from bridge at 207-46. † All cylinders broke around coarse aggregate. Most cylinders broke due to large pieces of aggregate causing planes of weakness.	4/10/65	92B 93B 94B 95B	† † † †	NOTE: Cylinder 89B broke along planes of weakness caused by several pieces of 4in. aggregate. Cylinders 90B and 91B showed insufficient ramming onto bottom causing rough surfaces. Cylinders received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Curing history not known. Plywood packing used on top face of cylinder. † Broke mainly around coarse aggregate. Cylinders 93B and 95B showed pieces of 4in. aggregate at break. Cylinder 94B although not showing very large aggregate at break, it did show lack of intermediate size aggregate between the largest and the fines.
16/8/65	58C 59C 60C 61C 62B 63B 64B	† † † † § † †	† Broke mainly around coarse aggregate. § Broke partly around and partly through coarse aggregate. NOTE: Cylinder No. 62B although showing similar cement paste composition to the other cylinders, it had more aggregate of intermediate size between the largest aggregate and the fine aggregate.	18/10/65	96B 97B 98B 99B 100B 101B 102B 103B 104B	* † * * † † † * †	Curing history not known, received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Advised by Rail Standardisation Department that sand used in these cylinders was from a different locality and contained more clay than previously. * Broke around coarse aggregate and showed a 4in. piece of aggregate at break. † Broke around coarse aggregate. All cylinders showed lack of sharp intermediate grade aggregate.
24/8/65	67B		Curing history not known, received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Cylinder broke around coarse aggregate at the large pieces.	22/10/65	105B 106B 107B 108B 109B	† † † † †	Curing history not known, received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. † Broke around coarse aggregate.
24/8/65	65B 66B	† †	Curing history not known, received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Plywood packing used on top face of cylinder. † Broke mainly around coarse aggregate.	3/11/65	110B 111B 112B 113B 114B 115B 116B 117B	† † * † † † † †	Curing history not known in the field. Received at laboratory in a dry condition and stored under ordinary room conditions until tested. † Broke around coarse aggregate. * Broke around coarse aggregate, but showed better grading of aggregate of intermediate size. Cylinder No. 114B had a piece of 4½in. aggregate at the plane of failure.
7/9/65	68B 69B 70B 71C 72C 73C 74C 75B	§ † † † † † † §	Cylinders received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. § Broke partly through and partly around coarse aggregate. † Broke around coarse aggregate. NOTE: Cylinder No. 69B had a ½in. crown on the top face. Cylinder No. 71C broke through large piece of limestone. Cylinder No. 73C broke vertically. Plywood packing used on top face of cylinders.	5/11/65	118B 119B 120B 121B 122B 123B	† † † † † †	Curing history not known. Received at laboratory on 4/11/65 in a dry condition and tested dry. † Broke around coarse aggregate. Cylinder No. 123B had a crown ½in. high on the top face, causing it to break vertically instead of conically. Plywood packing used on top face.
13/9/65	76B 77B 78B 79C 80C 81C	† † † † † †	Cylinders received at laboratory in dry condition and tested dry. Plywood packing used on top face of cylinder on account of surface unevenness. † Cylinders broke mainly around coarse aggregate.	12/11/65	124B 125B	† †	Curing history not known, received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Both cylinders broke around coarse aggregate. Plywood packing used on top face of cylinder.
22/9/65	82B 83C 84C 85C 86C 87B	† † † † † †	Cylinders received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Plywood packing used on the top face of cylinders due to surface irregularity. † Broke mainly around coarse aggregate. 85C and 86C did not show much aggregate of intermediate grading between large coarse material and fine aggregate.	17/11/65	126C 127C 128C	† † †	Received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. † Broke around coarse aggregate. Plywood packing used on top face of cylinder.
27/9/65	88B 89B 90B 91B	† † § §	Cylinders received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Plywood packing used on top face of cylinders 88B and 89B. Plywood packing used on top and bottom of cylinders 90B and 91B.				Curing history not known, received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. † Broke around coarse aggregate. Plywood packing used on top face of cylinder.

Date	Specimen Nos.	Reference Sign	Comments	Date	Specimen Nos.	Reference Sign	Comments	
7/12/65	129C	†	Bridge mileage for all specimens 194m. 22c. Received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Curing history in the field not known. 129C and 131C—8in. diam. cylinders 130C and 132C—6in. cubes. Corner broken off both cubes. Plywood packing used on top and bottom faces. † Broke around coarse aggregate.				To correct above strengths to that of a standard 6in. cylinder as indicated in AS. No. A/104 use following factors. For 6in. cubes multiply by .77, for 8in. cylinders multiply by 1.04.	
	130C	†			12/1/66	173C		†
	131C	†				174C		†
	132C	†				175C		†
10/12/65	134C	†	Bridge mileage for all specimens 194m. 22c. Curing history not known, received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. † Broke around coarse aggregate. * Broke around small aggregate. Plywood packing used on top face.		176C	†	Curing history not known; received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Plywood packing used on faces. Nos. 173, 175, 177, 179, 181, 183, 185, 189 were 8in. cylinders. Nos. 174, 176, 178, 182, 184, 188 were 6in. cubes. Others were 6in. cylinders. † Broke around coarse aggregate. * Broke vertically due to top face being convex.	
	137C	*				177C		†
	140C	*				178C		†
						179C		†
						180C		†
						181C		*
						182C		†
						183C		*
						184C		†
						185C		†
16/12/65	135C	†	Plywood packing used on top and bottom faces of specimens. Specimens received at laboratory in a dry condition, and tested dry. Curing history in field not known. † Broke around coarse aggregate. ‡ Broke vertically, top convex. § Broke around coarse aggregate, but received with corners of cube broken.		186C	†	Specimens received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Plywood packing used on both faces. † Broke around coarse aggregate. * Top of cylinder convex broke by cracking vertically. ‡ Broke partly through and partly around coarse aggregate.	
	136C	†			21/1/66	190C		†
	138C	†				191C		†
	139C	†				192C		†
	141C	†				193C		†
	142C	†				194C		†
	143C	†				195C		*
	144C	†				196C		†
	145C	†				197C		*
	146C	§				198C		†
	147C	†				199B		*
	148C	*				200B		†
	149C	§				201B		*
	150C	†				202B		†
	151C	†				203B		*
	152C	†				204B		§
	155C	†			1/2/66	205B		†
	156C	†			206B	*		
30/12/65	157B	*	Curing history not known; received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Nos. 158, 159, 162, 163 were 6in. cubes. Nos. 157, 160, 161 8in. nom. diam. cylinders. * Top of cylinder very uneven, broken by cracking vertically. † Broke around coarse aggregate. Plywood packing used on top and bottom faces of specimens. Tests were conducted in accordance with the method of AS. No. A104, except that plywood packing was used. NOTE: A correction factor should be used to correct above strengths to the strength of standard 6in. cylinder. For 6in. cubes multiply by .77. For 8in. cylinders multiply by 1.04.		207C	*	Curing history not known. Received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Plywood packing used on face. Nos. 205, 207, 208, 211, 213, 209, 210 were 8in. cylinders. Nos. 206 and 214 were 6in. cubes: Nos. 217 and 218 were 6in. cylinders. * Broke mainly around intermediate aggregate. † Broke mainly around coarse aggregate. † Broke mainly around small aggregate. Plywood packing used on both faces. Curing history unknown. Received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Plywood packing used on top face of all cylinders. Cylinders 220C and 221C very rough on top. † Broke around coarse aggregate. Nos. 219B and 220C were 8in. diam. cylinders. No. 221C was a 6in. diam. cylinder.	
	158B	†				208C		*
	159B	†				215C		†
	160B	*				211C		†
	161B	†				213B		†
	162B	†				214B		*
	163B	†				209C		*
						210C		*
						217C		†
						218B		*
					11/2/66	212C		†
						216C		†
10/1/66	164B	*		Curing history not known; received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Nos. 165, 166, 167, 168, 170, 171 were 6in. cubes. Nos. 164, 169, 172 were 8in. nominal diameter cylinders. † Broke mainly around coarse aggregate. * Broke vertically due to top of cylinders being convex. ‡ Broke partly through and partly around coarse aggregate. § Plywood packing used on top and bottom faces of cylinders.		1/3/66		219B
	165B	†				220C	†	
	166B	†				221C	†	
	167B	†						
	168B	†						
	169B	*			7/3/66	223C	*	
	170B	§				224C	*	
	171B	§				225C	*	
	172B	*				226C	*	
						227C	*	
						228B	†	
						229B	†	

Date	Specimen Nos.	Reference Sign	Comments	Date	Specimen Nos.	Reference Sign	Comments
			low results. Cylinder No. 227 had ends about $\frac{1}{2}$ in. out of parallel.				partly around coarse aggregate.
17/3/66	222C	†	† Broke mainly around coarse aggregate.	21/4/66	244B	†	† Broke around coarse aggregate.
			Received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry. Top face very rough so plywood packing used on it.		245A	§	Received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry.
			† Broke around coarse aggregate.		246A	§	† Broke around coarse aggregate.
18/3/66	231B	†	Received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry.		247B	§	§ Broke partly through and partly around coarse aggregate.
	232B	†	Plywood packing used on top face.	5/5/66	248A	¶	Received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry.
	233B	†	† Broke around coarse aggregate.		249A	¶	Plywood packing used on top face of cylinder.
28/3/66	234B	†	Received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry.		250A	§	¶ Could not be broken on test machine.
	235B	†	Plywood packing used on top face of cylinder.		251A	§	† Broke around coarse aggregate.
	236B	†	† Broke around coarse aggregate.		252A	†	§ Broke partly through and partly around coarse aggregate.
			Nos. 234 and 235 representing bridge at 188m. 31c.	11/5/66	254A	†	Received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry.
			No. 236 representing bridge at 190m. 61c.		255A	†	† Broke mainly around coarse aggregate.
30/3/66	237B	†	Received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry.				Plywood packing used on top and bottom faces.
	240A	§	Plywood packing used on top face of cylinder.	19/5/66	256A	†	Received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry.
			† Broke around coarse aggregate, vertical failure.		257A	†	† Broke mainly around coarse aggregate.
			§ Broke partly through and partly around coarse aggregate.				Plywood packing used on top face.
12/4/66	238B	†	Received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry.	6/6/66	258B	†	Cylinders received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry.
	239B	†	† Broke around coarse aggregate.		259A	†	Top face of cylinders uneven, so plywood packing used on this face.
					260A	†	† Broke around coarse aggregate.
20/4/66	241A	§	Received at laboratory in a dry condition and tested dry.				Cylinder 260A was also branded 8½ bags.
	242B	†	§ Broke partly through and				
	243B	†					

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What was regarded by officers of the South Australian Railways as the critical strength in relation to the stresses to which the concrete poured by Mr. Egan under his contract with the South Australian Railways, between 1964 and 1966, would be subjected?

2. What was the estimate of the durability of such concrete?

3. Was the estimate of the durability of concrete up to specification?

4. What deterioration, if any, has taken place in such concrete work?

5. What remedial action has been taken and when was it taken, by whom and with what result?

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

1. The piers and abutments of the bridges concerned were designed as mass concrete units in which the concrete stresses are not only very low but also quite indeterminate when considered in relation to their magnitude. The officers, therefore, were not concerned with relating any critical strength to stresses, knowing full well from experience and engineering judgment developed from that experience that any distress of the concrete would be gradual and that ample warning of the development of an unsafe condition would be apparent. Subsequently history has shown that philosophy to be correct.

2. No such estimate was made.

3. No such estimate was made.

4. The deterioration experienced to date has been as expected by the Chief Engineer, South Australian Railways, when the work was accepted.

5. In February, 1973, one pier of the bridge at 193m. 56c. was strengthened by removal of faulty concrete and pouring of new concrete, and in June, 1974, one pier of the bridge at 194m. 67c. was given similar treatment. The work was performed by forces of the Chief Engineer for Railways, and seems to be satisfactory.

TOURISM

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Has the substantial growth of South Australia's tourist industry in 1973, detailed in the Minister's reply on August 29, 1974, to a question from the member for Fisher, been sustained in the current year?

2. To what extent has the industry in the Riverland benefited?

3. What effect has heavy flooding in northern parts of the State earlier this year had on the industry in the Flinders Range?

4. To what extent is any decline in 1974 in the growth rate of the tourist industry attributable to natural disasters, and to what extent is it attributable to other factors, including the general economic situation?

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

1. Information so far available suggests that the growth of South Australia's tourist industry in 1973 has continued for most regions into 1974.

2. Patronage in the Riverland was reduced in the first half of 1974 because of widely held beliefs that there were

health risks and that the high river would interfere with holiday safety and enjoyment. However, patronage for houseboats has been substantially restored and there is some improvement in business at hotels and motels.

3. Heavy rain in the northern areas of the State affected patronage in the more remote parts of the Flinders Range until recently. Patronage in the Quorn to Wilpena area seemed to be above average from January to April, but suffered in May, June, and July because of weather conditions. From August onwards, the whole Flinders Range region seems to be enjoying very high patronage, aided by the attraction of lush conditions and the wildflower displays.

4. The Murray River and the northern areas of the State have suffered in 1974 through natural causes. There is no indication at this stage of deterioration due to other factors, including economic conditions.

PINE POSTS

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. What prescribed standard is required in the formula of treated pine posts?

2. Are any field reports available on the performance of these posts?

3. What numbers of these posts have been sold in other States by the Woods and Forests Department?

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

1. An Australian standard entitled *Farm Fencing Timber Pt. 1: Preservative-treated Softwood Timber* (DR 72065) has been drafted and will be released as a standard very soon.

2. Yes. Records of treated pine railway sleepers in South Australia have been maintained since 1915, and tests conducted by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization on poles and stakes are recorded in issues of the Forest Products Newsletter.

The results of a recent trial on the fire-resistant properties of treated pine posts were published in the August 1973 issue of the *South Australian Journal of Agriculture*.

3. About 4 600 cubic metres, including struts, rails, and strainers.

TUBERCULOSIS

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (August 15).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture has informed me that the Australian Bureau of Statistics records that there are 328 properties on Kangaroo Island that claim to have cattle. The bovine tuberculosis eradication programme has 307 of these recorded, and 289 have been tested to clean status with one herd still in quarantine due for further testing. During the year 1973-74, 59 herds containing 7 355 head of stock were tested on Kangaroo Island under contract let to private veterinarians. If the remaining herds can be traced by registration and the owners have facilities for handling stock, it should be possible to complete the testing in the near future, but a few problems have already occurred when owners have failed to present cattle for testing when requested. All stockowners must be able to provide suitable stock-handling facilities for an effective programme to be maintained.

With regard to the future, Kangaroo Island is a proclaimed protected area under the Stock Diseases Act, and it is an offence to introduce cattle to the island unless they are covered by a health certificate endorsed by an inspector of stock. This requirement is aimed at preventing further tubercular animals from entering Kangaroo Island. The vigilance of stockowners in ensuring that they purchase only approved, clean stock will also help to prevent the introduction of any diseased stock.

JAMESTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. VENNING (August 27).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is agreed that a library has been listed for Jamestown Primary School for some time and when provided it will be constructed in Demac. There is a considerable need for general classroom accommodation at the moment. When the immediate urgent requirements in this direction have been satisfied, it will be possible to build libraries and other facilities. Present planning is for a library at Jamestown early in 1975, but the honourable member will realise that the date is contingent on the progress of the new Demac programme, and the room requirements of schools where increased numbers occur.

FAIRVIEW PARK SCHOOL

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (August 27).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A school for Fairview Park was referred to the Public Buildings Department for planning and feasibility study some time ago. However, because of increasing enrolments and accompanying stresses on accommodation and other resources at Banksia Park and Surrey Downs Primary Schools, it is necessary to provide either additions at these schools or a new school at Fairview Park in the near future. It is considered undesirable to increase the size of Banksia Park, so that a new school in Demac construction is now being planned for Fairview Park. It is hoped that a new school for up to 250 children can be provided by the beginning of the 1975 school year. As the honourable member will appreciate, the ability to keep to this schedule will depend on the rate of progress in Demac construction.

PORT AUGUSTA SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. KENEALLY (August 22).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A project to pave and upgrade the grounds has been deferred because of the general shortage of funds for minor works and the low priority given to paving schemes. Although there are no plans to proceed with a complete upgrading of the school grounds, the Public Buildings Department has been requested to inspect the asphalted areas, and to provide such repairs as are necessary to ensure the health and safety of the children. Officers of the Public Buildings Department at Port Augusta have provided a report in relation to the demolition referred to by the honourable member. No date could be provided as to when work could commence.

RIVERLAND SPECIAL SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (August 20).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Schools Commission funds provided by the Australian Government for capital expenditure on special education facilities for the years 1974 and 1975 have been allocated to include the rebuilding of Riverland Special School. A brief for the school was submitted to the Public Buildings Department some time ago, and initial discussions with an architect of that department have already taken place. It is not possible to give any more accurate information regarding a timetable at this stage.

READERS DIGEST

In reply to Mr. WELLS (August 8).

The Hon. L. J. KING: In the case referred to, a constituent had received three copies of the *Readers Digest*, followed by an account from Readers Digest Services Proprietary Limited for one year's subscription. He had not ordered the magazine. Investigations disclosed that the company's order form does not require the purchaser's

signature; an order had been received bearing the constituent's name and business address; on the assumption that the order was genuine, the magazines and the account had been despatched. It would seem that the order was sent to the company by some person unknown, and was in the nature of a hoax on the constituent. That the sending of the account was not part of an organised course of action by Readers Digest Services is borne out by the facts that the account was sent to the constituent at his business address, which would not be available to the company; and no similar complaints have been received by the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch. The company has now cancelled the account.

MISLEADING ADVERTISING

In reply to Mr. OLSON (August 21).

The Hon. L. J. KING: The shed concerned was advertised as 1.8 m x 1.8 m x 1.8 m but measured only 1.7 m x 1.7 m x 1.8 m. The store responsible for the advertisement took the measurements from the interstate manufacturer's invoice. The matter has been taken up with both companies and appropriate corrective action has been implemented. In addition, the retail store concerned has offered to rescind the contract with the consumer who was misled by the advertisement.

CYCLING TRACKS

In reply to Mr. DUNCAN (August 21).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Director-General of Transport is awaiting the results of studies that will be carried out during the closure of Richmond Street to facilitate the construction of the north-east trunk sewer. On completion of these studies it is expected that the Richmond Street cycle track will be implemented but I must emphasise that this is subject to agreement by St. Peters council. The council is now investigating the

implications of the cycle tracks, and is also interested in the results of the closure of Richmond Street. With regard to the proposal for a cycle track from Unley through the park lands into the city, I have to advise that the Unley council contacted residents in the area and the South Australian Teachers Institute both of whom objected to the closure of Porter Street that would be necessary for implementation of the cycle track. I regard these objections as relatively minor. However, it is not my wish to proceed with the street closure, despite its value as a collector route to the cycle tracks, if a majority is not clearly seen to be in favour of the proposal.

Honourable members could assist the development of cycle tracks by encouraging people who have expressed interest in the proposals for inner-suburban cycle tracks to contact the Policy and Planning Division of the Transport Department, as the next step in the planning is to consider alternative locations for a second experimental cycle track in lieu of the proposed Porter Street route. This invitation to participate in the cycle tracks project is extended to all members of the public. Those supporting the project should contact the Director-General of Transport's staff so that any new ideas or suggestions can be examined in the search for suitable locations.

PORT LINCOLN RAIL TRAFFIC

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (August 15).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As stated at the time, traffic on the Port Lincoln Division is seasonal, with the exception of gypsum and salt from Kevin to Thevenard. The following statement sets out the earnings and tonnages of goods and livestock carried for the past five years. For statistical purposes gypsum and salt are grouped with other loadings under the heading "Other Freight", but for all practical purposes can be considered as representing the total of other freight.

PORT LINCOLN DIVISION TRAFFIC

Year	Earnings \$	Manure Tonnes	Wheat Tonnes	Freight			Livestock	
				Barley and Other Grains Tonnes	Other Freight Tonnes	Total Freight Tonnes	Earnings \$	Animals
1969-70	2 338 062	54 062	324 882	85 729	380 859	845 532	7 296	21 588
1970-71	2 484 694	36 273	342 014	81 782	389 448	849 517	5 652	23 609
1971-72	3 165 527	40 888	371 375	139 037	506 972	1 058 272	2 575	12 965
1972-73	2 394 216	57 740	265 097	51 989	557 452	932 278	2 048	9 956
1973-74	3 191 138	65 075	321 174	98 252	749 891	1 234 392	1 110	3 150

BUSES

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (August 21).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Municipal Tramways Trust is at present faced with an acute shortage of buses because of the need to provide services on several routes abandoned by a private operator earlier this year, and for this reason it would be impracticable to extend the Somerton bus service at present. However, consideration will be given to such an extension when buses now on order become available, and other more urgent requirements have been met.

METRICATION

In reply to Mr. BECKER (August 22).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A further supply of the booklet *Important Rules to be Observed by Motor Vehicle Drivers* with information in metric terms has been ordered, but the heavy load placed upon the Government Printer at present has caused some delay. However, it is hoped that they will be available shortly.

DRY CREEK RAIL CROSSING

In reply to Mr. RUSSACK (August 22).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Improvements to the railway crossing facilities on Port Wakefield Road at Dry Creek are currently scheduled for commencement in 1977-78, subject to the availability of funds, and are expected to require 15 to 18 months to complete. The works will comprise: Stage 1: Construction of a new two-lane carriageway immediately west of the existing road, including bridges over the existing broad-gauge railway and over the locations of the seven proposed standard gauge tracks. Stage 2: Repair of the existing bridge, and reconstruction of the existing road over this bridge and over a new bridge crossing the standard gauge alignment.

PUBLIC TELEPHONES

In reply to Mr. BOUNDY (July 30).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Postmaster-General (Senator R. Bishop) has advised me that, although public telephones are costly to provide and maintain, the facilities are established as widely as practicable in the

interests of service to local residents and the travelling public. However, the financial aspect cannot be disregarded entirely, and before a new public telephone is approved, it is necessary to confirm not only that it is justified in the public interest, but also that the estimated revenue from it will cover to some extent the installation costs and the annual expenditure incurred by the Postmaster-General's Department in its upkeep. The request for a public telephone at Hardwicke Bay, Yorke Peninsula, has been investigated several times and has been re-examined especially following my representations on this matter. The latest review, however, has confirmed that the expected usage of such a facility would be far from sufficient to justify incurring the substantial costs involved in its provision, operation and maintenance.

Inquiries disclosed that the area is by no means completely without telephones, as three services are already installed—two in permanent dwellings and one in temporary premises. Also, it is expected that two additional connections will be made within the next two months, and a further service has been offered to yet another applicant. Frequent representations are made to the Post Office for the provision of public telephones in areas when the use which could be expected of the facility would not be sufficient to justify their installation. Consequently, if preferential treatment was extended in this instance, the Post Office would be obliged to give favourable consideration to the claims of other centres where similar conditions apply.

GUM TREES

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (August 28).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is difficult to be sure that the unhealthy eucalyptus trees observed by officers of the Environment and Conservation Department were necessarily those referred to by the honourable member. However, the most common cause of unhealthiness observed in the gums in the Houghton-Highbury area was the Lerp insect, *Rhinocola costeta* or Scallop-Shell Lerp. The same insects are also causing similar damage to eucalyptus trees in the Belair and Eden Hills area. These sap-sucking insects sometimes appear in plague proportions and cause considerable disfigurement to the foliage, but rarely cause permanent damage to the trees. Consequently the trees will recover and make new healthy growth in the spring and summer months. It is not feasible to control these insects by the application of chemical sprays, and therefore this must be left to the natural predators.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1974.

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MONARTO

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In recent days very serious allegations have been made by the Leader of the Opposition concerning the alleged activities of a public servant in connection with land acquisition at Monarto. Despite the fact that, when one reads through the newspaper reports, one sees that in most cases the Leader of the Opposition expresses himself carefully by saying that something is his belief and also saying "If further inquiries

confirm" the things put in front of him, such serious allegations should not have been made until those things had been substantiated.

The charges seem to have taken broadly two forms, first, that a public servant allegedly abused my knowledge of the Monarto development for personal gain, or that this public servant had been used by the Government to negotiate a land deal in such a way as to depress the prices that the Monarto landowners would be able to obtain from the Government in the subsequent land acquisition. It should be stated that no complaints of this kind have been referred to any Minister or to any Government department as yet, and therefore, in addressing myself to the problem, I have only the newspaper reports on which to base my remarks. The two allegations that have been made are, of course, contradictory, in that, if the Government deliberately used a public servant to negotiate a deal in order to depress land prices, there was obviously no personal gain for that public servant; alternatively, if a public servant had been able to line his pockets by the use of some prior knowledge, this would have had anything but a depressing effect on land prices in the area. In regard to the allegation of a public servant seeking personal gain, I have received a letter in the past day or two from a person who feels, from the evidence of the newspaper reports, that he is the person to whom reference is being made. With his permission, I will read to the House the contents of this letter. The letter, which was addressed to me, states:

On reading the lead article in the *Sunday Mail* today, I consider that the article that a public servant acted improperly and/or in collusion with the Government to fix low prices for future acquisitions by the Government both unwarranted and untrue. On or about March, 1972, my cousin and I discussed various investments to diversify our portfolios and to invest for our future. Among other things discussed, we examined farming prices, etc. With this in mind, I openly approached Southern Farmers (contacted a Mr. Spillane) and inquired about farming lands associated, *inter alia*, with chicken breeding and we were directed to several properties, including one owned by a Mr. Herbert Braendler, near Murray Bridge.

On examining the property which was already on the market because of the depressed state of the rural industry, an option was taken out to investigate matters such as rainfall, finance, etc. It should be noted that this was done prior to any announcement of a new growth centre at Murray Bridge, a matter that even in my capacity as Secretary to the S.P.A. I could not have known about!

After initial investigations my cousin for several reasons withdrew, and I again openly discussed this farm proposal at a meeting of a Lions Club with which I am associated. Several of the people there present expressed interest, and we decided to again examine the matter, and again I personally visited the farm with some of the interested persons. Indeed on another separate occasion I went to the farm with a person knowledgeable in farming to advise on fencing, soil type, etc.

At or about this stage (or perhaps a little earlier) the legislation relating to the establishment area was announced, and the State Planning Authority's role of acquiring Authority and investigating body was passed in Parliament, and although negotiations as to acquisition price, etc. commenced with Mr. Braendler, I made known to him that I was no longer to be financially involved. Of course I could not advise him or the now prospective purchaser my reasons in full. If I told them not to proceed because the land may be acquired (something I could not know for some more months) then I would have been prejudging the site boundaries. I had to allow them to pursue negotiations, knowing full well that in the near future as Secretary of the S.P.A. I may be involved in acquiring the land for the Authority. To tell them to buy another farm in the area but outside the designated site would also be giving away information which I did not and could not have known at the time.

I stress the following points:

1. Negotiations commenced before any suggestion of a growth centre near Murray Bridge were known either to myself or to Parliament.
2. The property was acquired at or near the price at which it was on the market, I believe as early as December, 1971.
3. At no time did I divulge the boundaries of the designated site to prevent the normal transaction from being completed, or to encourage more favourable acquisition outside the designated site.
4. At no stage did I influence or negotiate with the group as to final sale price to the Government, this having been done by the Land Board at all times.
5. At no stage was there any suggestion of collusion between myself and the Government (or the S.P.A.) to set a low price for future Government acquisitions.
6. The price paid for the land was I understand fair market value at the time of acquisition and consistent with the vendors then asking price.
7. At no stage did I attempt to hide my personal interest, identity or status and at all times when I was involved, I gave my phone number at the S.P.A. both to Mr. Braendler and to Southern Farmers.
8. Most certainly and without any question, the State Government, the S.P.A. and the Land Board were not involved in any of the above dealings which were conducted openly in the private real estate sector.

I must add Mr. Minister that I am assuming that this set of facts is the one to which the article refers, but in any event, I wish to state these, for your information. I regret any embarrassment that these facts may cause either yourself as my then Minister or the Government and indeed the S.P.A. but I believed then and still believe that there was nothing improper in my actions.

As to the second set of allegations concerning the Government's use of a public servant to negotiate a deal that might have had the effect of depressing the price at which the Government would later acquire land on the site, I will have with me (and I must add that I do not have it at the moment, but I will have shortly) a complete schedule of land sales in the general Monarto area from 1970, including private sales and as between individuals and Government acquisition. I intend to table the document. The document further shows that the Braendler property was acquired by the Government on November 20, 1973, and changed hands at a price a hectare, excluding buildings, which was neither significantly below nor above the rate of other acquisitions which had occurred prior to that date or soon after. This was the eighth such property acquired, and the rate for each hectare, excluding buildings, for each acquisition is included in the table.

It will be interesting for members to know the proportional interests of the purchasers of the property on March 21, 1973. This indicates just how ridiculous are the allegations of the Leader of the Opposition. I had difficulty in getting typed in time the schedule to which I have referred of persons who were the purchasing interests in this property. Many people were involved, each with proportional shares. I will table this schedule for the benefit of members. By looking through it, they can see the many people involved in the purchase, and it will be obvious that those people could have had absolutely no relationship with the Government in attempting to take this opportunity to act as agents for the Government in purchasing the property in this way. This will be clear when the schedule is placed on the table.

Mr. Millhouse: Why can't you name them?

The SPEAKER: Order! As the honourable member is out of order in interjecting, the honourable Minister would be out of order if he attempted to reply to the interjection.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I think that I should repeat what I said at the beginning of my statement. For the Leader to take the step (and over the last two or three years this action has unfortunately been taken in this Parliament by a number of members opposite) of making the most outrageous charges affecting the good name of not only members of the Government but also of private members of the community—

Dr. Eastick: You haven't given any names yet.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It may be all very well for the Leader to say that no-one has been named yet, but does the Leader really think that no-one in the community would know who the Minister was at the time the Monarto legislation was enacted? Yet he makes these charges by inference. I believe that the activities of members opposite are to be deplored.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Works and the honourable member for Davenport know the Standing Orders that apply when a Ministerial statement is being made. The honourable Minister of Environment and Conservation.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I reiterate that, when we reach the stage in this Parliament when members are willing outside to make public statements including all sorts of wild charges against the character of people, I think it is time that members considered what sort of action should be taken to deal with what I consider to be a most pitiful state of affairs. A while ago, the member for Mitcham, by interjection, sought the names of those people involved in the transaction to which I have referred. The names are as follows: Constantine Nicholas of 4 Mingbool Avenue, St. Marys, company director, and Thecla Nicholas, his wife, eight undivided twentieth parts; George Foundas of 52 Roebuck Street, Mile End, electrical contractor, and Katina Foundas, his wife, four undivided twentieth parts; Emmanuel Avitzis of 48 Baroda Avenue, Netley, driver, and Stella Avitzis, his wife, six undivided twentieth parts; and Constantine Michael Yamas of 14 Albert Street, Payneham, electrician, and Helen Yamas, his wife, two undivided twentieth parts. When the Leader considers that he has any material that requires answering in this Parliament, he has every right to raise the matter. However, when he tackles the matter by seeking cheap publicity in an article that calls for all sorts of assumption—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: —I believe, and repeat, that it does nothing but disgust me, and I hope it has the same effect on those responsible members of his Party who sit behind him.

QUESTIONS RESUMED

MONARTO

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the writer of the letter that he has just read in this House was one of the persons referred to in this morning's newspaper as follows:

Very few public servants would have had advance knowledge of plans to build a new city of Monarto, the Minister said yesterday.

The Minister, without naming the writer of the letter in question, indicated clearly to every member of this House that that person had in fact had some knowledge of activities associated with the development of Monarto. The Minister of Development and Mines having clearly stated that few

public servants had this information, I specifically ask the Minister of Environment and Conservation whether the writer of the letter was one of those people.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The answer is "No". The only people who had any knowledge that could be used in any way were members of a small committee under my chairmanship, that committee having been established by the Government to consider various aspects relating to the development of a site for an additional city in this State. Nevertheless, if any people had had inside information on this matter, they would have known (and this is why we had not made any public announcements on where the site might be) that the Government intended, right from the early considerations dealing with the establishment of a site for a new city, to freeze the price of the land. Therefore, anyone with inside information would have avoided buying land in the area, because it would have been a complete waste of time for him to do otherwise, knowing full well that the Government would later acquire that land at a price that would be back-dated to ensure that no profit was made on the sale of the land. I think this shows the total stupidity of the suggestion that anyone who may have had inside information in this matter could have gained from it. All members of this Parliament know this to be so. The person concerned had no inside knowledge.

Mr. JENNINGS: Will the Leader of the Opposition say whether he sought to make political capital out of an alleged occurrence at Monarto by making uncorroborated statements to the press before—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is wrong in addressing that question, as he has so far worded it, to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. JENNINGS: I am sorry, Sir. I ask the Leader whether he sought to make political capital out of an uncorroborated statement—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I must once again rule the question out of order. A question asking another member whether he sought to make political capital out of any matter is not one concerning the House. The question being asked must be one with which the House is vitally concerned.

Mr. Goldsworthy: On a point or order!

The SPEAKER: Order! I have ruled that the question is out of order.

Mr. DUNCAN: In view of the embarrassment caused to all members of this House by his wild allegations concerning Monarto land purchases, will the Leader of the Opposition give an unqualified apology to members of this House, to the Minister concerned, and to the Public Service of South Australia, on which an unpardonable slur has been cast? In view of the Ministerial statement that this House has heard earlier this afternoon, it is clear that the Leader has acted in a completely irresponsible way and, because of this conduct, it seems clear to me and to many other members that the only course open to him is to apologise to this House and to the other people I have mentioned.

Dr. EASTICK: As to an apology to this House, the answer is "No".

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As to whether the statements were irresponsible, the honourable member, along with other members on both sides of the House, will have the opportunity to decide that when I bring to the

House full details, as I have promised to do, of transactions in that area and when I have had the opportunity to check out the detail that the Minister has provided this afternoon by reading part of a letter.

Mr. WELLS: Will the Minister of Development and Mines say whether at any time he has refused to meet with landholders or ex-landholders from the general area of the proposed city of Monarto? I heard recently on a radio programme, which took the form of a talk-back programme, a lady making great play of the fact that she and a group of people from the Monarto area (and she claimed she was an ex-landholder) had invited the Minister to attend and discuss land acquisition but that the Minister had flatly refused to attend. Will the Minister say whether there is any truth in that statement?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: One of the first jobs I did as a Minister was to receive a deputation of the Monarto Landowners Association when they placed what they regarded as their grievances before me. I promised that everything would be done to ensure they were fairly treated within the terms of the Act that I administered. There has been full consultation at all times with landowners as part of the acquisition process. However, one incident may have led to this radio report. At one time I was invited to attend a meeting of landowners and to hear what they claimed was a tape recording made by my colleague the Minister of Environment and Conservation when he addressed a public meeting in the area on land acquisition. At that time I said I would not attend a meeting purely for that purpose, but I invited these people to send me a transcript of the tape, which I could look at and which might have led to further discussions, or to send me the tape or a copy of it. I promised as a *quid pro quo* that in the event of receiving the tape I would make my own transcript, which would be made available to them for further use. However, they chose to ignore the request. In fact, one of them appeared on television and made a statement which, as I recall, was along these lines: "Funny things can happen to tapes when they get into Government departments", a statement that nearly provoked me into taking out some sort of libel writ against that person for the reflections he had made on me and my department. During that television programme a part of the alleged tape was played. I was able to obtain a copy of that tape and had the benefit of hearing part of my colleague's words on that occasion. In fact, the quality of the tape was so scrambled that it was impossible for me to make any sense at all of what was said. I heard nothing further from these people as a result of that incident. That is possibly what led to the report to which the honourable member refers. I have been invited to no other meeting of landowners.

Mr. CRIMES: Will the Leader say why he has seen fit to voice in public certain unchecked allegations concerning land transactions at Monarto, before raising the matter in this House with a view to ascertaining from the responsible Minister such official information as may have put the situation in a more legitimate perspective for public presentation?

Dr. EASTICK: It becomes a matter of opinion as to what is a legitimate method of presentation. Regarding information made available, approaches were made to me about information that was known to be in my hands.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Unchecked.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: It was not unchecked. I have already indicated that I will present to the House all the information I have, as soon as all aspects concerning the information

made available to me are dealt with, and after I have been able to consider the abridged letter presented to the House this afternoon by the Minister of Environment and Conservation.

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Leader say why he has refused to make available to the House the information he claims to have on certain Monarto land transactions? Will he make this information available today to the responsible Minister? The Leader has explained that he has certain information which he has verified. If that is so, I ask him to make it available to the Minister, as otherwise it will clearly indicate that he has raised this matter only as a means of making political capital.

Dr. EASTICK: I think the honourable member can do much better than his point about political capital. He would know, as I know, that all members have a responsibility to bring to the House information that they have and that they have checked completely to their satisfaction.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Why go to the press?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: I have already indicated this afternoon that in due season (to coin a phrase) I will make the information available to the House.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What about the Minister?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: And to the Minister, he being a member of the House.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why not give it to him today?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: I have no need to alter the course of action I have already outlined to the House.

Later:

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): As I said I would do earlier, I table the complete letter, unabridged, from Mr. M. J. Taliangis in connection with the allegations made concerning Monarto land acquisition.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. COUMBE: In view of the alarming jump in unemployment figures (which are the subject of a somewhat controversial statement by the Deputy Prime Minister this morning), particularly in South Australia, will the Premier say whether he intends to apply for assistance under the scheme suggested by the Minister for Labour and Immigration (Mr. Cameron) on behalf of South Australian workers? Has the Premier any knowledge of when such a scheme will operate, if at all, and how it will apply? In addition, has the Premier made representations to his Commonwealth colleagues to reduce the great influx of imported motor vehicles which is affecting the employment prospects of so many of our workers?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has asked two questions. The reply to his first question is that a submission to the Commonwealth Government regarding works to employ unemployed people in South Australia is now being prepared. It will be made to the Commonwealth Government, seeking its assistance in maintaining employment in South Australia. The basis of the examination will be the same kind of basis on which we proceeded previously when we obtained for the first time assistance in respect of our metropolitan unemployed, which was refused to us by the previous Commonwealth Liberal Government, but which we later received from the present Government in Canberra.

In reply to the honourable member's second question, the answer is "No": I have not made any representation

on that basis. The officers of my department, as I have previously said, are in the course of preparing submissions for an alternative plan to be presented to the Industries Assistance Commission in relation to the rationalisation of the motor vehicle industry and the attaining of the objectives that the Australian Government specified to the commission for it to prepare its report.

Mr. Coumbe: That's slightly different.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Nevertheless, that is what we are doing. We are not simply saying that we want to stop importing cars. We are concentrating on the area that is crucial to the industry here: that is, an effective plan to maintain a high Australian content in vehicles manufactured in Australia. I expect that that will be ready soon. It is being discussed with the industry and will be submitted to the Commonwealth Government as early as possible.

FOOTBALL TRANSPORT

Mr. HARRISON: Can the Minister of Transport say what provision will be made by the Municipal Tramways Trust for the expected large attendance at Football Park for the football match between Sturt and Port Adelaide next Saturday? In view of the parking problems experienced by patrons at this oval and their wish, if possible, to be catered for by public transport, can the Minister say whether patrons from the Sturt and Port Adelaide districts will have direct transport to and from the oval, in addition to the usual transport from the city?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Special arrangements are being made for next Saturday (and special arrangements were made for last Saturday) for Football Park and Adelaide Oval patrons. Those who want to go to the Adelaide Oval will find that public transport will be available there, and public transport by bus will be available to and from Football Park. I do not have the specific details at my disposal now, other than to say that officers of my departments are negotiating in an endeavour to get the maximum number of vehicles down there so that as many people as possible will be able to travel by public transport.

WARDANG ISLAND

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier say whether he was aware before today that Wardang Island was no longer occupied? Will he also say whether the Aboriginal Lands Trust, which owns the island, has been in touch with the Government concerning the security of the island? This morning's *Advertiser* carries a report alleging that thousands of dollars worth of foodstuffs, electrical goods, furniture, and other valuables, including many new items, has been left unguarded on the island, following the apparent departure from the island of some or all of its occupants. This revelation is bound to attract the attention of certain members of the criminal element within the community, who would see these items as easy pickings. Will the Premier also say what steps have been taken or might be taken to prevent the theft of these goods, and whether the trust has established any liaison with the Government on this issue?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The island is under licence at present to the Aboriginal Lands Trust, prior to the transfer of the freehold to the trust after arrangements have been made with the Commonwealth Government concerning its provision of lighthouses on the island. As soon as that matter has been dealt with, the freehold of the island will be transferred to the trust. The trust undertook the operation on the island in an interim period while a study on the island and its future operation as a tourist resort was prepared by W. D. Scott and Company, through the

Commonwealth Government. The trust has withdrawn from all entrepreneurial activity and at this stage is simply acting as the holder of land in trust for the South Australian Aborigines. The trust has been negotiating with the Point Pearce council about the future running of the island. I point out that the problem regarding the island is that the previous occupants of the island were given a perpetual lease by a former Liberal Government.

Let us go back in the island's history. The island, which was part of the Point Pearce reserve, was excised from the reserve by the Playford Government, without any compensation being paid to the Aborigines. It was leased to an industrial company for the mining of sand on a miscellaneous lease. When the company retired from that lease (although the Hall Liberal Government knew that the trust had expressed to me interest in the property while I was Minister of Aboriginal Affairs), the miscellaneous lease was given to European lessees to run a tourist resort. It was then, despite questions in the House concerning the matter, raised with me and with the Government by Aborigines in South Australia, including those at Point Pearce. The miscellaneous lease was converted to a perpetual lease by the Hall Liberal Government after the price paid by the people who had gone there was only \$3 700. In order to match this Government's pledge of returning Aboriginal lands to the Aborigines, it cost this Government \$115 000 to buy back the perpetual lease.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That wasn't a bad profit, was it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As to conducting the tourist resort, the previous lessees had told the Government that they could not continue to run the resort without Government assistance, which they sought. They did not get it, because we intended to make it once more an area of Aboriginal lands and, together with the Commonwealth Government by establishing a study by W. D. Scott and Company, we sought to make this a resort that could be run with Aboriginal involvement.

Mr. Rodda: What about answering the question?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am answering it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The Aborigines had allotments—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I hope that that interjection has been heard, namely, that the honourable member's attitude is that, if the Government decides to hand Aboriginal land back to the Aboriginal people, it will be better that white people get out of this country. The attitude of the front bench Liberal Party spokesmen, in their anti-Aboriginal approach, is fairly obvious.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Rubbish! I'm just—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Goldsworthy: —following up your statement.

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members know that, when a question is asked, the reply must be given without interjections. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Regarding giving their land back to the Aborigines, I point out to the honourable member that, until a Labor Government was in office in South Australia, the specific provisions of the letters patent founding this province regarding the protection of land rights for the Aboriginal people had been ignored. That had applied throughout the history of this State, yet these conditions were in the letters patent upon which our forebears came here. We set out in this small way (and it was an extremely small way) to do partial justice to a small group of Aborigines who had land reserved

to them previously but who had it excised from their reserve without compensation being paid to them and without any consultation with them.

The manager of Wardang Island resigned and the Aboriginal Lands Trust could not replace him. The trust currently is negotiating with the council at Point Pearce about the future running of the resort and about the management of that resort, with the aim of providing Aboriginal employment on Wardang Island on their own lands. In the interim, normally there is a caretaker on the island. Apparently, a newspaper reporter went to the island.

Mr. Becker: He shouldn't have gone?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is true. He seems to be protesting that we did not have displayed a notice stating that trespassers would be prosecuted. The fact is that the reporter was unlawfully on Crown property, and then he proceeded to state that there was some great mystery, although he made no approach to the Minister, to me, or to anyone else in the Government.

The Hon. L. J. King: Or to the Aboriginal Lands Trust.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Or to the trust, which is the licensee.

Mr. Mathwin: Everyone applies to you, does he?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, but frankly, when it is possible to telephone me, the Minister, or the trust, what he himself did seems a fairly ersatz kind of mystery to be outlined in the *Advertiser*.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you reply to the question?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am telling the member for Fisher what is the position at Wardang Island. Negotiations are currently taking place between the Aboriginal Lands Trust and the council at Point Pearce about the future of that reserve, based on the W. D. Scott report on its development. Until that matter can be dealt with—

Mr. Coumbe: When will that be?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That will depend on the Aborigines themselves.

Mr. Evans: Will you guarantee that the assets will be protected?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course the assets will be protected and, if the honourable member, Mr. Boucher, or anyone else goes there and removes the assets, that person will be prosecuted. The decisions about this reserve will be made by the effective owners, and they are the Aboriginal people themselves. They have every right to make those decisions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I asked a Question on Notice, and the Attorney-General replied to it. As the Premier has seen fit to reply to a question about Wardang Island—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The question is (and the Ministers can make up their own mind)—

The SPEAKER: Order! Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is the Government taking part, or does it intend to take part, in the discussions about the future use of Wardang Island? If the answer to that question is "Yes", what attitude will the Government take to the discussions? This afternoon I have received replies to two Questions on Notice regarding this matter, and they show that, in all, \$175 000 of State and Commonwealth Government funds has been spent in the past three years or advanced to the Aboriginal Lands Trust on account of Wardang Island. The Auditor-General's report, which we have received today, shows that the trust has a trading

deficit in relation to Wardang Island of over \$38 000. In his reply this afternoon to the member for Fisher, who has interested himself in the matter, the Premier has referred to discussions that are referred to also in part of the reply I have received to Question on Notice No. 19. Those discussions were between the trust and the Point Pearce council about the future use of the island. There is nothing in the reply I received to show that the island necessarily would be used in future as a tourist resort, but I am willing to accept what the Premier has said just now about that matter. However, in view of the money that has been put into the venture by both the State and Commonwealth Governments, and in view of the fact (and I use that word "fact" advisedly) of the report in this morning's *Advertiser* by Bernard Boucher about the present situation on the island, I ask the Premier to comment. As a final explanation to the Premier I refer him to the time I was Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (and he acknowledged the fact because he looked at me while he was replying) and said publicly in the House that, before the lease was granted to Mr. Pryce, I personally discussed the future of Wardang Island with members of the Aboriginal Lands Trust, and they, at a meeting, after consideration resolved that the trust was not interested in operating Wardang Island. It was not until that had been done that the lease was granted to Mr. Pryce. The Premier knew that when replying this afternoon yet he deliberately chose to ignore it and to mislead the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating subject matter, and that is not permitted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Quite. In conclusion, all I wish to say is that the report in this morning's paper and the replies I received to my Questions on Notice underline the wisdom of the decisions taken at that time by the Aboriginal Lands Trust, if not by the Government.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer to the question whether the Government would involve itself in discussions between the Aboriginal Lands Trust and the council is "Yes, to the extent that our support and assistance are required". As to the other matter raised by the honourable member, the Attorney-General and I have searched the files in this matter and I can say only that the information contained therein does not substantiate the statement just made by the honourable member.

Mr. BOUNDY: I am in a similar quandary to that of my colleague.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. BOUNDY: In that case I will direct my question to the Premier. It refers to Wardang Island once more, and I think—

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the question?

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Premier say what technical studies were made of the launch *Silver Cloud* before it was decided to offer it for sale? If no such studies were made or if irreparable damage was not proven, can the decision to sell be reversed in the interest of retaining and repairing the *Silver Cloud* for future use in servicing Wardang Island? When I visited Port Victoria recently, the *Silver Cloud* was afloat once more. In the opinion of residents of Port Victoria and Point Pearce, the vessel is fit to be repaired, the damage appearing to be only in the superstructure. As the future use of Wardang Island depends on a launch such as this being available, I hope the Government will consider reversing the decision to sell.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I must refer this question to the Aboriginal Lands Trust. This operation is not undertaken by the Government: it is an area of activity of the

trust, from which I will get a reply. I can only say to the honourable member that, before we purchased for the trust the assets of the Wardang Island operation, the report to the Government by the Marine and Harbors Department on the ketch *Silver Cloud* was anything but favourable.

Mr. Millhouse: Yet you let it be used by other people. The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, we did; we allowed it to be used on the same basis as the Government of which the honourable member was a member allowed it to be used for the Pryces' operation at Wardang Island, and with the same concern for the safety of people. As to the future of the vessel and whether it was a good investment as a vessel, the original report to me when I inspected it with officers of the Marine and Harbors Department was anything but optimistic. I will get a report for the honourable member from the Aboriginal Lands Trust. I will ask my colleague the Minister of Community Welfare to do this, and we will let the honourable member have the trust's specifications on the vessel.

HOUSEHOLD KEROSENE

Mr. WRIGHT: Is the Premier aware that an extreme shortage of household kerosene exists at present and, if he is, can he say why there is a shortage? On the other hand, if he is unaware of a shortage, will he initiate investigations immediately? I have received several complaints recently about the shortage of household kerosene for use in home appliances. In particular, complaints have come from pensioners in my district who, because they depend on this sort of heating, have been unable to warm their houses. I went to the trouble this morning of checking with some garage proprietors as to the current situation and discovered that the shortage exists not only in my district but also in other districts. The proprietors could not give any reason except that the oil companies say there is a shortage of household kerosene. I therefore ask the Premier whether he will try to solve the problem.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

GOVERNMENT OFFICE ACCOMMODATION

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say when the Government departments presently housed in the Government offices at the corner of Rundle and Pulteney Streets will move into office accommodation in G.R.E. Building in Grenfell Street? I understand that office space has been held in that building since July 1973 and that the rent paid for five floors is about \$15 000 a month. Rent paid since July 1973 would now total about \$210 000. In view of the large rental that has been paid, can the Premier say when the Government departments will move in? I believe that one reason given for their not moving in is a shortage of furniture. If the departments are not to move into this accommodation, for how long will taxpayers be expected to meet the bill?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I expect the Community Welfare Department will transfer some time this week. As to the other matter, I am not sure so I will get a report for the honourable member.

HIGHWAY MARKING

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Transport say who is responsible for setting the standards for road marking, and what plans exist at present in relation to road marking in South Australia? When travelling on the Lobethal road at present one has to travel a long distance before one can pass anyone because the road markings

are restricting traffic flows considerably, particularly when there is a slow moving vehicle to be passed. The Uraidla road has been marked from the Burnside area, but since the original markings were made no further work has been done. The case of the road marking at Windmill Hill at Mount Barker is similar, with some of the original road marking having been obliterated and no further work having been done. What authority determines the standard of road marking, and what is the present programme for this work in South Australia?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think that all roads to which the honourable member has referred come under the care and control of the Highways Department. However, as I am not absolutely certain about the matter, I will check it and bring down a reply.

OVERSEA VISITS

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier now give the final total of the expenses of the recent overseas visits of himself and his Ministers?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I do not have that information with me, I will inquire about the matter.

NATIONAL ANTHEM

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say whether the Government is satisfied with the choice of *Advance Australia Fair* as the National Anthem of this country? In reply to a Question on Notice by the member for Mitcham, the Premier explained that the choice of this song was made by the Australian Government (as it calls itself), and that the State Government had no say in the matter. In his reply the Premier also said that he had some notification from Canberra that the Prime Minister had said that the words were not regarded as part of the National Anthem. Therefore, the national Government had accepted *Advance Australia Fair* without any words. The dictionary explains that an anthem is a composition for church use or is a non-metrical composition set to sacred music. It seems that it is a ludicrous situation to have an anthem without words. From time to time I have been present at public functions at which it is obvious that local residents prefer *God Save the Queen* as the National Anthem. Today, I received a letter from a constituent who views this matter with some concern, and she believes that *God Save the Queen* should be retained as the National Anthem. If the Commonwealth Government conducted a survey, it did not reach deeply into this State. This is a matter on which the South Australian Government should have some views.

Mr. Jennings: What's your view?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: *God Save the Queen* is a more appropriate anthem than is *Advance Australia Fair* without words. The Returned Services League and others obviously do not accept the present ludicrous situation, as outlined in the Premier's reply to the member for Mitcham some time ago, whereby we have an anthem without words.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The South Australian Government has not been called on to express publicly or formally to the Australian Government its view on the National Anthem. I have given my personal view to the Prime Minister that the best of those offering was not *God Save the Queen* but *Song of Australia*, and I believe that most South Australians would agree with that point of view.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you check?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did check. Perhaps I am not always as effective as I should like to be, but I have more humility than has the honourable member.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Most National Anthems have words that are extraordinarily banal, and if the honourable member looks through the succeeding verses of *God Save the Queen* he will realize that they express some extraordinary sentiments.

Mr. Millhouse: Only the second verse.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest that the honourable member read on to the fourth and fifth verses.

Mr. Goldsworthy: At least it has words.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Most of them are strange, and I do not think that in South Australia at this stage we should attach ourselves to a German religious tune, because that was its origin.

Mr. Millhouse: What's the matter with that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know that Beethoven and others have used it in compositions, but I do not think it is a marvellous tune. I agree entirely with the Australian Government that there should be a distinctive tune to be played for Australians. It has been confusing at Commonwealth or international games that, when an Australian wins something, *God Save the Queen* is played: people become confused because they think the British have won. National Anthems have been used in all other British dominions, except this one, quite distinctive from *God Save the Queen*, and local residents have been proud of their anthem. There has been a Canadian anthem for many years. Concerning the music, *Advance Australia Fair* cannot compare with *Song of Australia*, but I think the Prime Minister's problem has been that people in other States are not so musical as we are and do not know *Song of Australia* so well.

At 3.16 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PRIVACY BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to create a right of privacy, to provide a right of action for an infringement of that right, for matters incidental thereto and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

For some time now, law reform commissions, commissions of inquiry, and legislatures in various parts of the world have concerned themselves with the question of the preservation of personal privacy. The demand that more systematic attention should be paid to this problem has been growing since the end of the Second World War. Article 12 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1948, stated that "no-one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, or to attacks upon his honour, and reputation". The terms of the declaration emphasised protection against the activities of secret police and the officers of public authority, experience of totalitarian regimes being in the forefront of the draftsmen's minds. But the terms in which the right was expressed were broader than that.

The same principle is expressed in Article 17 of the United Nations Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of December, 1966, which further provided that "no-one

shall be subject to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation" and that "everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks". At a non-official level an international conference of distinguished jurists from many parts of the world, organised by the Swedish section of the International Commission of Jurists held at Stockholm in 1967, made a more comprehensive and specific examination of the right to privacy and of the steps necessary to protect it. Amongst its conclusions were:

(1) The right to privacy, being of paramount importance to human happiness, should be recognised as a fundamental right of mankind. It protects the individual against public authorities, the public in general, and other individuals.

(14) . . . (a recommendation) that all countries take appropriate measures to protect by legislation or other means the right to privacy in all its different aspects and to prescribe the civil remedies and criminal sanctions required for its protection.

In Australia this question has, over the years, occupied the attention of the Standing Committee of Commonwealth and State Attorneys-General, and in this State in particular some aspects of the question have been referred to our Law Reform Committee. The reasons for this growing interest in and discussion of the protection of personal privacy are not hard to find. There are growing pressures exerted by modern industrial society upon the home and daily life which produce a demand by the urban dweller for anonymity and seclusion. There is the growth of the various forms of mass media which, in catering to the taste of an increasingly broad public, furnish descriptions of extraordinary events of all kinds containing detailed information about the life and habits of a variety of people. The development of technological and scientific means of invading privacy is also a factor.

Already, in the previous Parliament the Listening Devices Act, 1972, was enacted into law, and that measure afforded the individual some protection from invasion of his privacy by mechanical means. This measure now introduced intends to create a general right of privacy, a right that has in the terms proposed not been previously recognised by law in this country. Such protection as privacy enjoys under our law is the fortuitous by-product of laws designed for other purposes, such as the laws of trespass, nuisance, breach of copyright and breach of confidence, or defamation; but the protection is incomplete because it is only incidental to the protection of other aspects of the citizen's life.

The concept of privacy causes little difficulty to the ordinary citizen. He can readily identify the part of his life which he considers to be peculiarly his own and for which he claims the right to be free from outside interferences or unwanted publicity. But a man's privacy requires protection from the law only to the extent to which it might be unjustly infringed. What must be balanced against the individual's claim for privacy is the "public interest", that is, society's interest in the circulation of truth. There can be no doubt as to the importance to be attached to truth in a civilised society. But that is not to say that the public is entitled to know all the truth about an individual or group. Some areas of a man's life are his business alone. Thus the privacy this Bill is designed to protect is that area of a man's life which, in any given circumstances, a reasonable man with an understanding of the legitimate needs of the community would think it wrong to invade. I seek leave to incorporate the balance of the explanation in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 formally binds the Crown. Clause 4 makes clear that, given a choice between the public good and the assertion of a private right, the public good must prevail and, in aid of this, provides that the exercise in good faith by a person of any duty or obligation imposed on him by law will not be touched on by this measure. Clause 5 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of this Act, and I draw members' attention to the definition of "right of privacy" which, of course, is crucial to the measure.

The right proposed is the right to be free from a "substantial and unreasonable" intrusion upon a person's private affairs. It is not intended that this protection will extend to insubstantial and trivial incursions. There have been many attempts in the past to define "privacy". Perhaps the most succinct was the one adopted by U.S. Judge Cooley last century when he called it "the right to be let alone". Rather than search for a precise or logical formula that would either circumscribe the meaning of the word "privacy" or define it exhaustively, a broad concept of privacy has been used in this Bill. This is to allow the law to keep pace with changing social needs. The scope of what is considered should be private at any given time is governed to a considerable extent by the standards, fashions and mores of the society of which we form part, and these are subject to constant change. The definition of privacy that has been used in this Bill will allow the courts to preserve a degree of flexibility and so to decide from case to case, and from time to time, what should or should not enjoy the law's protection. The courts already exercise this sort of flexibility, for instance, in interpreting what is "reasonable" in relation to negligence and nuisance or in assessing the defence that a statement complained of in actions for defamation is "fair comment on a matter of public interest".

Clause 6 establishes a statutory right of privacy and gives a right of action against any infringement of that right. Subclause (3) does not limit actions to cases where special damages, such as actual pecuniary loss, are claimed. Clause 7 makes clear that a person who knowingly benefits from an infringement of the right of privacy of another person will be liable to the same extent as if he were the author of that infringement. Clause 8 sets out the statutory defences that are available to an action for an infringement of a right of privacy. In effect, these defences delineate the circumstances where a *de facto* infringement of a right of privacy is, in effect, justifiable. Paragraph (a) provides that, where a person did not know and could not by exercising reasonable care have known that he had infringed another's privacy, he will have a complete defence to any action brought against him. I draw members' attention to paragraphs (b) and (c) of this clause, since these two paragraphs represent a compromise between the need to preserve a right of privacy in an individual person and the need to ensure that the public interest is preserved.

The defence set out in paragraph (d) again is an attempt to strike a balance between what might be called a "conflict of rights", and this defence makes clear that the right of privacy is a shield not a sword which may be used to attack another's lawful interests or to deprive a court of law of evidence that should properly be available to it. Clause 9 sets out the powers of the court to grant relief in an action for infringement of a right of privacy. Subclause (2) enables a defendant to mitigate the effects of his infringement by apologising for his conduct and tendering suitable amends. Subclause (3) sets out some of the matters that the court is enjoined to take into account in considering an award of damages.

Clause 10 is intended to enable the court to refuse to award what may be in effect "double damages". Clause 11 provides that in actions under the measure an appropriate degree of protection from publicity can be afforded the litigants by the court. Much thought has been given to the implication of this clause, and its inclusion is advocated for the reason that without it, in many cases, injured persons may have no real means of claiming relief from invasions of their privacy, as the publicity attendant on legal proceedings of this nature could well exacerbate their situation, rather than provide a proper remedy for it.

In conclusion, it is conceded that a measure of this nature can only, as it were, plant a seed in the soil of the common law. To a considerable extent it is for the courts, in the consideration of the cases that come before them, to ensure that this seed grows and flourishes and proves a real value in the protection of the rights of the citizen. The problem of protecting the citizen's privacy by legal measures is complex. It is not to be thought that either this measure or any other single measure will provide the needed protection of itself. There must be a multi-pronged attack on the problem. The Government has already given attention to the matter in relation to listening devices and the regulation of bailiffs and inquiry agents, and in other ways. Legislation is planned to deal specifically with information storages and data banks and probably with regard to electronic devices that may be used for surveillance of the activities of the individual. All of these and other measures are necessary. They will be progressively enacted as their efficiency is demonstrated and the difficulties inherent in drafting such legislation are mastered.

The creation of this new tort of invasion of privacy must therefore be regarded as but one prong of the attack on the problem of protecting the privacy of the citizen. By development of common law principles, the courts have already gone some distance towards providing remedies for certain types of infringement of privacy. It is plain, however, that without legislative impetus, the law cannot be developed by the courts to a sufficient extent to deal with the problem. The effect of this measure will be to provide the legislative impetus needed to set the wheels of the judicial process moving in the direction needed. Just as the courts have applied concepts of reasonableness in the law of negligence and nuisance to concrete situations, so they will apply the general concepts expressed in this measure in a way that will in time provide a coherent body of law covering the subject. The judicial process by which the common law develops is particularly suited to the development of a new tort of invasion of privacy after receiving the necessary legislative impetus provided by this measure.

As I have indicated above, it is not to be thought that the creation of a new tort and the provision of civil remedies for its infringement are more than a partial answer to the problem of effective protection of the citizen's privacy, but the measure fills a gap that exists in the existing law and will give protection and justice to many people who have hitherto been denied it.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

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

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

Mr. COUNBE (Torrens): Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Is the member for Torrens the member whom the Leader has deputed as the Opposition spokesman?

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Torrens.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish to speak to the Premier's motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Torrens has also sought that leave, and has been given the call. The honourable member for Torrens.

Mr. COUNBE: Referring to the latest development in the Government's decision to press on at all cost with its relentless policy of preference to unionists in this State, I will confine my remarks to the question of preference to unionists and whatever connotation may be placed on it, more particularly as it relates to members of the South Australian Public Service and to the controversial instruction issued by the Government shortly after it took office. That instruction has from time to time caused considerable controversy in the House because of its application to several sections of the community, particularly the industrial community. The Government's action has now been taken further, and I am beginning to wonder (as are other members of the community) how far the Government is willing to go to further the demands of its supporters. Will anyone be immune to the oversight, influence and direction of the Government and its industrial policy?

I refer particularly to the report in the *Sunday Mail* of September 1, regarding the Government's action with respect to the South Australian Public Service, stating that the Premier had agreed to help the Public Service Association obtain lists of non-unionists employed by the Government. Let us follow this through and see where it leads, because it is most interesting. The report states:

In reply to Public Service Association submissions the Premier had said Cabinet approved the request, and lists would be made available from Government departments including hospitals, and Government instrumentalities would be advised of policy on the matter. The submissions had referred to Government policy of preference to unionists, and the principle of encouragement of employees to become members of their appropriate industrial organisation. It was noted that employee organisations affiliated with the Trades and Labor Council received quarterly lists of the names, locations and classifications of all departmental employees who had not joined.

Mr. McAnaney: Isn't that invading their privacy?

Mr. COUNBE: I will come to that very good point later. The report continues:

As soon as lists were available, association organisers would pass on to representatives the information needed to increase their departmental membership. Areas requiring special assistance would be visited by organisers, and members arranged as necessary.

What does that mean? Does it mean that the Government has decided to supply lists of those members employed by the Public Service in Government departments who are non-unionists, including their names, locations and classifications, in all departments? I am not sure whether this refers to officers as well as to daily-paid and weekly-paid employees; it could apply to all. One immediately asks: under what authority is this action being taken? Naturally, Cabinet can decide, and I suppose it can be claimed that that is the authority.

However, I point out that this action is being taken at the expense of the taxpayers of this State, who are paying for such action to be implemented. In addition, I ask whether this is really a function of government. The Government has many functions to perform. They are

all set out, and the Government can expand its functions from time to time. However, this matter interferes with the private interests of individual Government employees. I doubt whether this is a function of government, especially as it is being carried out at the expense of the taxpayers of this State.

This leads me to my next question, and I am sure that Government members who are so vitally interested in this important matter will be interested to know the answer to the question: is this action being taken without the express permission of the personnel concerned? Are they being consulted? Is every member of the Public Service being consulted on this matter? Are their names being given to an outside body without their personal consent? After all, these are South Australian Government employees. In various debates (particularly in the one that will be coming on later today) we have to consider moneys allocated to departments in which these officers and employees work. Surely a matter of whether or not a person (employed by the Public Service Board or by the Government) joins a union is his own affair. Surely he can please himself, and he should not be coerced, but the action that the Government is taking does coerce him. The interjection made earlier by the member for Heysen leads me to ask how the Government's action in sending out these letters equates to its announced decision to press on with legislation regarding privacy. I am not referring to the Bill that has just been explained, but the Government has said more than once that it is concerned about the privacy of individuals in this State. Surely the action to which I have referred impinges on that principle and policy, and one wonders how far the Government will go and how it equates its present action to its previous ideas about open government and the loss of privacy.

The Government has claimed that a person should have the right to privacy, yet it wants control regarding the use of computers and records. Obviously, the lists required and which the Premier and his Cabinet have announced will be sent out are being prepared from computer lists, and possibly computer lists are being sent to those concerned. Is it the function of any Government to keep lists of those of its employees who are or are not members of a union? The Government is in office to preserve the good order, peace and conduct of South Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: We're not getting that.

Mr. COURCE: The honourable member can say that again! The Government is not in office to carry out the actions that I have just described. The Premier's action is just what his supporters want, and he has agreed to what they have asked for. Surely we have not yet got to the stage of being Big Brother, and surely our citizens have some right to privacy and a right to keep their opinions to themselves. What would be the position if an employee caught by this action by the Premier objected to the information going out on a computer list to the organisation concerned?

Mr. Crimes: He doesn't object to the benefits he gets, though.

Mr. COURCE: I thought that that interjection would come, because that is the one that usually comes on cue every time from the member for Spence, my dedicated Socialist friend. He came in on it immediately. I am saying that, according to the statements I have, the Premier has told the Public Service Association that he has agreed to the association's request, and Cabinet has approved, that lists be sent to the various branches in the Government

service of those employees who are not unionists, and I emphasise that the information will be dissected into names, locations, and classifications in all Government departments.

I submit that to do this is not a function of the Government and, furthermore, that it is completely wrong for the Government to indulge in such action, because it immediately infringes the rights of the individual. We have debated previously, although not in this session, the difference between preference and compulsion, and the line gets fairly thin at times. The present Government's policy is one of preference to unionists, and that really means compulsion. I have seen the position in some Government departments that, unless the person joined the union, he did not get the job. We have seen the position where some people who have the decency and guts do not want to become involved in trade unions.

Members know that I support the trade union movement as such, but people like those to whom I have referred are forced into the position where, unless they join the appropriate union, all employees go on strike and these people are blackballed, so that, for peace in the industry concerned, they join the union. Therefore, I consider that the Premier deserves censure for agreeing to this request.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the prompt holding of an inquiry into recent happenings at Flinders University. It is not an understatement to say that the people are extremely disturbed at what has been happening there for about six weeks. It is also true that many people, maybe justly and maybe unjustly, look askance at university activities in general, and university students come in for justified and unjustified criticism from time to time. Those students can attend university largely because of the infusion of public funds, most of which now come from the Commonwealth Government, to finance the operations of the institution. Further, when university students are successful in their studies, they move into the higher echelons of salary ranges paid in the community. University staff also are among the more highly paid members of the community and enjoy a degree of autonomy and freedom unparalleled in other sections of the community.

These matters highlight the responsibility that these people have to the community that so heavily finances the continuance of the institution. Therefore, it is not surprising that many people are alarmed at the events that have occurred at Flinders University over about six weeks. The university virtually was brought to a standstill when the registry was occupied. It may have been during a holiday period, but the functions normally carried out were obstructed, and the people are demanding action in this matter.

A newspaper report sums up what is occurring, and the remarks it contains are by none other than the Chief Justice of the High Court of Australia (Sir Garfield Barwick). The headline quotes Sir Garfield as saying, "Keep dissent in check," and I shall quote from the report, because it sums up what many people are thinking about the activities of sections of the community (and I do not confine that remark to university students). The Chief Justice said:

There was a growing tendency among Australians to deny the validity of institutions elected to represent them. The report continues:

The Chief Justice of Australia said that this attitude led some people to believe that the passing of a law by Parliament did not matter if the law did not suit them. It also caused some groups in the community with different ideas to think that they could go their own way if they had strength and muscle. The community had reason

to be concerned that some people were refusing to accept basic concepts Australia had inherited, including that of government by elected representatives.

The final paragraph states:

If we were all tribes we would be taught when we were small about the tribe's way of life and would be admitted to the tribe knowing how it operates.

One could spread one's wings in debating this matter and include the actions of unionists and others: a matter raised by the Deputy Leader, and a matter that is in the public mind. It gives weight to the Chief Justice's comments that if one has enough muscle—and I am talking about union muscle—then anything goes. In the minds of members of this Government there seems to have developed, since I have been a member of this House anyway, this overriding idea that we must have peace at any price: the idea that the law must not step in, and that it must take no action. That applies not only in this situation but in others, too, because the people involved might be violent and resist.

Mr. McAnaney: How did Chamberlain get on?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That gives weight to what I am saying. One must use discretion in making decisions in difficult situations, but this Government tends to push the philosophy of "peace at any price" too far. There are many other instances to which I could refer, where the Premier says that if people do not like the law they should forget it and the Government should allow the Commissioner of Police to do what he believes is his duty. This is the view that is held by the Government and, in relation to the Flinders University dispute, it was advanced again by the Minister of Education in replying to questions I asked in the House. From the tenor of his replies, one would believe that I was almost out of order in asking questions of the Minister about that dispute.

This business of the Government's conveniently disclaiming responsibility for these matters because the university is autonomous is not good enough: this opting out of responsibility is not good enough. The Minister implied that I had no right asking him questions about the matter because we have on this side of the House a member representing Parliament on the Flinders University Council. That is an absurd attitude for a Government or the Minister to adopt. The university council is set up by Statute of this Parliament and it is the responsibility of this Parliament to keep the activities of that type of institution under scrutiny.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you believe in academic independence?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I believe it is the duty of the Minister to keep this House informed in that regard. The university council in its wisdom has asked the Government to set up an independent inquiry into what happened recently at Flinders University.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you answer my question? What do you think about academic independence?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In view of the honourable member's particularly churlish interjection, I will ignore him.

Mr. Millhouse: I take it then that you would not say anything about the principle of academic independence at all? You can't have it both ways.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Crimes): Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not believe that academic independence should put these people above the law.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not the point you have been making: you've been castigating the Minister.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: All I can say to the honourable member is that he should clean out his ears.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Kavel should address the Chair and not engage in crossfire with another member on his side of the House.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The public is highly disturbed about what is happening at Flinders University. It appears there have been breaches of the law and that not only were students involved in the illegal occupation of the registry but that also some staff members addressed the students in the registry. It is my view (and, I would have hoped, the view of the member for Mitcham) that, if these people could be identified by means of an inquiry, appropriate disciplinary action should be taken against them. When I was a member of the Adelaide University Council an inordinate time was taken up by the council's looking into the activities of one of the academic staff. In most circumstances it appears to me to be extremely difficult (certainly in these circumstances it is) to discipline a member of the academic staff. The council pursued the matter of one professor literally for years. The matter was discussed month after month and, finally, someone suggested as an aside that the professor in question should just be sacked. The fact is that he could not be sacked.

The Government should do all it can to facilitate an inquiry. The terms of reference of that inquiry should be made available so we can see what the university council is looking for. The inquiry should not simply be used to smooth the whole matter over so that the public will forget what has happened. I believe the law has been broken and that those people who have an opportunity to see that the law is upheld should take every action to see that it is upheld. If members of the university staff are shown to have been actively involved, appropriate steps should be taken to bring them to account.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): There are two matters I wish to mention. The first arises from questions I asked and replies given during Question Time today about Wardang Island. My colleague the member for Goyder will later deal with some of the matters now occurring there. However, I wish to take this opportunity now, because it is a better opportunity than I had when explaining the question I asked, to refute the impression the Premier gave this afternoon that everything that the Government of which I was a member (and previous Governments, too) had done with regard to Aboriginal affairs was wrong. It was not until the Labor Government took office in 1970, the Premier said, that any justice was given to Aborigines. The Premier heard me on an earlier occasion, when I said something about this. Today he saw fit to repeat the allegations that we had virtually given Wardang Island away to a European entrepreneur and that that was done against the wishes of the Aboriginal people in this State. That is just not true.

The Premier then had the gall, in the final sentences of his reply, to say that he and the Attorney-General had searched the files on this matter (I do not know which files they were or when they were searched) and could find no trace of what I had said repeatedly in this House or what had been discussed with the Aboriginal Lands Trust or with Mr. Pryce. The question of leasing Wardang Island or its use by Mr. Pryce as a tourist resort was raised in Cabinet, the matter being discussed. As Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, I was instructed by my Cabinet colleagues to discuss the matter with the trust, as Wardang Island was a piece of land of special interest to Aborigines,

I discussed the matter with the trust, and my recollection is that this took place over a considerable time.

The occasion on which the trust met and made its decision was at a meeting held at Port Lincoln one evening. Mr. Tim Hughes, Mrs. Natasha McNamara, and Mr. Garnet Wilson, who were the three members of the trust at the time, were all present. I think that the Secretary of the trust at that time (Mr. John Millar) was present, and I was present. The meeting was held, as I recollect, after dinner one evening at Port Lincoln. After the discussion, a resolution was passed by the trust that it had no interest in taking over Wardang Island for any purpose. The resolution was passed after the suggestion that the island should be leased to Mr. Pryce had been explained to the members and they had been given time to discuss it. I reported to Cabinet that I had no doubt that the decision was taken after due consideration by members of the trust who had complete knowledge of what was intended. The decision was that the trust did not want to have Wardang Island. This was taken by me, members of the trust, and Cabinet as the signal that we could go ahead, if other things were in order, with the arrangement with Mr. Pryce, and that is what happened.

Obviously, the Government takes seriously what was reported in this morning's newspaper, judging by the way the Premier, rather than the Attorney-General (the former Minister of Aboriginal Affairs), replied to questions on the matter. I have no doubt that what has transpired since shows the wisdom of the decision of the trust taken in the late 1960's (I think in 1969). I want once and for all to nail the accusation that the Premier has now made twice deliberately in this House that the trust and Aborigines of the State were ignored in this matter. I suggest that, if the Premier cannot find any record, he consult Mr. Hughes, Mrs. McNamara, or Mr. Wilson about what happened on the occasion to which I have referred.

I now wish to refer to the trade union movement, the relationship of the Government to it, and the way in which trade unions are being administered in this State at present. One or other aspect of this matter has been raised in this House repeatedly, and no wonder, considering that trade unions are now so powerful that they affect the life of the community all the time. It is possible for a trade union or its members or for a group of unions and their members to hold the community to ransom; this is done openly and deliberately by trade unionists. Therefore, if trade unions are to have the power they have in the community for good or evil (I do not pass on that at the moment), their affairs are the concern of the community. If their affairs are not being run as they should be, the community is entitled to take a hand. Last session, the then member for Goyder (Senator Steele Hall) raised the question of trade union funds, suggesting that they should be subject to audit because of grave irregularities that he believed had occurred in at least one union. I supported what he said, believing my support to be justified. Another matter raised repeatedly in this place and elsewhere is secret ballots. I do not intend to say any more about that matter now, as there is a Bill before the House dealing with it.

The matter that I intend to raise is just as important and significant in its way as the other two matters to which I have referred. I am speaking about the way in which the meetings of unions are being run, the people who attend, and so on. I refer particularly to the Transport Workers Union, which I will use as an example to show the sort of thing that is happening. I use the T.W.U. as an example because I possess information about a meeting of this union held last week, and because I believe the

union exemplifies all the undesirable aspects of trade union activity and organisation to which I have referred, as it has been engaged for many months in a demarcation dispute at Port Adelaide with the Waterside Workers Federation. We all know what has been going on down there, that dispute having caused widespread dislocation in the economy of the State. The actions of the T.W.U. have been the subject of strong comment by Ministers of this Government. When I use the T.W.U. as an example of what is going on and of the misuse of power taking place at present, I believe it is a good example and one to which no member can object.

Last week, Senator Hall made a public statement about the T.W.U. In the last day, I have spoken to a man who attended the meeting of the T.W.U. held at Trades Hall on the evening of Monday, September 2. Although he is not a member of the T.W.U., being informed that the meeting would be held (there was no secret about this), he attended it, went in, and afterwards, at home, made notes that same evening of what had gone on at the meeting. As he has given me the notes, I intend to refer to them to show the sort of thing happening in at least one trade union in this State, and if it is happening in one union supposedly it is happening in others as well. If this sort of thing is taking place, it calls for public scrutiny. I intend to go right through these notes, for I do not want to be accused by any member opposite of picking out what is particularly advantageous to my case and omitting other matters.

Mr. Langley: You have the reference of one man?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; I have known him for several years and trust his opinion. I am not at liberty to disclose his identity now, but I have his authority to say that, if there is a Royal Commission (as I believe there should be) into the affairs of trade unions in this State, he is willing to say himself in public what he saw and heard at that meeting. It will be based on the notes I have. He is a courageous man and one whose word I trust.

Mr. Langley: One man at the meeting!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He was one of 49 at the meeting, and not 110.

Mr. Wells: He is not a member of the union?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He is not, but he walked in and was not challenged by anyone. I shall quote from the notes as follows:

The meeting was called for 7.45 at the Trades Hall on Monday, September 9. When I arrived I saw two men discussing in a hallway whether the meeting should be in the small or big room. The caretaker put up a blackboard with "T.W.U." by the doorway. The Secretary of the union and the other man went in and the Secretary put his papers on the table and was followed in by the President of the union. Men started to file into the room, apparently from the bar in the Trades Hall. The meeting began at 7.50 with about 20 people present but the number later built up to 49 as they arrived from the bar. Apologies were taken and the Secretary read the minutes of the August monthly meeting that were passed and accepted. The Secretary then read the minutes of the executive meeting of July 28, 1974, which had been adjourned to August 26, 1974, and then to August 29, 1974. These were passed and accepted as a whole. Discussion then took place. The Secretary reported on a salary rise for him and organisers, and said that the Secretary in his third and subsequent year would receive \$9 898 and an organiser in his third or subsequent year would receive \$8 144. The Secretary admitted that the union was nearly bankrupt because of the number of unfinancial members and, because of this, the union would not support the John Curtin Building Fund. Apparently, at the meeting held at St. Clair \$400 was collected for the men on strike, and it was moved in the executive that the executive raise this to a minimum of \$1 000. The Wheatsheaf Hotel and Greyhound and Murray

Valley Coaches had had the black ban lifted because they had sent a suitable letter of apology, guaranteed all present and future employees would be members of the union, and had paid \$50 into a fund (missed the name of the fund). These actions were conditional on the black ban being lifted. Mr. Davies, the Salisbury contractor, had not had the ban lifted because the letter of apology was not suitable and he had only guaranteed that present employees would be members of the union. This was not suitable so the ban remained. The terminal 29 dispute at the port was reported on, and the Secretary really worked on the explanation of the reason for the back-down by the union. The Secretary told members present how they could do the job better than the wharfies, and that the wharfies and clerks were scum and scabs. They could not load any truck quick enough, it did not matter who it was. The Secretary said the two members who were the original picket-breakers should be expelled, but if the executive did it they could be issued with a civil writ, but if the meeting directed them to do it no-one would know who was there and, as a result, those who were there could not be found and the executive did not want to know who was there, either.

That is, presumably, at that meeting that night.

Mr. Jennings: Is that how you got it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member will be interested in this paragraph. The notes continue:

Nobody was checked in any way on entering the building or the meeting room. Again it was suggested by the Secretary that someone move that they expel these two men. Someone asked how many other unionists broke the picket-line, and the answer was "12". It was suggested they all be expelled, but the Secretary only wanted the two leaders, and that is how it went. Late in the meeting someone moved—

and this is significant—

that at future mass meetings only financial members be admitted. The Secretary would not take a direction as it was not constitutional, and would only accept a recommendation. There are 6 400 members of whom 2 500 to 3 000 were unfinancial members, and they would create a big anti-strike force. The President then told members they should force co-workers to pay up or not to drive trucks. Someone then asked, are not the financial members carrying the unfinancial though, this was agreed. The Secretary then went on and said although the unfinancial members were allowed in and no checking was done others were not entitled to be there but were present, but while they went along with them, what the hell. The Secretary was quick to add that the direction could not be accepted from the floor as it was unconstitutional, but they would accept it as a recommendation only and he would reserve his right to oppose it at executive meeting.

The significance of all this is that at the meeting at St. Clair there were supposed to be 5 000 present, but no-one knows whether this is an accurate figure, what the number of members was, how many were professional stirrers, and so on. That is the sort of thing about which I complain and which seems to be the deliberate policy of Mr. Nyland (Secretary of the T.W.U.). The notes continue:

Organiser Sizars said it would take 5 000 minutes to check 5 000 members. The Secretary again took over and with great to-do spoke about going into this pocket and into that pocket and then suggested that the union ticket could be in the truck or be left at home.

As I understand it from my informant, he said that it would take far too long for people going to a union meeting to show their credentials before being allowed in. The notes continue:

It just wouldn't work to bar these men from the meeting. A vote of confidence was carried by the meeting in the Secretary's handling of the terminal 29 dispute.

Mr. Goldsworthy: How many were there?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Forty-nine, including my informant.

Mr. Jennings: And how did he vote?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I could not answer that. I continue from the notes:

The Secretary did not want it and would oppose it in the executive. Both Austral Steel and Scarfe Steel should have been black-banned it was suggested, but this did not get to a vote. Eastick was called for everything because he said the Davies episode was a trivial matter when a few words were used in the heat of the moment. Nyland took it as serious offence and got himself worked up trying to work up the meeting. He called Davies' driver a mongrel Fascist b— (one woman present). Nyland complained that Eastick was reported in the *Advertiser* but they would not publish his reply and they said it was his turn and that Eastick calls them up every week and it was his turn and during show week neither Eastick nor Nyland would get any cover. An A.B.C. cameraman hit an organiser between 13 and 14 times with his camera before the organiser retaliated. He won't be allowed into any meeting in future, all media would be barred. The question was asked how far from a truck does a driver carry a 45 kilogram load: does he have to carry it 274 metres? This was an old chestnut and was a matter between the employer and the employee. Drop a bag of cement in mud and you will soon get some help.

This seems to be typical union tactics.

Mr. Groth: How would you know whether it is union tactics or not? I've had enough of you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The notes continue:

One member said his employer did not co-operate, and he went down to the shop and got 25c of sugar and put in the petrol, and would do it again. The meeting closed at 9.57, so they could get to the bar before 10.

They are the notes that were taken by this man, and I believe that they are accurate.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Who is he?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He is willing to give evidence before a Royal Commission, if such a Commission is appointed, but I do not have his authority to disclose his name.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You always put up this anonymous stuff.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister can put me right if he likes.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: I won't reply to anonymous letters.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not want the Minister to reply. That would be a waste of time. There should be in this State an inquiry into the affairs of trade unions because of the sorts of thing exemplified by the report I have given of this meeting. Let the Minister know this (and I have said it before): I believe it can be only by a Royal Commission. This Government does not mind Royal Commissions (it even had one into an incident involving a girl who stayed home from school). If there is a Royal Commission into this matter, the man who went to that meeting and got in without being questioned will come forward and give evidence along the lines to which I have referred, and there will be no hiding his identity then. The point of my reading the notes is to show how utterly haphazard is the conduct of trade union meetings: anyone can get in. We do not know, as members of the public, whether or not all the people present are trade union members. How many of the people who went to the St. Clair meeting were union members? How many of them were entitled to vote? These people were disrupting, by their vote, the economy of the State. Are we to have no say to protect ourselves and our community?

This is the kind of thing that is being carried out by the deliberate policy of the union. This is a disgraceful state of affairs. I am glad that I have been given this information. I believe that the man who went to the meeting showed courage in going to it. He was not a

union member and he had never been to a union meeting before. He was willing to go to find out what happened. There was no check on him or on anyone else and, apparently, that goes on all the time. This means that it is a paradise for the professional stirrer of any kind. Anyone who wants to influence the affairs of this State can do so through the trade unions, whether or not he is a legitimate trade union member.

Mr. Payne: Rubbish!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let the member for Mitchell get up and refute what I have said. This incident actually occurred less than eight days ago at a meeting at the Trades Hall. If it occurs with the Transport Workers Union (and we all know the reputation of that union and what we all think of it), there is at least a chance that this sort of thing goes on in other unions. We know about the allegations and suspicions we have about other unions, the stand-over tactics at meetings, and the lack of secrecy in the vote. These things call for an inquiry. Believing there should be an inquiry, I now put that request to the Government and expect that the Minister of Labour and Industry, who has been present during most of the time I have been speaking, will reply.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): During the speech made by the member for Kavel, the member for Mitcham interjected about academic independence and freedom. No-one believes in that more than I do, but the limit was reached at Flinders University when the students and possibly some of the staff went into the canteen, rifled food, and damaged property. What sort of freedom is that? If people at the universities want freedom of expression, they must see that the universities are controlled and run on decent lines. I believe in consulting with the students as much as possible to hear their views but, immediately they break the law of the land, they should be treated the same as any other criminal is treated. The same applies to the woman who parked her vehicle outside Parliament House; no-one took any action. I was going to park my car behind hers, but I am older now and less active than I used to be. What sorts of standard are we developing in the community? If university students want to retain their independence and have community support, they must put their own affairs in order and ensure that no damage is done to property and that reasonable standards are maintained.

The member for Mitcham referred to my acquaintance, Mr. Nyland, and the unofficial members. One of my constituents came to me once. He had received a summons from Mr. Nyland regarding three or four years of unpaid union fees. Mr. Nyland knew that this man was an invalid pensioner and had been so crippled that he could do only light work. Yet, Mr. Nyland summonsed this man for his pound of flesh. That is the kind of attitude I abhor. I have many friends in the trade union movement. In the House only this morning I spoke with some the workmen who are worried about the tragic happenings in Australia today.

This matter has affected my own area, where Clarks Shoes Limited employed in Strathalbyn 52 people, all of whom were recently dismissed under conditions created by the Commonwealth Government, which says that it believes in decentralisation. The Premier is reported to have said that this action was the result of a 25 per cent tariff cut. How ridiculous can we get if this is the truth of the matter! I do not know what is the tariff on shoes. The maximum tariff was 50 per cent and, if reduced by 25 per cent, it must be 25 per cent. The Clark employees were put out of work

because the company could not compete against imported shoes. About 12 months ago Australia was in its greatest position in history with a chance to become one of the great trading nations of the world. Some countries had suffered as a result of the oil crisis, but we in Australia had not suffered from it to nearly the same extent.

Food prices in many countries had more than doubled because of the increases in costs of raw materials, whereas Australian working people could buy wheat at the same price as previously. Wheat is now about the same price as it was 10 years ago. Why have the Clark employees lost their jobs and been forced out of work? The South Australian Government gave me the answer only about a fortnight ago. The Premier used to refer these matters back if he did not think they were good politically, but the Attorney-General now administers the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch, and probably he let out something that was not politically wise. The Attorney-General stated:

Recent increases in the price of many goods including grocery lines have been brought about not only by wage rises but also by added costs caused by improved workmen's compensation, four weeks annual leave, 17½ per cent leave loading, and by the introduction of equal pay for equal work performed by women.

No-one objects to this in principle, but we cannot pay wages at a higher level than the value of the work done. The Attorney also stated:

There is little indication, however, that price rises under present conditions are excessive compared to wage increases, as in the past eight years average weekly earnings have almost doubled whilst the consumer price index has increased by 51.7 per cent. It is not possible under the Prices Act, 1948-1973, to control interstate manufacturers' selling prices. However, all industries with annual sales of over \$20 000 000 are subject to the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Prices Justification Tribunal, and several large food processors fall into this category. It is also not possible to devise a satisfactory system of price control for commodities such as vegetables and meat. These are subject to the law of supply and demand, which greatly affects prices usually on a seasonal basis. From time to time retail prices of meat are checked to see that retail margins are not excessive. Further, excessive profits are not being made by manufacturers in this State, including bakers. Retailers such as grocers, both supermarket and small corner stores, and butchers, show low percentage profit returns on trading.

In most cases, that is well below the high interest rates that the incompetent Australian Government has inflicted on the Australian community. At Strathalbyn 52 people have been put out of work because increased costs have prevented competition on world markets. The biggest tragedy is that some workers are receiving much more than others. Skilled people and tradesmen are still taking home about \$80 or \$90 a week, yet unskilled workers are taking home half as much as that again, or twice as much.

Another industry in my district, the tannery at Mount Barker, recently dismissed 50 employees but re-engaged most of them when the tannery obtained orders. Industries are under pressure for wage increases, and a newspaper report last Friday showed that increased wages were being offered. Local people could solve their problems if there was not outside influence from people who are seeking to destroy the living standards of the Australian workers. I was about to say that I was fortunate enough to live through the last depression but, really, I was unfortunate enough to live through it. I learnt much from the depression, but I was out of work for a long time, as many other people will be in the next few months.

I consider Dr. Cairns to be one of the best economists in Australia at present, and he is reported this morning as saying that there had to be growing unemployment to stop inflation. The Australian Government has introduced

strong restrictive trade practices legislation, and fines of up to \$250 000 are provided for, yet members of unions can combine to exploit the people. I am not against trade unions (indeed, some union members are the salt of the earth), but union affairs have reached the stage of despair. This morning, when I was speaking to two or three such people, they asked me what would happen in the present position.

The Attorney-General has announced that he will retire from Parliament in about 18 months time, and when he does that he will say, "Look at what I have achieved for the consumers by my consumer protection legislation." However, I hope he never becomes a judge if his attitude to one section is that it must be restricted, while another section is allowed to run wild and exploit the people. All the secondhand dealers say that the Attorney has done good work, because they are making much more now in the secondhand trade than they have ever made previously.

Mr. Mathwin: He'll look well in that big wig!

Mr. McANANEY: I hope he is never a judge, unless he changes his attitude about what is right for different sections of the community. I have always opposed price control and no country has proved that it is practicable, but when people combine to exploit other people there must be strong legislation. A small majority of stand-over people in the trade union movement is destroying the living standards of the Australian worker, and we must realise that the quantity of goods we can produce and the willingness of people to work are important matters when we are trying to do better than another country. We are rapidly getting to the stage where we cannot export without losing.

Mr. Jennings: We can't export our imports.

Mr. McANANEY: I know someone that I would like to export, and I should hope that he never came back as an import. When Australia had an opportunity to become a great trading nation, the Australian Government budgeted for a deficit of \$700 000 000, and that deficit reached \$1 500 000 000 by the next March. Instead of being happy people, we are in no end of trouble, and I do not know what is the solution to the problem. We shall not resolve this matter by adopting a Chamberlain attitude, as has been adopted by the Premier of this State. For most of the time he accepted the situation that applied at Port Adelaide during the steel dispute. However, he eventually showed, for once, some intestinal fortitude and the problem was soon solved. Unless people take an interest in matters affecting them, the future for Australia is bleak indeed.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): My first grievance is that we have had once again to wait until we resumed after the Royal Adelaide Show recess to receive the Auditor-General's Report. I was given an explanation for the delay about two years ago, but I still maintain that it is important that members of this House, particularly Opposition members, have the chance to study the report before debating the Budget. The present Government does not believe in open Government. It likes to keep the Opposition waiting for the right answers and when Opposition members seek information from some Ministers they are not given the correct information. The Auditor-General's Report is a most important document, and I should hate to think of the interference that takes place in the preparation of the document. However, I know that the Auditor-General is not directly under the control of any Minister.

I am still wondering why a certain department some years ago, when the matter of rents and cleaning fees being paid by that department before other Government departments occupied certain premises was raised, paid those

costs some months before a Government department moved in. Today we have been told that the Community Welfare Department is at long last moving into its new premises in G.R.E. Building. It has been said that that department or the Public Buildings Department negotiated a lease in the building in July last year. However, information received since indicates that it could have been as early as April last year. I tend to believe that it was in July last year that the office space was acquired and that the Government, through either the Public Buildings Department or the Community Welfare Department, is paying about \$15 000 a month rent to Guardian Royal Exchange Assurance Group for five floors in its building. That accommodation has not yet been occupied, but the Community Welfare Department is now moving in.

South Australian taxpayers have paid out about \$210 000 since the lease was acquired, and only now is the department moving in. This is an absolute waste of public money. How long can South Australians continue to pay the increased taxes they are expected to pay only to see the money wasted in this way? It appears there are enough officers in the department to use the space that has been obtained. We must get office space when we can: a department cannot move in overnight. An excuse offered is that the department could not obtain the furniture it required. What a ludicrous situation!

The Auditor-General's Report this year (and last year, too), under Public Buildings Department, does not refer to the rent paid for accommodation not yet occupied. I raised the matter some years ago, and that now seems to be the reason why it is not included in the report. I cannot accept that situation, because I believe the Auditor-General has a duty to inform Parliament and the people of this State of everything and anything he can.

Mr. Dean Brown: When is the Government going to shift the Agriculture Department?

Mr. BECKER: The Agriculture Department is housed in the most disgusting accommodation of all. I cannot understand why the Public Service Association of South Australia (the department's union) has not complained about the accommodation, or why staff members have not refused to work in the building.

Mr. Dean Brown: Perhaps the farmers vote the wrong way.

Mr. BECKER: The Government has been leasing five floors in G.R.E. Building that could have been used by the Agriculture Department. The Government has also taken over four other floors in the building. Someone has suggested that the total rent is about \$45 000 a month. The important thing to remember is that some Government departments have been occupying the seventh, eighth, and ninth floors and that the Ombudsman occupies the tenth floor. I cannot understand why there has been so much vacant space in the building and why it has not been occupied. It is also interesting to note that the Auditor-General discovered that, in the Supply Branch, unserviceable school furniture was being reconditioned by a contractor and taken back into stock at a price that was greater than the standard price set for new furniture. In other words, the Public Buildings Department was salvaging school furniture and having it reconditioned by a private contractor at a price greater than that paid for new furniture. That comment reminds me of a question I asked the Minister of Education on August 13 this year, as follows:

Is there a shortage of desks in schools in this State? Have old desks been recalled from salvage to be used in schools?

The Minister replied:

No school is known to have been without an essential supply of desks at any time, though it has not been possible to replace older type furniture with more modern desks in every case where a request has been submitted.

To my second question, the Minister replied:

No desks have been recalled from salvage and issued to schools excepting a small number of kindergarten tables, which were issued in isolated cases to meet the demand caused by mid-year intake of pupils.

However, the Auditor-General says that unserviceable school furniture was reconditioned. One therefore wonders what is really going on. Moreover, when one wonders about the sum of \$210 000 used to pay the rent on unoccupied premises one wonders how the finances of this State are being handled and whether they are being handled responsibly: in fact, whether the right hand knows what the left hand is doing, and whether the taxpayer is getting a fair go. I have always believed, and will always maintain, that, until the theory can be tested whether there is a better method of handling taxpayers' money in this State, the Government should have a closer look at the whole budgeting system used by Government departments. It is interesting to see once again that the Auditor-General in his opening remarks has indicated, as it appears to me, that some departments are using bush accountancy methods, and that if they had a \$1 000 000 allocation last year then, because of inflation, they increase that sum, and work within that system. Further, if, during May, they find they have part of their allocation left, they spend it so that nothing remains at the end of the financial year. That system has been operating for many years: indeed, it operated during the terms of previous Governments. That is where the waste of public funds occurs, and no-one is going to change the system. I cannot see why, if a Government department does not spend the sum allocated to it in one year, it cannot carry a surplus into the next year. If anyone says that that is a reflection on the Public Service, I am willing to take up the matter anywhere because public servants are not being given an opportunity to run their departments in the way they would wish: they are being hamstrung by incompetent Ministerial advice and direction. This causes frustration amongst public servants. If the present Government wants to save taxpayers' money, it should let top public servants who administer departments have greater responsibility in controlling the financial affairs of their departments. There is far too much Ministerial interference in financing. When some Ministers decide on the spot that certain things should be done, such decisions can upset the plans of various departments. The Minister of Transport would be an expert in this field. It is interesting to note that he is well in the lobby of those it is suggested will replace the Premier. The coup is on; all this will unfold in the next few months.

Dr. Tonkin: Is that why the Attorney-General is going out?

Mr. BECKER: The Attorney-General is leaving the sinking ship; he has brains. I have always said that the Minister of Labour and Industry has brains, and he is retiring.

Mr. Coumbe: Who will be the replacements?

Mr. BECKER: It does not matter because, after the next election, there will be no need for those Ministers to be replaced, as the Labor Party will no longer be in Government. It has no need to get a certain medical practitioner to stand for Parliament, as he will not be needed. Various unscrupulous methods are being used down my way by the Labor Party. Over the next few months there will be an

unfolding story of the skulduggery that certain Labor Party members are up to. We will see whether they print this in the *Herald*, a rag in which I receive great publicity. There is no point in suing it, as it has no money, anyway.

This week, a constituent of mine returned from an overseas visit. In England, he found that many people whom he met were interested in migrating to Australia. He answered their questions as well as he could, then referring them to South Australia House. However, he was concerned that most of the inquiries were from people who wanted to come here for only a short time. What I say is no reflection on English migrants who come here, settle down, and prove to be first-class citizens. He brought back a newspaper called the *Southern Evening Echo* which is dated Monday, August 19, and which contains an article stating that a 22-year-old girl is off to Australia. Having been for the last three years secretary of the Hampshire County Cricket Club, she will come to Australia on an assisted passage, planning to stay for two years. She says she will miss the many friends she has, and so on. She hopes to get a job when she arrives in Adelaide at Adelaide Oval, presumably with the South Australian Cricket Association.

The assisted passage for this young English girl would cost her, I understand, \$75. Whether she comes by sea or air is immaterial: Australian taxpayers must bear the cost. This girl will have no job when she arrives in Adelaide. Under the conditions applying, she must stay two years, but it is a pity that, at a time when we are becoming more and more restrictive in our immigration scheme, people are assisted to come here for only a short time. I should rather see money available for this purpose used to assist people who would settle down here and make a worthwhile contribution, such as that made by the member for Glenelg, who has served local government and now serves his State and country in this Parliament. That is the type of migrant we want. We do not want young people popping out here for a couple of years to get out of the trials and tribulations being experienced in England under a Socialist Government. People are also coming here to get away from the English medical scheme. It is far cheaper to migrate to Australia for two years and have performed certain operations for which one would wait three years to have performed in England. In Australia, these operations can be performed almost straight away. What is happening makes one wonder what Flash Al set up when he was the Commonwealth Minister for Immigration and what is happening under the present Minister. These matters should be investigated, as the position can be made difficult for migrants who are trying to do the right thing.

Recently, the member for Florey rightly complained about the method of discounting adopted by some supermarkets. As my Party is concerned about consumer protection, we are looking at various schemes at present. Cases are brought to my attention that show that members of the public are the victims of the present supermarket system. One week a supermarket has a special, but the next week it is no longer a special, having been re-marked at something close to the full retail price. The price of some articles varies three or four times in five or six weeks. Recently, I visited a supermarket in the district of the Minister of Environment and Conservation. As we left, I asked my wife to check the tape from the cash register. Needless to say, this caused a problem. It was found that my wife had been overcharged for three items. In one section of the supermarket she picked up an item apparently marked "Three for 99c". Taking only one item, she supposed she would pay only 33c, but

she found that she would have to pay 99c. Therefore, unless she took the three items, she had to pay 99c for one. Being a keen cigar smoker, I picked out my favourite brand, but I was overcharged for that. As the member for Florey has said, it is not good enough for housewives to have to suffer under this system in which prices vary not only from week to week but, I believe, from day to day. I should have thought that, following his return from overseas, the Attorney-General would come up with a system to protect consumers.

I receive many complaints from constituents who find that they are charged for an article they have not received. Mistakes obviously occur. I believe that housewives and others who visit supermarkets will have to insist on checking the articles they have received before they pay at the cash register. On the occasion to which I have referred, we would not have received the tape from the cashier unless we had asked for it, although some cashiers present the tape straight away. It is not good enough to have housewives robbed left, right and centre. The supermarket barons are fooling us by saying that we are getting a fair deal from their discount methods.

There is no such thing as a permanent discount price throughout their stock, but they do not tell people this. If a supermarket advertises that it is the best place with which to deal and that it is selling its goods at lower prices, it should permanently discount prices. However, this is not happening, and no-one is checking the retail prices of goods offered for sale. Although these establishments admit from time to time that mistakes are made, as a result of which money is refunded, this is not good enough because, for every person who demands that the correct price be charged, another 10 people would be taken down unknowingly.

Whether it is the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs or anyone else, someone should be responsible for going through supermarkets and checking prices. W. D. and H. O. Wills, the manufacturer concerned, was hostile that such a price was being charged for cigars. However, the matter should not be left to that organisation. Unfortunately, not all wholesalers do the right thing.

In the pricing system there is a wholesale price, a supermarket bulk-buying price, and a recommended retail price, the last not necessarily being the minimum price that is charged. One often hears people referring to misleading advertising. If certain supermarkets want to continue in this vein, we will get somewhere only if the people I have contacted continue to check their price tickets and return the goods if discrepancies occur. Although the Government appears to be reluctant to do anything about this matter, a committee has been set up in my district to try to do something about it. It wants people to check on the pricing system in all supermarkets, and I should like to hear from anyone who has been a victim of circumstances, whose price tapes have not balanced, or who have seen the prices of articles being continually adjusted. It is not fair that the public should be charged such exorbitant prices. If the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch is bogged down in certain areas, the Government will at least have to ensure that officers check on prices of articles, as obviously profiteering is occurring in certain areas.

To its credit, the Commonwealth Department of Customs and Excise has requested oil companies to introduce a quota system for sales, to be imposed from August 12 to September 17. Brewing companies, wineries and tobacco distributors have also received similar notifications. During

the same period they have been placed on a quota and are to reduce their stocks pending an announcement in the Commonwealth Budget. It is estimated that, as a result of the Budget, the cost of premium grade petrol could increase by between 5c and 10c a gallon, and that there could be increased excise duties on beer and cigarettes. Any such move would, however, be inflationary. As the Commonwealth Government has been known to change its mind overnight, anything could happen in this respect.

The oil companies have maintained that, had industrial disputes occurred in South Australia in the last few months, service station stocks could have been depleted. The Commonwealth Government does not want service station proprietors to profit from increases in excise duties announced in the Commonwealth Budget. I take this as a reflection on the oil companies and service station proprietors. The latter balance their books each week, and some of the oil companies have auditing firms that check returns monthly. It would not therefore be difficult for a service station proprietor to ascertain what stocks he had on hand at the close of business on September 16, sign a statutory declaration, submit it to the company, and then pay the excise duty on the stocks held in reserve. This could also happen with cigarette retailers, as well as with wine shops and hotels. It is unfair to put these organisations on a quota system.

We have been fortunate that recently there have been no industrial disputes involving transport workers carrying fuel in this State. One hopes this does not happen before September 17 because, if a dispute occurs, many service stations will experience difficulties and South Australian motorists may well be stranded. This could easily result in our playing into the hands of irresponsible unions, particularly in relation to fuel supplies. Our community depends on the motor car, and it likes to see adequate fuel reserves at service stations. This is indeed a reflection on service station proprietors, and it is the first time that the Commonwealth Government and the Department of Customs and Excise have seen fit to take this action. Although their action is intended to stop profiteering, surely they must have some understanding of the situation. Other action could be taken without reflecting on the integrity of retailers.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I refer, first, to the Government's credibility. Already, many matters that have been raised in the House have reflected on its credibility. One matter with which I wish to deal has been referred to in the press in recent weeks: the decision of this Government, on the advice of the Minister of Transport, to acquire a property on Burbridge Road that was owned previously by a Mr. and Mrs. Elston, who were unfortunate to have a tenant who was not carrying on in a satisfactory manner or, indeed, in their interests. As a result, they wanted to auction their property. However, before dealing with this subject, I should like to refer to one or two other matters.

Parliament and the people of this State expect the Government to be credible and to act in the best interests of the people, so that Ministers and their staff should not be able to benefit from inside information. I believe that the situation at Burbridge Road was completely unethical, and one can only conclude that Mr. Edmund, who had purchased Theatre 62, benefited when the property was acquired. I believe we are entitled to a full public inquiry as to how and why, as late as 1½ hours before that property was to be auctioned and after it had been advertised for about five weeks, a telephone call from the Assistant Secretary of the Minister of Transport to the

auctioneers stopped the sale. The people who owned the property are most dissatisfied at the manner in which they were treated, and this matter should be discussed fully here and in public. Who received the lease? How did they—

The SPEAKER: Order! Generally, members can talk about practically anything in this debate, but they cannot anticipate a matter on the Notice Paper. Consideration of a message from another place is to be discussed in this House and the honourable member is not permitted to discuss that matter, even in a grievance debate.

Mr. GUNN: I abide by your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I have been approached by a constituent who was unfortunate enough to purchase a lease from John Ceruto, a person who has been employed in the Premier's Department and who was supposed to be a reputable agent. However, it was found that this person was not a properly registered agent and great difficulty has been experienced in obtaining the commission from Mr. Ceruto. I have had several discussions with my constituent—

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member discussing the purchase of the Hilton property? The honourable member has referred to a transaction concerning a land agent, but this property is the subject matter of an item on the Notice Paper.

Mr. GUNN: I am not anticipating legislation—

The SPEAKER: Order! I asked the honourable member a straight-out question. Is the matter he is now discussing concerned with the acquisition of the Hilton property?

Mr. GUNN: It is not the acquisition. It is the operation at the property and the practices that took place there.

The SPEAKER: I ruled that matter out of order. Honourable members can discuss practically any matter, but when the honourable member is anticipating an item on the Notice Paper he is out of order.

Mr. GUNN: In accordance with your ruling, Sir, I will not discuss the acquisition, but am I allowed to speak about the person unfortunate enough to have conducted a business at that property and then to lease the property?

The SPEAKER: In accordance with the item on the Notice Paper I rule that that discussion is out of order.

Mr. GUNN: Order of the Day, Other Business, Wednesday, September 11, item 15 relates to "Acquisition of land at Hilton by Highways Department: consideration of message No. 21 from Legislative Council." I intend not to canvass that matter at all but to speak about a person who was conducting a business at that property. The member for Flinders and I interviewed this person last week for about 3½ hours. This person, after seeing an advertisement in a newspaper, thought that he was dealing with a reputable person. He came to Adelaide, inspected the premises and was led to believe that the goodwill, stock and plant that he had inspected were included in the property for the price of \$14 500.

The SPEAKER: Order! For the honourable member's benefit the motion to be considered by this House is as follows:

That, in the opinion of this Council, the Ombudsman should be requested to investigate as a matter of public interest all matters in relation to the acquisition by the Highways Department of allotment 4 containing 480 square metres or thereabouts of subdivision of portion of block 24 and other land of section 49 laid out as Hilton from George Sydney Elston and Kathleen Annie Elston, his wife and the subsequent use of the above land and to report to Parliament on any matters which he considers to be of public interest.

The honourable member has already referred to the name of Elston, which is contained in the above motion, and, as he is anticipating legislation, he cannot continue in this vein.

Mr. GUNN: In accordance with your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I will discuss this matter at greater length later. Following a question I innocently asked the Premier, I now refer to another restaurant in Adelaide that has provoked much interest. I cast no reflection on the present management board of the Coalyard Restaurant, because I believe the people who invested money in this project have a high business integrity and are upstanding citizens, and have invested money in this restaurant in order to promote tourism for the benefit of the people of the State. The question "How did Mr. Ceruto first obtain that property?" should be answered by the Government, because I believe members of the public require an answer. I have been contacted by a person who, with another gentleman, conducted a business at 11a Hindmarsh Square. These people spent much money setting up the business, but were approached by R. W. Swan Proprietary Limited, a reputable group of land agents in this city, and asked if they wished to sell their remaining interest in the lease. They said, "Let us think about it." The representative of the company returned on another occasion to discuss the matter with them, and they said that they were not interested.

So, some time later Mr. Ceruto came to this enterprise and approached the gentleman concerned and said that he was from the Premier's Department. He explained what it was intended to do with the property, and the gentleman said, "If this is your plan, we will make way for you, but you will have to pay us out for the amount incurred—\$6 500." From the information I have, this sum was agreed to by Mr. Ceruto. He said that he was endeavouring to set up a situation. At that time a company was formed by the legal firm from which the Premier has now withdrawn (and I wonder what the significance of that decision is; it is a particularly interesting decision to make at this time). The first two people to form the company were Mr. Ceruto and Mr. Lynch, a member of the legal firm of which the Premier was formerly a member. So, these two gentlemen—

The SPEAKER: Order! It has been brought to my notice that the honourable member is now discussing a matter that is *sub judice*. It is a matter of litigation at this stage, and it cannot be considered. Honourable members cannot discuss a matter of litigation.

Mr. GUNN: If that is the case, it looks as though I shall have to resume my seat. I had a number of things to say in the remaining 17 minutes of my time. I am not permitted to discuss either the first matter I raised or this matter. I am sure the public will be interested when we get the opportunity to debate these issues.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I am sure the public will be interested in you two blokes as well.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I am delighted to hear that the Premier thinks that the public will be interested in what I say. I wish to refer to the environmental impact statement on Monarto. It is unfortunate that the Premier has walked out at this point, because he previously indicated that he would be interested in what I had to say. In replying to a Question on Notice, the Minister of Development and Mines clearly indicated today that the State Government was willing to prepare such a statement. The Minister also said that no ecological study had yet been carried out. We therefore need to assess

the present facts. According to the Minister, construction work at the site was started about a fortnight ago; that being the case, the Minister now claims that an environmental impact statement will be prepared. But what is the point of preparing it when the Government has already ruined part of the environment? How can the Government possibly prepare such a statement when it has not even carried out an ecological study to find out what the environment is? The Government has already begun construction work at the site.

So, the Minister's statement is nothing more than glib environmental window dressing for Monarto. But is that not usual with all the statements about Monarto? We can think back to the television-set telephones, the magnificent lakes, and the other glib promises for this Utopia! Yet we find that the State Government has fallen down in one of the basic points: it has not even assessed what the ecological effect will be, and it is now too late to assess it. Only two weeks ago the same Minister claimed in relation to the Redcliff project that the Labor Government was concerned about the environment, but I believe that the Government is not concerned about the environment: it is willing to window dress in relation to environment matters, but it is not willing to do the basic work in which academics are interested. We learn about the Government's attitude when we read the comments of people like Mr. Warren Bonython, the Chairman of the Conservation Council of South Australia. The Government's environmental statements in relation to the Redcliff project have been ridiculed. The Government is two-faced and is trying to present a front of concern about the environment when, in fact, it is not concerned.

I turn now to the question of secrecy and the regulations controlling public servants. The Premier has often claimed that the Labor Government of South Australia has pioneered open administration; he has claimed that the Government has no facts to hide and is willing to allow public debate on all issues. Of course, we know full well that nothing could be further from the truth. Only three weeks ago when I discussed Monarto in the debate on a no-confidence motion the Minister of Development and Mines scorned me for apparently having inside information about Monarto; that is the most recent of many attempts by the Government to pinpoint sources of leaks of information to the public, the press or Parliamentarians. The Premier should recall the Prime Minister's significant statement on June 3 that Commonwealth public servants—

Dr. Eastick: Did he have permission?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Probably not. The Prime Minister said that public servants no longer had to fear the restriction of Public Service regulation No. 34, which provides:

An officer shall not—

(a) use for any purpose, other than for the discharge of his official duties, information gained by or conveyed to him through his connection with the service; or

(b) —

and this is the appropriate part—

publicly comment upon any administrative action or upon the administration of any department.

Provided that nothing in this paragraph shall prevent an officer resident in any Territory within the Commonwealth from publicly commenting upon civic affairs relating to that Territory.

The part about the Territories is insignificant. The Prime Minister has allowed Commonwealth public servants to comment publicly on the administration of the Public

Service, whereas South Australian public servants do not have the same right to comment on the administration of our Public Service. Although, again, the Government has glibly come out and boasted about open government, it has not allowed our public servants to come forward and exercise it. Section 58 (Division VI) of the Public Service Act, 1967, for this State, provides:

If any officer . . .

(i) otherwise than in the discharge of his duties, directly or indirectly discloses to any person information acquired in the course of his duties except by the direction or with the permission of the Minister;

or

(j) without the permission of the Minister directly or indirectly and whether anonymously or otherwise, makes any communication or contribution or supplies any information to any newspaper or publication of a similar nature on any matter affecting the Public Service or any department thereof or the business or the officers of the Public Service or any department thereof or on his own office or his own acts or duties as an officer,

he shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable to such punishment as may be determined under section 59 or section 64 of this Act.

This State's public servants are not allowed to comment on the administration of the Government. We know why: because the Government is trying to suppress some shady administration deals currently going on in the State and is trying to hide some shoddy administration work by Cabinet. The most classic example can be seen in cases such as were referred to today. The Leader of the Opposition and other Opposition members have had great difficulty in obtaining from the Public Service answers to general questions. If an Opposition member telephones Public Service officers, he is immediately told that they cannot comment without the Minister's permission.

Mr. Mathwin: Big Brother!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Very much, and many are guilty of this. I can refer to about six individual cases in which Ministers have tried to carry out witch hunts when trying to find information leaks. Having been a member of the Public Service, I know the kind of witch hunts that were carried out on several occasions.

Dr. Tonkin: Did they catch you?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: No, because I did not break any regulations. Several times officers of the Premier's Department raided the Agriculture Department in an almost Gestapo fashion.

Dr. Tonkin: Did Senator Murphy come, too?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: No. They tried to find the appropriate information relating to the suggestion that I may have been absent from work without formal leave. However, they found on all occasions that I had obtained formal leave or that I had not made statements to the press or to other persons without the Minister's permission. I was completely innocent on all occasions, and their investigations bore me out. I was completely innocent, but it reminded me of the Gestapo and of the sorts of activity other dictatorial Governments engage in. Yet the same Government boasts of its open government policy within the State. I urge the Premier or the Attorney-General to amend the Public Service Act to allow our public servants at least to comment on the administration of the Government.

If the Government believes that it is competent, it should allow public comment on its administration. If

it has any doubts (and it obviously has), it will try to suppress comment. What danger could come from allowing public servants to comment publicly on non-policy issues? We would be allowing them to comment only on the administration within the Public Service. Public servants must not release to the press or anyone else floods of information, secret documents, or anything else involving Government departments, for that may be unreasonable.

The Government would find it difficult to negotiate with outside bodies or to conduct the affairs in the administration of the State if all this information were made public, but public servants should be able to comment on how Government departments are being administered. I am fascinated by the reaction when Opposition members come forward with any information relating even to the interpretation of an Act. This is particularly so, if it involves the Attorney-General. On one occasion I referred to swimming pools, and asked whether the builders of swimming pools came under the jurisdiction of the Builders Licensing Board. A member of the public telephoned me, and I think I then asked my secretary to inquire whether the board actually controlled the builders of swimming pools. I could see the Minister's reaction in the House when I described the subsequent telephone conversation. I have no idea who the person was who gave the information.

The Hon. L. J. King: While you were about it, you should have asked who was the Minister responsible for the board.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: That is all right. The Minister took responsibility for the question, and was apparently willing to accept it at the time. If he did not realise who was responsible, perhaps he should have telephoned the board to ascertain who was.

The Hon. L. J. King: By the look on my face, I might have been surprised that you were directing the question to me.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If I remember correctly, I think there was an interjection, "Who told you that?" The Government is scared that members of the public will ring up and seek information.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're talking your usual fantastic rubbish.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: This is obviously embarrassing the Government. I would like to know the attitude of Education Department teachers, because I know what the responsibility of the Minister would be if his officers came out on an *ad hoc* basis and commented on the administration of that department. The teachers would cop it in the neck as quickly as could be administratively arranged.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I think there's a difference between advisers coming out in criticism of a matter of Government policy and teachers coming out in criticism—

Mr. Mathwin: Has the Minister the call?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister's interjection is totally out of order. He will have the chance to comment shortly if he wishes, but of course Ministers never do; they are just like the back-benchers. I return to the original point: members of the Public Service in South Australia are not allowed to comment on the administration of the Government.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you think they are afraid?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Of course they are; they are afraid of losing their jobs. I have seen this in the Agriculture Department, and more recently since I have

been in Parliament. It is not possible to get from many people even reasonable answers, because they are scared they will be pounced upon, and they ask one to get permission from the Minister. How can any State be carried on with such a dictatorial, black-ban attitude?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why are they prepared to talk to certain members of the Opposition and not to you?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is interesting to hear the Minister of Education make this point. In the case of his department, I always go to the Minister or to his Secretary, as a matter of courtesy; there is no point in going directly to anyone else in the department. I accept that, and I am not commenting on it because, when it relates to policy, one would expect to go to the Minister or to his Secretary to get permission. I am making the point that officers cannot comment on the administration or criticise the Government for its administration.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: There are members on your side who will contact officers directly with questions on administration.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am not denying that. I am saying that public servants are not allowed to comment, and they cannot go to the press. I am sure the Minister would accept that he would take appropriate action against any officer who went to the press on a matter of administration.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: On what authority? You had better read the Public Service Act.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have just read it to the House.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The Minister does not have that authority; the permanent head of the department has it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am sure the Minister would lean on him very quickly.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No, you are saying that.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I thought the Minister was implying it. The Minister knows that he would lean on the permanent head of his department. It is for this reason that we need a Royal Commission to get the facts. I ask the Minister of Education, who I presume is the senior Minister on the front bench at the moment, to draw my plea to the attention of the Premier. I simply make the valid plea that public servants be allowed to comment on the administration of the Government and, in particular, of the Public Service. Without that, inefficiencies existing within the Public Service will continue, and ours will not be the so-called forward State that Government members like to think it is. Even their Canberra colleagues are well ahead. I look forward to the time, I hope soon, when the South Australian Government will adopt a new policy on this matter.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): My first comment refers to the building industry, where the record of the Government is a disgraceful one. It is almost as bad as its record in relation to tourism in South Australia, regarding which it professes to have done so much, when in reality it has done nothing. I draw to the attention of members a log of claims lodged in connection with the building industry award. Not long ago, South Australia was a cheap State for housing, and during the term of office of this Government we have heard promises that it would continue to build low-cost housing. We were even to have the assistance of Mr. Hawke, who said he would build hundreds of houses at Christies Beach at a lower rate than that at which the Housing Trust was building them at that time.

All that has changed. The time for completion of any house, however small, has gone from 12 weeks from the laying of foundations to the tenants moving in (as it was when I was in the building industry) to six, eight, or even nine months. That difference represents the difference between this Government and a Liberal Government in South Australia. The log of claims first sets out that the basic wage should be \$120 a week and that such wage should be adjusted quarterly, in accordance with the retail price index numbers. It adds to that a disability allowance of \$20 a week to be paid in compensation for disabilities. Then there is an industry allowance of \$20 a week to compensate for hard conditions associated with the industry. In my opinion, the building industry is not a difficult one in which to work. People have been content to work in it for many years. When I worked in the industry, I found conditions quite reasonable. In addition to the items I have mentioned, the log of claims sets out a loading of \$60 a week to compensate for the lack of general over-award payments in the industry.

Mr. Crimes: Of course; they are creating ambit.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am glad the member for Spence agrees with this as it is. Further, we have a tool allowance of \$10, and a leading hand in charge of an employee is to get an extra amount of 40 per cent of the ordinary rate of pay. In my day, a leading hand had to be in charge of five or more men, but now he simply has to be in charge of an employee. A further provision states that, in addition to the rate appropriate for the type of work, a casual hand shall be paid an additional 50 per cent of the hourly rate. Most members of the building trade are casual hands, no matter what their trade. We have all this added expense. Looking at the matters I have mentioned (and they are not all the matters contained in the log of claims, but just some of them) we see that they add up to \$230 a week. In this log of claims we have the further addition of a site or area allowance of \$2 an hour, or any other amount that may be agreed upon. I do not disagree entirely with the next part of the claim, but I certainly disagree with the amounts sought. That part of the claim states:

Employees shall be eligible for incremental payments in recognition of satisfactory service in accordance with the following scale for all purposes of the award:

On engagement \$40.00 a week;
After 1 year's service \$50.00 a week;
After 2 year's service \$60.00 a week.

The story goes on and on. Certain special rates are laid down, and I refer to the rate for working in hot weather.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You wouldn't know about that.

Mr. MATHWIN: If the Minister (who is out of order in interjecting from the middle benches, where he began a few years ago) suggests that I have not worked, I tell him that I have worked as hard as, if not harder than, any member on the Government side. Whatever I have done, I have done by my own hard work. Many members opposite came here after being trade union secretaries or organisers, and they would not know what hard work was.

I do not disagree about a man being entitled to a special rate of pay if he is working in the hold of a ship (and the member for Florey would know about that) or in a small area. However, we are dealing with the building trade, and anyone in the building trade can work in a temperature of 37°C, which is about 99°F.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Tell us about—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is out of his place.

Mr. MATHWIN: In terms of this log of claims, if the work continued for more than one hour, the employee would be entitled to a rest period of 25 minutes, without loss of pay. That means that for every hour that anyone in the building trade works in a temperature of more than 37°C, he must have a rest period of 25 minutes. We are not dealing with work in the hold of a ship or inside a boiler room, or with a man using fire bricks: we are dealing with a building site. Most people are pleased to work in hot weather in the building trade.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: And you're shortsighted.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will be shortlived if he continues.

Mr. Wells: 37°C is about 104°F, not 99°F.

Mr. MATHWIN: My experts have told me that it is the equivalent of 99°F. I ask the Minister of Education to confirm that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I have no comment.

Mr. MATHWIN: The log of claims also seeks to have the following provision in the award:

No employee shall be required to remain on site during periods of inclemency and no employee shall be transferred after being on site for more than two hours after starting time.

Under that provision, after two hours on a site a man could not be sent to another job and he would have to be paid for eight hours. The big problem is that the people who want houses built would have to pay the cost involved, and many of these people are struggling young people. Older people also would be involved, as is the Minister of Labour and Industry at times.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Tell us what hard work you have done and when last you were inside a boiler.

Mr. MATHWIN: I have never worked inside boilers in my life. Regarding the section of the log of claims dealing with meal allowance, the following provision is sought:

Where an employee is required to work overtime outside ordinary working hours he shall be paid by his employer an amount of \$10 to meet the cost of a meal and a further \$10 for the second and subsequent meals after each four hours overtime.

Let us be reasonable! Any member of this House could go to a hotel and get a first-class meal for \$2.30 or \$2.80, yet a meal allowance of \$10 is sought in this log of claims. Even a member of Parliament does not receive a meal allowance of \$10.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Because you're not worth it.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister is worth it, because he eats more than I do and he is fatter than I am. No wonder he is retiring earlier than I am. I refer briefly now to the travelling allowance sought in the log of claims. The amount of allowance sought, when the distance is up to 5 kilometres (which is about 2½ miles) from where the man lives or from the General Post Office, is \$5 a day. The amount claimed when the distance is between 5 km and 10 km is \$8 a day, while amounts of \$12 a day and \$15 a day are claimed where the distance is between 10 km and 15 km and between 15 km and 20 km respectively. These amounts are sought in the building trade, not in some big organisation that gives an open slather. It would have cost the organisation probably \$200 or more to put out a brochure like this one. Paragraph 21 (c) states:

Where an employee is directed by the employer or his agent to use his own vehicle he shall receive \$5 per day for each day it is so used plus 85c per kilometre for each kilometre travelled . . .

So, if he uses his own vehicle, he must receive \$5 a day plus 85c a kilometre.

Mr. Harrison: But how much will it cost a man in another 10 or 15 years time when he has to pay \$99 000 for a house? He would starve on this allowance.

Mr. MATHWIN: I come now to "Allowances for distant jobs", and a "distant job" is one that is at least 20 km away. That means that, if I was working, as I used to, from my depot in Seacliff and I took someone to do a job at Payneham, that would be called a "distant job". Therefore, that man would have to be supplied with first-class hotel or motel accommodation. If I send three of my men from Seacliff to Payneham, I have to supply them with hotel or motel accommodation.

Mr. Wells: And you would add that to the cost of the job.

Mr. MATHWIN: That, of course, would mean an allowance of \$30 a day.

Mr. Wells: Do you understand what an ambit claim is?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes; I know all about that. If a man is employed on a job for less than a full working week, the allowance is \$30 a day for accommodation; if a man is employed on a job for a full working week or longer, the allowance is \$150 a week for accommodation. That's not bad! At those rates, I will be willing to take in lodgers if this goes through. I will be ready to supply lodgings for these poor fellows working on building sites, and I am sure the Minister of Education, too, would supply them with accommodation. Now let me come to the annual leave allowance. Paragraph 28 states:

(a) A period of 35 consecutive days leave shall be allowed annually to an employee after 12 months employment

(d) Each employee, before going on leave, shall be paid in advance the wages, allowances, or rates which would ordinarily accrue to him if he had worked during the currency of the leave, plus an additional annual leave loading of 50 per cent of such wages, allowances or rates.

Mr. Payne: What is wrong with that?

Mr. MATHWIN: I maintain that 35 days consecutive leave is not bad, taking into account Adelaide Cup Day, Labor Day, and all the other public holidays we have in South Australia. I turn now to sick leave. Paragraph 29 provides:

An employee who is absent from his work on account of personal illness or accident shall be entitled to leave of absence without deduction of pay. Where required by the union, the employer shall contribute to a central fund a sufficient amount to enable sick leave to be administered on an industry basis.

Now let me come to compassionate leave. This is interesting:

An employee shall, on the death of a near relative, or for other pressing or urgent reason, be granted five days leave on full pay in any one year as compassionate leave.

That's not so bad, is it? Let us look at what a "near relative" is in this connection, because I should like honourable members to hear this. It is stated:

For the purposes of this clause a "near relative" means the father, mother or wife, or *de facto* wife, or a brother, sister, son, or daughter, or step-son or daughter, mother-in-law or father-in-law, sister-in-law or brother-in-law, son-in-law or daughter-in-law, grandparents, grandchildren, foster parents or foster children of the employee.

They are all "near relatives" and an employee is allowed five days compassionate leave if one of them dies. I have brought this log of claims by the builders labourers to the attention of the House; it is known as the Building Industry Award, which has many definitions that it would take me some time to read through. With all these

travelling allowances, special allowances, and the like, one would be paying these employees \$230 a week plus an extra 50 per cent for a casual hand, which would mean nearly all the building trade employees. The site allowance and other allowances and incremental payments for years of service make a total of \$110 a week. However, when we work out how long it takes to build a house and how many people are involved in the building of it, the cost, under these conditions, would make it impossible for anyone ever to own his own house. That is the crux of the argument as far as I am concerned.

The other matter to which I refer briefly is that brought before the House by the member for Torrens—the Government's aid to the Public Service Association, where the Premier agrees to help that association to obtain lists of non-unionists employed by the Government. I quote from the *Sunday Mail* of September 1:

In reply to Public Service Association submissions, the Premier had said Cabinet approved the request, and lists would be made available from Government departments, including hospitals,

The article continued that the Government supported the policy of preference to unionists, and the principle of encouraging employees to become members of their appropriate industrial organisation. Encouraging members to join the appropriate association I agree with, but I do not think the Government should force it on to people, as does happen today and has happened in the last few years. It is wrong for the Government to do that. How much further information would the Government give these people? Would it be right for the Government to say, "You are filling in an application to show that you want to join a union; you must also give your political affiliations, and say whether you lean towards one Party or another."

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

Mr. MATHWIN: I refer to a report in the *Sunday Mail* of September 1, that the Treasurer will supply a list of non-unionists employed in Government departments. The report states, in part:

The submissions had referred to Government policy of preference to unionists, and the principle of encouragement of employees to become members of their appropriate industrial organisation.

I agree that people should belong to a union, but I do not believe that they should be forced to join. It is hard to pinpoint where the matter of preference to unionists and compulsory unionism departs in practice, because they are the same sort of thing. What information is to be supplied in these lists? Will it include the name of the political Party to which these people belong, or will they be asked what are their political affiliations?

A big percentage of members of unions do not belong to the Labor Party, but they pay to the Party through their sustentation levy. The Labor Party can claim that this payment makes these people members of their Party, but that is incorrect. When unionists must pay sustentation fees or political levies, I part company with the principle, because I believe it is grossly unfair of any Government to take such action when the payment of a sustentation fee to the Party is involved. Is this part and parcel of the idea behind the Government's action?

Mr. Langley: We don't know what you mean.

Mr. Gunn: Read your own rule book.

Mr. MATHWIN: I refer the member for Unley to his own rule book, which provides that union members shall pay a sustentation fee to the Labor Party. Honourable members opposite know that is true.

Mr. Langley: They don't, and you know it.

Mr. MATHWIN: Any member opposite who has been a member of the Amalgamated Engineering Union knows that a political levy is applied to members, with payment going to a political fund.

Mr. Max Brown: Rot!

Mr. MATHWIN: Members opposite know this is true.

Mr. Max Brown: It's not true.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am not surprised that members opposite will not admit to this.

Mr. Max Brown: That is not true.

Mr. MATHWIN: Members of metal workers unions pay a levy. The only way they don't pay a levy—

Mr. Max Brown: Now you're saying they don't pay!

Mr. MATHWIN: —is to approach the union secretary and ask him to have their pay remain intact.

Mr. Max Brown: Rubbish!

Mr. MATHWIN: Members opposite know that is correct. The basis of the Treasurer's statement is that he will get as many people as possible in his departments to join the union, as that will result in more money for the Labor Party. That is why he is supplying this information. The union paymasters will pay more money to the Labor Party if the number of union members is increased. That is in the rule book, and members opposite know it.

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): I address myself to one only point, Wardang Island, which was referred to today in Question Time.

Mr. Jennings: By your Leader.

Mr. BOUNDY: Yes, by my Leader, and I thank him for doing that. Not all the answers that were received to his Questions on Notice were satisfactory. The issue surrounding Wardang Island has been reported in the South Australian press, and I am indebted to the *Sunday Mail* for its report on September 1 of the problem surrounding the *Silver Cloud* launch, to which I referred earlier today. The *Advertiser* reported today on the tourist aspect of Wardang Island.

In reply to a question today, the Treasurer referred to the previous lessee of Wardang Island, Mr. H. G. Pryce. Although I do not have the figures he gave, I believe the Treasurer referred to the purchase price being \$3 500, and said that the lessee received \$115 000 on the sale of his lease. However, what the Treasurer did not mention was the amount paid for improvements by Mr. Pryce, for which he was compensated. During the dinner adjournment I took the liberty of ringing Mr. Pryce to ask what he had paid in respect of his involvement with Wardang Island. He told me that he paid \$15 000 for improvements when he took over the lease, and that he paid a further \$50 000 to get the island ready for occupation. Those figures put a different light on the matter. Mr. Pryce agreed that he received \$115 000 on the sale of the lease, but he said that that was the sum reached only after negotiation.

I have visited the area since the matter was first raised in the press. However, I assure the Treasurer that I did not trespass on the island; I saw it with the aid of a powerful telescope. While I may have viewed it from a distance, nevertheless I did view it. Also, I sought permission from the Point Pearce council to drive around its property and view the island from the closest possible point.

Mr. Mathwin: Did you see the gunboat?

Mr. BOUNDY: That has only recently been raised. I saw at first hand the improvements that have been made there, including the water catchment. Water is the most important resource on the island. It does not share the benefits of a reticulated water supply, because it is an island. The Treasurer also stated in his reply earlier today that the problems involving Wardang Island were not problems for the Government but were problems involving the Aboriginal Lands Trust and the Point Pearce council. I have visited Point Pearce and have discussed with several of the senior residents and council members the future of Wardang Island. It seems they are waiting to see what assistance the Government will offer. The people of Port Victoria are concerned about the possible future of the island, and continually refer to the boatloads of furniture and bedding that have been sent to the island.

In his article this morning, Mr. Boucher highlights the resources that are lying idle. Money has been spent on water catchment and other improvements, and it seems that Wardang Island still has tourist potential. However, the point of no return has been reached in that, after much money has been spent, any suggestion that this facility should be allowed to fall into disrepair and disuse is nothing short of irresponsible. The Auditor-General's Report refers to a deficit, and that is an indication that most of the money has been spent in order to make the island a viable proposition. In the early days, Port Victoria was the deep sea port for the grain trade on Yorke Peninsula, but that has disappeared with the advent of bulk handling, so this small community does not have this major industry. In the early days people at Port Victoria realised there was a tourist potential, and they exploited the fact that windjammers visited the town, with many people coming to see them.

This town is accustomed to tourism, is the centre of the farming community it serves, and, in addition, supports a fishing industry. Without the attraction that Wardang Island can provide, Port Victoria will suffer. The Government should consult the Aboriginal Lands Trust and Point Pearce council with a view to leasing the island to any entrepreneur, whether Aboriginal or European. As the member for Mitcham has said, the trust was not interested earlier in developing the island as a tourist resort, and, from the discussions I have had with members of the council during the past week or so, I have gained the impression that the Point Pearce community does not wish to have the responsibility of continuing this facility. The Government has to discover what are the wishes of the Aboriginal community and to tell that community what it is willing to do about Wardang Island.

Today, I received a letter from the Port Victoria Progress Association telling me that the feeder bus service that served the town and connected it with the Adelaide passenger service (including a service to the Point Pearce community), providing a fast carrier service for cargoes of fish to the city, is to be discontinued. Obviously, this further highlights what Port Victoria will suffer if Wardang Island is not used for tourist services. Mr. Pryce told me that, during his tenure on the island, 30 000 people visited it on a daily-trip basis, and, on the October weekend holiday in 1971, 1 500 people stayed there. When asked whether he considered the island was a viable proposition as a tourist project he said, "It certainly is: it has great potential." All my points are relevant to the need for this Government to show how it can assist members of the Point Pearce community and reassure the people of Port Victoria that it has a viable future as a tourist resort.

Motion carried.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 29. Page 785).

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I believe that the presentation of the Budget was the non-event of the year. However, one can perhaps question whether it was the non-event of the year, having regard to the fact that, in the first instance, the Treasurer told us that he was introducing a document that would not have disastrous effects on the people of this State, that it was a very mild Budget, and that it would relieve the tension of the community.

Mr. Crimes: Conservative!

Dr. EASTICK: Coming from the honourable member, it is an unusual term, but if he likes it I will let him wear it. The method of approach by the Treasurer to this vital issue is like the pea and thimble exercise. It involves an increase in taxation over that of the previous year of 38 per cent, a matter that I will discuss in detail later. This document is a camouflage that has been used as a promotion exercise to hoodwink the people, who clearly have had massive increases foisted on them in advance of the presentation of the Budget. The attempt by the Treasurer to soft-soap the people of this State, and to mislead them with a deceitful approach to the financial administration of this State, is not an unusual practice.

The Treasurer has had the gall to treat members of the public as gullible fools, and he does himself and his Party no credit if he believes that he can continue this hoodwinking approach to the financial management of the State. He had the effrontery to claim in this House that his responsible attitude towards State administration has meant that he has not had to increase taxation markedly in this Budget. He did not have to, because he had already put through this House measures in relation to pay-roll tax and extra motor vehicle charges and, by administrative activity, had increased stamp duties and the cost of water, and had placed a charge on the South Australia Gas Company that meant the cost of gas to the consumer would be increased. One could go on almost *ad infinitum* in enumerating the increases already imposed on the people of this State. The Treasurer knows that most of what he has done is merely a book-keeping exercise.

Mr. Harrison: It is in the interests of this State.

Dr. EASTICK: Coming from a member who claims to represent the views of people in the vulnerable motor car industry, that is an interesting statement. The Treasurer has not had to impose a significant new tax because of the slugs previously imposed and because of the massive oversupply that has been effected by taxation measures introduced in previous years. Receipts during 1973-74 amounted to \$30 331 000 over the estimate. These massive increases are continuing during 1974-75, and to them must be added the other increases imposed on the public earlier this year. For example, increased hospital charges totalling \$3 000 000 were announced in June; an increased liquor tax will raise \$700 000; and another \$700 000 is to be raised by imposing a 5 per cent levy on the South Australian Gas Company, which has to increase its charges.

Water charges have been increased by 1c a kilolitre; in this way the Government will rake in another \$1 400 000. The Government has urged that there should be no exploitation in connection with the metrication programme. The basic unit for water charging previously gave the recipient 1 000 gallons of water; by reducing the unit to four kilolitres, the effective amount available for the basic fee is 880 gallons—a double-take and a behind-the-back increase imposed on the people of this State.

Mr. Harrison: Where would you have got the money, had you been in Government?

Dr. EASTICK: It would not have been necessary to raise these sorts of amount if there had been proper financial management and priority planning for the benefit of the State. The proportion of profit that the State Bank contributes to the Treasury is to be increased by 5 per cent to 50 per cent. The Savings Bank of South Australia, which up to the present has been free of this impost, will be required to pay 50 per cent of its profits to the State Treasury. From October 1 the motoring public will be forced to pay 25 per cent more in vehicle registration fees, an increase from \$3 to \$5 in the fee for drivers' licences, a \$10 increase in the registration fee for trailers of more than 254 kg, and an increase from \$1 to \$3 in the fee for driving tests. In some instances the increases imposed on the motoring public are up to 212 per cent.

The financial rip-off continues as a result of State Government policies and Commonwealth Government policies that condone and assist inflation. Recently there have been increases in stamp duties on cheques and on general and life insurance, on third-party policies, on conveyances, and on new registrations and transfers of registration of motor vehicles. These measures will increase the Government's income by \$3 000 000 this year and by \$5 000 000 in a full year. On September 1 came what could be termed the Treasurer's first spring attack—the onslaught on the pay-roll tax rate, which was increased from 4½ per cent to 5 per cent. This will bring in about \$7 000 000 this year. The Treasurer has clearly indicated how successful he is as a money-grabber.

Let us briefly examine the provisions of this inflationary Budget, inflationary because, first, it provides for a deficit of \$12 000 000. Written into it in fine print, so to speak, is the fact that, depending on whether the Commonwealth Government provides further funds, it may be necessary to decrease the deficit by raising from the people a further \$6 000 000 in taxes. Any announcement in this connection will be made before this House adjourns at the end of November for the Christmas recess; or, perhaps the announcement will be made in February or March next year. If the decision to raise an additional \$6 000 000 is not made until February or March next year, the South Australian people will have that additional sum taken from them in only 3½ months.

There is a 38 per cent increase in State taxation, following increases in the previous three years of 31 per cent, 25 per cent, and 57 per cent respectively. I suppose the percentage increase is lower in 1974-75 than the 57 per cent increase for 1973-74, but it would be remiss of me if I did not draw members' attention to the fact that we are on the downhill run toward a State election. Consequently, the Treasurer is trying to make himself into Father Christmas and Mary Christmas all in one by suggesting that he has found the answer to taxation and is trying to prevent massive increases. Add the \$6 000 000, which is a distinct possibility, as already outlined by the Treasurer, and the 38 per cent will start to move dramatically towards the 57 per cent. If the Treasurer is willing to maintain his position as a pacesetter in relation to increases in salaries and wages, the sum may well be greater than \$6 000 000.

State taxation has risen by 256 per cent since 1970-71. I accept that that 256 per cent increase does not take into account the fact that pay-roll tax (a growth tax) in 1970-71 was the province of the Commonwealth Government. Even allowing for that situation, however, the

actual income to the States from direct taxation has increased by 256 per cent in that short period, using the predictions for the income for 1974-75. That massive figure is passed on to the cost structure of business, which, in turn, passes it on, in most instances, to the consumer.

The other factor I point out is that the contingency item of \$30 000 000, which allows for increases in the Government pay-roll, is likely to prove completely inadequate, since one-half of that sum is already committed to cover the increases granted during July and August. So, for 10 months of the year, in a climate in which the Commonwealth Government gives lip service only to holding salaries and wages, it will, I suggest, be nowhere near enough to meet those contingencies. The honourable member opposite may well shake his head in doubt.

Mr. Crimes: No. I'm agreeing with you, but what can we do about it?

Dr. EASTICK: The Commonwealth Government has failed in leadership (as has the State Government) by failing to come face to face with the reality of inflation. We know also that it has failed miserably to come face to face with the reality of unemployment, but I will come to that matter later. The Premier's Department, which increased its expenditure by 54.3 per cent in 1973-74, now intends to increase it by a further 32.1 per cent in the current financial year: that hardly sets an example for other departments and people to follow. It is not difficult to understand why the Australian people consider themselves to be worse off today than they were a year ago. One does not have to look far to see the ramifications of the Government's ineptitude in dealing with inflation. The *Australian* of July 30 contains a report of a survey, conducted by the Melbourne University's Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research, under the heading "More People Feel Worse Off—Survey". The report states:

More Australians believe they are worse off financially now than a year ago, according to a university survey. This was despite the fact that a record 67 per cent of people surveyed said they were earning more than in June last year. The survey report, released yesterday, said, "With prices of consumer goods and services rising at an annual rate of 17 per cent between February and May of this year, the highest rate for more than 20 years, fewer consumers now feel they are better off financially than a year ago."

The most relevant part of the statement is, "This was despite the fact that a record 67 per cent of people surveyed said they were earning more than in June last year." The article was referring only to gross income, not to actual take-home pay or purchasing power. The \$10, \$20 or \$30 pay increases awarded to wage-earners on an almost non-stop conveyor belt system are not giving the wage-earners the full \$10, \$20 or \$30-worth of spending power. I believe that every Government member will fully appreciate the position. Certainly their Commonwealth colleagues appreciated the position when they sought to give themselves a massive pay increase.

Mr. Crimes: They accepted a recommendation: they didn't give it to themselves.

Dr. EASTICK: Who had had the riot in Caucus because the Prime Minister showed a little courage, for a change.

Mr. Harrison: Are we discussing the Commonwealth situation or the State Budget?

Dr. EASTICK: I know that I am not supposed to refer to it, but it highlights the fact that the member for Albert Park would have us believe that we in South Australia can live in a vacuum away from the effects of the Common-

wealth Government's incompetence in and mismanagement of the total economy. It shows that the honourable member does not realise how pitiful the situation is and how close the States are to being brought to their knees by the Commonwealth Government's incompetence. I put incompetence in inverted commas, because one begins to wonder whether it is a feigned incompetence that is all part of the scheme to destroy the State structure and to put everything in a centralist Government's hands. However, I will return to that matter later.

I make the point again, in referring to the interjection made by the member for Albert Park, that we cannot look at the Budget without referring to the Commonwealth situation, because the honourable member's own Treasurer, both in the Budget and in the recent Loan Estimates, clearly spells out (and it may have gone over the heads of Government members) that his ability to fulfil the programme he is mapping out depends entirely on hand-outs from Canberra. Members opposite ask why I do not return to the South Australian situation. I will return to that situation soon, but I want the member who interjected (perhaps for the first time) to come face to face with the reality that South Australia cannot live in a vacuum away from the scene being set from Canberra. As wages rise, so do production costs. In turn, the manufacturer must increase the selling price of his goods to keep a balance, so the cost to the wage-earner is greater. That is basic economic theory, and no-one argues about that. The vicious circle is not broken by a Commonwealth Government and a State Government agreeing to every request made of them. Why have the State and Commonwealth Governments refused to stop the spiral? It is because every increase further increases the money going into the Commonwealth coffers; the Commonwealth Government puts out its hand and takes an additional massive sum.

In the year ended June 30, 1973, the Commonwealth Government received in taxation \$4 089 000 000, while to June 30, 1974, the figure was \$5 480 000 000, and it is predicted that, for the financial year to June 30, 1975, the amount will be \$8 000 000 000, which is almost a doubling within two financial years. Members opposite are silent now. That money is going into the hands of the Commonwealth Government, which refuses to make additional sums available to the States. Members opposite have only to listen to the comments of their own Treasurer and of the Minister of Transport, who stated that road grants for South Australia for the year 1974-75 had decreased by \$900 000, yet the increase in amounts going to the Commonwealth Government has been marked. That Government is prepared to make money available to the States only by tying it to a grants system that requires a decision from Canberra even on when and how any pothole can be patched.

Mr. Crimes: That is an unwarranted exaggeration.

Dr. EASTICK: It is not. If the honourable member goes back to the statements made by his own Minister—

Mr. Crimes: That is ridiculous.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer the honourable member to the statements of his own Minister, to the debate in the Senate, and to the fact that the compromise effected in the Senate takes responsibility away from Canberra except for urban arterial roads. However, that is another matter. I turn now to figures relating to the benefit received by an ordinary wage-earner from a \$10 salary increase. I have considered the effect on the salary of a married man

with two children, taking the actual benefit after tax on the \$10 increase from the cost of living adjustment on the wage of this person. If the wage is \$4 000, the increase is \$8.20 (he has lost 18 per cent in tax); if the wage is \$5 000, the increase is \$7.20 (he has lost 28 per cent in tax); if the wage is \$6 000, the increase is \$6.55 (34.5 per cent lost in tax); on a wage of \$7 000, the increase is \$6.40 (36 per cent lost in tax); on \$8 000, the increase is \$6.15 (38.5 per cent lost in tax).

Mr. Harrison: But that is on the Menzies Government formula.

Dr. EASTICK: I remind the honourable member that his Commonwealth colleagues have been in office for more than 18 months.

Mr. Langley: A long time!

Dr. EASTICK: Even up to the time of the most recent Commonwealth elections they were not going to alter the tax structure at all. Since that time, however, we have heard so many statements that the mind boggles and we are not certain what might transpire. On \$9 000, the extra take-home pay is \$5.90 (41 per cent lost in tax); on \$10 000 he takes home \$5.65 (43.5 per cent lost in tax); on \$11 000 he takes home an extra \$5.45 (a tax loss of 45.5 per cent); on \$12 000 he takes home an extra \$5.10 (49 per cent lost in tax); on \$13 000 he takes home an extra \$4.90 (a tax loss of 51 per cent). If he happens to be in a position to earn \$14 000, his extra take-home pay is \$4.65 out of the \$10, which means he has lost 53.5 per cent in taxation.

Mr. Langley: How many workers are getting \$14 000? How many carpenters, electricians, or plumbers?

Dr. EASTICK: If the honourable member takes heed of the salaries of members on the staff of some Ministers, he will find they are in that bracket, even including research assistants.

Mr. Langley: I am talking about the ordinary workers.

Dr. EASTICK: What is an average worker? These people are still workers. No wonder many people believed they were worse off than at this time last year. I shall not go further with these figures, but I seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard* in statistical form.

Leave granted.

ACTUAL BENEFIT, AFTER TAX, OF \$10 INCREASE (e.g. cost of living adjustment) ON THE WAGES OF A MARRIED MAN WITH TWO CHILDREN AT THE FOLLOWING WAGE LEVELS:

Wage \$	Increase \$	Percentage lost in tax %
4 000	8.20	18
5 000	7.20	28
6 000	6.55	34.5
7 000	6.40	36
8 000	6.15	38.5
9 000	5.90	41
10 000	5.65	43.5
11 000	5.45	45.5
12 000	5.10	49
13 000	4.90	51
14 000	4.65	53.5

Dr. EASTICK: This Budget fosters South Australia's inflationary programme. I have said that, from 1971 to the present time, pay-roll tax has increased from 2½ per cent to 5 per cent. However, the amount that will be obtained is not just double but about 3½ times the amount previously obtained. We must consider the Loan Estimates and the Budget against the background that is part of present everyday living. I refer now to a press statement

issued by the Minister for Labor and Immigration (Mr. Cameron) and embargoed not to be released before 8 p.m. on September 8, 1974. Part of that press release states:

PROVISIONAL COMMONWEALTH EMPLOYMENT SERVICE STATISTICS, AUGUST, 1974.

There was a further significant downturn in the demand for labour during August. In seasonally adjusted terms, unemployed excluding school-leavers increased by 22 720 (25.8 per cent) to 110 891, and unfilled vacancies declined by 12 739 (20.9 per cent) to 48 186. Seasonally adjusted average hours of overtime worked per employee in the department's monthly survey during July remained constant at 3.5 hours. This compares with an increase in unemployed excluding school-leavers of 17 300 in July and a decline in vacancies of 16 460 in the same month. The next comment is extremely significant in relation to the Budget:

With 200 000 young people between the ages of 15 and 24 completing their full-time schooling at the end of the year, it is anticipated that 185 000 will be seeking to enter the work force by January, 1975. This must result in a significant deterioration in the employment situation.

I do not think it necessary to quote more detail: the Minister's statement regarding the July figures shows a realisation that unemployment is a fact of life and that we are not in the position suggested to us earlier of not having a potential or actual unemployment situation in Australia. A report on page 2 of the *News* this evening, headed "Clash on Unemployed expected in Cabinet", states:

Canberra, today. Cabinet Ministers are likely to clash later today over the Commonwealth Government's future stand on unemployment. The Deputy Prime Minister (Dr. Cairns) is predicted to be the most likely target for criticism.

Mr. Max Brown: But that didn't eventuate, did it?

Dr. EASTICK: We have not heard that.

Mr. Max Brown: Yes, we have. You didn't see the television news this evening.

Dr. EASTICK: The report also states:

He is expected to face bitter opposition for backing down last night to the Treasury's view that unemployment was the inevitable price of fighting inflation.

I ask whether he backed down from that statement, because he had been quoted widely in the news services from Canberra this morning on it. The report also states:

Dr. Cairns' reversal from his belief that inflation could be dealt with without putting people out of work was a significant sign of a change in Government policy.

We are not sure what is Government policy, because it comes from about 27 heads and never from the Prime Minister, who is mute on these matters. In painting the background in which this Budget must be considered, I refer also to a report in the *Advertiser* of September 5, which states:

Big dip in savings. Savings bank deposits showed their largest monthly fall in July, plunging \$108 000 000 to \$11 087 000 000, but it is believed the slump was reversed in August, with deposits jumping \$100 000 000 to \$120 000 000.

There has been a major fluctuation in this area, which has always been a backstop to our economic position. Regardless of which authority we take, we see that retail sales are slowing down, and we have the fact, widely stated in the press for anyone to see, that the number of motor vehicle registrations has decreased. The member for Albert Park well could be in his place now to listen to a commentary about a vital industry to South Australia. The percentage of overseas motor vehicles sold in Australia is much higher. The increase, against the backdrop of an overall decrease, has been made by overseas vehicles. I am

pleased that the Minister of Labour and Industry is in the House, because he was with me recently when the Sales Manager for Australia of a big motor vehicle producer—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: I am pleased you're raising this. What did he say about South Australia?

Dr. EASTICK: If the Minister does not get himself into a tizzy, he will hear. That man said that the motor car industry in Australia had benefited and continued to benefit because it could place many units overseas. In other words, the overall motor car industry, which is largely based in South Australia—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Talk about the State Budget, not the Commonwealth Budget.

Dr. EASTICK: The economy of the Australian motor car industry, in which South Australia has a large investment, requires that units be placed overseas. The Sales Manager pointed out clearly that, whereas in the past it had been possible to ship Australian-made products for construction in South Korea and the Philippines, when those components went to South Korea now they did not require engines produced in Australia, because South Korea was producing her own engines. South Korean engines could be put in those units more economically than could Australian engines. So there is a decrease in the market for the motor car industry. This gentleman also pointed out, as the Minister will agree, that, whereas it used to be possible to send transmissions to South Korea and the Philippines, it was no longer necessary to do that, because the Philippines transmission was cheaper and could be fitted into the finished product more cheaply than the imported Australian transmission could be. So there is this downturn in the exporting of components from this vital industry.

These statements were made with due regard to the efficient motor car industry in South Australia and I hope that, by waiting, the Minister now has my point. The gentleman in question acknowledged the efficiency of the South Australian industry but he looked at it as a whole and the overall impact that this type of cost structure was having on it. This statement was made by Mr. Bagshaw before about 450 people and, as has been said, it came only about five to 10 days after the motor car industry had appeared before the Prices Justification Tribunal and had told the tribunal and the whole of the Australian public that there was a distinct possibility that the motor car industry of Australia, on the construction side, could fold up, because it was pricing itself out of an economic manufacturing base.

Only a few days before the occasion of which I am speaking, in addressing myself to a debate in this House I indicated where this statement by General Motors-Holden's to the Prices Justification Tribunal had been mentioned in the *Financial Review*. I was scoffed at by members opposite but, when we look at the Australian Industries Commission's report, which the Treasurer has rightly condemned in this House, we find that the statements of that huge organisation, one of the biggest employers in this State, become a real live issue that we must examine. It is part of the background scene in South Australia in 1974-75, the same scene against which we are looking at these Budget documents.

We see also the frequently referred to problem of tight liquidity and, notwithstanding the release of oversea funds (there had been a 33½ per cent retention in funds coming from overseas held in the Reserve Bank which is now down to a level where at present we are sitting on 5 per cent) and when we see that sums held by the Reserve Bank

under Statute, so far as the savings banks are concerned, have been reduced, there is still the great problem of tight liquidity. Much of that problem is associated with the huge rake-off in taxation by Canberra, by way of increased taxation of companies. There are the increases associated with the taxation of State Governments by way of pay-roll tax, and so on. Cost of production in all these fields is reducing liquidity and, therefore, the ability of industry to function satisfactorily.

Interest rates have never been higher, even in that vital field where the people of Australia were promised that they would not have to bear increased interest rates. There has been this massive rise in interest rates in many areas, affecting the Australian people. The Australian Industries Development Corporation certainly is not behind the door when it comes to imposing interest rates on the industry it is supposed to be helping: 18 per cent is not an unheard of interest rate from the A.I.D.C. against organisations seeking its help. We find as part and parcel of the overall ploy that we are fast forcing many businesses to their knees: they cannot manage the servicing of an 18 per cent interest rate, and rates even greater than that. One can only conjecture that the next move is for the organisations to be taken over by the A.I.D.C.—nationalisation through the back door.

What about the recession in land transactions? I spoke of massive increases in interest rates and the effect they are having. We see in this evening's *News* the heading "Recession seen in land deals". It is important that we look at this as part of the background to our consideration of the Budget. The article states:

A report from the Registrar-General, Mr. G. E. Cresswell, to the Attorney-General, Mr. King, says the recession in land transactions was now being reflected in a decreased departmental workload. The report says that, compared with the first eight months of last year, total transactions so far this year had dropped by seven per cent. Transfers were down 12½ per cent, and mortgages down eight per cent. Just under 4 700 new allotments had been created this year compared with just over 4 500 last year while 2 112 strata units had been created compared with 1 179 last year.

Even with those increases, there is seen to be a recession in land deals. This is a problem not only for our future housing but also for the future availability of land, when the problem is associated with a decrease in the funds coming into the State coffers to try to meet the inflationary programme adopted by the Government. What is the Commonwealth Government's attitude to inflation? I could spend the rest of the evening here discussing that (it has been written about frequently), but all I want to do now is to read one paragraph from the *Australian* of September 4, under the heading "Reform or live with it: Cairns". The article states:

The Deputy Prime Minister, Dr. Cairns, last night warned that people may have to learn to live with a high rate of inflation. "No-one, and no Government, need do anything but learn to live with inflation," he said.

That is what he said he wants to do with inflation—tell the people to learn to live with it.

Members interjecting:

Dr. EASTICK: The information I gave the House, in the absence of the member for Mitchell, was that we shall see a projected increase in Commonwealth income tax of \$8 000 000 000 by June 30, 1975. We find that the Treasury and the Reserve Bank are losing on the fiscal side but winning on the monetary side. This is pointed out in the *Financial Review* of Wednesday, August

28, under the heading "Reserve Bank backs the Treasury line": and we know who is on that Reserve Bank Board—Mr. R. J. L. Hawke.

Mr. Crimes: Is he a majority voice?

Dr. EASTICK: No, but he did not put in a minority report so we must believe that he accepted it. Looking at the Reserve Bank report, we find under the heading I have just mentioned an article by P. P. McGuinness (Economics Editor of the *Financial Review*), which states:

In its latest annual report, issued last night, the Reserve Bank of Australia has achieved the remarkable feat of discussing at some length the "Problems of economic approach management" without once using the word unemployment.

The article further states:

Economists outside official circles now agree, almost unanimously, that the first could involve further increases in unemployment, and the second a fuelling of inflation, especially if any kind of cost of living indexation of wages is accepted by the Arbitration Commission, as seems probable.

That refers to the statement in the document that the bank endorses the policies advocated by the Prime Minister at the Premiers' Conference in June. The Prime Minister has since repudiated his suggestions under the pressure of growing unemployment and business uncertainty. It is a strange situation when the Reserve Bank supplies a report substantiating the Prime Minister's arguments at the June 7 Premiers' Conference, yet, now that he has repudiated it, the bank is left holding a report based on an entirely false premise.

I refer to the July, 1974 edition of *Housing Australia*, and the report, under the heading "Convention Summary—Shadows loom over the housing industry—says Housing Industries Association's National President", as follows:

It seems inevitable that the level of activity in the housing industry will decline significantly during the remainder of 1974. All indices—home-loan approvals, housing permits, and commencements—have dropped sharply since the beginning of this year, and nothing emerged during discussions at H.I.A.'s National Convention, held in Sydney at the end of May, to suggest that the downward trend would be reversed in the foreseeable short term. Thus the Government's monetary policy, which deliberately aims to reduce the demand for homes, indicates either an unawareness of, or a disregard for, the nation's real need for housing. Every member in this Chamber accepts that housing is a vital issue for the people of South Australia. I refer to the September 6 *Advertiser* headline "South Australia Leads House Cost Spiral", and the report by Brett Bayly, as follows:

Canberra—A rise in the price of materials used in house building in Adelaide has far exceeded rises in all other capital cities. The cost of materials in June increased by 4.7 per cent compared with a national average rise of 3 per cent.

I could continue with such examples, but it is important that what is said is seen in the light of the Budget we are now examining. However, I refer all members to the Reserve Bank report for the year ended June 30, 1974. Members opposite can say that it is easy to criticise, but what is the solution? I refer members to what the member for Glenelg said only a few moments ago: that the Government is continually moving its ground and is accepting the policy first advocated by my Commonwealth colleague Mr. Snedden prior to the May 18 election. Members opposite have changed their ground so much that they are now espousing the view he then put forward. Members opposite and their colleagues are now espousing, in South Australia and throughout the Commonwealth, a policy based on what

Bill Snedden was saying, even though previously they said such a policy was impossible, that unemployment was not likely, and that inflation was not an issue.

However, the Liberal Party reaffirms that the Commonwealth Government should immediately call a national conference including trade unions, employer groups and State Governments. The present Commonwealth Government has said it will do that, yet Labor members said this was all wrong when it was first suggested. So far the Government has given only lip service to this suggestion and has gone no further. We believe that inflation is a national problem and that nothing short of a full national conference will be adequate.

Mr. Jennings: How did you vote in the December referendum?

Dr. EASTICK: Responsibly! How did the honourable member vote? The aims of such a national conference must be, first, a reduction in income tax rates designed to enable real increases in the take-home pay of trade union members; secondly, reductions in indirect tax rates to relieve the burden, particularly on low-income earners; and, thirdly, a commitment to policies to secure full employment and a high rate of productivity growth, a factor that is not currently applying.

In respect of trade unions, we advocate the adherence to the maximum wage increase guidelines laid down in the national conference, and a reduction in the number of strikes in wage negotiation. Certainly, we seek a reduction of all strikes, no matter how they are disguised. For the employers, we advocate the adherence to maximum price increase guidelines laid down by the national conference, as well as adherence to all decisions of the Prices Justification Tribunal (and we are to be asked in this House to support a more realistic approach concerning such tribunals as opposed to the politically manipulated Prices Act). Further, we seek employers in their undertakings to improve specified working conditions, especially those relating to industrial safety. It is part of the integrated approach that the Commonwealth Government must abandon the pace-setter principle. Never let it be said that a guide was not given to the ways in which the problem could be solved.

In the Budget the Treasurer has outlined the new approach to financial management. I accept the advantages that this will give to the people of South Australia, because the new approach is sound and responsible, but it does not go far enough when we find that there is no bringing to account stores on hand and various other financial activities associated with the conduct of business, as is the normal practice in every other responsible business undertaking. I think significant statements were made in the Auditor-General's Report presented today.

Mr. Coumbe: And only today.

Dr. EASTICK: Of course. At page 3, under the heading "Basis of Accounting", the report states:

The Treasurer's accounts are kept on a "cash" basis, revenue not being brought to account until received, and expenditure until the actual disbursement is made. The accounts of Government departments, other than Railways and departmental accounts operated through a deposit account, are presented on the same basis. However, the published accounts of most Statutory authorities are on an "accrual" basis under which revenues are accounted for as earned or due and expenditures brought to debit as goods and services are supplied and liability incurred.

I believe we must use this form of accounting, and the activities of the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee are highlighting several grave deficiencies in the overall

activities of government that would be better considered in advance of the time it now takes, if only that action were taken. At page 3, the report continues:

However, a considerable amount of expenditure met by Public Buildings Department is not allocated for inclusion in the accounts of the departments concerned. Where accommodation is shared, charges for telephones, rent, electricity, cleaning, maintenance, etc., are not usually apportioned to departments. Where departments occupy the whole of a building, such expenses are usually met by the departments concerned and shown in their published accounts.

In other words, that is an admission that, because of our present system, we do not have a clear record of the activities of various departments and, therefore, they are not scrutinised closely enough to say whether the measures being adopted by departments are self-supporting or otherwise. There is no indication that the activities of departments are in the best interests of the community, or whether the community is supporting departments that are supposedly self-supporting, or are required to raise sufficient funds to maintain their activities by being subsidised through the back door. This is another aspect we should consider to improve the financial management of this State. I believe that the present system whereby funds are made available to departments on what one may call an imprest system, and each department is allocated funds for the year, means that it is inevitable that those funds will be spent.

Many officers of the Public Service (and this does not in any way denigrate them) believe that, unless the money sought is spent, there will be a reduction in subsequent allocations. This is a major fault in financial management of government in this State. I recognise that this system has applied for many years but, if we are to become properly managed on an efficient business basis, simple basic managerial requirements should be considered.

I believe that this and other States are in an almost catastrophic position. Each State has been called on to run down its capital funds, and the Commonwealth Government is refusing to indicate in advance what funds will be available so that forward planning can be maintained. Funds being made available by the Commonwealth Government are too often associated with requirements that are reducing the chance of the State Government to determine its own priorities and development programmes.

Under section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution, the States are having grants given in such a way that present services are being duplicated whilst the areas of State need are being denied. The attitude of the Commonwealth Government in refusing funds to the States as a definite percentage of the total funds raised from the States is improving the chances of a centralist Government in Australia, and that situation is moving closer and closer. We cannot have the States starved of funds whilst the communities expect improved education, hospitals, transport, and other facilities. We have a clear indication in the funds that have been made available for sewerage. I use this as an example because, when we discussed the Loan Estimates a few weeks ago, the Minister of Works was questioned closely about the actual sum to be made available, whether the amount we were considering would come from State revenue, and whether funds from the Commonwealth Government would be additional funds. The Minister was also asked whether the actual amounts included the funds from the Commonwealth. In a letter to me dated September 9, 1974, the Minister of Works states:

I refer to your question in the House on August 20 during the Loan Estimates debate concerning the allocation of Loan funds to the sewerage programme for 1974-75. The following information is supplied:

Formulation of provision for sewerage: The amount of \$12 006 000 (\$8 536 000 in metropolitan sewerage area and \$3 470 000 in country areas) was determined by adding to the programme the projects which are expected to be financed from the Australian Government funds (\$3 500 000).

There is no clear indication that we have that sum yet, but it was included in the figures that we were asked to consider last month.

Mr. Jennings: Tell us more.

Dr. EASTICK: For the information of the honourable member, I point out that funds were to be made available for 30 or 35 years at 8½ per cent interest. So, the sum of \$1 600 000 that we get in 1973-74 will result in a cost to this State of \$5 000 000 by the time the money is repaid. The letter continues:

Maintenance of State effort: A comparison of actual expenditure from Loan Account on sewerage works in 1973-74 and estimates for 1974-75 is as follows:

Because the details that follow are statistical, I seek leave to have them inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

	SEWERAGE EXPENDITURE	
	Actual 1973-74	Estimated 1974-75
Metropolitan works—	\$	\$
State Government	6 354 000	6 066 000
Australian Government . .	1 378 000	2 470 000
	<u>\$7 732 000</u>	<u>\$8 536 000</u>
Country works—		
State Government	1 977 000	2 440 000
Australian Government . .	220 000	1 030 000
	<u>\$2 197 000</u>	<u>\$3 470 000</u>
Total—		
State Government	8 331 000	8 506 000
Australian Government . .	1 598 000	3 500 000
	<u>\$9 929 000</u>	<u>\$12 006 000</u>

Dr. EASTICK: The letter concludes:

These figures clearly indicate the extent of State effort as regards sewerage works.

This Budget was a shambles even before the ink dried on the document. It is based on the premise that the Commonwealth Government will make sums available: for example, sums for sewerage projects. The Treasurer has indicated several times that he hopes, he expects, and he believes that the sums will be forthcoming. How can one consider what should be a responsible document if there is no positive commitment of funds toward the projects that we are asked to consider? This is a reflection of the increasing pressures being imposed on this State Government and on every other State Government. Costs are being increased as a result of the refusal to meet the challenge of inflation. Section 96 grants prevent the State from undertaking priority projects of its own. Unfortunately, the Budget gives members on this side no clear indication of the programme that is to be completed for the benefit of the people of this State.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This is definitely an inflationary Budget. It is a budget of "ifs": if we get these sums we will be able to do various things. This theme pervades the Treasurer's explanation. We have already had a mini Budget that was a complete squib. This evening we are being asked to consider the State Budget at a

time when we do not know what will be in the Commonwealth Budget, even though the Commonwealth Budget could have a severe impact on the future of this State.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: So, you are only guessing.

Mr. COUNBE: Let me say this to the Minister, who is a most erudite mathematician: this Budget is being introduced at a time of extreme uncertainty in the community.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Have you been talking to Bjelke Petersen?

Mr. COUNBE: Surely the Minister cannot deny the evidence that there is extreme uncertainty in the community. Savings bank deposits are dropping dramatically, and the Minister knows that unemployment figures are soaring. Further, inflation is on the rampage, and interest rates are the highest on record. There is uncertainty in the housing industry, and the Minister should know that there has been a considerable reduction in the number of building approvals. Moreover, there is a real threat to jobs in the motor vehicle industry and the pressed metal industry in this State. It is in this atmosphere of uncertainty that we are being asked to consider this Budget.

The Treasurer said that last year he allowed in his Estimates for a 12 per cent (\$10 000 000) inflationary effect by way of wage increases; this is increased to \$30 000 000 this year, which represents a 20 per cent inflationary rate. This figure is repeated at least three times in the Treasurer's statement. So, he is introducing an inflationary Budget. In addition, he is deliberately gambling on South Australia's getting an extra \$6 000 000 from the Commonwealth Government which was not forthcoming earlier but which now magically appears on the horizon. We are expected to take this sum into consideration, even though the Treasurer himself has expressed considerable doubt whether the sum will be received, because he says that, if we do not get it from the Commonwealth Government, we will have to impose other severe and unpalatable taxes on the long-suffering public of South Australia. He is also gambling on our receiving further Grants Commission grants. I agree with his statement that next year we may not be able to expect the same level of initial or completion grants from the Grants Commission as we have had in the past, because of the conditions extant in the two non-claimant States.

Mr. Jennings: They're in a bad way, too.

Mr. COUNBE: That is why we will find that we may not get the same level of Grants Commission grants in future. Why? Because the Commonwealth Government itself has not come to the aid of its own Party in South Australia, to give one instance. The Treasurer is also gambling on containing the wage increases in South Australia within the sum of \$30 000 000 to which I have referred. The Leader of the Opposition referred to the Budget as a mild Budget, and I believe that my colleagues will deal with that aspect shortly.

I turn to several other matters contained in the Treasurer's overall comments. He said that the Government intended to retain over \$4 000 000 in the Loan Account against a rainy day. The Government has not done too badly with the Loan Account! It has run it down by \$10 000 000 in three years and has been living on the fat during that time. The Loan Account, which is now down to about \$4 000 000, will not be able to go down much further. It is becoming abundantly clear that the States are becoming more and more dependent on the Commonwealth Government through general revenue grants, special purpose grants, and section 96 grants. Why is it that the

Commonwealth Government has refused to come to the aid of the Party? Before May 18, everyone was on side as far as the Australian Labor Party was concerned, whereas suddenly, after the election was over, the money was not offered. South Australia is not the only State to suffer regarding this aspect because the Commonwealth has suddenly decided that the States will not receive any increased sums.

I will look for a moment at what I call the balance-sheet of the State, namely, the Consolidated Revenue Account, which is Parliamentary Paper No. 7 and which shows that we had a deficit in the Revenue Account at June 30, 1974, of just over \$500 000. Once again that is subject to a special grant, under section 96, of about \$8 500 000, which may give us a surplus of about \$7 900 000. Then we come to the Estimates for the year ending June 30, 1975, in which we are likely to have an estimated deficit for the year ended June 30, 1975, of about \$12 000 000. That is not a bad deficit!

I turn now to what is happening in the Revenue Account (and I wonder whether members of the Government Party, because we are unlikely to hear much from them, have done their homework and appreciate the impact of what the Treasurer has put before us in several aspects). I take first, on page 4 of the Estimates of Revenue, State taxation. It is incredible to see the rate of increase: the estimated receipts for 1974-75 have increased in one line alone by 53.2 per cent. So, one can see the effect of State taxation being imposed once again on the long-suffering citizens of the State. State taxation is 38 per cent above actual receipts and 53.2 per cent above the estimated receipts last year; that is in one line alone.

Mr. Jennings: What are they saying in Victoria and New South Wales?

Mr. COUNBE: Will the honourable member tell his constituents the effect of this one line (State taxation) since Labor has come into power (and I am taking the figure of June, 1970, as the nearest balance period)? The State taxation line at that time was \$56 400 000, which represented taxation of about \$50 a head over the whole State.

Mr. Jennings: They'd say, "We're a lot better off, Jack!"

Mr. COUNBE: That was when the Australian Labor Party took over from a Liberal Government. What is the figure estimated for June, 1975? It will increase to \$174 a head. I invite the honourable member to go out and tell his electors that that is the price we are paying in South Australia for the luxury of having Labor Governments here and in Canberra. The honourable member cannot get away from those figures. That is the price we must pay for the Socialist Government in South Australia.

Mr. Venning: He'll lose his seat.

Mr. COUNBE: I am giving him free advice. I have done these calculations, which have been checked. That is the cost to the people of the State of having a Labor Government. Public works, services and other receipts has increased by 11.3 per cent, and the total receipts from all kinds of taxation have increased by 23.7 per cent. Let me take one or two individual lines. On motor vehicle taxation, estimated receipts this year show an increase of 25.4 per cent. I again invite the member for Ross Smith to explain this to one of his irate constituents who must pay increased registration and driving licence fees. Land tax (and most of the honourable member's constituents and most of yours, Mr. Speaker, pay land tax, I suppose)

has increased by 17.3 per cent. Stamp duties, which the member for Playford would know all about, have increased by 39 per cent. Then we come to the beauty—pay-roll tax. The estimate this year shows an increase of 92 per cent: that is a solid increase at any time, and it is the type of thing the Treasurer is asking us to accept. The Attorney-General is laughing at that.

The Hon. L. J. King: I am not, really.

Mr. Jennings: So are Mr. Hamer and Mr. Askin laughing!

Mr. COUMBE: If the Attorney-General was still in private practice he would not be laughing if he had to pay that rate of pay-roll tax.

The Hon. L. J. King: If I were in Sydney or Melbourne I would be performing in the same way. The rates are the same in every State.

Mr. COUMBE: Notwithstanding that, Victoria offers a rebate, and the Minister knows that. The Treasurer did not refer to some of these items when he explained the Budget, because we find that stamp duty on cheques will increase from 6c to 8c, and we will have all kinds of stamp duty increase. The \$2 surcharge on motor vehicle third party policies will increase to \$3. These items will affect the little man (not the big business man) and the average housewife who uses a cheque account. The Attorney-General will have to pay the same as everyone else pays. Duty on motor vehicles will increase: everything above \$2 000 will attract a new maximum rate of 4 per cent. Conveyance fees will go up, and if we are not satisfied with that we find this comment in the Treasurer's statement:

Members may recall that, immediately after the Premiers' Conference, I announced that the Australian Government was not prepared to give general purpose grants beyond those payable under the formula and that new or increased charges to bring in an additional \$20 000 000 in 1974-75 would be necessary.

That is rather curious. I looked up last year's debates and last year's documents; the figure of \$20 000 000 mentioned this year by the Treasurer was mentioned by him last year. Twice he has gone to his friends in Canberra (his buddies of the same political persuasion), he has been slapped in the face and has had to come back saying he must raise \$20 000 000. It is a coincidence that the figure has been the same in two consecutive years. We have had increases in charges for water, in liquor taxes, hospital fees, and gas sales. For the first time, public companies are being taxed in relation to gas sales.

Mr. Gunn: And he said there would be no increases.

Mr. COUMBE: There were to have been no increases at all in this Budget. I agree with the Treasurer when he speaks of forecasting revenue Budgets. I have no quarrel with that process as long as Parliament is given a clear view of what is going on and has the opportunity to debate the details in this House.

I turn now to certain items mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report, which we saw for the first time this afternoon. I regret that we did not have an opportunity to read it during the show adjournment. However, I find that the number of people employed in Government departments has increased by 4 200 in the past year. Although this does not take into account persons engaged on construction and maintenance contracts by the Government or employed by statutory bodies, this figure of 4 200 in one year represents a direct increase, has a direct effect on the Budget, and is part of the \$30 000 000 mentioned by the Treasurer.

We used to have in this House an honourable member (the late Mr. Quirke), who would speak at some length about the public debt and, while I did not agree with everything he said about financial policies, the public debt must be a matter of some concern. I do not know how it is to be resolved.

The Hon. L. J. King: It is an institution!

Mr. COUMBE: Quite. I am not talking about the sinking fund, but the net increase in the public debt in 1973-74 was about \$66 000 000, bringing the public debt of South Australia, at June 30, 1974, to the amazing figure of about \$1 481 000 000, a sum which no doubt we will be paying forever.

Mr. McRae: Your Government did the same with the sinking fund.

Mr. COUMBE: I said I would not touch on that; I know the provisions. Turning now to schools. I shall deal not with capital works but with the cost of educating children in our primary and secondary schools. The figures, which have been supplied by the Education Department, include payments for administration, but exclude debt charges on Loan funds. In 1972, the figure was \$274 a pupil in primary schools and \$507 a pupil in secondary schools, but by June 30, 1973, the figures had increased to \$313 and \$587 respectively. The Auditor-General states that the costs for 1973-74 are not yet available, but will show considerable increases. Last year saw an increase of about 15 per cent, and it would appear that it will be much greater in the coming year.

I shall touch now on only one aspect of the figures relating to the Highways Department. Last year a little embarrassment was caused to the Government when we spoke of the amount of money spent on freeways. I use that word because the Auditor-General uses it; he does not refer to "high-speed corridors", as does the Minister of Transport. The Auditor-General speaks of the expenditure on the acquisition of land for freeways and sets out a list totalling \$1 800 000, and including the Central North-South Freeway, the Adelaide to Modbury Freeway, the South-Eastern Freeway, the Gillman Highway, the Islington Highway, and the North Adelaide Connector. A couple of those projects, of course, are in my district. When we consider what has been spent already on freeways, the amount becomes significant. The total sum spent on the acquisition of land for freeways and the construction of roads and bridges is substantial. From 1968-69 to 1973-74, \$19 500 000 has been spent by the Highways Department in acquiring land for freeways. Deducting about \$5 000 000 or \$6 000 000 spent by the previous Government, we see that about \$13 000 000 has been spent by a Government that has said that it will not have a bar of freeways, but that it may be interested in high-speed corridors by about 1980. The report of the Auditor-General indicates what has been spent by the Highways Department on freeways. The Minister speaks with another voice when he denies he is spending money in this way.

We are considering a set of official statements on expenditure and revenue that will provide the greatest amount we in this Parliament have ever had to consider. We are looking at estimated expenditure and payments from Revenue Account in the coming year, totalling \$774 645 000, an increase over the estimate last year of 24.4 per cent. I commented earlier that the total increase in receipts was 23.7 per cent, so one can see how the \$12 000 000 deficit comes about. That will combine with other factors. We are considering a Budget without

knowing what will be in the Commonwealth Budget that is to be introduced next week and at a time of grave uncertainty in this State, when the people are suffering from the effects of the actions in Canberra of colleagues of members opposite. Those actions are showing up for the first time, and I am afraid that remedial measures will take a long time to become effective.

One major action taken was the reduction by 25 per cent in the tariff scale of imports into Australia. I know that the member for Albert Park and many workmen in this State would share my concern about the influx of foreign-made cars into this country. I am not suggesting that we should not import those cars. We should have them, but I am concerned about the flooding of the market by an uncontrolled upsurge in the number of these vehicles, at the expense of the workmen of this State. There should be moderation and the Commonwealth Government should examine the matter closely, in conjunction with the matters to which the Treasurer referred about a fortnight ago when he was speaking about the Industries Assistance Commission report on motor vehicle construction in this country.

I have not much confidence in this Budget. It is definitely inflationary and contains many taxation imposts that in themselves will generate further inflation. That is unfortunate, and I place most of the blame on the Commonwealth Government because of its absolute rejection of the claims of the Australian States for a better allocation of funds through the normal channels. A better allocation would reduce inflation, because the States would not have to introduce measures that induced inflation.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): It is refreshing to see, for a change, so many members sitting on the Government benches. My Deputy Leader has said that this Budget is inflationary. I do not altogether agree that this is the major aspect of it, but certainly it is inflationary. Anything that happens financially in these days must be inflationary. Again, the Leader said that it was a mild Budget, and I would not agree with that: I think he used too strong a term. I think it is a nonentity, and that is typified by the way in which Government members are treating it. When the Budget was introduced, the Treasurer adopted what has become accepted practice. For the second time in succession, he read only the first few pages, more or less as a formality. One wonders whether he will bother to read from the document at all next year, or whether he will merely table it.

Mr. Venning: I doubt that he'll be there then.

Dr. TONKIN: I should like to hope that for some reason he would not be there, although normally we would not have an election in this State for about 18 months. I think that is the period for which the Attorney-General still has to serve, unless he goes to higher things before then.

The Hon. L. J. King: You make it sound like penal servitude.

Dr. TONKIN: That is exactly how the Attorney-General has been regarding his term, and I am not surprised. He wants to get out. During the Second World War a book was written and a film made entitled *The Man That Never Was*. The book and the film were about an army officer who was used to mislead the enemy, and a corpse was loaded with false information about the time and place of

the invasion of Europe. One may say that this is the Budget that never was, because it does not mean much at all.

The Hon. L. J. King: Why mention it at all then?

Dr. TONKIN: Now the Attorney has tipped his hand. He has shown that the Government wants us to think that it is not worth worrying about. To be perfectly honest, I was rather surprised about a newspaper report headed "No new tax increases for South Australia in tame Budget." That report was written by Ian Steele, and I must say that I was astonished. He is a journalist of much credibility, standing and stature in his profession, yet apparently for a short time he was overcome by our peripatetic Treasurer's miraculous media machine.

Mr. Venning: He even hoodwinked the press.

Dr. TONKIN: He did for a time. Doubtless the Treasurer's peripatetic media machine has been extremely effective.

Mr. Langley: Tell us how many votes you got when you stood against him.

Dr. TONKIN: I reduced his majority, and I was pleased about that. If he carries on in his pig-headed and stubborn attitude regarding boundaries in the Kensington and Norwood council area, I suspect that his majority will be reduced further.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You're willing to help that along, I suppose.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, if necessary I am. I cannot really believe that responsible reporters could have been so naive as to swallow the story that there were no new tax increases in this tame Budget. I do not think they did swallow it: I think they had their tongues in their cheeks when they wrote those reports. Some people in the provincial press could have been taken in for a time, because they were not as close to the political scene as were the newspaper reporters in this House, and they did not realise that many people still were not aware of the tremendous confidence trick that this Government and the Commonwealth Government were playing on the people.

Mr. Coumbe: They will find out when they get their bills.

Dr. TONKIN: It is coming true. I do not think that responsible journalists would accept that kind of thing, unless they were sending the Budget up. I hope that it was a send-up, not what otherwise was a fairly deplorable situation. Obviously, no new tax increases were announced in our Budget, for the very simple reason that, as we all know, they had all been announced beforehand.

How on earth people can be lumbered with all these new taxes (and we have heard them all detailed in the comprehensive speech of the Leader of the Opposition) and then swallow the story as it is trotted out (because it is mainly in the press) that there have been no new tax increases in this Budget I do not know. We have seen a total break with tradition and normal practice, and the situation has arisen where not only have details of the Budget been publicised beforehand (and they have indeed been announced beforehand) but also no secrecy has been observed. We have seen all the announcements about taxes made well in advance of the Budget itself, yet the presenting of the Budget was the time when these taxes should have been announced. Just as we have broken with tradition in reading only part of the Treasurer's statement, so we have broken Budget secrecy.

Mr. Keneally: Your speeches on financial measures are always appalling.

Dr. TONKIN: I am sure I am on the right track, and I am reassured by that interjection. However, the whole action of the Government highlights its feeling that the State Budget no longer has any significance for the State. The Treasurer's attitude has been one of total boredom: in fact, he has not been here very often. The Attorney-General has been reading reports; he even skimmed through the Auditor-General's Report. He picked up this red-covered book, said to himself "What's this?", and skimmed through it while sitting there. He is not the slightest bit interested. The other amazing thing is that the various heavy increases in charges which should have been announced in the Budget have already been dealt with by this Parliament. On pages 6 and 7 of the Financial Statement we see references to pay-roll tax, the price of water, increase as a result of metrication, increases in hospital fees and liquor tax, gas sale levies, and savings bank levies. Motor vehicle registration is increased by only \$7 133 000! That is nothing to worry about! What is \$7 000 000 among friends? Then stamp duties are up by nearly \$8 000 000. What is \$8 000 000 in a Budget? And so the taxpayer is hit and hit. We find on page 7 of the Treasurer's statement:

Under the customs of several years ago, all of these measures would have been announced at the time of the Budget presentation, but under our present procedures we are better able to make earlier decisions and I see advantages in announcing as many decisions as possible right at the beginning of the year.

I am sure the Treasurer sees advantages because he can take the opportunity of pulling the wool over the eyes of the taxpayer. That is what he is trying to do. He is hiding from the public the full impact of the increases that he has imposed in a spread-out, piecemeal fashion. We see the same schizophrenic attitude to the Loan Estimates. The increases in taxation are dissociated from the Budget, on the one hand, and blatantly associated with it, on the other hand. I have only to quote from page 11 to illustrate what I mean:

A levy on gas sales by the South Australian Gas Company and the Mount Gambier Gas Company . . . was announced in June, of course.

Then a little further down we read:

This statement merely confirms my earlier announcement.

That was to do with the State Bank. The comments made on page 12 are also revealing:

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

This is a classic, of course, because these fee rises were announced earlier but were not introduced until September 1, but even that is 10 days after the Budget. They did not apply until after the Budget was brought in. That is the coy and rather reluctant approach to the acknowledgement in the State Budget of the effects of increases in State charges forced upon us by the actions and policies of the Commonwealth Socialist Government. The whole exercise would be amusing were it not so tragic in its implications, and were it not so serious. In spite of the haphazardness of this document, I believe it was deliberately designed to hide the truth. It is difficult to find any continuity in it; one must jump from page to page and paragraph to paragraph. It switches from subject to subject at random but, in spite of all that, it has been deliberately designed to hide the true issue. For instance, there is a summary of major financial factors, stating the obvious, and even more obvious is another passage on

page 7 (which is significant, I think; it is the Treasurer speaking) as follows:

As to this, I think the best course of action is to make the two sides of the Budget, that is to say receipts and payments, consistent with each other.

To whom does he think he is talking? In spite of this and the schizophrenic attitude that we have come to expect—that, on the one hand, he is confident of getting funds and, on the other hand, he does not know what will happen if he does not get funds from the Commonwealth Government—the Treasurer reflects with some concern on the uncertainties of the future of the State; no doubt, he is referring to the Commonwealth Government, which is calling the tune as far as the affairs of this State are concerned. The document is too haphazard and higgledy-piggledy for me to keep any continuity at all. I quote now from page 4 as follows:

Recent advice from the Prime Minister discloses that the total of cash to be received this year will be a little greater at \$23 500 000, but the break-up between the two years will be different.

I may interpose here "not very different". The Treasurer continues:

The completion grant, as recommended, will be \$8 500 000, and the advance grant only \$15 000 000.

But emphasising the completion grant cannot hide the true position that the Commonwealth Government is giving us less money this year for general revenue. I turn now to the heading on page 8 "The Effect of Australian Government Programmes". This is probably the most significant paragraph in the whole document, because the Commonwealth Government's part in what should be South Australia's major affairs is the predominant theme running through this Budget. It is relieved only by one secondary theme, which is obviously a move introduced under the guise of a semi-academic discussion on forward planning (an even more insidious move) to prepare the way for a series of three-year plans. Reading this document, it is apparent that the Treasurer and the Government are moving more and more towards a series of three-year plans. There are five-year plans in other countries but here we are obviously moving towards three-year plans. The paragraph headed "The Effect of Australian Government Programmes" could well have headed the Budget, because it is the most important part of the document. The Treasurer states:

The Australian Government has initiated a number of new programmes which involve specific purpose grants to the States to improve social services, to protect and improve the environment and to up-grade public services in urban areas. These grants, which are for both capital and recurrent purposes, are making a valuable and widespread contribution towards the improvement of our quality of life but, in their initial stages, they are raising some problems for State Governments in their budgeting and forward planning.

That is saying a mouthful. Certainly it is raising problems. General revenue is restricted and special grants are being increased, but increased sums are being demanded through matching grants, and these matching grants must come from the State's general revenue, thereby further depleting that account and forcing us to go round and round in ever smaller circles. Of course, the reason for this is obvious: this whole exercise is directed to increasing Commonwealth Government control, and these tactics are proving successful to the extent that the State Labor Government has already handed over to the Commonwealth our powers concerning Aboriginal affairs. I am sorry that the Minister of Education has left, because we are well on our way to handing over to the Commonwealth control in other areas, including our total commitment to education. This has become apparent.

At page 11 the Treasurer states:

There will be a very large increase in the volume of funds becoming available under various Australian Government schemes to improve the standard of State education systems.

Mr. Venning: They've taken the lot now.

Dr. TONKIN: Just about. The Commonwealth Government has taken over tertiary education, and it would have taken over the pre-school area if it had not gone back on another election promise. Under the heading "Social Services", the Treasurer states:

With the availability of Schools Commission funds for a full financial year, a steady growth in most educational areas is expected. The Budget provides for continued emphasis on the provision of additional ancillary staff in primary, secondary and area schools, together with further increases in the provision of teachers so that the pupil-teacher ratio can be reduced. Further consequences of Schools Commission funding will become apparent in the strong development of various specialist areas of activity. Particularly is this the case in the development of special education and the very rapid growth of work in the remedial reading area. There will be considerably increased expenditure to provide necessary equipment in the fields of physical education and music.

No-one will quarrel with this. This is a worthwhile programme that I will support, but I will not support being dictated to by a Commonwealth Government as to how we will spend our money, where we will spend it, and what our priorities will be. The same situation applies to health, etc. Social Welfare is another area where we have the Australian Assistance Plan being implemented, and we heard the Attorney-General earlier give perhaps his weakest reply yet when he tried to explain how the plan would not conflict with the work undertaken by the Community Welfare Department and when he tried to tell us that we were not going to be taken over by the Commonwealth Government and the Australian Assistance Plan.

This is the way in which the whole scheme is being worked. Worthwhile programmes are being put up, but this State Government and other State Governments are losing the right to decide their own priorities, to say where pre-school education is necessary, to say in which spheres special education is necessary, to say where community welfare programmes should be instituted, and to say where hospitals should be built. I resent this. It is totally regrettable that the State Labor Government should be so totally tied to a political ideology that it will sacrifice the autonomy of South Australia and its closer links with the people in favour of a massive monolithic, impersonal, bureaucratic department controlled from a remote centre. As I have previously stated, it is not really surprising, because apparently the Treasurer and many of his other colleagues opposite are willing to help kill Kensington and Norwood and all the other little councils, obviously, for the same political and ideological reasons.

The Hon. L. J. King: Are you suggesting that the members of the Royal Commission were influenced by ideological motives?

Dr. TONKIN: I am suggesting that the Treasurer and other members opposite will support the findings of the Commission because it suits them to do so. I am referring not to the Commission but to the actions we are going to see when members in this Chamber vote in favour of their Party against the wishes of their constituents, and that is exactly what will happen. The recurring three-year programme may be summed up and explained by the Treasurer saying that there is a desire for greater flexibility, for wider long-term planning: that is, if the money is available. However, there is a total contradiction in attitudes: if

this present financial situation is generally supported by the Commonwealth Government, flexibility must be lost. Surely the funds are not definitely there, and we are heading towards a more and more rigid form of Government control.

I agree that more flexibility is needed. Obviously, there must be more flexibility in individual departmental arrangements. There have been some ridiculous situations in which Government departments have had to spend their allocations before the end of a financial year for fear, first, that they would not get that money again and, secondly, that they would not get as much money in the next year. Further, people have had to take their annual leave when they did not want it, simply because it was due to them. It is time that Government departments started to wake up to themselves, spent their allocations rationally, and became far more flexible.

Certainly, that would enable longer-term planning, but annual budgeting is still essential. It would not inhibit this more rational and commonsense approach to Public Service operations. In fact, I believe that every argument that the Treasurer has advanced in his statement has been an argument in favour of having more regular Budgets. We could well have six-monthly Budgets or three-monthly reports (a series of mini Budgets). With increasing Commonwealth Government involvement in the affairs of this State, we do not really know whether we are coming or going, or whether or not the money will be available.

Indeed, far from there being a three-yearly Budget, which I am sure the Treasurer would love to have in order to hide all the deficiencies, I think of this type of situation: fancy a treasurer not having to answer to his local golf club committee, or to a private company or a union. Fancy not having to answer for one's financial affairs for three years. That is just not on. I am amazed that the Treasurer even seriously considers that as a worthwhile suggestion. Of course, we are getting used to the whole idea now. This State Labor Government is adapting itself and is accepting and welcoming the growing Commonwealth Government influence. Every now and then the Treasurer makes an appropriate noise and kicks the Commonwealth Government. He can afford to do so, because he knows that the Commonwealth Government has the State Government pretty much where it wants it. It is traditional for the Treasurer to say that he is getting a raw deal. However, he has an election to face before the Commonwealth has (at least as far as we know). Whether or not that will help him, I do not know.

With the past increases in the number of public servants, it was worth while to see the announcement that recruitment for the Public Service was to be reduced by half, although that is not much comfort for those young people leaving school this year. At least we will cut down on Government spending. With the increase in the Treasurer's staff and the cost of his overseas visits (figures for which we are still waiting but which will amount to more than \$60 000), and the visits of four other Ministers (the costs of which are not yet available but which will be at least \$20 000 a head), we should get value for money. I am not saying that these people should not go overseas, but if it is good enough for members to go away on Parliamentary business or study tours on a single fare, it is good enough for Ministers to do the same thing.

Mr. Langley: What about heads of departments?

Dr. TONKIN: They can go too, but it need not cost \$60 000—plus for one Minister to travel abroad. That is not value for money. We are becoming more involved

with the Commonwealth Government, but I have no doubt that this Budget has been introduced on a typical low-key note because the Government wants it ignored. It is a non-issue, a Budget that never was. Like the man who never was who was used to deceive the Germans and lull them into a false sense of security, I believe this Budget is designed to lull the people of this State into a false sense of security until they are finally wrapped in the toils of the Commonwealth Government, which will have absolute control. I believe that this could be one of the last State Budgets to be introduced into this Parliament. If the Commonwealth and State Labor Governments have their way there will be no State Parliaments, and this situation will arrive much sooner than people in this State may think. This is a situation that we should consider deeply.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): A Government member has suggested that the Leader of the Opposition should not be referring to the economy in terms of the activities of the Commonwealth Government. That remark is completely inept, because the whole economy of this country and the State is bound up with what is happening in Canberra. At present the economy of this country is in complete chaos. Every day we are confronted with confusion and a mass of conflicting statements from those supposed to be directing the financial affairs of this country. This Budget must be considered in this situation. One need only read the daily press headlines—"Strains in the economy"; "Depression next year—employers predict"; "Business 'alarm' at state of the economy"; "Banker has a bash at the P.M."; "Dangers in wage experiment"; "South Australian prosperity vital, says Whitlam"; "Development policy lacking"—

The Hon. L. J. King: What a profound student of the economy, if you have to refer only to headlines!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: They indicate the alarm throughout the country from the Prime Minister to every housewife. The headlines continue, "Managers gloomy about prospects"; "P.M.'s hazy solutions"; and "Credit squeeze should ease soon", under which the article warns that 200 000 may soon be jobless. The number of jobless now exceeds 200 000. The Commonwealth Government suggested a scheme whereby \$2 000 000 a month would be spent to provide more jobs, but this week Mr. Cameron has suggested that the Government will spend \$10 000 000 a month for this purpose. Those headlines indicate what a complete mess the Commonwealth Government has made of this country since it came to power. Under the heading "The leadership: Labor in labour" a recent article in the *Bulletin* states:

Inextricably bound up in Australia's current economic-labor mess is a leadership crisis. What was supposed to be Prime Minister Gough Whitlam's greatest attribute, his stature and capacity as a leader, is proving of very doubtful worth. He seems incapable of controlling his cabinet and his caucus or coming to any realistic compromise with the trade unions which, after all, are the industrial arm of his party.

It is a very strong arm not only in the Commonwealth Party but also in the Labor Party in this State. The industrial arm of the Labor Party is predominant, as it is within the Parliamentary Labor Party in this State. The Prime Minister is having no more success in Canberra with that arm than is this State Government. The article continues:

Although he resents anyone saying he is uncomfortable with economics Whitlam clearly is. And this is no time to be avoiding issues simply because they are disagreeable to you. This country faces grave economic problems. To listen to Whitlam and Treasurer Crean (or Mrs. Whitlam) you get the feeling they are either apathetic or confused or both. This is not the sort of leadership

that is required if we are to get out of the mess which is shattering business and consumer confidence.

This situation is exacerbated by the seeming impotence of A.C.T.U. president Bob Hawke. In Hawke's early career in this position he was an industrial Henry Kissinger. Now his increasing isolation from the more militant and powerful trade unions added to his apparent inability to deal with government on some major strikes results in their remaining unsolved.

The only leadership apparently coming from within the A.L.P. these days seems to be from Dr. Jim Cairns. To business, Labor Parliamentarians, and unions he seems to be the man who realises that there is no economic law which says that you should automatically be better off this year than you were last year.

The article continues for several pages with pertinent comments on the economic situation of this country at present. In those circumstances we should expect to be debating tonight a financial document that does not tell us very much, and that is the situation in which we find ourselves. We are fortunately spared the self-adulation in which the Treasurer often indulges. Last year in his Budget speech he gave himself and his Government a pat on the back when he said:

The annual Budget statement gives a limited amount of information—

the same applies to the present position—

about physical progress in the explanation of departmental expenditure proposals. So it is this year, and I will give information about the major 1973-74 proposals in a moment.

Here the Treasurer pauses to indulge in the self-adulation that he and his Ministers are apt to pour on themselves, and then says:

More information is available in other ways; for instance, in annual reports, in answer to questions in Parliament, and in Ministerial announcements. But, as we all know, the real test is the individual's experience and reaction to the quality of service offered when he or she seeks it in education, in health, in the protection of the law, in assistance against hardship, or in some other area of Government-provided service. I suggest to members that, in the totality of these things, the ordinary South Australian is far better off because of this Government's efforts.

Fortunately, that sort of self-adulation is missing from this year's statement, and we appreciate that omission, because the Treasurer has little cause this year (and, indeed, he had little cause last year) for self-adulation. In the past the Treasurer has been critical of the Commonwealth Government, but such criticism is noticeable for its absence this year. However, it would have been entirely relevant. In 1970, the Treasurer said:

What of South Australia then? Where does the June conference leave us? I have already made clear my bitter disappointment at what I, and I believe the majority of informed observers, consider to be most unfair treatment. Rather than a reasonable offer of additional assistance such as was made to other States, South Australia was told (and was told with a sneer) that if it was not satisfied it could go back to the Grants Commission.

If South Australia ever had grounds for complaint about the treatment doled out to it by the Commonwealth Government, it has grounds right now. Let us remember that the present Commonwealth Government is the marriage partner of this Government; this happy union between the State Labor Government and the Commonwealth Labor Government was going to set a cracking pace in development, but what do we find? We have had the roughest deal from a Commonwealth Government in living memory. In his Budget statement the Treasurer seeks to mislead the public. It has been widely promoted by Government agencies, press secretaries, and the like that there have been no increases in taxes and charges, that we have had a soft Budget. The public has been led to believe in both the major newspapers that there are no shocks and no increased charges in the Budget, but that is simply not true.

We have had attempts by the Treasurer to mislead the public on numerous other occasions. Let us remember the Treasurer's announcements that he would tax the wealthy and the tall poppies, not the average citizen; that was obvious nonsense. All taxing efforts are directed at the average citizen, as are the taxing efforts in this Budget. There is no truth in the statement that there are no increases in this Budget. The Treasurer has devised a clever scheme to soften the impact of the increases.

Mr. Chapman: He is becoming skilled at that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes; if there is a way of deluding the public, this Government will find it. This sort of statement gives a political advantage to the Government:

Under the customs of several years ago, all of these measures would have been announced at the time of the Budget presentation, but under our present procedures we are better able to make earlier decisions and I see advantages in announcing as many decisions as possible right at the beginning of the year. As I said a moment ago, there are good reasons for maintaining flexibility in our approach and for introducing other measures during the course of the year, if that seems appropriate.

Of course, the other measures that that paragraph refers to are measures mentioned earlier in the Treasurer's explanation; for example, increases in water charges, liquor prices and hospital fees, and levies on the sale of gas and on the profits of the Savings Bank of South Australia. These measures are expected to bring in about \$12 000 000 this year. So, in that paragraph the Treasurer is saying that there is considerable merit in his being able to announce those things prior to the Budget. He has spread them out over the months prior to the Budget, and some were announced only a week or two before the Budget. Then, he has the amazing gall to say that there are no increases in the Budget. If that is not misleading, I do not know what is.

Actually, there are widespread and savage increases in the Budget. The Government has sought to soften the blow by spreading the announcements over a period. It has tried to cloak the increases by making a statement that is tucked away in the document; this borders on the dishonest, but it is not untypical of the Treasurer or other Government members. This will not wash. In one of his unguarded moments the Treasurer apparently lost some of his normal caution when he was confronted by what he himself described as the lousiest deal ever. On that occasion the Treasurer gave a chronicle of the taxation increases levied by this pace-setting Government of which he is so proud. He is reported to have said the following:

Mr. Whitlam had not faced facts and his deal for road grants was the shabbiest he had received from any Prime Minister, including John Gorton.

The Treasurer used to criticise John Gorton in the House and on every public occasion he could. The report continues:

\$28 500 000 is an amount we cannot conceivably finance from State resources. This must be obvious. In 1970-71, we put new and extended levies on stamp duties, succession duties, betting tax, charges on sales of electricity and harbor charges. Rail freights, rail, tram and bus fares, water and sewer rates and hospital fees all went up.

In 1971-72, we followed with increases in land tax, duty stamp, motor tax, payroll-tax, water and sewer rates, hospital fees and university fees. And in 1972-73, increased water and sewer rates, bus and train fares and charges for departmental services. In 1973-74, we were forced to bring in the heaviest programme of tax increases in the history of the State. I raised an extra \$18 000 000. There were increases in pay-roll tax, harbor charges, water rates, a further levy on electricity sales and hospital fees.

That indicates clearly that the continuing history of this Government has been one of continual and savage increases in tax levies on the public of the State. What about the

emotive issue he seeks to raise on every occasion: "We will not cut back on education and health"? Whenever he thinks he can whip up some public support to justify savage increases, we get the education and health bit. When the Treasurer was overseas, even the Minister of Education trotted it out. Let us look at what the Auditor-General says, in his most recent report, about what is happening in these two areas and see whether there are tangible benefits accruing to the public of the State, in view of the ravages of inflation in these areas. The Treasurer has been saying this for years. First, we had the "tax the tall poppies" bit. That was a completely misleading statement. Now we have the completely misleading idea that there are no tax increases in the Budget, and the continuing announcement is trotted out about increased benefits accruing to the public of the State, particularly in health and hospitals. The Auditor-General's Report shows the primary schools education cost for each pupil for the four preceding years before this year. The report states:

The cost per pupil enrolled in State primary and secondary schools is shown in the following table. These figures, which are supplied by the department include payments for administration but exclude debt charges on Loan Funds. In 1970, the cost for each primary pupil was \$187, whereas three years later the cost was \$313 (nearly double). In secondary school education the cost for each pupil was \$353 in 1970, whereas in 1973 it had escalated to \$587 for each pupil. One does not have to look far to see whence these costs have come. I will mention that when I refer to the addendum to the Budget Speech, which shows that the increases have been eaten up entirely by salary increases. What about the much-vaunted improvement in hospital services? The daily average cost a bed occupied at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, excluding debt charges, in 1972 was \$36.62. In 1974, the cost, excluding debt charges, had almost doubled to \$64.59. This story is repeated in this table in the Auditor-General's Report in relation to the whole of the public hospital system.

What the Treasurer is really saying is that costs and wages have escalated to such an extent in recent years that we are now paying for these services in running costs about double what they cost two or three years ago. If the Treasurer thinks that the public will make the conclusion that he wished them to make from his Budget statement last year, he is deluding not only the public but also himself, because in real terms there has been a retrogression simply because of the tremendous escalation in the cost of providing these services. It is not difficult if one looks at the addendum to the Budget (in which reference is made to last year's expenditures) to see that the extra sum has been more than eaten up by salary and wage determinations in the education and health fields. The statement on education says that expenditure by the Education Department was \$9 184 000 greater than expected, and salaries and wages were \$8 114 000 more than the figure included in the original Budget. It also says that the cost of awards during the year was about \$9 150 000. It is apparent that considerable savings were made to accommodate these increases. In other words, less was done in the Education Department than was expected. The Auditor-General's Report, under the heading "Minister of Health", states:

Expenditure by the Hospitals Department was \$5 260 000 above estimate. The cost of awards, service and over-award pay, leave loadings and higher fees for visiting medical specialists was about \$6 140 000 and, in addition, all hospitals were hit with cost increases on contingency items of about double the anticipated severity. In order to absorb some of these increases expansion had to continue at a slower rate than had been hoped, in particular at Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

What the Auditor-General is saying is that expansion had to be cut back simply to accommodate increases in salaries and wages, yet the Treasurer has the gall to noise abroad the statement, "The Government will not cut down on health and hospitals", and, in last year's Budget statement, "The public knows that it is better off under our administration." What complete nonsense, and what an appalling attempt by the Treasurer to mislead the public. Much uncertainty surrounds this Budget. It refers to the salary increases expected; I think \$30 000 000 is mentioned. It also states that \$15 000 000 has already been used by determinations already finalised. The escalation last year was considerably more than \$30 000 000 and, from the way in which the Commonwealth Government is failing to give economic leadership to the country, I think we can confidently predict that the escalation in this area this year will be even greater than that of last year.

The Treasurer said that there was an area of uncertainty about the Budget, and that is also referred to in the summary relating to last year's financial statement. That area of uncertainty is greatly accentuated by the fact that the Government does not know where it stands with the Commonwealth Government. The Treasurer has said that he confidently expects a supplementary grant of \$5 000 000 or \$6 000 000. If he looked at other statements made by his Commonwealth colleagues that had not been honoured, perhaps he would not have been so confident in his prediction that money would flow to South Australia. My major complaint is the idea noised abroad that there are no taxation increases. They are mentioned in the Budget document, in two or three places. Under the heading of "Taxation" the Treasurer states:

The greater part of the expected increase in receipts from motor vehicle registration and drivers licence fees is explained by the recent proposals to raise the level of the fees in order to finance the State's share of the cost of the new roads arrangements proposed by the Australian Government. The expected increase is \$7 133 000 but, as members will be aware, road finance has no net impact on the Revenue Budget and any extra funds raised from these charges will be transferred to the Highways Fund for expenditure on the construction and maintenance of the roads network. Revenue from stamp duties is expected to increase from \$41 914 000 to \$49 700 000. Announcements of higher tax rates in this area were delayed until the last possible minute in the hope that alternative sources of finance could be found but, as the Budget review progressed, it became apparent that some increases were unavoidable . . .

He goes on to talk about increases in stamp duties on cheques, general and life insurance licences, third party policies, conveyances, and new registrations and transfers of motor vehicles, and so on. How we can have the sort of headlines we have seen in the past week or so, saying that we have had a soft Budget with no increases, I do not know. It is beyond the bounds of credibility. This Budget is as savage as any Budget we have come to expect, as was indicated in the remarks of the Treasurer when, in a fit of frustration, he outlined to the Prime Minister just what increases in taxes had occurred in the past three years. This Budget is completely in line with previous savage increases in taxation heaped on the public of South Australia. I do not believe the Treasurer can continue indefinitely to delude the public. The day of accounting is coming; it will come soon for his Commonwealth colleagues, and the capacity of the public to pay is fast running out. The Treasurer, in the statements that he is dishing out from year to year, is losing all credibility. I hope that, in future, we can have a more

honest approach from the Government; however, I believe that is probably a vain hope.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I approach this subject in the same vein as that in which the member for Kavel concluded. A local newspaper report published in the area in which I live states:

State Government taxes and charges are unchanged in a \$774 000 000 Budget presented to Parliament Thursday afternoon by the Premier and Treasurer (Mr. Dunstan). It was, he said, a "careful and considered" Budget.

I think the approach has been somewhat deceitful. I have seen it written somewhere that a half truth can be a great lie. I hope it was not intended that this should be a half truth presented to the people of South Australia, who are asked to accept this as a Budget in which charges are unchanged. I am sure the Government set about increasing the charges before the Budget announcements so that these statements could be made, and so that people could be given the impression that nothing was being changed. However, on page 4 of Parliamentary Paper No. 7 we find that in 1973-74 receipts were estimated to be about \$138 000 000, although actual receipts, at \$151 000 000, were about 9 per cent higher. For 1974-75 the estimated receipts are about \$209 000 000, a 38 per cent increase on the actual receipts of the previous year. If an increase should transpire beyond those estimates at a rate equivalent to last year's increase, the figure for the current year could be about 50 per cent higher, so I cannot see how the Government or the Treasurer can say there are no altered charges and taxes in this Budget.

I do not wish to go over all the ground covered by previous speakers, because it has been dealt with in a most able and detailed manner, but we cannot ignore a situation in which the motorists of South Australia are to be hit for another \$7 000 000, and where there will be a new tax on the consumption of gas to bring in another \$700 000. General stamp duties will increase by about \$8 000 000.

Mr. Mathwin: What about water rates?

Mr. RUSSACK: I am coming to that. Stamp duty on cheques will be increased from 6c to 8c, and insurance companies will be charged a stamp duty for an annual licence on their general business at a rate increased from 5 per cent to 6 per cent, and on the net premiums on life business from 1 per cent to 1½ per cent. There will be an additional surcharge on motor vehicle third party insurance policies, which will be increased from \$2 to \$3. In a rather smooth way the Treasurer has introduced the fact that there will be an increase in the profits of the State Bank and the Savings Bank received by the Government. I quote from Parliamentary Paper No. 18 at page 11, as follows:

It is common practice for the Australian and State Governments to require their trading and savings banks to contribute a proportion of profits to Revenue Account as a form of substitute for income tax. The State Bank of South Australia has contributed 45 per cent of its profits for several years now, but to date no charge has been imposed on the Savings Bank of South Australia. The Government is extremely reluctant—

and that is what I meant when I referred to the smooth approach—

to introduce measures of this nature, but is conscious of the need to raise funds from all available avenues if standards of service are to be maintained. Accordingly, both banks will in future be required to contribute 50 per cent of their profits to revenue. This statement merely confirms my earlier announcement.

Last year the estimated revenue from 45 per cent of the profit of the State Bank of South Australia was \$542 000, and that was achieved; as a matter of fact, it was

exceeded by \$190. This year, with the increase to 50 per cent, the revenue will be \$990 000. However, there appears to be some discrepancy. The Parliamentary Paper shows a figure of \$990 000 as the estimated receipt, but the Auditor-General's Report shows that the amount will be \$1 012 000.

Mr. Mathwin: Whom do you think is right, the Auditor-General or the Treasurer?

Mr. RUSSACK: I would say that the Auditor-General would be correct. This is a new field of revenue, and it will bring in much revenue to the Government. One could continue with other detail about other individual revenue and taxation, but I wish to concentrate on two aspects of revenue. I have mentioned them in the House recently, and I make no apology for again bringing them before the notice of the Treasurer and the Government. The first aspect is land tax. Earlier, the member for Glenelg asked, "What about water rates?". The valuation of land affects water rates, so water changes have been affected in two ways. First, there have been steep increases in land valuation and, secondly, on page 11 of the Treasurer's Financial Statement it is stated that the charge for water has been increased from 10c for 1 000 litres to 11c for 1 000 l. There is also, on that page of the Financial Statement, an admission by the Government. The Treasurer states:

The Government is at present investigating problems which have arisen from sharply increased valuations in some areas.

I hope that these problems will be investigated, because I consider that some valuations are right out of proportion and, even if the valuations are maintained, the land tax scale, which has not been amended since 1966, should be altered so that it is more commensurate with the valuations now being made. I hope that the Government is sincere and that it will investigate properly these problems in land valuation.

Mr. Mathwin: That's a bit of a hope! I think you're stretching that a bit far.

Mr. RUSSACK: I hope I am not and that the Government will accept responsibility in this area. I represent a rural district, and it is my duty to bring before this House again the matter of valuation regarding rural land. In the District of Gouger, the major industry is the rural industry and, therefore, it is my privilege to speak on this aspect. At present, the Valuation of Land Act defines areas for valuation purposes as the various district council areas, and recently in the areas of the District Council of Bute and the District Council of Clinton (the latter is in the District of Goyder) there have been land valuations that are, in the opinion of the taxpayer and landholder, far above the realistic unimproved value.

Because rural industry at present is facing added increases in costs and a run down in prices for the commodities it produces, much hardship will be experienced in future. I heard the other day that it was accepted that costs had increased by about 20 per cent in this industry and the receipts for its commodities had been reduced by 30 per cent. Therefore, difficulties will be faced in future, and it is the responsibility of this Government to do whatever is possible to alleviate the position. I consider that, beyond doubt, the increase in land valuation is unrealistic, and I will give an example additional to the examples that I gave recently. On December 9, 1971, a property about 24 kilometres north of Kadina was valued at \$32 250, and the tax paid on that property was \$83.80. On June 26, 1974, the unimproved value of the property was fixed at \$93 710. If the appeal that this landholder has lodged

is not upheld and the present valuation is maintained, his new tax will be \$786.78.

I admit that the figures I have given include the allowance for rural land. The Treasurer, even when he introduced the Budget, mentioned Victoria and New South Wales. Further, Government members have asked, "What about New South Wales?", "What about Victoria?", and "What about Queensland?". In Victoria, land used for primary production is exempt from land tax. In New South Wales, except for one or two minor cases, the provision states that primary producing land held at December 31, 1973, is exempt. The provision in Western Australia regarding land used for primary production states:

Land used for primary production: Improved land owned and used solely or principally for the purposes of an agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, apicultural, grazing, pig-raising, or poultry business, is exempt from the payment of land tax.

When South Australia is compared in one field for one purpose, it is reasonable to compare it in another field. Therefore, let us follow those other States and wipe out tax on land used for rural purposes. On August 6 I asked the Treasurer whether the Government would consider amending the scale in the Land Tax Act. As yet, I have not received a reply, and I hope that sincere consideration is being given to this matter and that, as the Treasurer states in his Financial Statement, these problems are being investigated. I hope that a more realistic and sensible rating will be the outcome.

The other matter that I should like to mention is pay-roll tax, which the Deputy Leader has also mentioned this evening. When I referred to this matter earlier in this session, I stated that many small businesses were being hit by this tax. Recently I saw some interesting facts about small businesses in Australia, and South Australia is no exception. The report to which I refer states:

Big contribution by small business. The term "free enterprise" is associated in the minds of most people with the larger companies. In fact, the vast majority of businesses are small. It has been estimated that there are some 350 000 businesses of all kinds in Australia. About 330 000 of these employ 100 people or less. Of the total number of factories in Australia in 1967-68—62 619—over 60 000 were "small". The total value of manufacturing production amounted to \$7 132 000 000, of which small businesses contributed nearly \$3 000 000 000. Those who go into small business are people who prize independence and who like to have full opportunity to use their personal talents. Many small businesses fail. Those that succeed sometimes grow into large public companies. Some small businesses show a remarkable aptitude for being able to compete with much larger enterprises. They can provide a brand of specialised personal service which big companies often find difficult to match. Small businesses are particularly prominent in retail trade, despite the growth of large chain stores and super-markets. In any assessment of the free enterprise system, the contributions of small businesses and the opportunities they provide for men of independence, initiative and courage, should not be overlooked.

And they should not be overlooked. I have mentioned that because it is pertinent to pay-roll tax, which is iniquitous. Irrespective of who introduced it and of the fact that all States in Australia have accepted it as a growth tax, I still say it is not a fair tax for an employer, for the privilege of employing people, to have to pay on the wages he pays. I suggested recently that many businesses must have been caught in the net and now are paying pay-roll tax, not because they are employing any more people but because of the increases in wages while the statutory exemption has not been increased. In the Auditor-General's report it is stated that at June, 1974, 7 329 employers were registered under the Act compared to 6 448 at June, 1973. Therefore, in 12 months 881 more businesses in South Australia

are paying pay-roll tax than there were paying it a year ago. I venture to say that only a small percentage of new businesses have been established and, therefore, the major part of that 881 represents small businesses, those businesses that contribute greatly not only in the metropolitan area but also in country areas, businesses that are being victimised by this tax. So I suggest that consideration be given to this matter, and that the exemption be increased from \$20 800 a year to a more reasonable figure commensurate with the increase in wages and costs today.

Mr. Coumbe: At least double.

Mr. RUSSACK: At least double, because in many instances wages have increased by more than 100 per cent. Therefore, it would be reasonable if the pay-roll tax exemption was doubled to \$41 600.

Mr. Coumbe: It has not been changed in 15 years.

Mr. RUSSACK: It has not, so it is reasonable that a change be considered. I said I would not reiterate the same points that other speakers have made. I do not intend to do so but I wish to bring these two major matters before the House, the Treasurer and the Government. If the Treasurer and the Government are honest and creditable, they will consider these matters seriously and take action to alleviate the hardship that will result from these matters not being considered. The Budget is a more vicious Budget than the Government has led the people to believe. It has misled the people in the way it has presented the Budget. It has imposed taxes at various stages before presenting the Budget, and it is trying to mislead the people to believing there are no higher taxes; yet the revenue is increasing by 38 per cent. Those people responsible should understand that a half-truth can sometimes be a big lie.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I begin by saying how amazed I was to read in one of the local publications in my area a press statement attributed to the Treasurer. This is another example showing that this Government has no credibility. Today, we have seen its credibility completely shattered. As the days go by, members on this side are exposing the Government's activities and there is no longer any credibility on the front bench opposite. I quote from the *Eyre Peninsula Tribune* of Thursday, September 5, 1974, as follows:

Tax unchanged in State Budget. State Government taxes and charges are unchanged in a \$774 000 000 Budget presented to Parliament by the Premier and Treasurer, Mr. Dunstan, last week.

It is worth reading the whole article.

Mr. McRae: He never said that, of course.

Mr. Coumbe: Then who did? It appeared in all the daily papers.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: The article continues:

It was, he said, a "careful and considered" Budget. Mr. Dunstan said he expected State Government revenue spending in the year to June 30 next to reach \$774 645 000. Set against expected receipts of \$762 645 000 this left a deficit of \$12 000 000. There would be a surplus of some \$8 000 000 this year, leaving a \$4 000 000 shortfall. Mr. Dunstan, said, however, this could be further reduced by grants from the Commonwealth Government.

That would be a joke. The article continues:

The main spending is on education, some \$186 900 000, with most of the money going to pay teachers' salaries. There would be further increases in both the number of teachers and ancillary staff in South Australian schools. Next biggest item was \$110 200 000 on health and hospital services.

That's a joke, too. The article continues:

Mr. Dunstan also detailed increased spending on welfare services, and environmental protection.

That statement is a deliberate untruth. If, as members opposite have said, this was not a statement by the Treasurer, I shall be expecting in the next edition of this paper a correction from the Treasurer. Knowing how honest and upright are the citizens running this paper, I am sure they would be glad to print the correction if they were in error, but I believe this statement is the work of one of the many press officers employed by this Government, people for whom the taxpayers have to pay, and the payment for whom is one reason why vicious charges are levied against the people in this Budget. One could go on at great length and quote from other articles prepared from the same source, clearly misleading the people. It is an obvious attempt to give the people false information so that it will distract them from their bitter anger when they find that, slowly but surely, they will be taxed out of existence. The little people of this community who own a motor car and drive it for only a few thousand kilometres a year will suddenly find themselves faced with a massive tax slug from the Minister of Transport. The whole motor vehicle taxing system in Australia needs a complete overhaul, because it is unfair that a person who uses his car for only 10 000 km a year must pay the same registration fee as a person such as I who may travel about 100 000 km a year. State Governments in Australia should have the right to levy their own fuel excise tax so that those people using the road pay more for that privilege. It is criminal that people on fixed and low incomes, who use their motor vehicle virtually for leisure purposes only, must pay such a disproportionate amount.

Any Government willing to continue to increase taxation on such people should be ashamed of itself. How can this State Government claim to represent the little people when it acts so arbitrarily. The people of Australia were completely deluded by the false promises and half truths that were spread throughout the country by the Prime Minister. He was aided and abetted by the Treasurer, who we see nowadays occasionally turning on his colleague. Certainly, I do not believe their relationship is as good as it was. We have seen the cracks beginning to appear.

These men told the people of Australia that the only way to achieve a prosperous social welfare State was to have a Socialist Government. Of course, we know that that is another misconception and another untruth. Australians are seeing their savings destroyed by inflation. Even the Prime Minister has admitted that inflation is probably running at 20 per cent. It is an amazing set of circumstances in which we find the Treasurer admitting that, in less than two years, the national Socialist Government in Canberra has destroyed our savings and has created rampant inflation. I refer to the reasons for the Commonwealth Government's having created inflation.

Mr. Duncan: It's a pity you wouldn't—

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member is impatient and is making nonsensical interjections, although rarely do we see him rise in this House. He and his colleagues are merely part of a voting machine and are not allowed to take part in any debate in this House, which is supposed to be the forum for discussion in this State.

Mr. Duncan: I was on my feet this afternoon and you were only too anxious to see me sit down.

Mr. GUNN: If the honourable member wishes to rise, why does he not make a contribution and justify the vicious taxation increases that this Government has imposed on the people? Why has the Government created inflation? I believe, as do many other people, that the present Commonwealth Government has created this inflationary

situation to finance its present extravaganza of social reforms. I now refer to page 259 of the most recent publication of the Taxpayers Association, under the heading "Personal tax collections are sky high", as follows:

At the end of June, 1973, income tax paid by individuals came to \$4 000 000 000, and the 1973-74 total was close to \$5 500 000 000. But next year the graph will go through the ceiling when the collections are likely to exceed \$8 000 000 000.

The Commonwealth Treasury is laughing all the way to the bank! The Australian Government (and I thought we were part of a federation: not part of a Canberra dictatorship) is receiving massive increases in revenue from personal income tax, yet it is screwing the States and forcing them to increase their forms of taxation, which are highly inflationary and which are having a detrimental effect on the general community. This is an intolerable situation, and we must again look closely at the whole financial relationship between the Commonwealth and the States.

One of the most enlightening statements of policy on this subject has recently been made and deals with a position similar to what has taken place in the Federal Republic of West Germany. Prior to the last Commonwealth election, the Liberal Party and its friends the Country Party issued an excellent policy document. I refer to page 30 of the policy recommendation, which states:

The Liberal and Country Parties believe that the States must be provided with adequate and assured sources of revenue with which to discharge their proper responsibilities and that the States should receive a guaranteed proportion of Commonwealth personal income tax revenues. The proportion shall be determined by arrangement with the States.

I fully endorse that suggestion. When that situation is reached, the State Treasurer will be better able to forecast the sum he will receive from the Commonwealth and will be better able to forward plan. The Treasurer referred to the Budget and the role of financial planning and stated:

I see a decline in the emphasis on annual Budgets . . . People cannot take exception to such a remark.

Mr. Keneally: You should speak to the member for Bragg because he spent much time in taking exception to such remarks as that.

Mr. GUNN: If there were a responsible Government in the Treasury benches which was continually examining the affairs of the nation and making a proper review, the situation would be different. Obviously, there must be planning over a longer period than 12 months. I agree that it is an important and essential part of Parliamentary democracy that the Parliament debate annually matters concerning the financial programme and the taxing powers it has, and for the Parliament to scrutinise and make such comments as are necessary.

I believe that the Auditor-General's report should be laid on the table on the same day the Budget is presented by the Treasurer. Indeed, the Treasurer should not present the Budget to this House until the Auditor-General's report is ready, so that members had sufficient time during the traditional Royal Show break to examine both documents. Currently, in the few hours available it is impossible to scrutinise the recommendations and the comments of the Auditor-General to the required depth. Members just do not have sufficient time to study that document.

Mr. Venning: Do you think that is done on purpose?

Mr. GUNN: I would not cast any aspersion on the credibility of the Auditor-General.

Mr. Venning: It may not be his fault.

Mr. GUNN: Numerous comments can be made about the action of this Government. It could have purposefully designed the situation to which I have referred so that members do not have sufficient time to scrutinise the report. The Treasurer went on to say that the Australian Government is the Government that has the major say in controlling the financial affairs or the economy of Australia. True, yet that is Government which is to receive massive increases in its own revenue and which now wants to make it as difficult as possible for the States to operate and discharge their proper constitutional responsibilities.

It is obvious to anyone who reads the Treasurer's Budget speech, that he himself is deluded and unhappy with the policies emanating from Canberra. It is clear that the centralist approach that the Labor Party has traditionally espoused and adopted is in tatters. The Treasurer has rejected that approach and, obviously, if people of Australia are to receive the type of Government social welfare schemes and benefits to which they are entitled, and normally receive under a responsible Government, the Commonwealth Government has to abandon this centralist approach and be willing to give States the revenue they require. The States cannot continue to engage in rare and extravagant spending programmes: they have to be responsible. However, to be responsible they must have adequate funds, and the only source of such funds is from the central Government, because the types of taxation measure listed in this Budget are a complete burden on the community, are highly inflationary, and are forms of taxation that should not exist. The suggestion that it may be necessary to impose a consumer form of taxation should be rejected by every member but, if it is necessary, every member should blame those responsible (that is, the present Commonwealth Government), because it would be the fault of that Government. The Commonwealth Government has the funds and, if it wants to play the game and allow State Governments to discharge their proper responsibilities, it will ensure that this bad form of taxation is not forced on the Australian people. However, the Commonwealth Labor Government is so dedicated in its centralist approach it will do anything to weaken and destroy the States instead of helping them so that the people will benefit. A federal system operates successfully in West Germany. I have not visited that country but, if I receive a Parliamentary scholarship, I hope that I shall be able to visit it to study the federal system operating there. *Revenue Sharing in the Federal Republic of Germany* by J. S. H. Hunter of the Centre for Research on Federal Financial Relations at the Australian National University, Canberra is an interesting working paper on the Federal Republic of Germany. It refers to several interesting matters. In commenting on this document, one should reflect on the immediate past history of Germany. It has had two dictatorships in this century, and when the new constitution was framed it was designed to ensure that the disgraceful happenings in that country before 1945 would not occur again, so it contains built-in protection for the people. Referring to the Upper House, the publication states.

The Council of States has been able, in large measure, to counter the tendencies towards centralism which are inherent in most modern federations.

That is a most interesting comment, because in this country we have a Commonwealth Labor Government that is willing to sell out the States and to do everything to destroy the Federation. It is interesting to note that the

Upper House in West Germany consists of Ministers from each of the State Parliaments. Perhaps this would not be a bad idea, because every piece of legislation that affects the States' taxing or revenue-sharing must be passed by that Chamber. This is a good concept and perhaps something that the Constitution Convention, if allowed to continue as it is, should consider.

Mr. McAnaney: Who would we send from here?

Mr. GUNN: That is debatable, but if we sent the honourable member any financial arrangements would be in good hands because he is a good financier. On page 31 of this document (and I hope Labor members will read it), we read:

It would therefore seem that the Constitution of the Federal Republic was framed and subsequently amended so that the advantages of federalism—unity at the national level and diversity at the regional level—could be preserved, in order to secure the necessary degree of co-operation.

Those are significant comments, particularly when we consider how taxation in that country is distributed. After the Financial Reform Agreement of 1970-71, the Federal Government received 43 per cent and local government 14 per cent of wage and assessed income tax. I believe that we should consider that situation as applying to this country, because, if State Governments and local government are to continue discharging their responsibilities, they must have access to income tax revenue.

It is interesting to note that States in West Germany also have power to levy excise on beer and other beverages. This is a matter that we should consider in this State and in our federal system. I realise that on imported alcoholic beverages and on wine this may not be practicable, but in relation to beer products it would be a satisfactory way by which the States could raise revenue on what could be classed as a luxury item, and perhaps we would not have to include the types of charge that have been included in this Budget. Conveyance charges have increased astronomically, and this will make it more difficult for the average young couple in this country to own their own house, which is the basis of Liberal philosophy. It should also be the aim of every member of this Parliament and of the Commonwealth Parliament not to engage in activities that would seem deliberately to make it almost impossible for the average married couple to own their own house. This situation is forcing young married women to go to work if they want to own their house, and that is deplorable. Any member who justifies that activity should be thoroughly—

Mr. Simmons: A woman's place is in the home!

Mr. GUNN: I did not say that at all. The honourable member said it, and I do not agree with that comment. I said that, if women want to go to work, they should be allowed to, because I have nothing against that. Opposition members do not accept the Labor Party policy of directing and restricting people, but rather we encourage them. However it should not be necessary for them to work, but they are forced to work in the prevailing economic situation in this country today. The Budget details some of the increases in tax, for example, a tax on the South Australian Gas Company. What companies will be selected next? Will it be the large emporiums?

Mrs. Byrne: We may put a tax on you!

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member suggests imposing a tax on members of Parliament. I should not be surprised at anything this Government will do.

Mrs. Byrne: I mean only on the wealthy members.

Mr. GUNN: Obviously, the wealthy ones are on the Labor side, because they seem to be moaning about what I am saying. One could quote a lengthy list of taxes—

Mr. Duncan: You are called the member for Eyre because—

Mr. GUNN: It is interesting to hear personal comments from members opposite, and I have been waiting for them. The Government has reached such a low level of credibility in the community that it has decided in its own publication to engage in personal character assassination of people on this side of the House. The Labor Party has stooped to such a low standard of journalistic ethics that it has published certain articles under a pen name. I refer members to the latest edition of the *Herald*, No. 34. Members can read it in the Parliamentary Library. In the September, 1974, edition the writer uses the pen name "Shrike", because he does not have the courage of his convictions. In this respect he is not like the member for Alexandra and me and others who have been attacked. We are willing to stand behind everything we say.

Mr. Duncan: The member for Alexandra knows something about using privilege in this place.

Mr. GUNN: I have never been ashamed of anything I have said in this House, and I stand behind it. This article, under a pen name, maligns members of my Party. The writer did not have the courage to put his signature to it. The article states:

The true reactionary is not dead. Not only are Ted Chapman and Graham Gunn in full paranoid flight in the Legislative Assembly but 66-year-old Sir Arthur Rymill weaves the same old stale tales.

We are all aware that "Shrike" does not know what takes place: he did not mention that the Minister of Agriculture virtually commended the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill for what he said. I do not like an allegation over a pen name. If people want to make allegations, let them sign their names. I do not mind what people say about me, so long as they put their names to what they say. I detest slanderous attacks by such people.

Mr. Duncan: The magazine is put out under the name of the editor, who takes responsibility for what is in it. You know who he is.

Mr. GUNN: The editor did not write this article; I have already complained to him about it. I do not mind criticism, but I reject it when the writer has not the courage to sign his name. I support the Budget but with many reservations. The Government has again tried to pull the wool over the people's eyes. I hope that, when we debate next year's Budget, the Government will give clear and precise information to this House and the media about the effects of its proposals. The Government should not issue irresponsible and nonsensical press releases that have little relevance to the forms of taxation being inflicted on the people. I hope that benefits will accrue to the people, and I hope that those benefits will not be eaten up by the inflationary spiral that this Budget will inflame. My constituents want to see many projects financed. I hope that the Government will provide funds, through the Industries Development Committee, for people in outlying areas, instead of promoting restaurants for the benefit of people with dubious backgrounds.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): The most obvious weakness in the Budget is the extra \$10 000 000 allocated for the railways. We know the Australian Government's attitude: it will probably grab with both hands anything that makes a loss of about \$30 000 000. It is ridiculous

that \$40 000 000 is allocated to the railways without any effort being made to improve its operations. Receipts from suburban rail passenger services in the last financial year amounted to 26.8 per cent of working expenses; receipts from country passenger services amounted to 16.6 per cent of working expenses; and receipts from inter-system passenger services amounted to 56.7 per cent of working expenses. Why should anyone using an interstate passenger train pay only slightly more than half the cost involved? Operators of interstate passenger buses have to pay all their expenses, including petrol tax, yet they can provide a cheaper service than can the railways. Despite what the Minister of Transport has said, the railways have been spoon-fed. Receipts from freight and livestock services amounted to 75.6 per cent of working expenses. It is wrong to finance railway services by collecting increased taxes from people who may not use the railways.

The cost of the passenger service to Victor Harbor in 1972-73 was \$485 000 and the earnings amounted to \$31 000, resulting in a loss of \$454 000. The goods and livestock service to Victor Harbor resulted in a loss of \$176 000; the service to Barmera resulted in a loss of \$1 409 000; the service to Loxton, \$466 000; and the service to Waikerie, \$305 000. The Auditor-General, who at one stage was a member of the Transport Control Board, recommended the closing of these lines four or five years ago. In his report for the year ended June 30, 1974, he states:

It is clear that these lines warrant economic investigation as to their possible closure.

This is inevitable. The Government is building a modern road to Victor Harbor which will take more and more custom from the railways, as will the road being built to connect with the freeway. The Minister (and I am glad to see that he has just entered the Chamber to hear my remarks) has been the Minister for four years, during which the railway operations have deteriorated each year. Action must be taken to close certain lines. This is something on which the Government should act. The Minister knows that he will not get anywhere with the Commonwealth Government. It is utter eyewash to say that the Commonwealth will take over these lines. Action must be taken in this regard.

It is surprising to note that the number of Education Department primary pupils decreased during the year. The total number of enrolments of primary and secondary pupils decreased overall, the decrease being in respect of primary pupils. The Government should be able to improve the State's education facilities, but are they being improved? A few schools are being replaced, but it will be difficult to keep up with the demand for new schools. Admittedly, people are moving to newer areas, so the number of students in the older areas is decreasing. This is what is happening at Paringa Park Primary School, which the Government wanted to replace and at which the numbers have decreased considerably over the last two years.

Recently I asked the Minister, "What are you going to do with the wooden buildings to be removed from the school in order to erect a new one?" He replied, "We will shift them to other schools." So, they are being shifted to schools at which the numbers are expanding. What is the justification in removing wooden buildings that are being replaced with modern open-space units so that the wooden buildings may be taken to schools where the numbers are increasing? That is not logic. I know the way in which the Minister works in some respects. We should take the opportunity to catch up on education. There was

a time during the 1950's when the number of primary students increased by 15 per cent in one year, and the Government of the day provided wooden buildings, which are acceptable in other parts of the world. During the 1960's secondary students increased in large numbers as a result of the war-time baby boom. It is amazing to me that the number of pupils is not increasing now.

South Australia is stagnant with regard to population increase (there is little development here compared to some other States that are developing rapidly). The Government over the last four years has received a terrific spin from the Commonwealth Government. I am not one who believes that we should have another tax. The Government can, through better management of its affairs and as a result of development within its administration, continue to spend a greater percentage of its wealth. We cannot continue the 20 per cent increase of the last four years, otherwise the Commonwealth Grants Commission will take over.

There is the classic example of the Municipal Tramways Trust, which was actually paying its way at one time (admittedly, it was assisted by writing off loans). Gradually the trust incurred losses, and buses were taken over. The sum of \$5 000 000 has been allocated to the trust this year. Why cannot such organisations as the trust at least pay their running expenses? I see no reason why another group of people should be expected to subsidise a service used by others. Having used buses myself lately, I find that the service has improved considerably. The buses are much better: they are not so rough, and I think they travel faster than they did previously.

Mr. Simmons: How would you make the trust pay?

Mr. McANANEY: I know that it would be difficult, and I have only another 19 minutes left.

Mr. Simmons: No city in the world knows how to make its buses pay.

Mr. McANANEY: It would take an expert to make rail passenger services around Adelaide pay, but it could be done, if such services were modernised and speeded up and if parking facilities were provided near railway stations, as is to be done at Christies Beach. Country passenger services could be eliminated overnight. No-one would be any worse off, provided that the Government extended the same concessions to pensioners and students who use private buses as it does to those who now use the railways. The cost of such an operation is debited to Treasury accounts, and it would make no difference to the Budget. I agree that it is a difficult situation, but the present attitude of the Government is to accept it as a matter of course. The principle seems to be that it is unnecessary to make a service pay.

Every effort must be made to ensure that a service pays, by increasing its efficiency and by looking at it from that angle. This year, the State Government has not received as much money from the Commonwealth Government as it has in recent years. I remember the Treasurer returning three or four years ago and saying that John Gorton was not giving him an adequate share of Commonwealth money. Mr. Gorton said, "If you are dissatisfied, put up a case to the Grants Commission. You all agreed that you would not go to the commission. I will let you break that agreement and, if you are dissatisfied, you can appeal to the commission." What have we received from the commission? The sum of \$75 000 000 over a three-year period. At that stage, Mr. Gorton agreed to write off \$200 000 000 each year for State aid grants that did not have to be repaid. This meant about \$282 000 000 to the State Budget. There is

a limit to the proportion of the gross national product a State can spend, and it is up to the Government to check its expenditure.

I know that the Treasurer has said he will reduce to about 5 per cent the growth rate in the Public Service, even though it has been running at the rate of 8 per cent for some years. We must analyse whether we are getting that much more benefit from the Government's activities. This is a disappointing Budget. Although tremendous sums are to be spent by the Government, we see no indication of what benefits people will receive. Contributions to the arts and to the film corporation will be doubled and, although I do not object to this, I wonder whether our money is being used to the best effect when we have young people who have agreed to purchase houses and who now run the risk of losing them. We are getting into a precarious situation.

Last year we had practically a balanced Budget, largely because of increases in pay-roll tax caused by inflation and also increases in stamp duties. I quote the comments of Dr. Cairns when I say we will be running into trouble with unemployment. Revenue from pay-roll tax will drop, and we will see a slowing down in business activities. Receipts in stamp duties will fall, and suddenly we will face a situation similar to that which prevailed in the depression, and we will be in serious trouble.

Earlier today I spoke of 52 people in Strathalbyn who were out of work. Commonwealth officers visited Strathalbyn and those people are now being paid under the retraining scheme. One wanted to be trained in certain aspects of colour television, but there appeared to be no-one to train him. The Commonwealth officers seemed to have no interest in how the people were to be retrained or what would be done with them when they were trained. Obviously, they would have to leave Strathalbyn. Surely, if we are to have decentralisation and control the growth of Adelaide, every effort must be made to develop industry in country towns where housing is available and where people are willing to work.

Some members opposite seemed to think that price control would have been the answer to our problems. However, no authority can refuse a price increase when wages have gone up. Although the price of the wheat in a loaf of bread is little higher today than it was 10 year ago, the price of the loaf is vastly different. The manufacturers apparently are not making excessive profits, so the increase is going into wages. In turn, the higher price is paid by the people who earn those wages. What advantage is the rapid acceleration of wages in that situation? Strikes in New South Wales have cost the wheat-growers millions of dollars, and at the same time the Government has received lower returns for freight.

We have been told of inflation in other countries. We had a golden opportunity in Australia, because our food prices did not rise to the same extent as food prices in other countries. We did not have to import very much oil. The reason for the current inflationary trend is the Commonwealth Budget. In June and July of last year we had a balanced economy. The Commonwealth Government had made promises to give handouts and not to increase taxation; therefore, it budgeted for a deficit of \$700 000 000, creating immediate shortages. Employers were bidding for labour, and unions were in a position to exert pressure. The Chrysler firm

paid \$80 a week for 18-year-old unskilled workers, although some skilled tradesmen are not receiving much more than that now. The situation is one of shocking injustice, yet the wages that have increased in the past two months have not yet been absorbed in the cost structure.

My son sold his wool today and got exactly half the price he received last year. His land tax has increased, his council rates have gone up by 25 per cent, and he would not be making any more than a cleaner in a city store, although he works at least 75 hours a week. He may have to sack his man. I am an optimistic person. I went through the depression, and I did not like that, but I wonder how we are going to avoid a depression in these circumstances. People become isolationists; they become parochial. They will not let sheep be exported live because they may miss the opportunity of killing them. If other countries buy goods from us and if we buy from them goods they can produce more cheaply, we are improving our living standards.

A Commonwealth Government report on the motor car industry states that action will be taken, and a forecast has been made for eight years ahead. However, last January experts stated that the price of beef would be good for 10 years and they told people to grow more beef, but what happened? The price of cows now is about one-third of the price in January and the price of yearling beef is about half the January price, so it still costs more to buy a steak than it cost before the price dropped. How can anyone forecast so far ahead?

The car industry has priced itself out of the world market. It was admittedly cutting the price to get markets, but an industry can do that in order to export the additional cars that it can produce. Tooling-up costs are lower in those circumstances. We will lose oversea sales for cars and be flooded with imports. Some people say that these cars will not be allowed to come into the country, but if we do not trade with other parts of the world, they will not buy the goods that we can produce more cheaply. All I can see ahead is heartbreak for the many young people who thought that they would be able to pay off their houses in about 20 years or 30 years but have found that they will be paying them off for about 60 years.

Another aspect is that many unskilled people are earning about \$200 a week and enjoying far better conditions than are other workers. If we had experts in Canberra, they could easily straighten out the financial mess and get us back on an even keel, but I ask how we can overcome the difficulty of having some people underpaid and some overpaid. Under these conditions, small industries in my district will disappear in a year or two. I forecast that the Commonwealth Budget to be introduced next week will aggravate the position, and if I am proved to be incorrect I will admit in this House that I under-estimated the present Commonwealth Government. That Government has proved to me that it is completely incapable of dealing with the present situation. I ask whether Dr. Cairns is trying to destroy a system under which free enterprise can flourish. Although he is not a fool, why has he acted like one in regard to running the country?

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 11, at 2 p.m.