

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, September 9, 1975

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

### PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

MR. WARDLE presented a petition signed by 39 residents of South Australia stating that the burden of succession duties on a surviving spouse, particularly a widow, had become, with inflation, far too heavy to bear and ought, in all fairness and justice, to be removed. The petitioners prayed that the House would pass an amendment to the Succession Duties Act to abolish succession duties on that part of an estate passing to a surviving spouse.

Petition received.

### PETITION: LOTTERY AND GAMING REGULATIONS

MR. COUMBE presented a petition signed by 118 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the disallowance of the regulations made under the Lottery and Gaming Act regarding cash ticket machines and roulette wheels and permit licensed clubs to install such machines on a ratio in proportion to membership.

Petition received.

### STATE BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

### ASSENT TO BILLS

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

- Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment (Sex Discrimination),
- Stamp Duties Act Amendment.

### AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June, 30, 1975.

Ordered that report be printed.

### QUESTIONS

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

#### INDUSTRIAL TRAINING

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. Why has the Minister not proceeded with legislation to constitute the authority of the Industrial Training Council?
2. Is it proposed to introduce such enabling legislation and, if not, why not?

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

1. Cabinet has approved of an appropriate Bill being drafted, but the Bill is not yet finalised.
2. See No. 1.

#### FULLARTON CROSSING

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Does the Minister intend taking any action to expedite the installation of the urgently needed pedestrian crossing on Fullarton Road between Fisher Street and Ferguson Avenue near the Fullarton shopping centre?

2. What crossings are ahead of this crossing on the list of priorities?

3. At the current rate of progress, when is it likely that the requested crossing will be installed?

4. How many accidents involving pedestrians have occurred on this section of Fullarton Road?

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

1. It is intended to install a pedestrian crossing on Fullarton Road, at Ferguson Avenue, as soon as resources permit, and in accordance with existing priorities.

- (2) (1) Main North Road, Prospect.
- (2) Henley Beach Road, Thebarton.
- (3) Cheltenham Parade, Woodville.
- (4) Fullarton Road, Rose Park.
- (5) Churchill Road, Enfield.
- (6) Port Road, Hindmarsh.
- (7) North-East Road, Holden Hill.

3. During the 1977-1978 financial year.

4. Two over the past five years.

#### MAIN ROAD No. 436

Mr. VENNING (on notice):

1. Will the Minister take the necessary action to have the Port Broughton to Merriton Main Road No. 436 sealed and, if so, how soon can this work be completed?

2. If it is not possible to seal this road, why not?

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

- 1 and 2. All but 5.2 kilometres of this main road have been sealed. However, due to lack of funds, rising costs and relative priority with other roads throughout South Australia, it is unlikely that this remaining section will be sealed in less than five years time. In the meantime, this section will be maintained in a reasonable condition by the District Council of Redhill with grants from the Highways Department.

#### JAMESTOWN ROADWORKS

Mr. VENNING (on notice):

1. Why has a grant not been made to the Jamestown corporation for at least two years, to enable it to carry out urgent road works?

2. Will the Minister take the necessary action to enable funds to be made available to both the corporation and the district council for the purpose of preparing and sealing the South Terrace Boundary Road at Jamestown?

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

1. The Jamestown corporation's application for grants for the last two years were for minor roads under its care, control and management. The requests have been examined on more than one occasion, but bearing in mind the overall needs of the State coupled with the level of funds available, it was considered that the projects did not qualify for assistance. This position still applies.

2. Neither the corporation nor the district council has made application to the Highways Department for grant assistance for this road over the past two years.

#### CAVAN BRIDGE

Mr. VENNING (on notice): Are plans in hand to build another road bridge on the Port Wakefield Road over the railway line at Cavan and, if not, what action does the Government intend taking to overcome the congestion caused by traffic converging from the dual highway on to the present single-lane bridge?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

## BEEF INDUSTRY

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. How many applications have been received for assistance under the Beef Industry Assistance scheme?
2. How many applications have been successful?
3. What are the reasons for the rejection of the unsuccessful applications?
4. Is it now proposed to widen the criteria for assistance to beef producers?
5. What is the amount of money paid under this scheme to the successful applicants?

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

1. Applications received—126.
2. Applications approved—34. Funds approved—\$278 500. Applications rejected—60.
3. Main reasons for rejection are non-specialist beef producer or sub-economic proposal with the assistance available.
4. The question of widening the criteria for assistance to beef producers is currently the subject of investigation by the Australian Agricultural Council.
5. Funds paid to successful applicants are \$179 000.

## VOTING FIGURES

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What number of persons was enrolled for each House of Assembly district for the election on July 12, 1975?
2. What number of people voted in each district on that occasion?
3. How many "please explain" notices were forwarded to persons within each district who appeared to have failed to vote?
4. How many persons answered:
  - (a) claiming that they were enrolled on more than one roll; or
  - (b) claiming that they had voted?
5. How many persons have paid for their failure to vote?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows: 1, 2 and 3. See Appendix A.

4. (a) The number of electors answered claiming that they were enrolled on more than one roll was 255.
- (b) The number of electors answered claiming they had voted was 3 715.
5. To date no elector has paid for his or her failure to vote.

## APPENDIX A

House of Assembly District	No. of electors on roll	No. of electors who voted	"Please explain" notices sent
	(a)	(b)	(c)
Adelaide . . . . .	17 483	15 940	603
Albert Park . . . . .	18 520	17 282	650
Alexandra . . . . .	13 075	12 224	493
Ascot Park . . . . .	16 906	15 919	415
Bragg . . . . .	16 364	15 026	616
Brighton . . . . .	19 990	18 814	526
Chaffey . . . . .	12 416	11 652	396
Coles . . . . .	21 003	19 892	642
Davenport . . . . .	19 277	18 006	385
Elizabeth . . . . .	19 595	18 053	1 122
Eyre . . . . .	10 073	9 004	566
Fisher . . . . .	21 040	19 670	710
Flinders . . . . .	11 832	11 185	360
Florey . . . . .	21 858	20 525	629
Frome . . . . .	8 612	7 889	324
Gilles . . . . .	19 187	17 939	564
Glenelg . . . . .	18 650	17 353	588

## APPENDIX A—continued

House of Assembly District	No. of electors on roll	No. of electors who voted	"Please explain" notices sent
	(a)	(b)	(c)
Gouger . . . . .	10 594	10 039	251
Goyder . . . . .	10 776	10 310	173
Hanson . . . . .	19 784	18 325	679
Henley Beach . . . . .	20 744	19 436	773
Heyesen . . . . .	12 932	12 092	400
Kavel . . . . .	10 850	10 344	249
Light . . . . .	12 199	11 519	243
Mallee . . . . .	10 772	10 231	318
Mawson . . . . .	33 440	31 435	1 134
Millicent . . . . .	11 607	11 080	105
Mitcham . . . . .	17 341	16 181	738
Mitchell . . . . .	17 880	16 886	395
Mount Gambier . . . . .	12 452	11 805	347
Murray . . . . .	12 136	11 530	273
Norwood . . . . .	18 010	16 335	586
Peake . . . . .	17 277	16 225	535
Pirie . . . . .	11 095	10 537	316
Playford . . . . .	25 412	23 762	1 004
Price . . . . .	16 915	15 891	913
Rocky River . . . . .	10 394	10 030	111
Ross Smith . . . . .	16 646	15 499	506
Salisbury . . . . .	19 075	17 696	861
Semaphore . . . . .	18 740	17 822	608
Spence . . . . .	16 680	15 515	512
Stuart . . . . .	14 692	13 624	802
Tea Tree Gully . . . . .	30 764	29 105	840
Torrens . . . . .	17 302	15 905	574
Unley . . . . .	16 422	15 195	562
Victoria . . . . .	11 093	10 390	341
Whyalla . . . . .	11 509	10 653	461

Total for State: (All districts contested) . . 771 414 721 770 25 199

## LAND COMMISSION

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What are the locations and number of serviced allotments the South Australian Land Commission has:—
  - (a) totally developed from broad acres; and
  - (b) completed after buying partly created subdivisions?
2. How many allotments are being developed by the commission?
3. How many have been sold and what was the individual allotment price?
4. How many are for sale and what is the individual allotment price?
5. In what areas does the commission own land and what is the amount in hectares in each location?

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

1. The South Australian Land Commission has produced 298 serviced allotments in the Happy Valley subdivision in the Noarlunga District Council area. These were completed after buying a partly created subdivision. No other allotments have as yet been completed.

2. The Commission has land under varying stages of development. On-site work is currently proceeding as under:

	Allotments
Salisbury . . . . .	772
Noarlunga . . . . .	113
Marion . . . . .	168
Meadows . . . . .	130
Tea Tree Gully . . . . .	898
	<b>2 081</b>

- 3 and 4. As at September 1, 1975, 86 allotments were sold, leaving 212 still to be sold. Actual lots sold and unsold and individual prices are available in brochures

and price lists which may be obtained from the office of the S.A. Land Commission.

5. The Commission has acquired the following land up to September 1, 1975:

URBAN LAND ACQUIRED TO SEPTEMBER 1, 1975

Local Government Area	Area (Ha.)
Tea Tree Gully . . . . .	1263.32
Meadows . . . . .	170.67
Salisbury . . . . .	187.06
Munno Para . . . . .	604.22
Noarlunga . . . . .	870.05
Marion . . . . .	117.07
Port Adelaide . . . . .	1.22
West Torrens . . . . .	0.76
	<u>3 214.37</u>

OPEN SPACE ACQUISITIONS TO SEPTEMBER 1, 1975

Local Government Area	Area (Ha.)
Marion . . . . .	53.10
Noarlunga . . . . .	88.06
Willunga . . . . .	181.35
Noarlunga . . . . .	379.39
Salisbury/Tea Tree Gully . . . . .	56.98
Meadows/Stirling . . . . .	142.91
Munno Para . . . . .	2.65
Campbelltown/East Torrens . . . . .	166.25
Munno Para . . . . .	2.43
Tea Tree Gully . . . . .	12.98
Mitcham . . . . .	20.62
	<u>1 106.72</u>

MONARTO

Mr. EVANS (on notice): Now that the Commonwealth Government has given this State breathing space for the reassessment of Monarto, will the Minister give a guarantee that the only work carried out in Monarto in the next 12 months will be caring for the trees already planted?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As I have stated in the House on several occasions, the reduction in the level of funds made available by the Australian Government for Monarto does not mean that the project will not proceed at a reasonable rate in the next 12 months. In fact, the budget for 1975-76 now under consideration will provide a total expenditure of about \$4 000 000 and this will enable land acquisitions to be completed, essential planning studies and research and design work to continue, completion of the nursery project, on-going site maintenance, and a continuance of the tree planting programme. All these activities are related to the requirement that construction works on subdivision development, roads, sewerage, and water supply headworks will commence at Monarto next financial year. The effect of the reduction in funds available from the Australian Government will be to defer the Monarto programme for about 12-18 months only; and the abovementioned activities for the current financial year take this into account.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. To what work, other than on the Monarto project, is the Monarto Development Commission committed during the current financial year and at what expected remuneration to members and employees of the commission and to the Government, respectively?

2. Is any other work, in addition to any above, in contemplation and, if so, what is it?

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

1. To date there are no other commitments, although discussions are proceeding with the Australian Government

for work as a service to the Darwin Reconstruction Commission. There will be no remuneration to members and employees of the commission for such work, but the Monarto Development Commission will receive a fee for service similar to payments made to a consultant.

2. Discussions have been held with the Land Commission and the State Planning Authority on the possibility of the commission undertaking planning and related work for these authorities in the Adelaide region. It should be understood that the Monarto Development Commission, with a relatively small professional staff, will not be in a position to undertake a great deal of outside work as its first priority will be to the Monarto programme. With a budget of about \$4 000 000 for 1975-76 and the need to gear up for the commencement of construction at Monarto in 1976-77, the excess capacity of the commission staff to undertake other work will be quite limited.

HOUSING TRUST PROGRAMME

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many applications does the Housing Trust have before it at present?

2. What proportions of the applications relate to the type of housing and purchase plans offered?

3. On average, based on the previous two months, how many applications are received weekly?

4. How many houses were completed by the Housing Trust during the first six months of 1975?

5. On average, based on the previous two months, how many applications are granted a week?

6. Is there a delay in fulfilling applications and, if so, what is the cause of this delay?

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

1. It is extremely difficult for the Housing Trust to quote a specific number of outstanding applications which could be considered to be current at any given time. Further, the value of such a figure is doubtful because of the applicants' requirements be they economic, location, type or size of dwelling. The Housing Trust's experience has been that many thousands of applicants lodge their application as a precaution and actually do find alternative satisfactory accommodation before they come into line for a Housing Trust house. However, the Housing Trust is required, under the present Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement, to provide the Australian Department of Housing and Construction with a figure virtually based on the number of applications held in the Housing Trust's files. This figure does not allow for wastage which could be for some types of houses as high as 50 per cent. At present there are 27 700 applications in the Housing Trust's files.

2. Rental:

Family-type accommodation . . . . .	16 007
Cottage Flats (elderly persons) . . . . .	3 096
	<u>19 103</u>
Purchase Schemes:	8 597
	<u>27 700</u>

3. Rental: . . . . . 167  
Purchase Schemes . . . . . 70

237

4. 873, including 71 cottage flats for elderly persons.

5. It should be pointed out here that in addition to allocations of new houses, the Housing Trust, like all public housing authorities in Australia, relies extensively

on vacancies occurring in its existing rental houses. The average weekly allocations over the previous two months numbered 83.

6. The waiting time varies from two-bedroom to three-bedroom accommodation; the demand is stronger for ground floor walk-up flat accommodation than for the top third floor and it varies considerably from area to area. To give some idea of the situation, the following examples are supplied:—

- (a) For three-bedroomed rental housing in the metropolitan area in some suburbs, those who applied in late 1971 and early 1972 are now being offered accommodation.
- (b) In the Elizabeth and Salisbury areas, those who applied 21-24 months ago are now being offered rental housing.
- (c) For pensioner accommodation for single persons applications lodged in 1968-69 are currently being processed.
- (d) In the country areas, it varies from six months at Wallaroo and Crystal Brook to more than two years at Berri, Ceduna and Waikerie.

The three major sources of supply of accommodation for Housing Trust applicants are:—

New housing;  
Special rental housing; and  
Vacancies.

As announced during 1974-75 the Housing Trust completions of new accommodation numbered 1 589, an increase of 18.7 per cent on the previous year, whilst the number of houses under construction at the commencement of this financial year was 45 per cent higher than the corresponding period in 1974. The trust's low interest money obtained under the Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement is used for the provision of rental housing and the total amount provided has not been sufficient to enable the Housing Trust to reduce the waiting time to any extent. However, the decision to purchase older houses in the city and inner city areas has enabled the trust to assist many hundreds of families in urgent need. The vacancy rate from existing dwellings has fallen considerably. Examples of fall in the major areas is shown on the following table:

Area	1973-74	1974-75	Percentage Drop
Metropolitan area . . . . .	827	760	8.1
Christies Beach . . . . .	53	39	26.5
Salisbury/Elizabeth . . . .	902	684	24.2
Whyalla . . . . .	744	507	31.9

Finally, it is pointed out that, because of the number involved and because of the long waiting time, one of the Housing Trust's greatest responsibilities lies in the selection of its tenants, and it has long felt that the fairest basis of selection is date of application. However, this is departed from in many cases during the year where the degree of urgency is considered to be so extreme that the Housing Trust affords priority housing.

#### EMERGENCY FIRE SERVICES

Mr. GUNN (on notice): When is it expected that the new Emergency Fire Services headquarters will be constructed at Mile End?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member was told during discussions on the Public Purposes Loan Bill on August 28, the building programme for the country fire services headquarters complex cannot be determined until the current review of fire prevention services in South Australia has been completed.

#### EYRE DISTRICT ROADS

Mr. GUNN (on notice): How much money is it expected will be spent this financial year on the Talia to Streaky Bay section of the Flinders Highway and the Cummins to Tumby Bay road, respectively?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: An amount of \$50 000 has been provided for the construction and maintenance of the Talia to Streaky Bay section of the Flinders Highway in 1975-76. The district council of Tumby Bay has been allocated \$2 400, subject to a contribution of \$600 to maintain the unsealed length of the Cummins to Tumby Bay road, whilst the Highways Department will maintain the sealed portion at the Cummins end at an estimated expenditure not exceeding \$500.

#### NEW MARKET

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. When does the Government expect the new wholesale fruit and vegetable market will be completed?
2. Where will the proposed new market be sited?
3. How much land will be available at the site?
4. Who will be charged with the responsibility of operating the new market?
5. Will producers be represented on any authority administering the new market?

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

1. The tentative date set by the East End Market Relocation Committee for the completion of the market is the end of 1978.
2. The market will be situated on land currently held by the Department of Agriculture at Northfield.
3. The market site will occupy at least 30 acres.
4. No decision has been made regarding who will be charged with the responsibility of operating the new market. The Committee will make a recommendation on this matter in due course.
5. Whether producers will be represented on any authority which administers the new market will be considered by the committee, which will make its recommendations to the Government in due course.

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Does the Government intend to introduce a Fruit and Vegetable Marketing Act on similar lines to Acts now operating in other States and, if so, when?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is probable that marketing legislation of this nature would be enacted in conjunction with any decision to establish a new produce market for the Adelaide metropolitan area, a project that is now under investigation; but there are no current plans for the introduction of such a Bill during the present session of Parliament.

#### INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Will the Premier give consideration to the State Government Insurance Commission providing special insurance cover for people who wish to take out State succession duties protection insurance cover so that such policies could be assigned to the Treasurer and not be included in a person's estate?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The suggested proposal to meet succession duties payments could only be obtained through a life insurance policy. I would remind members that my Government introduced a Bill last year to permit the State Government Insurance Commission to (among other things) conduct life insurance business. Unfortunately, that particular measure was rejected by the Legislative Council.

### MASSAGE PARLOURS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. Has the Government any intention of introducing legislation to control massage parlours?

2. Is any effort being made with existing legislation to keep some sort of control over the ever-increasing number of massage parlours?

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

1. Consideration is being given to such legislation but there are some doubts as to its efficacy and possible side effects.

2. There is no way of limiting the number of massage parlours under existing legislation.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice):

1. In the past 12 months how many raids have police made on massage parlours and how many offences have there been that police can trace directly to these parlours?

2. Do the police keep regular checks on massage parlours, and what percentage do they consider are legitimate and what percentage are fronts for brothels?

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

1. Vice Squad police visited massage parlours on 959 occasions during the 12 months period ended July 31, 1975. Forty-nine persons were found in circumstances which required a police report. Of these, 13 have been convicted for offences involving brothels, prostitution and living off the proceeds of prostitution, two have been remanded, two are wanted on warrants for failing to answer to the charges and seven summonses have been issued but not served due to inability to locate the offenders. Three persons who would otherwise have been charged were called as witnesses for the prosecution and not charged. In 22 instances charges were considered but were not proceeded with.

2. The police keep regular checks on massage parlours. However, as there are a number of other establishments supplying massage and physical culture, which are not suspected of improper practices, an overall percentage is not available.

### HACKNEY REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What is the present stage of development of the Hackney redevelopment plan?

2. Has the Government accepted the revised proposals of the Hackney Project Committee and, if so, what are these proposals?

3. What is the total amount of money spent by the Government on this development project as at June 30, 1975?

4. What is the total area of land purchased by the South Australian Housing Trust for this development project?

5. What is the expected final expenditure by the South Australian Government on this project?

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

1. A total of 35 buildings have been demolished leaving approximately one and one half acres of land for redevelopment; planning is advanced for the erection of a medium density housing complex comprising 19 units on portion of the cleared site; one old terrace, containing six houses, has been rehabilitated and let, a further four houses are nearing completion.

2. The revised proposals by the Hackney Project Committee are under consideration by the Government.

3. The amount of money recovered from the Government by the South Australian Housing Trust is \$458 997.94.

4. 4.186 acres.

5. To answer this question, some of the outstanding factors to be resolved include a final road layout; river bank improvements; acquisition costs for the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization establishment, and if the prevailing economic constraints may enable subsidies from the Australian Government for both student and aged persons' accommodation to be included in the scheme.

### PENANG EXHIBITION

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Is Adelaide Week in Penang to be held from December 2 to December 8, 1975?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

### PARLIAMENTARY SITTINGS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. When will the Speaker of the House of Assembly be overseas on his trip, planned for next year?

2. For what months does the Government intend Parliament to sit during the first six months of 1976?

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

1. March 16, 1976, until April 6, 1976.

2. No autumn sittings of the House are at present planned.

### ABATTOIRS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Did the South Australian Meat Corporation make a profit for the year ended June 30, 1975, and, if so, how much was it?

2. If there was a loss, how much was it and what action, if any, is to be taken as a result?

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

1. No.

2. \$218 733 net (subject to audit). For the current financial year, the Board of the South Australian Meat Corporation has budgeted for a small net profit.

### PRIORITY ROAD CROSSINGS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What action, if any, does the Government propose to take so that pedestrians may be able to cross priority roads with greater safety?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is not considered that roads treated as priority roads will as a consequence become more hazardous to pedestrians. Traffic signals and pedestrian crossings will be installed on priority roads where justified.

### HYDE PARK INTERSECTION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many accidents have there been in the past 12 months at the intersection of King William Road with Park Street and Mitchell Street, Hyde Park, and how many of these have involved fatality?

2. What action, if any, is it proposed to take to improve safety at this intersection?

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

1. During 1974 there were 19 vehicular accidents at this intersection. During the period January to July, 1975, there have been nine accidents. No fatalities are recorded during either period.

2. This intersection is the responsibility of the Corporation of the City of Unley. The council is investigating its safety aspects.

### MONTACUTE ROAD BUILDING

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. For what purpose will the building which is currently under construction by the Public Buildings Department on Montacute Road be used?

2. What is the expected total cost of this building and when will it be completed?

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

1. Community welfare purposes.
2. \$360 000; June, 1976.

#### BOATING BOOKLET

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Has the Government published a booklet entitled *Safe Boating in South Australia*, and if so:

- (a) when;
- (b) where is it available and at what price;
- (c) for what purpose has it been published; and
- (d) is the Government satisfied that none of the statements in it is ambiguous and, if it is not so satisfied, what action, if any, is it proposed to take to correct the ambiguities?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The reply is as follows: Yes.

- (a) June 17, 1975.
- (b) The booklet is available free of charge from any office of the Marine and Harbors Department, the Lands Department at Barmera, Berri, Loxton, Murray Bridge and Waikerie, the Agriculture Department at Renmark, and the Motor Registration Division at Mount Gambier. It is also distributed by resident boating patrol officers at Murray Bridge, Barmera, Port Broughton and Wangary.
- (c) Its main purpose is to explain in concise and readable terms the boating legislation of South Australia. It is intended also to assist those persons who will be required to take the examination for a motor boat operator's licence.
- (d) Yes. However, the Marine and Harbors Department is taking steps to make the meaning of paragraph 2 of page 9, taken from the Boating Act itself, quite clear.

#### SOMERTON HOME

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (August 27).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, a decision has been made. The Government has decided not to purchase the property.

#### JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

In reply to Mr. DUNCAN (August 14).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The following is an answer to the question asked by the honourable member on August 14, 1975, on the question of whether a newly appointed justice of the peace may make an affirmation in lieu of the oath of allegiance and the judicial oath. Section 7 (1) of the Oaths Act, 1936-1969, provides that every justice of the peace shall, as soon as may be after his acceptance of office, take the oath of allegiance and the judicial oath. Subsection (4) of that section provides that the oaths to be taken by justices of the peace shall be taken in the manner prescribed by the Justices Act, 1921. Sections 8 and 11 of the Oaths Act respectively, provide for the form of oath of allegiance and the form of judicial oath. Section 10 of the Justices Act provides that the oath of allegiance and the judicial oath may be taken before a Judge of the Supreme Court, Special Magistrate or a Commissioner for taking Affidavits in the Supreme Court. The section goes on to provide that the oath shall be subscribed by the person taking it and attested by the person before whom it is taken. The form of oaths referred to in section 10 of the Justices

Act are those provided in sections 8 and 11 of the Oaths Act. Section 13 of the Oaths Act provides:

Any person may make an affirmation in lieu of taking the oath required by the Constitution Act, 1934, or any oath of allegiance, official oath, oath of fidelity or judicial oath.

Section 14 provides for the form of affirmation. I see nothing in the provisions of section 10 of the Justices Act, or any other provisions of that Act, which ousts the operation of section 13 of the Oaths Act. Section 10 simply provides for the persons by whom the oaths are to be taken, and the subsequent subscription and attestation. In my opinion, section 13 of the Oaths Act applies to the requirement that a justice of the peace shall take the oath of allegiance and judicial oath and that, in lieu of taking such oaths, a person appointed as a justice of the peace may make an affirmation as provided in the Oaths Act, 1936-1969.

#### ORROROO AREA SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. VENNING (August 26).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have recently approved the painting of Orroroo Area School at an estimated cost of \$40 000. Specifications have been prepared and tenders will be called this month. As the duration of the contract will be at least three months, it will not be practicable for the painting to be carried out before the centenary celebrations.

#### AMERICAN RIVER WATER SUPPLY

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (August 26).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In 1972 a scheme to supply a reticulated water supply to American River was submitted to the Public Works Standing Committee for investigation. This scheme was known as the short route and basically was a scheme designed for American River only. However landholders adjacent to the short route objected to paying rates, and a request was made to investigate an alternative route bringing in a larger number of landholders in the hundreds of Seddon, McGillivray and Haines who expressed a wish to have a reticulated water supply. The scheme is referred to as the long route. A plan has been prepared showing the location of the properties on the long route and includes spur mains to supply the majority of landholders who require water to their properties which do not abut the route of the proposed pipeline. A scheme has been designed to provide a water supply to the landholders and American River. However, before the scheme can be assessed financially, it is necessary to prepare an up to date revenue statement. Steps are now being taken to have this statement prepared.

#### IRRIGATION SCHEMES

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (August 7).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Lands has told me that the location of the pump on the Murray River proper was included by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works in its consideration of the Chaffey Irrigation Area (Rehabilitation of Irrigation Head-works) in May-October, 1970. It was found that although such a location would give a more assured supply of fresh quality water, the substantial additional expenditure involved (\$630 000 at 1970 costs) made this an uneconomical proposition. The present-day cost would be in the order of \$2 000 000. To install a gravity pipeline to convey water from the river to the creek would require the laying of some 3.6 kilometres of at least 1 500 mm diameter pipeline across the river flats at depths in excess of 6 metres.

A cost in excess of \$2 500 000 could be expected and this proposal is not feasible. An examination of the results of salinity test samples taken from Ral Ral Creek adjacent to the Chaffey Pumping Station regularly over the past 15 years shows that excluding the very low periods 1965-67 and following the high river in 1974, there is no indication of an increasing level in the salinity of water available for irrigation at this site. The occurrence of similar river conditions in the future would again result in a temporary increase in salinity. Investigation will continue into ways and means of minimising the effect of these occurrences.

#### ABALONE DIVERS

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (August 14).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague the Minister of Fisheries does not accept the contention that applicants for abalone permits have insufficient time to obtain X-ray results for inclusion in the medical certificates required to accompany their application. However, he has agreed to extend the date for lodgment of applications with the Fisheries Department until September 15. The Minister has assured me that the confidentiality of information furnished in the medical certificate will be strictly observed and medical data will not be divulged to any persons except Government officials or authorities who require such information in connection with decisions on the granting of permits.

#### TIMBER INDUSTRY

In reply to Mr. ALLISON (August 12).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague the Minister of Forests informs me that the State Government is currently negotiating with Modulock (N.Z.) Ltd. for the purpose of entering a joint venture to manufacture Modulock homes in South Australia. The South Australian Housing Trust is very interested in the project. The honourable member can be assured that if particle board (chip board) is required in the construction of these homes local manufacturers of the product at Mount Gambier will be given every consideration.

#### VEHICLE LIGHTING

In reply to Mr. KENEALLY (August 5).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The principle of the Cyberlite safety light system in which a rearward facing lamp is caused to flash whenever the vehicle to which it is fitted decelerates, was brought to the attention of Australian road safety authorities in 1968. The principle has been referred to the Advisory Committee on Vehicle Performance on a number of occasions but has not been recommended as a mandatory fitment due to a continuing lack of evidence that this additional information system would enhance the alertness of following drivers to rapid changes in the traffic environment rather than contribute to driver fatigue, confusion and annoyance. However, at the December, 1974, meeting of the A.C.V.P., the committee was advised that the system is to be considered in a study of vehicle lighting systems currently being conducted by the College of Optometry of Melbourne University. Furthermore, a review of overseas experience with devices of this type is to be made by the Secretariat to the A.C.V.P.

In view of the current studies being made into this system, it is felt that it would be premature to embark upon a local testing system based on the results of an overseas experiment which used a limited number of a particular class of vehicle operating in a traffic environment substantially different to that which exists in South

Australia. In addition, use of Government vehicles would not provide a representative sample since the majority of these vehicles are not operated during peak traffic conditions or at night.

#### PRIORITY ROADS

In reply to Mr. MAX BROWN (August 21).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is expected that the priority road system now being developed in the metropolitan area will be extended to cover the entire State over the next few years. To maximise the benefits to the travelling public, it is considered essential to convert roads in order based on traffic flows and accidents, with all important roads within one area being treated before moving to the next. Based on these principles, the metropolitan area should be treated first, and planning is proceeding on the assumption that it will be possible to treat all the important metropolitan routes by the 1977-78 financial year, after which other areas will be converted. It is likely that priority roads will be introduced to Whyalla shortly following completion of treatment in the metropolitan area. With respect to Nicholson Avenue, the Highways Department is actively collaborating with the Whyalla council in planning safety and traffic improvement measures for implementation on that road. The treatment of Nicholson Avenue as a priority road would not provide a complete solution to that road's traffic problems, and the introduction of those measures now under consideration by the Highways Department and the Council will still be necessary.

#### STREET CLOSURES

In reply to Mr. LANGLEY (August 6).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A full report on this study will not be available until mid 1976. Accident collation for a minimum period of 12 months is necessary in order that the final analysis contains no statistical bias. Furthermore, one change to the original proposals of some significance is the Wattle Street closure. It has been agreed to incorporate this proposal in the study and for the results to be analysed over a six month period. The Road Traffic Board is currently analysing data on accidents as it comes to hand and for the two month period immediately after the roads were closed, accidents were reduced by approximately 64 per cent in the internal road system and on the peripheral arterial roads by 47 per cent. These reductions are tentative only and could be subject to change over a full 12 month period. It is, however, encouraging at this stage. An attitude survey on the ratepayers in the area is currently in hand. This survey should confirm the verbal opinions expressed by the ratepayers of the overall improvement to their living environment in the way of noise reduction, road safety and reduction in traffic movement through the area. Apart from minor problems, the study appears to have been successful. However, for conclusive evidence, it will be necessary to analyse the data over a longer period than two months, to be certain that the trend is confirmed and unbiased in any way.

#### KANGAROO ISLAND TRANSPORT

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (August 28).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Following discussions with the Commissioner of Highways, I have approved of a variation in cargo rates for transport of sheep and cattle from Kangaroo Island to Port Adelaide on the m.v. *Troubridge* until further notice. Full freight rates will apply to loaded stock trailers from Kangaroo Island, but

the charge previously incurred in returning empty trailers to Kingscote will be remitted. This in effect will reduce *Troubridge* freight rates by approximately 25 per cent. The concession will be kept under review and adjusted as soon as the stock market conditions improve. It is hoped that farmers on Kangaroo Island will use this benefit to ship stock to the mainland and that other components of the freighting industry will also modify some costs during this difficult period.

#### GOODWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. LANGLEY (August 21).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is expected that the remainder of the classroom accommodation at the Goodwood Primary School will be ready for occupation by the end of September and that all siteworks will be completed by December of this year. An official opening is usually arranged following a request by the Principal and school council to the Minister of Education.

#### KAROONDA AREA SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. NANKIVELL (August 21).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The term "a five year plan" is rather a misnomer. To call it a five stage plan would be more accurate. In 1975-76, the Public Buildings Department hopes to carry out stage I of the redevelopment which consists of the replacement of toilets, upgrading of two dual wooden units to provide flexible teaching areas and the modification of a dual unit. No date has been fixed for the next or any subsequent stage.

#### LOVE METRES

In reply to Mr. MAX BROWN (August 19).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Investigations by officers of the Public Health Department confirm that the love metres contain methylene chloride which is a hazardous substance classified under schedule 5 under the poisons regulations of the Food and Drugs Regulations which require specific labelling of containers for this substance. The love metres do not comply with the regulations and the distributor has been informed accordingly. Stocks will be withheld and a list of sales is being obtained to enable each retailer (or sideshow proprietor) to be informed that the articles do not comply with the regulations and that it is also an offence under the poisons regulations for these articles to be given away. Methylene chloride is mildly toxic; however, care is necessary in use and handling of this substance and it is not a toy for children.

#### BEER PRICES

In reply to Mr. ABBOTT (August 26).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs has reported as follows:

Inquiries have established that the caterer, Cooke & Wallis Pty. Ltd., purchased the canned beer required to stock Adelaide Oval bars from the S.A. Brewing Co. Ltd. on Friday, 22nd August. Approval was granted to the brewery to pass on the higher excise duty on Wednesday, 20th so that the caterer incurred the higher charge on all the supplies purchased. Further, the driver has indicated he stocked the bars on Friday and did not discuss prices with anyone. In any event, no objection could be raised to higher retail prices being charged as approval was given for all beer prices to rise from the commencement of business on Saturday morning, retailers stocks, generally, having been exhausted by then.

#### WAGE RESTRAINT

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether the Government now intends to enforce its proposals for wage restraint outlined by the Premier on

August 27, in view of the latest reported hostility to those proposals by the South Australian Trades and Labor Council? Two weeks ago, I directed a related question to the Premier, in the absence of the Minister, but did not receive a satisfactory reply. Indeed, the Premier resorted to charges of union bashing. Many people now believe that the Premier dodged the issue and that the Government has no intention of enforcing the policy, because it will upset the Trades and Labor Council, according to the press reports today. People are questioning whether the Government will stand by its policies, even in the face of union opposition. The general feeling is that it will not, and there is widespread concern. I therefore ask what is the Government's intention in relation to wage restraint.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has made its policy on this matter perfectly clear. It was a policy at the elections; the Government was elected on that policy; the statement in this House was in accordance with the policy, and the policy stands. If the honourable member does not propose to support it, he of course has the opportunity to say so publicly.

#### INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether it is true that, despite an increase in the number of working days lost in May through industrial disputes in South Australia, this State still has the best record of any State regarding time lost through stoppages?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: By a mere coincidence I happen to have that information with me. The figures to which the honourable member refers are contained in a publication of the Australian Bureau of Statistics summarising statistics of industrial disputes in May, 1975. Unfortunately this publication does not give a breakdown of the number of disputes by States, but shows comparisons of the number of working days lost, State by State, which is the important factor. In May, the South Australian figure of 10 900 working days lost constituted only about 2 per cent of the total number of days lost throughout Australia. This is extremely gratifying when it is remembered that South Australia has nearly 10 per cent of the Australian work force. When one looks at the figures for the first five months of this year, the proportion of days lost in South Australia in that period is less than 2½ per cent of the Australian total. In fact, South Australia has had the lowest number of days lost through industrial disputes of all States except Tasmania (which is another Labor State, I might add) for the last five-month period.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question is somewhat supplementary to the reply given by the Premier to the question asked today by the Leader of the Opposition, a question that the Premier grabbed before the Minister of Labour and Industry could answer it. Will the Premier go to Rainsford's factory at Lonsdale (perhaps in company with the Minister of Labour and Industry) and address picketers and other strikers, using his good offices in an effort to persuade them to return to work? I imagine the Premier has looked at this morning's *Advertiser* and, in any case, is aware of the grave consequences of the strike that has been going on at Rainsford's factory at Lonsdale for some weeks. We are getting to the stage, as the *Advertiser* calls it, of ugly scenes between picketers and others. We know that the production of goods by Chrysler Australia Limited is being disrupted by a lack of components from Rainsford's and that that lack of components may lead to lay-offs at Chrysler within a day or so. I remind the Premier that Commissioner Heagney is to



hear the matter tomorrow morning and that the result of that hearing will be reported to a strikers' meeting at noon. Nevertheless, if the Premier was willing at that time to speak to the men and explain properly the Government's policies, which he upheld this afternoon in replying to the Leader of the Opposition, he might do some good and persuade those on strike to return to work and abide by the machinery of arbitration. I therefore put this question to the Premier as a constructive suggestion to help that industrial situation in South Australia of which the Minister of Labour and Industry was so proud a few minutes ago.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer to the question is "No".

#### PRICES JUSTIFICATION TRIBUNAL

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Is it a fact that the Government intends to legislate to give the Prices Justification Tribunal power to operate in South Australia, as reported in the press, or is this only another ploy to calm the trade unions, in view of the already announced policy on wage restraint, a policy reiterated by the Premier in reply to the Leader? As members know, we already have a Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch, which acts as a watchdog on prices, so it would be a simple matter for the list of goods and services subject to price control to be extended, without bringing in the Prices Justification Tribunal. There is little the tribunal can do that our branch cannot already do, unless all States agree to similar action. Does the Government intend to introduce this legislation, or is this only an exercise in semantics?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it is not an exercise in semantics, but it does depend on the action of the other States. The advantage to South Australia will come through uniform action of this kind by the other States, but the difficulties for South Australia in its price-control system arise largely from the fact that we operate a one-State price-control system; in some areas there is no uniform policy throughout Australia, particularly in the area of non-corporate incomes. In addition, at present the Prices Justification Tribunal does not have the administrative means of controlling on a uniform basis in Australia the wholesale prices of goods that are then sent to South Australia for retail sale. In fact, the largest increase in food costs, apart from the cost of meat and seasonal fluctuations affecting the cost of potatoes and onions in South Australia, is in the case of imported groceries which are wholesaled in other States and which at present have no effective price control on them. In these circumstances, there would be an advantage to South Australia if all States were to agree, as a part of their total support for the indexation principle, that the States should vest the Prices Justification Tribunal with State jurisdiction. This matter has been discussed at the Premiers' Conference and, if we are able to get the other States to proceed in this matter (they have backed and filled a bit about indexation, although we have constantly given our support to it for over a year), we will be legislating here in a similar fashion.

#### CUSTOMS BOARDING STATION

Mr. OLSON: Has the Minister for the Environment any further information about the future of the old customs boarding station at Semaphore? I am aware that this matter has taken the form of a long-running serial, with much discussion to and fro among the Government, local historical groups, and the Port Adelaide council. The latest move of which I am aware took place last

Thursday when, I understand, the Minister sent to the council a new proposal in an attempt to stop it from going ahead with demolition of the station. If I understand the position correctly, the Minister then offered to subsidise a study of the area around the Semaphore jetty, including the old boarding station. This offer came from the Coast Protection Board, which is also interested in the matter. I believe that this is a fair proposal, enabling the council and the Government to see clearly how the entire area could best be developed in the future. However, there has been some difference of opinion about the wisdom of retaining the boarding station, with the Town Clerk at one stage stating that the council did not share the Government's view on the building's historical value. Can the Minister say whether there is any hope that this problem can be solved?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member is correct: over some months continuing discussions have been held with the council and there have been some differences of opinion among people living in the area regarding the value of this building. Although various offers have been made by the Government towards assisting the council to repair and maintain the building, most of those offers have not been acceptable to the council. True, discussions were to take place at council level last evening to consider whether the building should be demolished. The honourable member referred to a further suggestion which I put to the council last week and which it considered last evening. This morning I have been told that the council has now decided to consider the matter again. I understand that an inspection of the building will be made by councillors and people interested in the building (I believe the honourable member will also be invited), so that the community can consider whether or not the building ought to be preserved. I have not received full details of the council's decision about the offer we have made through the Coast Protection Board for a general study of that area, but I can say that there has been a respite from the council's earlier inclination to demolish the building. I will keep the honourable member informed about the matter, and certainly do what I can to ensure that he is present at the inspection.

#### SWEETHEART AGREEMENTS

Dr. EASTICK: Does the Premier agree that the public statements of the Hon. Mr. Dunford, a member of another place, about sweetheart agreements totally disagree with the statements on this subject that the Premier has made recently and, indeed, this afternoon? What effect will the disagreement with the Premier of Mr. Dunford and the Trades and Labor Council have on the ultimate passage of legislation or regulations relating to this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Dunford has to me disclaimed statements that appeared under his name in the *News*. Further than that I can only—

Mr. Millhouse: The *News* made them up, did it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest the honourable member refer to Mr. Dunford: I can only tell him what Mr. Dunford has said to me.

Mr. Dean Brown: Whom are we to believe, then?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not concerned about whom the member for Davenport believes, because I find that normally quite irrelevant. Government policy is exactly what I have said it here to be. I point out to the honourable member that the Government's policy is binding on every member of the Labor Party and it was expressed very clearly at the elections, which the Government won.

## UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say what are the reasons for the increase in the number of registered unemployed in South Australia in August, and give the unemployment position in this State compared to that in other States? I am sure the Minister will be able to supply this information, as he always seems to have the answers to the most difficult questions.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The member for Stuart is so right; I just happen to have the necessary information to suit his convenience. The situation is worrying: there is no doubt that unemployment always worries State and Commonwealth Governments.

Mr. Gunn: Whose fault is it?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will not go into that at this stage, although I am willing to debate it with the honourable member anywhere he likes. The situation is that Queensland, with a Liberal-Country Party Government, has the highest percentage unemployed, 4.6 per cent. New South Wales, which has a Liberal Government, follows closely with 4.32 per cent. I notice the member for Eyre has gone quiet now. Victoria, which has a Liberal Government, has an unemployment figure of 4.24 per cent. Tasmania, with a Labor Government, has a figure of 3.77 per cent, then comes South Australia (another Labor State) with 3.59 per cent and, much to its credit, Western Australia has kept the figure down to 3.31 per cent. That is the only Liberal governed State that features in the event at all—

Mr. Dean Brown: What about seasonally adjusted figures?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am allowed to reply to only one question at a time, and if the honourable member is so ignorant—

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Speaker has insisted that only one question be answered, and that is what I am doing. If honourable members want to ask other questions they are permitted to do so.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the Minister to continue answering the question.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I would not mind your keeping other honourable members in order, too, Mr. Speaker. Since I took over office I have said that one of the major factors in our keeping up reasonable figures in South Australia was the Regional Employment Development scheme, and I have continually expressed my gratification to the Commonwealth Government for introducing that scheme. Other people have been critical of this scheme and of my comments as well, but let us consider the position now revealed. We already have, as shown in the breakdown figures, 582 adult male workers that the Commonwealth labour office registered against the RED scheme, which has been phasing out for only about three or four weeks. The figures show that 229 junior males and 198 junior females lost their jobs in August, and the number of adult females employed fell by 71. Unfortunately, the position in Port Pirie and Port Augusta has also deteriorated because 127 workers at Port Pirie and 89 in Port Augusta lost their jobs during August, and this is attributed directly to the phasing out of the RED scheme. I urge (and the Premier is already doing this) that the RED scheme be retained by the Commonwealth Government. If it cannot be retained, some other scheme should be started, as this would certainly give an uplift to this very worrying and drastic situation.

## RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Premier say why Cabinet has decided that the Industrial Research Institute of South Australia Incorporated should be disbanded, and what action the Government will take to guarantee that the co-ordinator, Mr. Fry, and his staff find suitable alternative employment? I understand that, about a month or six weeks ago, Cabinet decided to disband this institute, and that the Minister acting for the Premier, Mr. Broomhill, went to see the Chairman of that institute. This was the first knowledge the Chairman had that the institute was to be disbanded. I believe that the Premier then wrote a letter confirming the conversation that Mr. Broomhill had had with the Chairman. I find it a particularly interesting decision of Cabinet, as I believe that the disbanding of the institute will severely affect small businesses in this State. I also find it interesting because a brochure on the institute contains a letter from the Premier and also the Governor of this State (written, I understand, only last year) acclaiming what a great asset this institute would be for small businesses in South Australia.

Mr. WELLS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Davenport is going far beyond an explanation. I suggest that what he is saying is absolute comment.

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave must be given to an honourable member to explain his question. However, I ask all honourable members to try to make their explanations as brief as possible.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: This decision of Cabinet makes an absolute mockery of the apparent concern of the Premier for small businesses in this State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Industrial Research Institute was a creation of the Labor Government. I point out to the honourable member that no work of this kind occurred in the State under a Liberal Government.

Mr. Venning: That's not the point: we're not talking about that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member now becomes a protagonist of an institute for which he said absolutely nothing until it had been disbanded.

Mr. Dean Brown: I supported it in this House last year.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall be interested to find out when the honourable member supported that or anything else that has ever been done by the Labor Government. I point out to the honourable member that the decision in this matter was taken after there had been a review of the activities of the Industrial Research Institute, and it was decided that the aims of the institute had unfortunately not been achieved, and that they could conceivably be achieved by reorganising activities. It is hoped that, through additional work being done through the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories, results can be achieved. Negotiations have been undertaken with Amdel in relation to the employment of staff.

## CATTLE TAGS

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture, ascertain whether a more satisfactory method of trace-back of disease in cattle for slaughter can be found to replace the various compulsory types of tail-tagging now in use? Several graziers in my district have approached me because they are dissatisfied with clip-on and stick-on tail-tags. When this type of tag is fixed the cattle are aggravated and sometimes bruised. I have a tag (No. S17069) that was found floating down the wash drain at the Naracoorte saleyards, clear evidence

that it came off the beast to which it was attached. I have been told that as many as 200 tags have been found in the wash drain after a sale of 1 100 cattle at that saleyard. It has been put to me that perhaps an ear clip or ear tag, suitably branded, would be a more satisfactory method and would be less likely to come off the animal than a clip-on tag that breaks or a stick-on tag that gets wet and is washed off when cattle are herded in the yards. This matter needs to be investigated because the trace-back of disease in cattle is most necessary.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will be pleased to take up the matter with my colleague to see whether a more satisfactory system can be produced.

#### BEEF INDUSTRY

Mr. RUSSACK: My question is supplementary to a reply given today to a Question on Notice by the member for Victoria regarding beef industry assistance. Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands what progress has been made on the matter of widening the criteria for assisting beef producers? Further, as there is an urgent need to assist many producers who have applied, when will a decision be made? The amount of \$3 000 000 was made available and, according to information given today, there have been 126 applications, of which 34 have been approved and 60 rejected. Obviously, some applications are still being considered. The amount of \$278 500 has been approved, and this is less than 10 per cent of the amount available. It is obvious that the criteria are too limited, because the main reasons for rejection are that the persons are non-specialist beef producers or that the proposals are sub-economic with the assistance available. It has been indicated that the matter of widening the criteria for assistance to beef producers is currently the subject of investigation by the Australian Agricultural Council and I ask the Minister whether the investigation could be expedited because of the urgency of the situation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I should be pleased to pass the honourable member's comments on to my colleague. I understand that the Australian Agricultural Council discussed this matter recently but that the Ministers from the Eastern States who went to the council meeting had not done their homework and the plan that they put forward was not suitable in any way. My understanding of the situation is that the Industries Assistance Commission is now considering the form of assistance to beef producers and that, as a result, a meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council will be held early in October, at which this report will be available. I think that is a proper and sensible course to take. I agree with the honourable member that the scheme presently operating is not as suitable as I thought in the first place that it would be. However, before it can be altered, proper studies should be undertaken so that decisions are properly based when they are made, and so that we do not have a situation similar to the situation we have had in the past whereby people who have been receiving the money are not the people who have really needed it.

#### DEPARTMENTAL ACCOUNTING

Mr. BECKER: Will the Treasurer say what the Government has done to assure the taxpayers that urgent action is being taken by the Government to protect public moneys handled by various Government departments? I refer to page 1 of the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1975, which was issued today. The Auditor-General comments that for the past

two years his report has contained comments that were critical of the financial administration of certain departments. He states that he has contended that real budgeting principles have not been appreciated or practised in some departments. He also states that a Financial Management Advisory Committee was appointed by the Public Service Board and that the committee had met and had undertaken certain activities in advising Government departments, as a consulting service, so that the departments could overcome some of these difficulties. The Auditor-General also comments that the difficulty could have been caused by staff shortages. He states:

Included in this report is a number of references to poor accounting performance in certain departments.

The Auditor-General comments on the complexity of the programmes and the need for maximum protection of public moneys. On page 2 of his report, he refers to budget procedures in the Agriculture Department, to the Attorney-General's Department regarding an apparent weakness in the Licensing Act in relation to fees, to the Correctional Services Department in relation to comments on accounting activities and the fact that the average annual net cost for each prisoner doubled over the past two years, to the Education Department in relation to budgeting and control of expenditure, to the Environment and Conservation Department in relation to unsatisfactory accounting procedures and budgeting and control of expenditure, to the Highways Department in relation to comments on financial management, to the Hospitals Department in relation to unsatisfactory accounting procedures, to the Lands Department in relation to weakness in accounting activities, to the Woods and Forests Department in relation to budgeting and forestry accounting (which apparently has not been altered since 1926, about 49 years ago), and to the South Australian Craft Authority in relation to unsatisfactory accounting. Can the Premier assure this House and the taxpayers that every effort is being made to protect public money being handled by Government departments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, every effort is being made but, if we were to cover everything mentioned by the Auditor-General, the increase in the Public Service accounting staff in South Australia frankly would be enormous. We have set up a series of new accounting and budgetary procedures that I have explained to the House during the past year, and they are working specifically in several of the larger departments, including the Education Department, the previous accounting procedures of which could not give us current information of the kind that the Treasury required. Minor matters such as those affecting the South Australian Craft Authority's budgeting procedures have all been cleared up but, as to major accounting difficulties, it is inevitable, with turnover of the kind that we have and the variation in returns that we have from various revenue areas, that it is extremely difficult to get a completely accurate forecast. The Auditor-General has commented on this but I say that, in general accounting procedures, the South Australian Treasury is far ahead of any other Treasury in this country, and we have looked constantly and carefully at establishing accounting procedures that will give us proper controls without a vast increase in accounting staff, because we must strike a reasonable balance in this matter. I believe that has been done.

#### BOATING REGULATIONS

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Marine say whether the Government has appointed or intends to appoint full-time authorised officers to administer and police the regulations under the Boating Act and, if so, will he say what qualifications these officers require? With the

down-turn in the fishing industry, several men are available who are experienced in all aspects of boating and who could be engaged as authorised officers. These persons are qualified in all aspects of boating and also have had practical experience at sea. In the hope that some displaced fishermen may be re-employed, I seek information on the policy of the Government regarding the appointment of authorised officers under the Boating Act.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am afraid that the point that the honourable member has made would be lost, because only eight inspectors have been appointed to service the whole State, and it is not intended to appoint many more officers. The eight have been appointed already, and it is intended to use police officers to police the provisions of the Boating Act and the regulations, and it is also proposed to use harbor masters on this work. In those circumstances, I think there is little point in my describing to the honourable member or to other members of the House the qualifications needed, except to say that they must be not only well versed in relation to the Act and the regulations but must also have had experience in this area, and must possess much common sense, because, particularly in the early stages of the operation of this Act and its regulations, I want common sense to prevail. I want it to be a matter of education rather than prosecution. I do not think I can help the honourable member very much regarding the re-employment of people who have become redundant as a result of the bad season in the fishing industry.

#### SAMCOR BOARD

Mr. GUNN: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to remove Mr. Lynch, who is currently a member of the South Australian Meat Corporation Board and who, I understand, is well known to the Premier? The Premier would be aware that, in a judgment delivered on September 8, 1975, by the Chief Justice, Mr. Lynch was described as having conducted himself in an unprofessional fashion. On page 5 of the judgment His Honour states:

Failed to make a full disclosure of the exact nature of his interests and of all material facts to the Conways in relation to—

(i) the offer and subsequent interest of his wife as a purchaser.

The judgment states that, in the opinion of the Chief Justice, Mr. Lynch's conduct was not in line with what is expected of a person in the legal profession.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, certainly not. The matter has been dealt with by the appropriate tribunal, and its decision is such that there is not the slightest need for the Government to take further action.

#### SPORTS SUBSIDIES

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Environment ask the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport to inform sporting associations and clubs about the correct procedure for these bodies to obtain subsidies from the department? The Minister's department has over a period given subsidies to many associations. These subsidies have benefited many clubs and have been greatly appreciated. It seems that some applications have not come through the right channels, and this has delayed the subsidy. I am sure all members receive requests from clubs in their districts for subsidies to further sport and they therefore look forward to the subsidies.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will certainly refer the matter to my colleague. I understand that many circulars explaining the procedures that need to be followed

have been forwarded to the head offices of the various sporting organisations, but perhaps we should provide them with additional copies of this explanation so they can present it to all their affiliates. I should have thought that all members received a statement of the procedures. If they have not, however, I shall be pleased to ask my colleague to do that as well.

#### GRAIN SILOS

Mr. VENNING: Can the Premier say whether he has received a comunicado from the Prime Minister, or the Prime Minister elect, concerning a joint statement that the Premier and the Commonwealth Leader were expected to make concerning the grain silos in this State in relation to the taking over of the South Australian Railways by the Commonwealth? When this House was debating the legislation regarding the take-over of the South Australian Railways, members on this side expressed concern about the situation with regard to silos, and the Premier said that, as a result of our request, he would seek to obtain a joint statement from the Prime Minister about the situation. I therefore ask the Premier whether he has received a reply from the Prime Minister, or the Prime Minister elect. If he does not receive a reply soon, it will have to be from the Hon. Malcolm Fraser.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not a joint statement, nor have I whatever it is the honourable member refers to as a comunicado. This matter was raised in the House of Representatives while the Bill was being debated, and the Minister will provide the honourable member with the statement of the Commonwealth Minister on the matter.

#### TRAVELLERS' AID SOCIETY

Mr. CUMBE: Is the Minister of Community Welfare aware of the dire straits that the Travellers' Aid Society faces at the moment, and does he know that, through financial stringency, it is likely to close down its operations after many years? The Travellers' Aid Society, as most members would know, provides a most useful service not only in this State but in other States as well. This society unfortunately got into some financial bother late last year because of the intervention of industrial inspectors, amongst other things, and it was told by the Minister's predecessor to apply for financial assistance under the Australian assistance plan. This was refused by the Commonwealth authorities. The society applied for assistance under the Homeless Persons Assistance Act, but that application was refused. It then applied to the Hospitals and Health Services Commission under the community health programme, but help was refused. Late last year the Minister's predecessor gave the society a temporary grant to carry it over while it made these applications. In going through the Budget papers I can find no line that gives assistance to this society, and no news has yet come forward from the Minister's department about this matter. I ask the Minister whether he has considered, or will consider, giving financial assistance to this worthwhile society, which assists mothers, particularly those who are visiting the Adelaide Children's Hospital, so that it can continue to maintain its operations. At the moment the society is losing \$800 a week and, unless financial assistance is made available, it will have to close its doors.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The department is looking at the problem being experienced by the organisation. For the benefit of the House, I will amplify some of the remarks made by the honourable member in explaining

his question. He said, for example, that the department gave a temporary grant, or special grant on a temporary basis, to the organisation. It ought to be made known that the amount of the grant was \$5 000, which increased the society's ordinary amount of \$2 500 to \$7 500. That was a fair increase. I think the department accepted that an urgent need for help existed, and looked at the matter in that light. As was stated, it was my predecessor in office who dealt with the matter. The position has been brought to the attention of the Community Welfare Grants Commission, and it is being looked at. I hope that will satisfy the honourable member at this stage.

#### DARTMOUTH STORAGE

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Works say what stage has been reached in the construction of the Dartmouth storage and when it will be operational? Also, has the necessary maintenance been carried out on the control gates of Lake Victoria? While it is essential to South Australia that the Dartmouth storage be completed as quickly as possible, it is also essential that Lake Victoria be able to operate efficiently. Earlier this year one of the control gates releasing the water from Lake Victoria into the Rufus Creek prior to entering the Murray River seized, and could not be used. I ask the Minister whether this problem has been resolved in the interest of properly controlling the water supply in South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain from my officers an up-to-date report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

#### WORKS SCHEDULE

Mr. ALLEN: Does the Minister of Transport intend to make available to members a schedule of proposed works of the Highways Department for the financial year ended June 30, 1976? The Minister will be aware that, from 1969 to 1973, copies of the schedule were made available to every member: from 1973 to 1975 a copy was made available to the Party Whip, and members were able to get that information from him. This year the Whip has told me that he has not received any information on this subject, despite the fact that councils have had this information for several months. I cover a district that comprises 11 district councils and a huge area of roads outside of local government, and it would be of particular benefit to members to have that information.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The reply is "Yes". The information will be provided, but perhaps I should explain the reason for the delay. As I think I explained in the House before the show adjournment, the schedules were made up on the basis that South Australia would receive an additional \$6 000 000 for roadworks in this financial year. Obviously, an element of guesswork was involved in this, and, as a result, it was not possible to distribute the schedules until the facts of the situation were known, namely, when the Commonwealth Budget was presented. Once we had confirmation that we were receiving \$5 800 000 and not \$6 000 000, we were able to revise our programme, and that is now the works programme. As far as I was aware, it had been forwarded. If the honourable member's Whip has not got his two (I think) copies, the Leader certainly receives a copy, and I am sure the Deputy Leader receives a copy. Copies are made available to the Upper House, and the Parliamentary Library also receives copies. Indeed, the reason for cutting down on distribution was to spend more money on roads rather than on printing documents that many members did not use.

#### HOUSING RENTALS

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Housing say what action he will take to reduce the huge losses being made by the rental section of the South Australian Housing Trust? The latest report of the Auditor-General, which was tabled today, shows that there is a loss in this section of the trust of more than \$2 500 000. The Auditor-General states that a general rent increase was approved by the Government, effective from February 1, 1975, with increases in rentals ranging from \$1 to \$2.50 a week, but not applying to certain pensioner tenants. The rental of many houses is still unduly low, some being only \$10 a week even for full-income families. Some rentals were increased on reallocation following vacancies. During the year these vacancy rents were increased, and they are substantially higher than the rents being paid by other older tenants for similar accommodation. I have supported an increase in rent for trust houses to those persons who have average incomes. I do not advocate increases for the needy, low-income group, but those who receive what we may call full incomes are gaining a benefit, and helping to cause a loss to the trust. The total rent received was more than \$18 000 000, and a loss of \$2 000 000 shows that a substantial loss occurred in the operation. You, Sir, a man of some conscience, have the same problem in your district, and I hope you would support a move for an increase in rentals. I support having an increase for those persons who are gaining a benefit, at the moment, at the expense of the community, where those persons are on a full income and paying a cheap rental.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will consider the matter.

#### SOMERTON HOME

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Premier say whether the Government will ask the Commonwealth Government to reconsider its decision not to assist the State Government in purchasing a property at the Esplanade, Somerton Park, now owned by the Somerton Crippled Children's Association? I have asked many questions about this property: last year I asked a question of the Minister of Health, who said that the Government would approach the Commonwealth Government for assistance. I asked a question of the Premier on August 27, to which he replied promptly, and said that the Government had decided not to purchase the property. This property is situated in an excellent position and is ideally situated for a day-care centre or a home for the aged. I believe it is important to the community, particularly the aged people of South Australia and the needy, that this type of accommodation be available in South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will discuss the matter with my colleague, but I cannot promise the honourable member anything.

#### SUNKEN KETCH

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Minister of Marine say what action has been taken, or is intended to be taken, to mark the sunken hulk *Moorara* as a hazard to shipping? Also, can the department assist the Point Pearce community council to refloat the hulk or, alternatively, encourage the council to sell it for removal? A newspaper report dated September 3 referred to the fact that the ketch had sunk. She was anchored off Wardang Island when she sank 10 days ago in about 5½ metres of water, and turned on her side. I have been told that the hulk is unmarked at present, that it is totally submerged at high tide, and that it constitutes a hazard to shipping. I further understand

that some of the motors and pumps contained in that hulk are still useful and of considerable value, and the early raising of that vessel would ensure their continued usefulness.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not aware of the matter to which the honourable member has referred, but I will obtain a report for him from the department. I do not know who owns the vessel: I assume it is the Point Pearce council.

Mr. Boundy: It is the Aboriginal Lands Trust.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I thought it might have been. I will see what can be done, and tell the honourable member as soon as possible.

#### FOOD PRICES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Premier believe that the fact that food prices in South Australia are now the highest in the Commonwealth is due to the fact that the Prices Justification Tribunal is not an effective instrument in regard to those prices? I asked the Premier an earlier question this afternoon in relation to his wish that the Prices Justification Tribunal would be operating in this State, and in his reply he said it would be no good unless he could get the other State Premiers to agree. I also asked the Premier a question earlier in the session about why food was dearer in South Australia than previously, whereas previously he had always made much of the fact that, although the greatest increase was in South Australia, the absolute prices of food in South Australia were less than elsewhere. Of course, the Premier cannot fall back on that argument any longer, so he must cast around for some other explanation for the fact that we now have the dearest food in the Commonwealth. Earlier this afternoon I asked him a question with regard to the tribunal, and the only thing he said to back up his contention that we ought to have the tribunal operating here was that the tribunal did not seem to be able to control wholesale food prices and that the Consumer and Prices Affairs Branch could control only retail prices. It is difficult to obtain from the Premier a statement on what is the reason for our high prices for food. It would seem that it would be impossible—

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the Deputy Leader that he must not debate the question.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No, Mr. Speaker, I am explaining in some detail, because the Premier has not answered my earlier questions on food prices, except to say that he would obtain a report. The only information I have is what I have read in the press, that the Premier thinks that the tribunal might fix up the matter. I remind him that the cost of transporting food from other States will remain, and one would expect wholesale food prices to be dearer. Is this why the Premier wants the tribunal to poke its nose in here to do something about our high food prices?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I explained the basis of my contention earlier, and that is that.

#### LOWER NORTH-EAST ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport review the decision, based on a priority assessment, to delay the commencement of work on the widening and reconstruction of the Lower North-East Road between the Torrens River, at Dernancourt, and Anstey Hill? The Minister will be aware of my previous questions in the House and of correspondence to him on this subject. His latest reply to me, by letter dated June 23, contained the full reasons for the decisions given at that time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will have this matter investigated and bring down further information for the honourable member.

#### CHILDREN'S FOUNDATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA INCORPORATED

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether the Government will further consider helping in any way possible the current attempts of the Children's Foundation of South Australian Incorporated to acquire the Morialta Children's Home property or, alternatively, ensuring that its present programme of activities be continued? This matter was raised in the House on August 12 by the member for Davenport, and also by the member for Rocky River. I have received (as I believe other members and certainly the Minister would have received) lengthy details of the difficulties confronting the foundation at present, and Mr. O'Shea has written a detailed account of the foundation's present financial position. I understand that, at present, the foundation has \$67 500 of the \$85 000 necessary to secure the property, other financial arrangements being possible. Despite that, the programme has been suspended from September 7. As the foundation's programme has been of immense benefit to handicapped and disadvantaged children, I do not believe that the community can afford to do without it. Although I realise that financial stringencies apply in the present economic climate, I think it is largely a matter of priorities and a matter of whether it is worth supporting such a programme, as I am sure it is. If it is not possible for financial assistance to be given, will the department do everything in its power to facilitate the operations and the camping activities of the foundation?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am certainly willing to have another look at this matter. With regard to whether the foundation can continue for the present, I understand that there has been considerable correspondence between Mr. O'Shea, of the foundation, and the Premier regarding alternative arrangements that were worked out by the Community Welfare Department in regard to this matter. As I understand it, a long list was provided to Mr. O'Shea of alternative accommodation sites that could be used for children's camping efforts (the children to whom the Leader has referred).

Mr. Dean Brown: Those sites were not suitable, though.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: If the honourable member will allow me to finish my reply, he may learn something. There was some doubt about certain of the sites being suitable. My department handled this aspect of the problem satisfactorily, when it pointed out that it would make available to the foundation a trained officer who would assist with booking arrangements, the researching of sites, etc. Finally, I thank the Leader for displaying much more responsibility in the matter than did the honourable member who interjected, because the Leader has said that this is a time of some stringency and that there are many demands on the Government for assistance in many areas. I do not think that the Government ought to be criticised in such an area, when it is trying to do everything possible. Priorities must be applied, as the Leader has said. However, I will have another look at the proposition.

#### RETURNED SERVICEMEN'S BADGES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Returned Servicemen's Badges Act, 1952. Read a first time.

### SAILORS AND SOLDIERS MEMORIAL HALL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Sailors and Soldiers Memorial Hall Act, 1939. Read a first time.

### LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Licensing Act, 1967-1975. Read a first time.

### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debated on second reading.

(Continued from August 28. Page 550.)

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Normally a Budget document, when it is brought into the House and supported by statements of the Treasurer, is an important statement, encompassing the sphere of the economic policies of the Government and giving details of the proposed economic management of the Government. On this occasion at first glance the Budget seemed to be an unimportant document; there was nothing controversial about it, and it was described in some areas as a lack-lustre Budget. On closer examination there is no doubt at all that it is most important, not because of what it sets out positively, but because it proposes an economic policy for this State of doing nothing whatever about inflation.

It proposes an economic policy of accepting the present high inflation rate. Certainly the major initiative in controlling inflation at any time is one which depends largely on the Commonwealth Government. Through its Budget, it should be able to exercise the economic restraints necessary at this time. The fact that the Commonwealth has not done this does not mean that this is not its responsibility; that is a responsibility which it has shirked. However, this State Budget relies on that degree of inflation; it depends on inflation; indeed it is propped up by inflation. Expenditure has been increased by \$230 000 000, an increase of 28.1 per cent on actual expenditure in 1974-75. Taxation receipts for 1975-76 show an increase of \$50 000 000, or 22.5 per cent on the actual receipts for 1974-75, and the increase is \$65 000 000, or 31.5 per cent on the estimated receipts for 1974-75. This increase is entirely caused by the inflationary trends in our society today.

Any valuation tax or tax related to increasing wages must greatly increase revenue, and this will happen even though the base rates of those taxes are the same. The estimated receipts from land tax for 1975-76 are up \$6 300 000, or a 49.8 per cent increase on the actual receipts in 1974-75. This is a colossal sum. Pay-roll tax has increased by \$24 600 000, an increase of 24.2 per cent. This Budget is propped up by inflation, depending for its viability on inflation. It could not stand without inflation, and the whole economy and economic management of this State depend on inflation. Inflation is the essential ingredient. In accepting inflation, this Government is accepting the Commonwealth Government's policies, or lack of policies; it is accepting this lack of initiative and lack of action, and it is accepting with inflation all the thieving accomplices that go with it, robbing us of our standards and our way of life, and here I refer particularly to unemployment.

The latest figures for unemployment show that the seasonally adjusted unemployment figure for South Australia, including school leavers, is 24 323. There were about

2 400 unemployed still working under the Regional Employment Development scheme, giving a total of 26 700, as the RED scheme is not worth much any more because it is about to finish. This compares with about 11 100 for August, 1974, and represents an increase of about 140 per cent in the State's unemployed over that period. Gross economic hardship is resulting from rising prices, and a housing crisis has come about because of the astronomical increases in house building costs. The only good thing that could be said for this Budget is that at least it has been proposed as a balanced one; that is, it is not contributing in any further way to inflation. Although the Treasurer is so proud of this proposed balanced Budget, the circumstances are, to say the least, unusual. The Government has been liquidating assets to reach this balance and to put itself in a position where it can reach this balance; indeed, we have a surplus. Instead of recognising these unusual circumstances, the Government has used them as a reason for not exercising any noticeable restraint in Government spending.

As I have said, State Government spending will increase by at least 28 per cent this year. Even the Commonwealth Government managed to show some restraint in its spending by limiting its increase to 23 per cent. Many private enterprises are restricting their expenditure increase for 1975-76 to be just enough to maintain the real spending of last year. They are doing this by instituting retrenchment programmes that they should not be forced to institute. They are being forced into a situation in which they in turn are contributing to unemployment, and so the vicious circle goes on. This Budget is not only a Budget propped up by inflation, it is also a stingy Budget. State taxation is at an all-time high. Since the Treasurer took office, the revenue from State taxation has increased by about 330 per cent. For every \$1 paid by the residents of South Australia in State taxes when he first came to office, we now pay \$4.30. This is well above even the general inflationary rate. This is a disgusting state of affairs. The people of South Australia, whom the Treasurer and his Party are supposed to be protecting and helping, are being penalised by this steady vicious increase in State taxation.

There is no relief in this Budget for many people in financial difficulties, for small businesses, or for industry. Because of this, I believe this Budget could be termed a long-term economic disaster, and if this is the Labor Party's economic policy we can well do without it, just as we could well do without the Australian Labor Party itself.

So much for the Government's economic policy. In the field of economic management, the Government so far falls down in its performance that it can only be termed economic mismanagement. An analysis of its actual and estimated payments from the Revenue Account in the various departments consistently shows increases over the previous year in terms of actual Budget, and shows further increases over Budget estimates. The 1974-75 Budget made an overall provision of about \$30 000 000 to allow for increased wage demands. As these have not been allocated amongst individual departments specifically, the percentage figures quoted will be slightly less if this is taken into account. However, the list is most important and the increases in respect of almost every department are far greater than can be accounted for by normal growth factors, as the Treasurer would have us believe. I have a statistical table with a list of departments, the increase in the 1974-75 Budget over the 1974-75



actual expenditure, and the percentage increase over the planned 1974-75 period to the planned 1975-76 period. I ask leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

#### DEPARTMENTAL INCREASES

Department	Increase 1974-75 Budget to 1974-75 actual per cent	Increase planned 1974-75 to planned 1975-76 per cent
Legislature . . . . .	+ 14.4	— 7.6
Premier . . . . .	+ 3.9	+ 35.9
Chief Secretary . . . . .	+ 16.2	+ 17.2
Attorney-General . . . . .	+ 14.7	+ 24.1
Treasurer . . . . .	+ 1.9	+ 21.4
Minister of Lands, Repatriation and Irrigation . . . . .	+ 36.5	+ 1
Minister of Works . . . . .	+ 13.7	+ 17
Education . . . . .	+ 14.6	+ 21.2
Labour and Industry . . . . .	+ 19.9	+ 8.7
Agriculture, Forests and Fisheries . . . . .	+ 17.9	+ 14.4
Environment, Planning and Development . . . . .	+ 13	+ 19.3
Marine . . . . .	+ 13.8	+ 8.9
Transport and Local Government . . . . .	+ 7.1	+ 9.6
Community Welfare, Prices, Consumer Affairs . . . . .	+ 11.6	+ 32.1
Tourism, Recreation and Sport . . . . .	+ 7.9	+ 45.6
Health . . . . .	+ 17.6	+ 50.1
Mines and Energy . . . . .	+ 9.5	+ 13.8

Dr. TONKIN: This table shows an enormous increase. In only one sphere (the Legislature) is there a decrease in the planned payments for 1974-75 to 1975-76; in every other instance there is a massive increase. The prize-winners are the Premier's Department (35.9 per cent), Community Welfare, Prices and Consumer Affairs (32.1 per cent), Tourism (45.6 per cent), and Health (50.1 per cent). The last is a staggering increase, particularly in a situation where we have been told in this House time and time again by the Treasurer that Medibank will be the most wonderful and advantageous thing that could ever happen to this State. What price Medibank now? These figures, pulled as they are from the document and from a very poor list of details given in the Budget statement, show quite clearly, nevertheless, that there is a total lack of effective budgetary control, and the blame for this must lie firmly at the feet of the Treasurer and of his Ministers. This is not the result of a natural growth rate of departments, though I have no doubt the Treasurer will argue that it is. Even if we allow for the inflationary factor, the increase is still well ahead of natural growth in many departments, and it can only represent gross mismanagement, which must lie with the Ministers of the Government.

If we take this a little further and take an average of all the departments and work out the increase and the total sums involved, we see that in 1974-75 there was an increase of 5.9 per cent in actual payments (\$820 600 000) over the budgeted payments (\$774 600 000). The proposed expenditure for 1975-76 against the actual expenditure in 1974-75 shows an increase of 28 per cent. If we want to get some measure of the probable real increase in 1975-76, we add on that figure of 5.9 per cent from last time and we get a figure of at least 34 per cent: the figure will probably be more than this. Over the period from 1972-73 to 1975-76, the growth rate of expenditure in the Dunstan Government's departments has been almost 100 per cent. The Auditor-General's Report has been tabled today. As is traditional, it has come to us at least one week after it would have been useful to us in considering

the Budget documents. Although the member for Hanson has already quoted one section of this report, I will quote another section:

For the past two years my report contained comments which were critical of the financial administration of certain departments, and I contended that real budgeting principles were not appreciated or practised in some departments. Consideration of these matters now falls within the province of the Financial Management Advisory Committee which was appointed by the Public Service Board.

More power to its arm! I hope it gets moving quickly. The report continues:

The committee's objectives are to assist departments in the review and development of their financial management systems and to provide a consulting service in the areas of budgetary control, accounting and financial systems. I understand that the committee has been active during the year but, when one considers that, as mentioned above, payments by the State for the year exceeded \$1 000 000 000, the urgency for ensuring first-class financial management becomes obvious.

I do not have to point out that a 1 per cent error in a sum of that magnitude can lead to an enormous error in terms of actual cash. The Treasurer today, in reply to a question, said that there would need to be an enormous accounting staff. I believe that to be true. I point out further, though, that, if priorities were properly allocated in the first instance, enormous accounting staff would not be necessary. Perhaps, if there had been a little more emphasis on proper systems and if accountants had been put in in the first place, that massive staff would not have been necessary. But be that as it may, there has been a continuing shift of resources into the public sector by the Australian Labor Party, by this Government, and it is in furtherance of the Australian Labor Party's policy. That policy has been carried out on a Commonwealth level with disastrous results, and it is being carried out on the State level with results which are not so obvious and which are much more well hidden, but the policy is being carried out nevertheless, and it is to the disadvantage of the average citizen and the private sector in this community. Government departments are still being built up at the expense of productivity, and this is not what we need at this time. These things make one wonder whether the South Australian Government has learnt or taken any notice of the statements of economists, of business leaders and of financial advisers, and even whether it has taken any note of the comments of at least two of its recent Commonwealth Treasurers. If I remember correctly, I think it was Dr. Cairns before his downfall who said that the Australian economy could not afford to do without the private sector at this time. He announced it as though he made some enormous discovery.

Mr. Venning: It took him a long time to find out.

Dr. TONKIN: I cannot believe that he could be so naive as all that, but he did take a long time to find out publicly. Mr. Hayden, in the recent Commonwealth Budget, made some similar comments, and I will now quote one or two extracts from the speech that he made in the House of Representatives on August 19, 1975. The words of Mr. Hayden at that time for a short time gave the people of Australia some hope that finally the Government would be facing up to its responsibilities. He said:

Meanwhile, unless appropriate economic measures are adopted now, the hopeful signs in the economy could prove illusory, and inflation could take off again from its already high level, to a thoroughly destructive effect. The private sector would find it increasingly difficult to function, with increasing business failures, and unemployment could rise to dramatically higher levels. That situation can be avoided and it was with this objective in mind that this Budget was designed. Some sacrifice and patient restraint is called for from all of us in our demands for more resources, whether it is additional public services that are wanted or higher



personal incomes. We expect that as the expansion of public sector activity is restrained, the opportunities for private sector expansion will improve, though full responses to greater room for growth may take time to develop.

What wonderful words, Mr. Speaker: at last the Commonwealth Treasurer was beginning to see a little sense. Later, he said:

Because of the structure of our mixed economy, where three out of four jobs are in the private sector, there are firm limits on how far the public sector should be stimulated in this recovery phase. In framing the Budget, therefore, we have exercised the utmost restraint on Government spending. For these reasons, the key-note of this Budget is consolidation and restraint rather than further expansion of the public sector.

Having said all that, Mr. Hayden then went on to introduce a Budget that did virtually nothing to curb expansion of the public sector, and certainly did nothing worthwhile to stimulate the private sector. After raising the hopes of everyone in Australia, he dashed them again after nearly 10 minutes of propounding what should have been done and then demonstrating that he was not prepared to do them. He took no significant action, so inflation booms on in South Australia (one of the highest levels: over 18 per cent). The cost of living has increased by more than 40 per cent since the Labor Party came to power at Commonwealth level and, since the Treasurer came into office, by 63 per cent in this State. Unemployment moves inexorably upwards. It is almost 5 per cent of the Australian work force, and we are facing predictions by Mr. Hawke that about 500 000 people, or about 8 per cent of the Australian work force, will be unemployed in the next six months. God help us if he is the next Prime Minister! Mr. Hawke's predictions will break a new record. They will break the record of the level of unemployment during the depression years. It is a record of which no-one should be proud. Certainly, we cannot be pleased about it. It is a matter for great regret, and it is a matter for even greater regret that neither the Commonwealth Government nor the State Government has taken action to help reduce the unemployment level.

Taxation, under the guise of a revolutionary new scheme, continues at a crippling rate. Personal taxation has gone up; the average tax paid by individuals has increased by 92 per cent in the past two years, while average wages have increased by 57 per cent and company tax has increased by 59 per cent in the past two years. Real gross operating surplus has decreased by 40 per cent since the Australian Labor Party came to office. The move to expand Government departments keeps on and adds to a non-productive section of our community, continuing at the expense of everyone else in Australia. Mr. Crean, the first Commonwealth Labor Treasurer in the Whitlam Government, announced this as specific Labor policy in 1972. Dr. Cairns and Mr. Hayden acknowledged the crippling effect of this policy on the private sector but did little of value to correct the situation. The South Australian Treasurer shows by this Budget (and, indeed, I believe he is totally and absolutely discredited and condemned by it) that he holds exactly the same views as his Commonwealth Labor Party colleagues hold. He accepts unquestioningly the orders of his Commonwealth masters and is totally and absolutely unwilling to take any action to help the recovery of the private sector, a recovery on which he and his colleagues must know and acknowledge depends the economic recovery of South Australia and Australia.

I am sorry the Treasurer is leaving the Chamber because I was about to ask whether he is the businessmen's friend, whether he is the man the W. D. Scott report

wrote up as the most popular Premier in Australia. Is he the man who consults regularly with businessmen? Is he the man who some people are misguided enough to say is almost a Liberal, a good Premier for this State? Is this the man, with his wide business understanding and his jobs for the boys attitude? He is popular even with some Liberal Party supporters—those who do not understand what he is about.

A hard analysis of the Budget (difficult though it may be because of the way it has been presented) shows clearly what more and more people are gradually realising—that, despite all his apparent concern and apparent understanding, the Treasurer does not really care. He has been perpetrating a confidence trick, probably one of the most far-reaching confidence tricks of all time, on the South Australian business community. The Treasurer will not act to help the private sector (his so-called friends) just as the Commonwealth Government will not act to help the private sector. Without private sector activity, jobs will be lost and unemployment will soar, but the Treasurer does not care any more than the Prime Minister or the Commonwealth Treasurer cares. All his words are worth nothing. I repeat that he is perpetrating the greatest confidence trick of all time on the business community of South Australia, but that trick is beginning to show, and people are waking up to what he has been doing.

Had he stayed in the Chamber (and I can understand why he left) he would undoubtedly be hurt again. His Government is being attacked, and it hurts: that is what the advertisement during the recent election campaign said. I would not blame the Treasurer if he burnt all prints of the photograph that was used in that election advertisement. However, he will trot out all the usual excuses, if he bothers to reply, and we will hear those excuses. He will say that it is all the fault of the Commonwealth Government and will ask what he can be expected to do. Well, he can stop snivelling, grovelling and running to Canberra and running home again with his tail between his legs. I do not believe that he is totally without influence in Canberra or that his opinion does not carry some weight there. He should stop being an ineffectual puppet without a mind of his own, and should fight for the people of South Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you think he'd do better if Bob Hawke was the Prime Minister?

Dr. TONKIN: Apparently he gets on more easily with Mr. Hawke than he does with Prime Minister Whitlam. The basic remedy for Australia's present economic ills lies in a change in Government in Canberra. I have no doubt about that. In fact, no-one on this side doubts it, and I do not imagine that any members on the other side who really believe in the welfare of South Australians will be sorry to see a change of Government come about in Canberra. The Liberal Party and the National Country Party are developing a real, reasonable and practicable inter-government relationship document containing financial arrangements that will be fixed absolutely, will be clear cut and will enable the States to hold their heads up again. The present Commonwealth Government has brought Australia to the verge of bankruptcy and has put the States in the position of being mendicant States depending on the Commonwealth for all finance received.

A Liberal and National Country Party Government will provide a working relationship whereby the States will get a fair proportion of their money back again, where they can decide their own priorities and be their own masters. Until those Parties are elected to Government (and I

sincerely hope it will not be long) action could be taken at a State level to relieve the present financial and economic situation. The situation is so critical that even a small degree of relief could be of vital importance. The object of the relief is business survival, survival of the individual, of the people of the State and of the State itself. We have every right to expect the Government to take any initiative that may enable the State to survive and continue as a going concern. We must control Government expenditure. Our major aim must be zero growth for Government employment. We do not propose that there should be Public Service retrenchment, but the Public Service should be held at its present level.

The total wage and salary bill for the Government is hard to estimate, because the paucity of detail in these documents makes it extremely difficult to get an accurate figure and to be sure of the accuracy of the figure. In 1974-75, the total Government wage and salary bill seems to be about \$500 000 000. If there is to be an increase which, according to the Treasurer, will be an increase of about 21 per cent for 1975-76, plus the growth in the Public Service (which continues unchecked), the total wage and salary bill for the Government this financial year could be between \$600 000 000 and \$650 000 000—a staggering sum that represents about 60 per cent to 65 per cent of the total State Government outlay. Can that really be so? I think it obviously can, and savings can be made in this area. Most management consultants estimate that, by going through departments as the Auditor-General has suggested, expenditure could be reduced by 2 per cent, and 2 per cent of the amount that I have mentioned is not money to be sneezed at. It could have a significant effect that could be passed on by relieving the burden of State taxation.

I believe that we must advocate zero growth in the Public Service and that we must advocate wage restraint, as announced by the Treasurer. I say here and now that I agree with the policy announced by the Treasurer recently on wage restraint. My only concern is whether he really thinks he can bring it about. Obviously, the trade union movement is not sympathetic to the policy he has announced.

Mr. Mathwin: He has a few problems, hasn't he?

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, he has many problems. As long as he represents a Party that is the political wing of the trade union movement, I do not think he can be expected to bring about that policy of wage restraint. Certainly, he has announced the policy, but I do not think it is worth much, coming from him. Already he has been attacked by colleagues in the Trades and Labor Council, and I do not think he will defy his masters at the Trades Hall.

South Australia has been built up as an industrial State over the years and, whatever we do, we must help industry and encourage it to stay in this State. I go further and say that we must do everything we can to ensure that industry can afford to stay here. The Playford Government offered low establishment costs, land tax holidays, lease buildings with rental concession, concessional rates for power and water, and, above all, the low-cost advantage of this State.

Members opposite slam the low-cost advantage and say, "Yes, and we had the lowest wages, too." Now they have the most expensive food, and at least in those days people had jobs and wages. They did not have unemployment, and they had a fine industrial record. There is no question but that our low-cost advantage was destroyed by the activities of this Labor Government, particularly of the Treasurer. There can be no question at present of attracting new industry to the State. The Government's desperate attempts to get the Redcliff project were, I think, the culmination of its last dying struggle.

When did the most recent major industrial development occur in South Australia? I do not think many people can tell us that. What a different situation it was in this House in 1970, when the Government was only too anxious to bring out its so-called fine record of industrial development! I cannot recall one major new industrial development in this State during the past three years.

Mr. Mathwin: Plenty are closing down and moving, though.

Dr. TONKIN: Efforts have been made but, as the member for Glenelg has said, the only thing that has happened is that industry is beginning to close down and move to other States. The reasons given are that the industries want to be nearer to their points of distribution or that transport costs are such that there is too much handling and the industries cannot afford that. The whole point is that there is no advantage whatever to industry not only in coming to South Australia but also in staying here. The only reason why established industry stays here is that its capital investment is so high that it cannot afford to walk away, but the time when it walks away could come.

I remember the early days of the Treasurer. He was a bit of a joke, even then. He used to fall over himself to try to make an announcement of some industrial development. He used to hog every single announcement that came, and he has not had much chance in the past three years. The major problem that now confronts this State Government, in the light of the high consumer price index in South Australia, the increasing transport costs and other costs, and the deteriorating industrial situation, is the problem of retaining industry as a financial and viable concern.

Avenues are open to the State Government to assist industry and the economy generally. Avenues are open to it to relieve the burden of taxation on individuals. Has the Government considered using a proportion of the payroll tax funds to assist business and industry, to stimulate employment, or at least to avoid retrenchments? Expenses in the private sector are increasing by 10 per cent to 15 per cent a year. I may add that this increase is considerably less than the increase in the public sector, but this is happening despite every economy that can be introduced and the retrenchments that become necessary if the organisation is to survive and the remainder of the work force is to keep a job. Land tax concessions could be given. Has the Government thought of doing that for industry?

Concessional rates for industrial water and power are areas where concessions may just be enough to make the difference between an industry's keeping going or going bankrupt. I repeat that, if an industry goes bankrupt, people will be out of work. The Electricity Trust's industrial tariffs easily could be subsidised and reduced over a period, returning to normal by 5 per cent stages, just as has been done recently in regard to the sales tax on motor cars. Has the Government considered anything like that? If it has, why has it not taken some sort of action? That action is well within its power to take.

Stamp duty concessions would benefit and stimulate commerce and, again, would relieve the pressure on individuals. Workmen's compensation should be considered carefully so that the premiums bear a true and fair relationship to what should be fair and reasonable benefits. Despite the remarks made recently in this House by the Minister of Labour and Industry, insurance companies are not making a rip-off from workmen's compensation business. They are losing money. All that has happened is that the appallingly high premiums, which have become necessary because of

the legislation passed in this House two years ago, can prove to be the last straw.

Mr. Keneally: You would cut the benefits to the injured workers.

Dr. TONKIN: A balance must be struck between the need to support and help the injured worker and a fair premium rate that will ensure that the undertaking for which he works does not go out of business and that he does not lose his job, because workmen's compensation (and this does not seem to get across to members opposite) is of no value if there is no job for the worker.

Mr. Allison: That is one reason why industry is moving to other States.

Dr. TONKIN: That is one of the reasons why industries are moving to other States, as the member for Mount Gambier has said. Has the Government thought of amending the legislation along those lines or, if it does not agree in principle with this, has it thought of subsidising the premium payments in certain instances? Land tax and water rate concessions for pensioners could well be extended to superannuants and other people on fixed incomes. Many people on fixed incomes are far worse off than those pensioners, who at least get some sort of increase, although it is not worth much, because of increased costs and taxation.

The much vaunted and publicised stamp duty and gift duty remissions on house transfers, brought out at the recent election, seems to me to be much like a confidence trick, too. It is almost impossible as I see it to bring this scheme into operation without a major amendment of the Succession Duties Act. Section 8 (1) (o) of the Succession Duties Act specifically aims at bringing a gift with reservation into the estate of the deceased, and the Commissioner would therefore have to include in the notional estate of the deceased spouse the value of a joint interest in a home that had been transferred under the moratorium as a gift by him or her to the other spouse. The donor would have continued to live in the house after the gift and this would have the effect of including the notional estate, and therefore duty would be payable as if the gift had not been made. This is a matter of reversion, and the sum would revert back to the total estate regardless of what action had been taken and there would be no avoidance of duty at all.

I do not know what the Treasurer intends to do about this, but it is quite obvious that the simple remission of gift duty and stamp duty that he announced at the time of the election will not be the solution to the problem. Perhaps he will tell us what he has in mind. Perhaps he will amend the Succession Duties Act specifically to take care of this matter. People in the community are even now inquiring about what they should do and when they can take action. The savings that could be achieved by administering properly a State Budget would perhaps not go very far. Spread out in one direction or another, they must help the general situation. If nothing else, they could show that the State Government really did care, and this would help to restore confidence.

Every effort must be made to preserve the economy of South Australia and, if it means using some of the surplus to which the Treasurer so proudly referred (some \$25 000 000 in the bank), I think it would be money well spent. If it is left where it is, \$25 000 000 this year will be worth \$20 000 000 next year because of the effects of the inflation that this Government and the Commonwealth Government are doing nothing to contain. This sum will be of no value at all if the economy of

the State fails or if South Australia loses more and more industry. It is not good putting aside all our reserves for a rainy day. I do not know whether members opposite know that it is a rainy day, but they can take it from me that it is a rainy day and that the money is needed and can be used.

I note once again that, traditionally, the Auditor-General's Report was not available with the Budget papers. The report has not been available with the Budget papers for the last 30 years. The past tradition has always been the excuse used in my time in the House whenever we have asked for it to be made available earlier. It is not easy to follow some of the Budget entries without the help of that report. The entry relating to Medibank is particularly involved and complicated, and I doubt very much whether any but one or two officers of the Treasury can understand that, anyway. I am sure the Treasurer cannot understand. The report is now available. One of the major things in the report is that the State debt has now reached \$2 000 000 000, and the impact of that interest bill is staggering. Because the Auditor-General's Report has not been made available, and because I believe that it should be if we are to investigate this Budget properly, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: No.

Dr. TONKIN: The sooner the Government gets this iniquitous document out of the way the better pleased it will be. I assure members opposite that it will be examined most carefully. It is quite clear from the Budget that the Government supports the current inflation rate in Australia. It must, because this Budget is totally dependent on it, in both expenditure and receipts. It is a propped-up Budget. The corollary is that this Government does not care about unemployment, and is not willing to take any action to promote and stimulate the private sector on which our future economic welfare depends. This is a stingy Budget, and the Government has no regard for the hardship that its massive increases in State taxation will cause directly and indirectly. The increased expenditure in the public sector is more than that due to natural growth, and is evidence of the Government's economic mismanagement.

The State and Commonwealth Governments are, more than ever before, birds of a feather, inextricably bound one to the other. I can only hope this Budget is more reliable than the previous one. The sorry list of sums and circumstances changing almost daily is summarised in the attachment, and cannot give any great hope of greater reliability this time; this Budget can give no great hope for the future. The Auditor-General's Report should have been available with the Budget papers, and the proper thing to do at this stage would have been to allow the adjournment of the debate. The Budget is nothing to be proud of. It is unimportant when first seen but becomes vitally significant when it is analysed. Most reluctantly, I support it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I read with some interest, as I always do, the Treasurer's explanation that accompanied the Budget. As is his wont, the impression given is that all in the garden is rosy. This is the picture we get each year when the Treasurer talks about his financial management or his Government's record, as he has since 1970, when the Labor Party took over the Treasury benches. The sort of thing we get is that South Australia enters 1975-76 in a better financial situation than does any other State. Earlier, he had said we had had to go back to the Grants Commission, because the situation in South

Australia had deteriorated. From time to time he denigrates the leadership in other States and says that our budgetary situation is better than the situation anywhere else in Australia. However, some of the other leaders have taken issue with our Treasurer on this matter.

Last week, when I was briefly in New South Wales, I became aware of the pressure being placed on that Government to transfer its railways to the Commonwealth Government. If the New South Wales Government succumbs to that pressure to transfer its railways, we will find that New South Wales will be in a better position in relation to its Budget, because its railways deficit is greater than its Budget deficit. If we follow this argument through to its conclusion, it seems to me that, if a transfer is to take place, for one State to do this is nonsensical, as I have consistently said during the debates on the railway transfer. If all the States transfer their railways to the Commonwealth, any advantage that we gain by virtue of this special payment will disappear. We will again be precisely in the same sort of competitive situation with the other States for Commonwealth funds.

From this Budget document, it becomes abundantly clear that any improvement in the financial situation in this State has been caused entirely by the transfer of our country railways to the Commonwealth. I submit that if the other States do likewise that advantage will be immediately lost. I think that the proviso, which the Treasurer refers to in these documents (that we cannot close the door for all time on the necessity of falling back on the Grants Commission), is one that will have to be resorted to. Any advantage that has accrued to this State as the result of this much-vaunted railways deal will be of short-term advantage.

Mr. Coumbe: I wonder what the position next year will be?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is a good question, and it will be even more important in succeeding years. Any advantage that accrues to this State will be short term, because of the political expediency to which the Treasurer of this State succumbed in transferring the country railways. There is tremendous pressure in New South Wales on that Premier to transfer, if not all, the major part of that State's rail services to the Commonwealth. I believe quite firmly that the only thing that would give any sense to the move that has taken place in this State would be if it were a nation-wide move. The fact that the Government has seen fit to sell our non-metropolitan railways to the Commonwealth in isolation is a stupid move, and any advantage that seems to accrue will disappear.

We get regurgitated each year "I am the greatest", and "This is the healthiest economy of any State", and again we are told that there will be no new increases in charges and taxes. We had it last year.

Mr. Coumbe: It's a joke.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a joke, without doubt, but the Treasurer has said it again. Medibank is mentioned in this document as also being a great bonanza for the State. However, when we think of it as a national scheme, we will have to get on the queue with the other States. There is no long-term benefit in South Australia from Medibank. In his statement the Treasurer said:

It enables me to present a Budget which allows for modest expansion, which aims at a balance on the year's current operation and which does not require any new or increased taxes.

We have heard that song before: we heard it last year. What is this document worth as a financial statement of the year's activities? This sort of statement is repeated in two successive years, but we all know that there have been massive increases in Government charges during the period of the operation of these two Budgets. We have just had a massive increase in water charges. I have taken out some figures to show just what has happened in this State in the five years in relation to these charges, but the Treasurer keeps peddling these lies. There are no increases in charges! How can he say there were no increases in State charges last year and no increases this year? We know perfectly well there are increases in charges, and recent increases, too.

Is this document a statement of what is happening with Government charges or is it not? Obviously, it is fast becoming worthless if that is the sort of construction the Treasurer intends to put on it. He intends to remove from this statement any new charges he has sought to levy on the public in this State and say year in and year out there are no increased charges. The statement is not worth the paper it is written on; it is completely misleading. Many increases have occurred since 1970, when these saviours of the people, the little people, came into office. The Labor Government was going to tax the tall poppies: it is not what it has done to the tall poppies, but what it has done to everybody that matters.

We know the Government brought in this slug on the profits of the Electricity Trust, and this, of course, increased the price of electricity, and not just for the tall poppies. Most houses I visit have light and power on these days. Where that is not likely to be the case would be somewhere out in the bush, out in the country. After this Labor Party Government imposed the levy on the trust in 1970-71, it raked in \$468 000; in 1971-72, over \$2 000 000; in 1972-73, \$2 240 000; in 1973-74, \$3 755 000; and in 1974-75, \$4 860 000. It has added nearly \$5 000 000 to the trust's charges in this State, and that is not borne by the tall poppies but by all members in the community who turn on the electricity.

Mr. Coumbe: Including the pensioner.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, and much the same applies to the Gas Company. These basic necessities of life have been heavily taxed. I am led to believe that the tariffs for electricity will again increase steeply. I well remember reading the Treasurer's comments in *Hansard* early in 1970-71 when the matter of increased stamp duty on motor vehicles was raised. He quoted at some length the case of the poor little people who had to have a motor vehicle, and said that this was an iniquitous increase. What has happened since 1971, when the Labor Party came to office? I point out that it is not only the tall poppies in this State who drive around in motor vehicles, because almost every household in the State believes it a necessity to have a motor vehicle, and most of them aspire to owning a new car. These were the kinds of stamp duty applicable in 1971: on a \$2 500 motor car, \$25; on a \$3 000 vehicle, \$30; and on a \$5 000 vehicle, \$50.

On December 1, 1971, the Labor Party forgot promptly, as it does from time to time, what the Treasurer had said, and increased the rates of stamp duty as follows: on a \$1 000 vehicle, the duty remained at \$10; on a \$2 000 vehicle, the duty was \$30; on a \$3 000 vehicle, the duty was increased from \$30 to \$55; and on a \$5 000 vehicle, the duty was increased from \$50 to \$105. Then again, in 1975 (when the Government was proud to announce that there were no increases in the Budget), the following duty was payable: on a \$2 000 vehicle, \$30; on a \$3 000

vehicle, \$60; and on a \$5 000 vehicle, \$140. When one thinks of a family buying a vehicle in 1970 and buying a similar vehicle this year, a year of high inflation (and I am trying to think back to when I bought my vehicles), I think it fair to say that a vehicle in 1970 which cost about \$3 000 would cost about \$5 000 now.

Mr. Becker: And the rest!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am trying to be fair. For the average householder, this stamp duty on the same vehicle has increased under the Labor Party (the working man's friend, the enemy of the tall poppies—the only ones who use electricity and drive cars!) from \$30 to \$140—an increase of 400 per cent.

Mr. Coumbe: Then there is the third party increase.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, but I am pointing out what this Government's contribution to inflation has been in the State. Another area in which the Government has leaned on the public is in the area of mortgages.

Mr. Venning: Can you see where it has reduced anything?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I cannot. At the end of 1970, if a young couple sought a loan of about \$10 000, they paid \$25 stamp duty. We all know what inflation has done to the building industry, so that, if a person was looking for a \$10 000 loan five years ago, he would probably be looking for a \$20 000 loan today. He would probably not be able to get it, but would have to take a second mortgage. The stamp duty payable would be \$60 on that mortgage loan or, in real terms, a 140 per cent increase. In the area of water and sewerage charges there were supposed to be no increased charges last year or this year. We have just had a massive increase in water rates. In 1970-71, the cost of water was 7.7c a kilolitre. There has been a recent increase in charges (and this goes along with the statement in this document that there are no increased charges!) and the charge now is 14c a kilolitre, which is almost double what the charge was five years ago when the Labor Party first came to office, and that is irrespective of what has happened to valuations.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: To keep up with the losses.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That may be so, but on my inquiries in Sydney—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They charge more there.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will obtain those figures. Real estate is more expensive there. However, I will cite what are the council and water rates for an ordinary suburban home, which I would equate with some of the new mushroom developments. I asked about the standing charges, and the rates were lower there than I consider them to be for a comparable home in this State. We see what nonsense was being promulgated by the Treasurer when he said that there were no increases in last year's or in this year's Budget. He announced them a month earlier—the same kind of exercise the Commonwealth Government performed when it announced its new postal charges (one of the most massive slugs in this nation's history), but did not include them in the Budget papers. That is a cheap subterfuge, and no-one can accept it.

Another matter I raise is of vital concern to this country and to this State, and I am not deterred by charges by Government members that the Opposition is union bashing. I have made my attitude perfectly clear on numerous occasions. I have said that I believe that the unions, since their inception towards the end of the last century and over the years, have done a tremendous amount to improve the lot of the working man and save

him from exploitation, and I believe that there are still many genuine union officials who are seeking to do the right thing. I listened with interest to recent statements by the member for Price and I did not violently disagree with what he said. I recall when the member for Price was an official of the Vehicle Builders Union. I make no secret of the fact that I have had only limited contact with the union movement, because of my background, and I do not apologise for that. My knowledge of the union movement is what I read and know of the subject. When I saw the member for Price on television making his speech at General Motors-Holden's and elsewhere I judged him to be a fairly moderate man, but my judgment of Mr. Scott was that he was not a moderate union man. I do not apologise for making those judgments. Certain union officials in Australia are doing this country considerable damage. Although they do not believe it, they are also doing the people they represent a great amount of damage. Government members can take or leave what I say, but I say it because I believe it. Government members may disagree with sentiments that have been expressed in the last two or three months about the situation in Britain, but recently I received a document, and no doubt other members have also received the same document.

Mr. Keneally: Not Johnson!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes: obviously the honourable member does not agree with that author.

Mr. Keneally: That's been going on for a long time.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It was sent to me last week, but I have also read articles in the *Sydney Morning Herald* by the same author. The document I received last week referred to conditions in Great Britain and stated:

The unions have refused to recognise the limits of their historical role. They have not only rejected the idea of a progressive abdication, and the shift of their social and economic function to the political process, but they have flatly declined to allow the smallest diminution of their power to press the sectional interests they represent. Indeed they have steadily, ruthlessly and indiscriminately sought to increase that power. And in recent years, and in particular in the last five years, they have exhausted or beaten down any opposition and have finally succeeded in making themselves the arbiters of the British economy.

Also, the same document referred to collective bargaining, a matter that is being discussed in this country at present, and that is why I raised this point. The document stated:

For "free collective bargaining" necessarily excludes huge sections of society. They are not organised. They cannot be organised. Rapid inflation inflicts the greatest possible suffering on the very poor, the old, the very young, the sick, the helpless, the physically and mentally handicapped, all the outcasts and misfits and casualties of society. Collectively, they number millions. Collectively—from a trade union point of view—they are powerless. They cannot, like miners, power workers, railwaymen, busmen and so forth, make the life of society miserable, damage its wealth and so force authority to surrender. They cannot batter the public with their fists. Old people open their newspapers with dread, knowing they will read of 30-, 40- even 60-per-cent wage increases, leading inevitably to monstrous rises in the cost of essentials, like electricity and gas, transport and food, and to compulsory charges like rates.

The document continued:

In the British Labour movement it is absolutely forbidden, especially for socialists, to criticise the trade union movement in any respect whatever, and in particular to cast doubt on the intellectual brilliance of its officers. Infractions of this rule are severely and permanently punished. But the tragic truth is that British socialism has a devastating

case to make out against the post-war union leadership. Men ought to be judged by their record, and their record is contemptible. Smug and self-assured, oblivious of any criticism, they have encouraged British industrial workers in habits and attitudes, in rules and procedures, in illusions and fantasies, which have turned the British working class into the coolies of the Western world, and Britain into a stinking, bankrupt industrial slum.

They are strong words. Members opposite can interpret this how they like, but I am not attacking the union movement; it is an attack on some union officials. I believe they are a powerful and influential minority, and they do the economy of the country and those they purport to represent an incalculable harm. I read an article by the same author in the *Sydney Morning Herald*: he is a socialist and I do not agree with that philosophy, but the author has taken issue with some irresponsible union leaders in Great Britain, because the article states:

Socialism is rule and economic control by the people as a whole, as represented in Parliament. Syndicalism is rule by trade union militants, representing a collection of sectional interests.

The first time I met Aneurin Bevan, who had the clearest brain, as well as the strongest emotional appeal, of any British socialist in our times, he pointed out to me this radical distinction. He had been a trade unionist since his early teens, but he said, "Never make the mistake of confusing trade unionism with socialism. They are two completely different institutions, and at bottom they are in conflict."

My memory goes back to this much respected member of the Labour movement. There is much more which I could quote in the remaining time at my disposal and which emphasises this point. I have many quotations with which I basically agree. We know what has happened in Great Britain. There, the Labor Socialist Government is powerless to act because it is hamstrung by these militant left-wing union leaders. Unfortunately, I believe we are seeing precisely the same thing happening in this country. We get the new Commonwealth Minister for Labour and Immigration, Senator McClelland, making certain statements and the Government adopting certain policies in relation to wage restraint.

Mr. Keneally: The member for Spence—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think the member for Spence is idealistic. I read his speech again at length, because I was interested in it.

Mr. Abbott: I was always guided by the rank and file.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Perhaps the honourable member was, but he cannot tell me that a union leader cannot be influenced by the people he represents or that he cannot influence them.

Mr. Keneally: You just put the kiss of death on him.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I may have put the kiss of death on him. However, I am quite genuine—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: A genuine kiss of death. Is that what you're saying?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I repeat it again, because the honourable member for Spence is now in the House. I saw him on television during that dispute, and I thought he was a moderate, sensible fellow. However, I thought the fellow Scott, who has a foreign accent, was a real donkey. I thought that, if ever there was a stirrer—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No racism now!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not care about racism. It has been said in the community, and I will say it again now: we are getting imported union stirrers into this country who are doing the country much harm. I have heard that said dozens of times, and I agree with

it. The union officials who were born in this country and brought up through the trade union movement seem, in the main, to be fairly sensible "Aussies". However, I do not agree with all they say. I think their outlook on the way in which an economy must develop is a bit blinkered. I think they are genuine, but we get these stirrers from overseas and, in my opinion, Scott is one.

Mr. Keneally: Is John Mathwin another?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, I have only four minutes in which to complete my contribution to the debate. Frankly, these people do much harm to this country. Who is running the country? Is it Whitlam or Hawke? Although they wanted to wind down the Regional Employment Development scheme, the unions say, "No, we will fight it."

Mr. Keneally: What about those in the board rooms of T.A.A. and B.H.P.?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: An article appeared in the press last week. Max Harris seems to think that we have had too much leisure time this week, although I have taken the time to do a bit of reading. I refer, for instance, to a report headed "Unions campaign to smash Labor's wage indexation policy" in the September 8 issue of the *National Times*. Whether or not we agree with that policy, it was an attempt by the Government to come to grips with inflation, but the unions are trying to smash it. There is a fellow called Scott; I am not sure whether it was the same Scott to whom I have already referred. The report relates to the activities of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union on the national scene. It states:

Despite denials by officials, the A.M.W.U. has picked on vulnerable areas to exploit its claims. The two most striking have been the Tasman Bridge . . . and the Monsanto petrochemical complex. There has been no work on the bridge for 10 weeks, despite repeated entreaties—

It goes on to enumerate the exorbitant wage claims that these unions are demanding on the national scene. Although I do not know Mr. Scott, the Commonwealth President of the A.M.W.U., I read what he says.

Mr. Keneally: He's an Australian.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Perhaps he is. That gentleman told the *National Times* of a plant-by-plant campaign that had finally witnessed a collapse by some companies in Wollongong, Newcastle, Sydney and Victoria. The report states:

Mr. Scott said increases gained ranged from \$5 to \$15. He expected further gains. "It always takes a while to start the crack going, but now it's been done it will grow." I now refer to a list of the major industrial disputes that occurred in that last week, as follows:

Tasman bridge dispute—\$20 metal industry claim. Metal industry award—\$18 to \$20 a week claims. Meat industry, Victoria (supermarkets)—\$60 a week claim. Meat industry, Victoria (smallgoods)—\$20 a week over-award claim. Vehicle industry, Geelong—claim for \$9.50 a week flow-on. Coal industry—full log of claims. New South Wales oil refineries—\$35 a week claim. Building industry, Melbourne—dispute over employers' attempt to bring in national award. Brewery industry, New South Wales—\$25 a week claim.

I repeat what I said earlier. It will take some fairly strong arguments from the Government to convince me other than that the pendulum has swung too far in relation to union power. There are people in the unions who are using their power ruthlessly, as we have seen and as has happened in Great Britain. Some are well motivated, others are not. These people are dragging this country to its knees. We have seen this happen.

Mr. Keneally: Despite all that, the Budget is pretty good. Is that the message?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The fact of life is (and no-one will convince me otherwise) that Australia is, unfortunately, pursuing the same sort of path that Britain tried to pursue under a Labor Government, where the theoretical socialists were unable to control the left-wing extremists in their Party. The same thing is happening here in this country. We have the back-seat drivers. We see it happening in this State. The Treasurer is going to legislate for wage restraint, and immediately Shannon and company are up in arms. I only hope that the Treasurer is more successful on the State scene in coming to terms with sensible, economic policies than his Commonwealth counterparts have been.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria) moved:

That the debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda (teller), Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson (teller), Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

The SPEAKER: There are 23 Ayes and 23 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): Action such as that just witnessed by the House is not taken lightly. The Leader of the Opposition indicated that we received only today the Auditor-General's Report. During previous Budget debates Opposition members have emphasised the need for this valuable document to be made available sooner, because we are expected to examine carefully the Budget papers during the show adjournment, and it is not easy for us to make a detailed study of the accounts of the State without being able to refer to the Auditor-General's Report. I therefore again ask that the report be issued sooner.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How puerile!

Mr. RODDA: The Minister can say that it is puerile, but I believe he went through the same exercise when he was on this side of the House. This Budget was introduced against a background of concern by people who are depressed and who are wondering what is around the corner for them. The signs of the time were never more evident than they were at the recent Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of S.A. Show. Business people at the show expressed concern that they had there the best exhibits that the State had seen, but they received no orders. The Secretary of the society (Mr. Sedsman) said at the outset of the show that it would be the best ever but on the closing days I spoke to a number of exhibitors who said they were disappointed at the response people had shown to their displays. Indeed, manufacturers told me that they had not booked any orders. This attitude must be considered against the background highlighted by the document we as an Opposition are considering today. It is against that background that we took steps available to us under Standing Orders to express our disgust that all relevant data are not available during the week members on this side are doing their duty examining and criticising constructively the Budget papers.

Behind the dark cloud of this Budget is the Australian Government's Budget that was brought down by the Commonwealth Treasurer (Mr. Hayden) about a fortnight ago. Last evening I was talking to several schoolteachers who told me that, from the customary school compositions written by schoolchildren on their first day back to school and diaries kept by children during school holidays, it was clear that many children had been to the show but that they could not participate in the sideshows because the cost was too high and could not take advantage of wares offered in show bags and in other ways for the same reason. One gets the truth from a child; our own Royal Show is really a shop window of the State. In bringing down the recent State Budget the Treasurer said:

The forecast of payments comprises detailed provisions of \$953 000 000 at wage and salary rates and approximate price levels estimated to be effective at June 30, 1975, a round sum—

he is here dealing with the previous Budget—

of \$82 000 000 for the possible cost of new salary and wage rate approvals which may become effective during the course of the year.

We have become accustomed to this review. Indeed, we have heard much about it this year in previous debates when it has been referred to as a "leap-frog Budget". South Australia faced a deficit of about \$62 000 000, which was subsequently reduced to about \$36 000 000 when Parliament met in June. On June 30 we had a credit balance of about \$22 000 000. It is also interesting to note the variations from estimates in the Budget. Taxation was \$15 277 000 over estimate; public undertakings, \$6 159 000 over estimate; recoveries of debt services, \$110 000 over estimate; departmental fees and recoveries, \$6 628 000 over estimate; territorial, \$86 000 below estimate; and the Australian Government grants, \$38 252 000 above estimate. The Treasurer indicated that he was seeking a balanced Budget totalling \$1 051 000 000.

However, the Budget must be examined against the background of the situation existing in the 1974-75 financial year. I refer to inflation and the performance of the Government, and I believe that no-one can say what will be the sum total in the Budget next year. For the benefit of new members the Treasurer drew attention to how the appropriation from the Commonwealth Government was made. However, I remember talking to the member for Mount Gambier before his election to this House on railway issues, and although I was confused on the issue already, after he asked me what he thought to be only the basic question in the matter, I was further confused. The Treasurer stated that South Australia's share of the \$220 000 000 to be distributed was expected to be about \$26 000 000 based on a formula, and also contributing to the balanced Budget was the important sale of the railways.

When introducing his Budget on August 28 the Treasurer referred to a balanced Budget. More recently, it has been interesting to hear him refer to the banning of sweetheart agreements, although I think there has been some disowning of the word "sweetheart".

Mr. Evans: It will be the kiss of death.

Mr. RODDA: It probably will be and it will be interesting to see what emanates from future arrangements in this matter. However, industrial reporter Bill Rust in today's *Advertiser* reported:

Plans by the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) to outlaw sweetheart wage agreements between employers and employees in South Australia have been opposed by the South Australian Trades and Labor Council.



The Trades and Labor Council is the base of the Government, and it is interesting to see the Government's attitude not only on this question but also on that of redistribution. I am interested to see what confrontation arises in this matter. The press report continues:

The council represents 68 trade unions covering more than 110 000 South Australian trade unionists. The T.L.C. had decided to send a deputation of T.L.C. officers to the Premier and the Minister of Labour and Industry (Mr. Wright) to explain its opposition to the Government's wages moves. The deputation's mission will be twofold—to tell the Premier of the T.L.C.'s conditional support for wage indexation and to express opposition to Mr. Dunstan's plan to amend the South Australian Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to ban sweetheart agreements "which are contrary to the public interest".

That, I believe, sums up the gravamen of the success or failure of this Budget. If the State's wage bill gets out of control, the figure of \$1 051 000 000 referred to will become distorted and we might see the reintroduction of revenue-raising measures, which we have previously seen such as the petrol tax and other taxes on consumer goods through which the public can be milked. It is interesting to see that the additional excise on beer will bring in about \$234 000 000. That sum comes straight from the pockets of the individuals of this State, irrespective of their political beliefs. Those good Australians are being milked—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Can the honourable member explain whether it is possible to milk a beer drinker?

Mr. RODDA: The Minister appears to have no difficulty with his milking. He does not even need tail tags on his cows, and there is no need to explain why.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: In objecting to the beer excise, are you objecting on behalf of the breweries, or on behalf of the dairies?

Mr. RODDA: I am objecting on behalf of the people of South Australia and the people of Australia.

Mr. Max Brown: What role do you think the employers ought to play?

Mr. RODDA: Employers like beer, too. It is pointless to suggest that they are all teetotallers at Whyalla. There is some responsibility on the trade union movement to support the indexation system supported by Senators McClelland and Wheeldon.

Mr. Max Brown: I can assure you that Sir Ian McLennan is not a sweetheart.

Mr. RODDA: I am talking about Senator McClelland.

Mr. Max Brown: I am talking about Sir Ian McLennan.

Mr. RODDA: I think Sir Ian has done well for the people whom the member for Whyalla represents. If due heed is not paid to these issues now before us we will be in a difficult position in relation to the effect of this Budget, as balanced as it is and as well set out as it is. It will not work unless all members of society play their part. The Treasurer has stated that the sale of the railways has made a sizeable contribution towards eliminating the deficit of this State. A report in today's *Financial Review* states that the Hon. Charles Jones has said that he foresees the establishment of a transport planning committee, to be set up in each State under combined legislation. The Minister was commenting on a Government plan to introduce legislation to provide for a combined scheme of assistance for roads and urban transport and to operate from July 1, 1977. The announcement has been made at this time, even though the present urban public transport scheme will not conclude until June 30, 1978. The article points out that the triennium under the

Roads Assistance Scheme ends on June 30, 1977, and because of this the change would provide a practical date for the start of a new administrative approach.

This legislation for an integrated approach to transport programmes and associated problems is a straw in the wind to show what we can expect on the transport front. That matter is of concern to the people in the South-East, and I am sure it was a contributing factor in the return to this House of the present members for Millicent and Mount Gambier. It is interesting to note that the Hon. Charles Jones makes this statement after we have seen the passage of a Bill to turn over to the Commonwealth one of the valuable assets of this State. Today, we have received the Auditor-General's Report. I hope that next year this document will be available when the Treasurer presents his Financial Statement to the House. On page 1 of his report, the Auditor-General states:

For the past two years my report contained comments which were critical of the financial administration of certain departments, and I contended that real budgeting principles were not appreciated or practised in some departments. Consideration of these matters now falls within the province of the Financial Management Advisory Committee which was appointed by the Public Service Board. The committee's objectives are to assist departments in the review and development of their financial management system and to provide a consulting service in the areas of budgetary control, accounting and financial systems. I understand that the committee has been active during the year but, when one considers that, as mentioned above, payments by the State for the year exceeded \$1 000 000 000, the urgency for ensuring first-class financial management becomes obvious.

Included in this report are a number of references to poor accounting performance in certain departments. In some cases this has been attributed to staff problems and the increased complexity and volume of transactions. In other cases, because of the urgency of programmes, departments have failed to comply with certain regulations designed to give maximum protection to public moneys. However, I consider that speed need not necessarily be inhibited by compliance with regulations.

That is a warning of what has been drawn to the attention of members by my colleagues who are members of the Public Accounts Committee, and it bears out what has been said about that committee, giving a further reason why the Auditor-General's Report should be available when financial statements are made.

In the previous Parliament we considered the Beef Industry Assistance Bill. This is a disappointment to beef producers, many of whom are in real need of financial assistance but have been unable to get financial accommodation in others areas. When we debated the Bill, the research then carried out showed that South Australia had about 450 beef producers who derived more than 50 per cent of their income from the production of beef cattle for slaughter. Press reports have stated that the response to the calling of applications for assistance from the fund has been disappointing, but today we were told that 126 applications had been received, of which 34 had been approved (amounting to \$278 500) and 60 rejected. The main reasons for rejection were that the applicant was a non-specialist beef producer or that sub-economic proposals were put for the assistance available. The widening of criteria for assistance to beef producers is at present the subject of investigation by the Australian Agricultural Council. Funds paid to successful applicants have amounted to about \$169 000.

The Acting Minister of Agriculture made a statement in March this year saying he had goodies in his bag, and an announcement was made at a beef field day in the



hundred of Marcollat that assistance would be available to an ailing industry, but eight months later only 34 applications have been approved. Many people in my district are in dire need of assistance and yet, because of the situation in which they are placed, they are unable to make use of this \$3 000 000 made available on a 50/50 basis between the Australian Government and the State Government. Despite what has been said today, it is a matter of urgency to give effect to this type of legislation and to keep these people on their properties.

Another matter coming within the ambit of production concerns superphosphate bounties. The rural scene in some areas has been characterised in the latter part of the year by a total lack of application of superphosphate. A statement was attributed recently to the Prime Minister, who used as an example the case of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Fraser), who, because of the size of his property, would benefit to the extent of about \$5 000 a year; the top 50 recipients together would get about \$17 000. That example is quite out of touch with reality. It does the Government no good to take a case such as that for political purposes. I know (and I warn the House about it) that, if the superphosphate situation remains as it is, there will be a marked turnoff. The Minister of Education mentioned the milking of cows, but soon there will not be any cows to milk. Australian soils that are farmed are notoriously deficient in phosphate, and there will be a marked down-turn in our pastures. They will not collapse immediately, but there will be a rapid dropping off and our pastures will become non-existent, and will have to be built up.

It is an agricultural problem that all Governments and Parliaments must concern themselves about. Perhaps it is one of the most serious things facing our food production at present. There is, of course, difficulty in finding beef markets. The wool market is showing signs of picking up, and I hope, for the sake of the Australian people and the Government, that the wool cheque is good. The farming areas have had a late start to the grain season. Sowings have been late and it seems now that we will not have a very productive year regarding grain.

Agricultural production has a marked effect on the Budget, and I sound the note of warning to the Government that all is not well with the producer, and the foundations that start from the application of superphosphate, because of the inherent needs of the agricultural farm lands, should not be dismissed with a political jibe such as was delivered at the Leader of the Opposition in the Commonwealth Parliament last week. The Treasurer refers in his explanation to law enforcement, and states:

It is expected that expenditure by the Police Department will increase by \$6 059 000 to \$36 300 000. The principal development in 1975-76 will be the upgrading of the police radio communication network.

I commend the Government for that. We must be fair in these things: it should not be all a matter of knocking. If we are to get on top of the road toll, we must have an adequate Police Force, and that Police Force must be equipped. The radio equipment for use by the officers at the Keith Police Station could be upgraded. The police station is on Highway 8, the Dukes Highway, in an area where speeds are high and many fatal accidents occur. When the Police Commissioner has made available additional police on that highway, we have noticed a marked drop in the number of accidents and a big increase in the amount of road courtesy shown. I hope that the increased amount that the Treasurer has decided to provide for the Police Force will have a salutary effect in this important area.

We now have priority roads and, if one tries to get on to one of these roads at a busy time of day other than at a traffic light, one must be willing to stay at the entry to the road for a long time. There is a need to educate the motorist about where to join priority roads at lights, and that will take time. We see the uneducated driver just going on to a priority road, and here again there is a real job for our police to do to educate the public to take advantage of the facilities being made available for the safety of our people.

I could say many more things about this Budget, but I end my speech on the note that it will be interesting to see what transpires this year. The outlook for primary production is not good. The Treasurer has worked for a balanced Budget and I hope that his selling off of some of the farm will be of benefit. I support the Bill.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I, too, support the Bill. In the five years that I have been a member of this House, I have always said that the Government should try to present to Parliament a balanced Budget, and this is the first occasion that I can remember on which we have had such a Budget. Income and expenditure will each be \$1 051 000 000. In explaining the Budget, the Treasurer gave details of the financial situation of the Consolidated Revenue Account and made much play of the fact that we had about \$25 300 000 in the bank. In fact, we have not that amount in the bank, but we hope to get an additional grant of \$2 500 000 this year in respect of completion grants for 1973-74, so at some time we will reach the figure of \$25 300 000.

What the Treasurer has not pointed out and the Treasury has not stated (and I should think they have done that with tongue in cheek when preparing the Estimates) is that, if there is a mistake of 2½ per cent or if inflation increases at that rate over and above what has been estimated, the \$25 300 000 that we will have in the bank will be almost wiped out, so, when we consider the delicate situation of our State finances, we see that it is not as rosy as the Treasurer would like us to believe.

However, he can be thankful that the selling of the non-metropolitan railways has meant that he was able to rescue the Budget and the Consolidated Revenue Account. If the Budget had gone according to plan and if we had not received that \$20 000 000 straight into the Consolidated Revenue Account, we would have had a deficit for 1974-75 of about \$11 600 000. Regarding the Consolidated Revenue Account, if we had not received the completion grants for 1972-73 and the unused assessed special grants for 1972-73 of \$6 400 000, totalling about \$14 900 000, we would have been in real financial trouble. That is because we opened the financial year on July 1, 1974, with a deficit on the Revenue Account of \$535 000 and, if we had had a prospect of a deficit of \$11 600 000 for that financial year, the position would not have been as it is today.

We had to sell the railways, had to get rid of them, and we did not have much option about getting the best deal. The transaction has gone through and the money is in the bank. There is now a responsibility on the Government and the State Treasury to live within the income we have this financial year. It is based to some degree on stagnation in the private sector and in industry, because there is little scope for those groups to make real advances in the next financial year. The Treasury has taken advantage of the inflationary trend we are going through, which would be about 16½ per cent, and has used that to gain about \$50 600 000 through indirect taxes.

If we look at the actual receipts for 1974-75 and what the Treasury expects to receive in 1975-76, we can see how the Government is, to some degree, capitalising on inflation—not increasing taxes; it does not have to, because the arrangement is there. The whole set-up was made in the last financial year and the year before. Some taxes were increased, and the increases in certain areas were unpopular but, because of the inflationary nature of those taxes, the Government can now ride through.

For motor vehicles (registration fees, drivers licences etc.) actual receipts were \$29 400 000; the Government this year expects to receive \$32 800 000. On land tax, because of the benefits of the revaluation system at the peak of the highest inflation the country has ever had, in 1974-75 the Government received \$12 900 000, \$900 000 over the estimate. This financial year the Government hopes to receive \$19 300 000. In stamp duties from various instruments and licences and betting tax and totalisator tax, which are receiving the benefit of inflation, the Government expects to have an increase of some \$9 400 000, going from the actual receipts of 1974-75 of \$46 700 000 to about \$55 000 000 for this financial year. In respect of succession duties, where no relief is offered at this stage although it was promised in the election speech by the Government (and we understand something will be done about it), the Government is expecting that succession duties will benefit the Treasury by some \$900 000. Actual receipts in 1974-75 were \$15 600 000, and this financial year the Government expects \$16 500 000.

Pay-roll tax is the greatest benefit the State has ever received from the Commonwealth Government, and of course that was under a previous Liberal Government. The Government has, like all State Governments, really capitalised in this field. This is the biggest blow industry has suffered. There is no incentive here to industry, particularly to small businesses. The base it is worked on has never been increased, and this is the area where the money is really being filched from the private sector. In 1974-75, the State received \$101 400 000, an increase of \$7 000 000 on the estimated receipts for that period. In this financial year the Government expects to receive \$126 000 000, so it is not a bad way of bashing private enterprise and taking the cream right out of the incentive in that sector.

The business franchise taxes will, of course, bring in \$12 100 000 in this financial year against actual receipts of \$8 900 000, but the petrol tax will be taken out of that; that is taken over by the Australian Government, so it means that people who smoke cigarettes, the average man in the street, the average working man, will be asked to make a contribution there without any relief. So there, in brief, are some of these areas where the Treasury will benefit without having to be unpopular in respect of tax increases in South Australia. Of course, the Australian Government's contribution to the States this financial year will increase by some \$110 000 000—not a bad hand-out. Receipts for 1974-75 were \$312 000 000, and in this financial year the Government expects to receive \$422 000 000 from the Australian Government. The Treasurer on page 5 of the Financial Statement said:

As to 1975-76 and the future, the total of \$25 000 000 of special grants actually received on account of 1974-75 is to be built into the base of the financial assistance grants and escalated in accordance with the formula. The State has now withdrawn its application for a special grant in 1975-76 and hopefully will have no further need for special assistance.

In this day and age, and considering the difficulties the State Government has had in presenting Budgets to us in the past and having to review each of those Budgets during

the financial year, I am a little wary of the statement "and hopefully will have no further need for special assistance". The Treasurer continues:

However, it is not possible to see the future so clearly as to be able to say that South Australia will never be claimant again.

I was led to believe from the previous statement (and we have had a wealth of statements to try to clarify the grants in relation to the selling of the non-metropolitan railways) that it would never be necessary for the State to become a claimant State again. Now, the way is still there. In other words, we are out of the Grants Commission but the opportunity is there if we want to go back to it. I hope we do not have to do so, but I cannot see, under the Government's previous record, how we can stay away from the Grants Commission for very long. The test will come when the Budget for the 1976-77 financial year is being prepared. The Treasurer states:

The way has been left open for us to make a submission to the commission in respect of a future year if South Australia's financial position should deteriorate relative to that of New South Wales and Victoria and if the making of such a submission should appear to be in our best interests.

As I have said, a 2½ per cent mistake in the calculation will wipe out the \$25 000 000 in the Consolidated Revenue Account, and we will be in trouble: we will go further into debt. If we do not want to sell off the farm any further, we will make a claim on the Grants Commission. The Government has a history of doing this, of forcing the State into the situation where it has to go cap in hand to Canberra for assistance. It is all very well for the Treasurer to be critical, on occasion, of the financial situation in Victoria and New South Wales: he probably hopes they will not get out of that situation because it will make it all the easier for him when he gets into trouble. Selling off the assets that we have (and there is no doubt it will continue; there is no doubt that the Commonwealth Government will continue its attitude of interfering with local government, by-passing the State Government) the State Government will be forced into that situation in the future.

So there is the situation, as I see it, on the credit side of the Budget: there is little to enthuse about, and nothing to get uptight about except that there is no relief for the private sector. The future of the State is at stake. If we do not have a thriving private sector, a lack of confidence spreads throughout the community. That is the tragedy we are facing. On the expenditure side, this is the record expenditure of the State Government, and the warning for the second time is in the Auditor-General's Report in relation to the various departments handling their budgetary affairs; but the responsibility devolves upon the Ministers themselves, whether they are competent and capable of supervising the operations of their departments. The Government intends to increase the State's Ministry, and whether or not it is because of the work load, it probably can be more correctly stated that it is essential today on behalf of the taxpayers to ensure that the Ministers have the ability to oversee the operations of their departments and to ensure not only that the Government's legislative programme is carried out but also that the moneys handled by the officers are handled wisely and without the amount of waste we have seen in bygone years.

The Treasurer virtually admitted this afternoon, in stating in answer to my question that it would cost the State a large sum of money to engage additional accountants and economists. Some wastage would have to be expected, but that is not good housekeeping, from any

point of view. It means that the Government has not had its priorities in order in relation to the handling of the State's finances. We know we have first-class Treasury officials, and it must be frustrating to them and to the Auditor-General when they see what is going on in some of our Government departments. The Treasurer's attitude toward the Public Service does not show that he has complete confidence in public servants. A channel 10 news item about the Treasurer on Monday, August 25, was as follows:

Addressing a conference at the South Australian Institute of Technology he said various departments had tried to hinder legislation in the past and outlined several examples.

The Treasurer was reported as saying:

It was very difficult to accomplish. While we could get legislation through, it was not easy to get changes in administration. The people who were administering the new legislation were the people who had been in charge under the old Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board, and quite often in the community Governments are attacked for the fact that they say things possibly as to their policies but these do not seem to have been being carried out at the street level, at the organisational administration, and quite often it is because there is but real resistance upon the part of public servants to changes in policies.

There is the crux of the statement: it is alleged that there is real resistance on the part of public servants to changes in policies. In other words, the Treasurer was attacking public servants for alleged incompetence. In his second reading explanation the Treasurer said:

Provision is included in the Budget for the Community Welfare Department to recruit 40 social workers from overseas to fill existing staff vacancies.

I query the necessity to recruit 40 social workers from overseas. Why should we deny other countries the benefit of trained social workers? Why should we poach from those countries and bring social workers to Australia? On the other hand, the Minister of Community Welfare has said that his department is investigating the possibility of encouraging voluntary workers in the community welfare field. I fully support the idea, as did the *Advertiser* editorial this morning and the *News* editorial this afternoon: it is a first-class idea. Those giving their time and service in this way must be encouraged to do so and must not be restricted. I have previously said that I know people with spare time who are willing to help those less fortunate than themselves, but the department has not allowed them to give help because it insists on academic qualifications. For economic and educational reasons and through no fault of their own, some women with young families are unable to bring up their children in the way children were brought up in the good old days. Voluntary workers would be willing to support and assist such mothers. This very important area of community work should be expanded. The Treasurer's second reading explanation continues:

This will enable the department to staff its decentralised district and branch offices more adequately. It will also facilitate establishment of a crisis care service which will be available on a 24-hour seven-day a week basis to deal with family crises.

This is something of which we have heard very little. We are not informed of the extent to which family crises occur in the community. Once the service commences, the public will be amazed at the demand for a crisis care service, which will be necessary on a 24-hour, seven-day a week basis. The Treasurer's second reading explanation continues:

Youth services throughout the State will also be strengthened by the appointment of neighbourhood youth workers whose function will be to help train and support voluntary workers in local community organisations for young people.

I could not agree more. Problems arise in these areas because of the economic situation, the pace of living, the standard of living, and the period of growth that young people are going through. Through television programmes young people get grandiose ideas of what happens elsewhere, and they believe that they can do the same things here. The project to which the Treasurer referred will benefit the State and be a great improvement.

Members appreciate receiving copies of the Auditor-General's Report, and they would like to have as much time as possible to study it before they debate the Budget. For many years it has not been possible for members to receive the report before the Budget debate commences. This indicates that there must be something wrong with the system. Surely, with modern accounting procedures and with the use of computers, Government departments can supply information to the Auditor-General earlier than they have done in the past. Surely an effort could be made to give Opposition members as well as Government members a chance to look through the report before they are expected to debate the Budget. The Auditor-General's Report states that the State Government Insurance Commission now has accumulated deficits of \$5 500 000. When the Government set up the commission, it was warned that it would be some time before the commission could operate profitably, and it appears that at present there is no chance of the commission's doing it. The accumulated losses must be a source of concern to South Australian taxpayers. The Auditor-General's Report says:

The effect of the accumulated loss in respect of the commission's operations to date was that at June 30, 1975, the total net assets were less than the provisions of \$35 563 000 shown in the balance sheet by the amount of \$5 532 000 (\$4 006 000 at June, 1974).

In the balance sheet the provision for outstanding claims is \$23 100 000. The commission's total net assets have increased from \$8 000 000 to \$30 000 000 in the last financial year. Of course, the commission now controls all third party motor vehicle insurance in South Australia; that is why the figures will get worse before they get better, even though premiums have been increased.

Mr. Evans: Do you think it is a rip-off?

Mr. BECKER: It is the greatest monopoly I know. The State benefits through interest-bearing deposits. In connection with the Hospitals Department, in the Auditor-General's Report we see an example of what can happen when a Government plans huge capital cost programmes without taking inflation into consideration. Referring to the Flinders Medical Centre, the report says:

Building operations of the centre, comprising an integrated teaching hospital and medical school, commenced in June, 1972. The whole scheme was estimated in July, 1971, to cost \$38 700 000. Of that amount for the four phases of construction the hospital component (710 beds) was expected to cost \$31 040 000 and the medical school component \$7 660 000. The estimates did not include certain factors, such as cost escalation, equipment usually supplied by the Hospitals Department, the supply and installation of computers and terminals and the commissioning costs of the Hospitals Department.

We find further on in the report that the total funds approved escalated as at January 1, 1975, to \$58 076 000. The cost of this project, which will have to be referred back to the Public Works Committee for a further report, has increased from \$38 700 000 in 1971 to \$58 076 000 as at January 1, 1975. What the total completion cost will be, I do not know, but the effect of that increase on the works programme and the Government's long-term planning is really the problem. The Auditor-General points out that the Woods and Forests

Department's accounting system has not changed since 1926.

We find that, under the Education Department, on page 79 of the report, \$2 579 000 is outstanding in school bonds. We know of the many trainee teachers who have left the department for various reasons such as health reasons and who are finding difficulty in repaying their bonds. The Government has appointed a special organisation to collect these outstanding amounts. The difficulty is that the trainee teachers who received these bonds paid income tax on the income they received but, now they have to pay back the bonds, they are unable to claim a taxation deduction. This is a matter on which the Minister of Education could approach the Commonwealth Government and ask whether relief could be given to those former trainee teachers by allowing them to claim on their taxation returns regarding repayment of their teacher-training bonds. If such payments could become a tax deduction, I am sure that the department would find that a greater effort would be made to repay the \$2 579 000 that is owing.

We find under the State Supply Department about a 25 per cent increase in the amount of stocks held (page 216 of the report). One wonders why there is this jump from \$18 542 000 to \$26 097 000. It is interesting to note that, as referred to on page 297 of the report, the Lotteries Commission has benefited the Hospitals Fund during the past financial year through an operational surplus of about \$3 600 000 against the previous year's surplus of \$2 300 000, no doubt because of increased activity. That is a great benefit to the fund. In the past financial year, about \$3 600 000 was transferred to that fund for the benefit of hospitals. There are many other areas on which I should like to comment regarding the Government's proposed expenditure, such as the \$52 400 for inquiries in the Premier's line and the anti-litter programme costing \$50 000. That is a first-class idea and programme and I hope that, in the beach suburbs, we will be able to get behind the proposed projects outlined by the Treasurer, namely, community involvement through service clubs, thus making people more aware of this State's litter problem. That \$50 000 would be well spent in this regard.

Regarding the return visit to Penang, I query the worth of spending \$177 000, but if it is spent on promoting the State and its industries, and if we are to gain valuable contacts there and opportunities for export, the money will be well spent. I query the \$750 to be spent for the Premier's cup for yachting. If he thinks that his cup is going to be as good as the Admiral's Cup, he will find that it will cost more than \$750. I believe that that sum ought to be paid out of his own pocket. I am concerned to note that the Municipal Tramways Trust will have an \$8 000 000 deficit; in other words, it has gone in five years from a surplus to a thumping deficit, and that is a reflection on the poor administration of this State's transport. The sum of \$800 000 has been made available under the Lands Department for grants for metropolitan unemployment relief. I hope that that money will be used wisely to ensure that unemployment benefits can be maintained. Pre-school children will receive \$10 000 000.

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

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg) moved:

That the honourable member's time be extended by 15 minutes.

40

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Rus-sack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Noes (25)—Messrs. Abbott, Boundy, Broomhill (teller), and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Kenally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): The document that we are now debating has been variously described from this side of the House by members who have spoken. It has certainly had outside a response that is anything but gratifying to a Government that claims suddenly to be financially wise and to have found funds to enable it to balance its Budget and have money in hand. At the outset, I want to say that, for the first time in my memory, the document at least contains some frank statements. It comes face to face with some of the realities of the present situation and highlights the growing division that exists between the Treasurer and the Prime Minister.

The Treasurer indicates clearly that some Commonwealth Government activities are totally to the disadvantage of the State Governments, and he refers particularly to South Australia. He says that the difficult financial circumstances in which we found ourselves in the 1974-75 financial year were in great part engineered by the Commonwealth Government. He referred then to the Government's failure to come forward with an additional \$6 000 000. He said that, when the Commonwealth Budget was brought down in August, 1974, it created a situation in which the State's funds were disadvantaged to the extent of \$4 000 000 because of increased costs that it introduced. He also went on to state that the provisions made by the Government to offset increases in wages and salaries had been completely torpedoed by the Commonwealth Government's activities. I will return soon to more of the specific statements which the Treasurer made and which are refreshing because they are so frank.

Certainly, the Treasurer stated that, between 1938 and 1959 (it might have been between 1933 and 1959) and again from 1970 onwards, South Australia had been a claimant State. I was interested to return to the Treasurer's announcement in 1970, as a result of which the State, having been a non-claimant State, became a claimant State. I refer to *Hansard* of September 3, 1970 (page 1269), where it can be seen that the Treasurer introduced the Budget for the 1970-71 financial year which anticipated an aggregate expenditure of \$376 760 000, and a deficit of \$4 896 000. I refer to that solely because, as can be seen from the document that the House is now debating, the Government seeks authorisation to spend \$1 051 000 000, which is almost a 200 per cent increase in five years. As has already been pointed out, much of that increase has been in wages and salaries. The result has been that, apart from the massive increases in wages and salaries, the cost of the services normally applying in the Government, as well as the private, sector has markedly increased for a lesser return.

We have the Treasurer's own fairly recent statement in relation to the building industry, associated with public works (more specifically schools), where there has been a 100 per cent increase over five years, in the last two

years of which 67 per cent of the increase occurred. The Treasurer previously explained why he had decided that South Australia should revert to being a claimant State.

It was somewhat in a state of pique that the then Prime Minister had refused, the Treasurer claimed, a proper distribution of funds for the States. Indeed, the whole discourse in the early part of the report relates to the financial discussion that took place in Canberra at the conclusion of the previous five-year period of the financial arrangement and in the light of determining the new five-year plan for 1970 to 1975. The Treasurer said he was not satisfied with the total amount of funds that had been made available to the States generally, and particularly to South Australia. He 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. Believing that we had a genuine case for additional assistance, and that our need could be demonstrated and proven in the way the commission requires before it recommends special grants, the Government determined that an application should be made for an advance grant this year. One may ask how it is that South Australia could record a surplus on its current activities in 1969-70—

and that was a statement of fact; there was a surplus in 1969-70 trading—

and yet justify a special grant in 1970-71. Naturally this is a point on which the Grants Commission also needed to satisfy itself. As I will explain in a few minutes when reporting on the finances of 1969-70 there were some unusual factors, including recoveries from outlays in earlier years, very heavy grain movement, and receipt late in the year of increased Commonwealth grants.

That is an admission that the same Commonwealth Government (which was being damned in the period from June, 1970, onwards because it happened to be of a political persuasion different from that of the South Australian Government) had come forward with increased grants late in the 1969-70 financial year. Members who were present at that time will recall the various crises, particularly the one relating to education, which were engendered in the minds of people by members opposite, and foisted on the media and anyone else who happened to be about. Simply, Commonwealth funds were increased. The *Hansard* report continues:

The main factor, however, is a very simple one. Having regard to the number of children requiring schooling at Government schools, to the population requiring hospital services, and to other genuine requirements for social services, it can be shown latterly the South Australian Government has been spending many millions of dollars less than was genuinely necessary to give South Australian citizens standards of service equivalent to those enjoyed by the larger Eastern States.

That passage is worth analysing, too, because it acknowledges that the Eastern States were providing far better services than were provided in South Australia. One cannot deny that the exigencies that applied in South Australia during 1968-70 were the result of the financial mess that the State had been placed in by the Walsh and Dunstan Governments. Anyone who looks at the financial affairs of the State and its progress from 1965 will accept that situation. The Administration between 1968 and 1970 had to reverse the undesirable financial trend that had begun to develop and had to try to get the State back on to a proper financial base. I believe the Treasurer has now accepted that the changed attitude that was adopted in 1968-70 was necessary because of the rampant disproportionate spending that had been allowed between 1965 and 1968.

Indeed, if we read the relevant Budget documents we find that the Treasurer acknowledges the real service to the people of this State given by his predecessor (the Hon. Sir Glen Pearson) and that he accepts that the action taken by the Government between 1968 and 1970 was necessary. It is strange, when one considers the type of comment we now hear from members opposite, that the Treasurer accepts and acknowledges that the Eastern States were providing better services than those being provided in South Australia at that time. The Government may well say it has now reversed the situation, but I question that in many respects, because I believe that most of the statements emanating from the Treasurer regarding the Eastern States and also Western Australia have been politically motivated to try to rubbish the Premiers of the other States. We saw the come-back that most of those Premiers had to the grossly inaccurate and libellous statements made publicly by the Treasurer prior to July 12. The *Hansard* record continues:

Had those services been given at the standards provided in New South Wales and Victoria, the South Australian accounts would clearly have shown very heavy deficits. The attempt to improve standards of services and wages this year, coupled with the Commonwealth's refusal to offer any direct supplementary assistance, has made a deficit in 1970-71 quite unavoidable.

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

Dr. EASTICK: I accepted that, in 1970-71, there was a need for some alteration in several wage and salary levels associated with State services. However, one must accept the situation that, far from upgrading the services or making reasonable adjustments, the Government commenced to be a pacesetter for all Australia. It started off in the railways, as the Minister of Transport will recall, and that move, apart from movements in wages and salaries, led to a situation in which the difference between skilled rates and unskilled rates was grossly diminished, and in which service agreements and sweetheart agreements put South Australia at the forefront. Now, belatedly, the Treasurer wants to outlaw such agreements, but whether or not he will be successful is not clear from our questioning of him this afternoon. His assertion that his will prevail is not certain having regard to the public statements made by representatives of the Trades and Labor Council earlier today.

We had a situation in which South Australia became the pacesetter for many wage escalations that took place elsewhere in Australia. The Treasurer can shake his head, but if he examines railway wage levels in 1970-71 and the new figures that were introduced, he will see how South Australia became the first State (and it is still the only State), to pay workmen's compensation on a 100 per cent basis. Through the Government's activities over the past five years, South Australia has lost the advantage it used to have that ensured that our products from the motor vehicle industry and the white-goods industry could be placed on the important Eastern States' market at a reasonable price. That argument must be developed at a later stage, but I do make the point that in South Australia, in 1970, the Treasurer clearly indicated the course of action that his Government would take.

It is interesting to note that the views the Treasurer held in 1970 about the then Commonwealth Government are similar to the views he has expressed about the present Commonwealth Government. Of course, he now makes these comments in a rather guarded fashion, and rarely can they be accepted as meaningful. During the present session, the Treasurer acknowledged that his recent attack on the Prime Minister had been discussed beforehand with the Prime Minister, so that actually it was

all done for political convenience, for publicity, and it was not a meaningful attack on the Prime Minister. I point out that the Treasurer was allowed, and has continued to be allowed, by the media to get away with pulling the wool over the eyes of the South Australian people. I have previously referred to the occasions on which there have been several statements in respect of funds being made available, with newspaper headlines referring to statements that have been made three or four times before.

I refer to the situation that arose in, I think, June, 1974, when headlines indicated that \$44 000 000 of extra funds was to be made available for South Australia, yet not one cent of that sum was in the form of extra funds. It just happened that the Prime Minister was in South Australia and conveniently signed a document validating the arrangement. Perhaps this was on the Labor day holiday, in October, 1974, and not June, but the signing merely validated provisions that were contained in the Commonwealth Budget. There were massive headlines, and plenty of television and radio coverage that we suddenly had a new injection of funds.

Mr. Whitten: Was that the Labor day holiday that you're talking about?

Dr. EASTICK: I stand corrected if the honourable member can tell me the right date. However, it was a holiday, and perhaps I was correct when I referred to the period in June. There was a holiday when the Prime Minister came to South Australia and signed documents as if they represented a completely new injection of funds for South Australia when, in fact, that was not the case.

Mr. Whitten: It might have been about the time of the Adelaide Cup holiday.

Mr. Harrison: That's in May.

Dr. EASTICK: Whenever it was, the point is valid: it was suggested that massive funds were being made available to South Australia whereas, in fact, they had not been made available. The Government was permitted to get away with this facade, indicating a massive allocation to this State by the Commonwealth Government. I stated earlier that it was refreshing to see several frank admissions in the Budget. The Treasurer stated:

It is of interest to note that, had State Government employees as a whole experienced the same increase in average wages as the community in general (a little less than 27 per cent was the wages increase factor in the Financial Assistance Grant formula), this cost would have been some \$10 000 000 lower.

In other words, the Treasurer was willing to accept that the activities of the Commonwealth Government had caused much concern and financial embarrassment to this State. The Treasurer also stated:

In presenting the Budget to the House last year, I mentioned that there were indications of some stabilisation in the volume and value of land transactions and that receipts from stamp duties on conveyances were therefore expected to increase at a much slower rate than previously. Stamp duty on mortgages was expected to follow a similar pattern. In fact, the difficulties being experienced in the real estate market proved to be more severe than had been expected, and revenue from these two sources fell well short of estimate.

Those facts were made known to the Treasurer when the Budget was presented to the House last year. The Treasurer

then denied that there was any validity in the argument that was being put forward that there had been a gross misrepresentation or a gross misunderstanding by the Government of the true position applying in the real estate industry. It is pleasing to know that at long last we can get such an admission of guilt from the Treasurer, even though it is belated.

I wish now to refer to the plight of a voluntary organisation in South Australia which, so far as I can determine from the Budget, will not receive the type of consideration that is necessary for its continued service. I refer to the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. I am a member of its general committee, as is the member for Ross Smith, who has been a committee member and who has been referred to in its annual reports for a longer period than I have. The society has provided a real service to the people of South Australia. It allows the Police Force and the Agriculture Department to offload much of the responsibility that would otherwise be theirs if this voluntary organisation did not do the work that it does. In recent years the society has received \$1 200 per annum in a government grant. It has been able to tell the Government that it is facing real financial difficulties to the point that it may be required to cease much of its operation by October of this year.

I recognise that there are many voluntary organisations in the State and that they do considerable work in the interests of their particular area. This afternoon, the Minister of Community Welfare was asked whether the Morialta Children's Home property could be acquired by the Children's Foundation for its permanent home. I know the tremendous work that this organisation has done and I know the great work done by organisations for handicapped children and children who are disadvantaged because they live in the country areas. I know that organisation seeks to have these children in the city for education and other purposes and during holidays, and I recognise the vast amount of work to be undertaken on behalf of the aged.

Because of the failure of the Commonwealth Government to fulfil its promise to many aged cottage homes organisations, the building of homes for the aged is virtually at a standstill and, obviously, the Government cannot take up that leeway or necessarily increase the amounts made available for these projects. Therefore, one must balance the claims of all the organisations that are vying for money but, in promoting the cause of the R.S.P.C.A., I come back to my original point that, by its work, it prevents much cost and workload from being placed on other vital services in the State, particularly the Police Force. The 1974-75 report of the society states:

Reports and inspections received and actioned by the headquarters of the society, 3 854. This total does not include reports received and actioned by the society's honorary inspectors and branches. Each case of alleged ill treatment investigated may concern more than one animal. The report then gives graphic detail of the distribution of the calls that the society has had. I seek leave to have that table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

CALLS ON SOCIETY

	Dogs	Cats	Horses	Sheep	Cattle	Birds	Native & various	Total
Destroyed sick and injured . . . . .	285	627	5	6	3	139	39	1 104
Veterinary attention arranged . . . . .	177	33	2	3	—	126	31	372
Rescued and Released/Returned to Owner/New homes found . . . . .	697	100	3	4	2	99	3	908
Cases of alleged ill-treatment investigated . . . . .	642	85	122	38	28	79	96	1 090
Gone on arrival/Dead on arrival/Unable to locate . .	193	104	2	1	3	67	10	380
Total: . . . . .	1 994	949	134	52	36	510	179	3 854

Dr. EASTICK: In a document prepared for the Chief Secretary (or for the person who has occupied that position, which is quickly disappearing), the Secretary of the society states:

The function and work of the R.S.P.C.A. is detailed in the society's Constitution and Annual Report, 1973-74. During the year ended April 30, 1975, a total of 4 763 reports of suffering animals due to accident, sickness or cruelty were received and actioned by the society in the State. 1 278 of these reports were of allegations of cruelty, which were subject to formal investigation by R.S.P.C.A. inspectors. Nine hundred and two patrols to rescue suffering animals were completed during the night hours or over weekends and public holidays by the salaried inspectors (4) alone. In addition, 237 patrols were carried out of markets, abattoirs and other areas where animals may be at risk, 3 700 horses in transit were inspected and five

ships carrying stock were checked. Those figures do not include the large number of calls received by day and night from persons requesting advice on animal problems. If the society were not in existence, a large part of this burden would fall on the police. It is believed that it will be agreed that the society's function in the community is a necessary one and, due to the society's fund raising, carried out more economically to the State Government than it could be by Government alone.

The report then indicates that the society has been hit hard by the current inflationary spiral, and that can be seen from the table showing the costs involved from 1963-64 to 1974-75. Then a comparison is given of the figures for 1969 and 1975, and I seek leave to have those figures incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Year	Expenditure	Income	Op. Deficit	Offset by Legacies	Account Funds at end of year	Salary bill for year
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
74/75 . . . . .	83 149	21 050	62 099	13 689	30 094	45 729
73/74 . . . . .	60 278	26 025	34 253	58 583	78 504	33 927
72/73 . . . . .	46 544	16 182	30 362	16 429	54 174	27 730
71/72 . . . . .	40 995	15 884	25 111	10 534	67 564	24 709
70/71 . . . . .	36 561	16 621	19 950	4 320	81 729	22 013
69/70 . . . . .	28 874	12 803	16 071	13 517	97 349	16 526
68/69 . . . . .	25 201	12 115	13 086	1 918	100 034	14 560
67/68 . . . . .	22 959	12 710	10 249	32 557	111 238	13 683
66/67 . . . . .	21 008	10 737	10 271	21 677	87 667	12 388
65/66 . . . . .	20 409	9 359	11 050	13 235	76 261	13 051
64/65 . . . . .	20 570	11 436	9 134	10 593	74 076	11 710
63/64 . . . . .	17 662	9 816	7 846	10 010	72 612	10 716

#### COSTS

Comparison, of 1969-75:

	1969	1975
Income . . . . .	12 115	21 050
Expenditure . . . . .	25 210	83 149
(Salaries) . . . . .	(14 560)	(45 729)
Approximate percentage increase 1969-75:		
Income	73 per cent	
Expenditure		229 per cent

Dr. EASTICK: The important issue is that the approximate percentage increases between 1969 and 1975 show that the income increased by 73 per cent but that expenditure increased by 229 per cent. I may be in error; the Government may intend to give tangible assistance to this organisation to offset increased expense in the Police Department or elsewhere. However, I cannot find such information in the document, and I believe that the Government should urgently consider and attend to the vital needs of this organisation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): At this stage of the debate, there is no point in going over the general matters which have been canvassed already and which I have often mentioned in the past in the debate on what we used to call the first line of the Estimates. All these things have been said, and I will summarise them. First, under present financial arrangements, this State is carried on the chariot wheels of the Commonwealth Government, and the Party in office here and in Canberra wants it that way. Whatever may be said, it will continue to have it that way. I am not sure what will happen if the other crowd get into office in Canberra. What that Party says in Opposition may not necessarily be carried out when that Party is in office. However, that is one of the facts of life and we cannot do much about it.

It can be seen by looking at page 4 of the Estimates of Revenue that nearly half of the total revenue of South Australia comes directly from the Commonwealth Government. I remember when it was less than one-third, but

it is increasing all the time and it increases our dependence on the Commonwealth Government every day. Then, when the Commonwealth Government makes a decision that we do not like, we can do nothing about it, because we have no financial independence. My second point, which has been canvassed extensively in this debate, is that the Commonwealth Government has made a mess of the economy. That has been said again and again and everyone knows that it is true. There is no point in doing more than restate it.

There are several other specific matters concerning this debate and the Budget that I want to mention. The first is that I protest at the apparent intention of the Government to push the Budget through this House this week. When I came into the Chamber today, I was confronted with the roneoed sheet which every member has and which shows the legislative programme for this week. I saw that the Budget, according to the Government, was to pass all stages by next Thursday. We had a little set-to about the arrogance of the Government, particularly the Deputy Premier, a few weeks ago. When I said that he was an arrogant man, there were a few sniggers in the House, but what I said was true. If the Government expects to get this Budget through this week, I can tell it that it will not be with my co-operation. That is the most arrogant action by a Government that is frightened of this House that I know of. I have had research done for me about the time that it has taken in the past few years for the Budget to be debated in this place. Apparently, the Government proposes this year that it will be pushed through in three days, which allows 9½ hours of debating time. I see the Government Whip nodding in agreement, which confirms what I have said. In the four years from 1971 to 1974, the average time spent on the Budget has been 20 hours 16 minutes over a period of five days.

Mr. Jennings: What a waste of time!



Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me tell the honourable member that, when Government members were in Opposition, in 1968 the debate lasted over eight days, and for a period of 49 (nearly 50) hours. In 1969 it lasted over a period of 11 days, and again nearly the same time—over 48 hours of debate. That is when the Labor Party was in Opposition and the House was evenly balanced as it is now. Yet, on this occasion, we are told that this debate is to be finished in one week.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will do my best to see that it is not finished within one week, and that we have plenty of time to debate the various lines in the Revenue Estimates as well as having our say on this first line, whatever value that may be. I give that as a fair warning to the Government if it proposes to adhere to its legislative programme of putting the Budget through this week.

Two matters arise out of the Treasurer's speech concerning revenue—and, of course, this is our only opportunity in the debate to deal with revenue matters. The first concerns succession duties and the Government's promise (as set out on page 8 of the document) to amend the Succession Duties Act so that a widow or widower could inherit an average-size family home without payment of succession duties. That was almost the phrase used by the Treasurer in the Labor Party policy speech. It is an inexact phrase; no-one knows what it means. What on earth is an "average-size family home"? What it means to me may mean something entirely different to other members of this Chamber, and that promise was virtually no promise at all, as we see clearly from the speech itself. The Treasurer says that the proposals introduced in the Succession Duties Act Amendment Bill will cost the Government \$1 000 000 this year in revenue, and about \$2 000 000 in a full year. The irony of the situation is that it proposes to collect in total succession duties more than it collected before. The estimate is \$865 000 above the amount collected last year.

This makes a complete farce of the Government's promise. Let me say something about the campaign which has been going on for some months in this State about succession duties. The petition that has been circulating in this State goes further than the policy of my Party in this matter. That policy is to avoid succession duties on the matrimonial home, of whatever value, passing to a surviving spouse. The petition goes further than that and, whereas I drew the words of the petition, I made it clear to the person for whom I drew it (whom many of us have come to know quite well) that it went further than I wanted it to go. It has been a pleasure to hear members on both sides of the House presenting the petition that I so carefully drew for them. I am told that now 16 749 signatures have been put on copies of that petition which have been presented already in this place. I have 1 500 or more to present in the next few days. That petition asks for the abolition of succession duty on that part of an estate passing to a surviving spouse; in other words, everything if it goes to a surviving spouse. Perhaps we cannot go as far as that, but it is a farce and a confidence trick on the part of the Government to claim that it is giving any real significant benefit in what it proposes to do in this remission of succession duties.

Mr. Duncan: Don't overstate your case.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Elizabeth, the pretender to the Ministry, asks me not to overstate my case. I take it that the clear implication of that inter-

jection is that I have quite a good case even if he thinks I am overstating it. I do not believe I am overstating it, but it is an admission from him that I have a case in what I say, that the Labor Party is letting down and misleading those people to whom it has made the promise that there will be a significant remission of succession duties.

Another point is the indexation of taxation. The campaign against succession duty in this State has been sparked off mainly by inflation and the fact that, because succession duty is on a sliding scale, more and more people are caught by it and are paying a heavier and heavier proportion of the succession. We believe there should be indexation of taxation of all State taxation. That was part of our policy at the last election, and I hope it will remain so. There is not one word of it, of course, in the Government's proposals. On the one hand, it decries inflation in the community but, on the other hand, through taxation it takes advantage of it. Another matter that the Treasurer mentions on that same page 8 is pay-roll tax. He says:

The increase applied last year in the rate of pay-roll tax from 4½ per cent to 5 per cent will operate for a full year in 1975-76 and produce some further rise in receipts.

There is no remission there in this form of taxation. I believe, and my Party believes, there should be a significant remission of pay-roll tax. This is what I said about this matter in my Party's policy speech:

Pay-roll tax has been, since 1971, a State tax. Many employers who previously did not pay this tax, because their annual pay-roll was below the lower limit of \$20 800, now because of greatly increased wages are having to pay. They are finding it a great burden. I give two examples: first of all, a small business and, secondly, a voluntary organisation which has a small full-time staff.

I canvassed the position of many small businesses which the Government is supposed to want to help in this State. I said:

There are many business men now who are desperate because they see failure ahead of them.

Then I mentioned voluntary organisations and gave one example. Perhaps it is appropriate that I should mention this particular voluntary association again tonight in view of the announcement the Minister of Community Welfare made today about the Government wanting to help voluntary work in the community. It seemed to me to be a complete contradiction in terms that the Government should take over and organise voluntary aid. It would get on better on its own, so long as it did not have thrust upon it imposts such as this one. In the Liberal Movement's policy speech I said:

I mention one voluntary organisation which in 1972-73 paid \$54·70 in pay-roll tax. In 1973-74 it paid \$451, and in 1974-75, the year just ended, it has paid \$1 135. The number on the staff has remained constant at nine. It is a youth organisation, and this tax comes out of the pockets of its members and supporters.

If there is any example of the way in which pay-roll tax has escalated to the detriment of community organisations, that is it. I challenge any member to deny that that example could be multiplied time and time again. I now come to something that occurred in the House today. Obviously, in the Budget speech increases in wages dominated what the Treasurer had to say. It is no wonder that they did, because the prime cause of the inflation which we are now suffering is increases in wages. Before the House adjourned for the show recess, the Treasurer on Wednesday, August 27, (at page 488, *Hansard*) made in this place a Ministerial statement setting out Government policy about wage restraint. He said:

This I realise means that for the time being grounds for seeking wage increases will be very limited, but unless



something is done to contain the rate of inflation it seems inevitable that the number of persons unemployed will continue to increase. The Government considers it is preferable for there to be some wage (and price) restraint than for uncontrolled increases in wages to result in increasing unemployment.

He concluded by saying:

A separate Bill shortly to be introduced will require the Industrial Commission to certify that any industrial agreements must not be contrary to the public interest before an agreement can be registered.

That is all that the Treasurer said about it, with no qualifications whatever. It is in line with the sorts of thing he has said in the Budget speech about inflation; that was duly and faithfully reported in the *Advertiser* on the following morning. There were also some comments in that paper, as follows:

It is understood this legislation is aimed at cracking down on sweetheart agreements between unions and employers.

Everyone kows that that was precisely what was intended. The report in the *Advertiser* says:

The Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia (Mr. J. E. Shannon) yesterday warned that unions would oppose any moves towards legislation restricting "collective bargaining".

On the same day the *News*, under the name of Rex Jory, the political correspondent, has a quotation of the Treasurer, as follows:

"To be enforceable under the State Act, sweetheart agreements have to be registered," he said. "The court will have to certify that sweetheart agreements are not contrary to the public interest."

Those words are in inverted commas. I, for one, am willing to accept the entire accuracy of that, knowing Mr. Jory, a reputable and experienced journalist. We then had an editorial in the *Advertiser* on the following day, Friday, August 29, headed "Swansong for sweethearts". On that same day in the afternoon in the *News* we had the attack by the Hon. Mr. Dunford on the Government. The article in the *News* by Alex Greig is headed "Labor M.L.C. attacks Dunstan clampdown".

Mr. Abbott: We've all read it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Members are going to hear some of it again. In the course of disagreeing with the Treasurer in connection with the clampdown on sweetheart agreements, Mr. Dunford is reported as saying (again, it is in quotation marks):

"Mr. Dunstan has gone too far. He did not consult his Parliamentary colleagues or Caucus on this move. Maybe he did not do so because he felt many of us would have found it too hard to swallow. Whatever he felt, his clampdown will not work. It's as simple as that. . . . All hell will break loose in this State over this move because the majority of workers cannot keep pace with the price of basic commodities."

The honourable gentleman then had a swing at Senator McClelland, the Commonwealth Minister. Mr. Dunford is reported as saying:

"I was in the Trades Hall last night and they gave me hell over this. I'm afraid I couldn't defend Mr. Dunstan."

That was apparently a verbatim report of what Mr. Dunford had said about this matter in criticism of the Government. We find in this morning's paper (and this founded a question from the member for Light this afternoon) a quotation from the Treasurer in inverted commas, as follows:

"This policy—

the policy in the Ministerial statement to which I referred and which was criticised by Mr. Dunford—

has been previously discussed with the Party Executive, the Caucus, Federal members, and officers of the Trades

and Labor Council," he said. . . . Mr. Dunstan said he had never used the term "sweetheart agreement" which he believed had caused some of the misunderstanding.

That is not in inverted commas, but there it is. The Treasurer was quoted as using the term "sweetheart agreement" in the extracts to which I referred, but that is of much less importance than is his claim that the matter had been discussed by Caucus and with Commonwealth members and so on, and the disclaimer by Mr. Dunford that it had not been so discussed. Both those gentlemen were asked today in the respective Houses to which they belong what the explanation of this was. When the member for Light asked the question in this place, the Treasurer said that Mr. Dunford had told him that he had been misreported. When Mr. Dunford was asked a similar question by the Hon. Mr. Cameron in another place, he gave a similar reply. I say straight out that I do not believe either of them. I do not believe for one moment either that the Treasurer believes that Mr. Dunford was misreported or that Mr. Dunford was, in fact, misreported. That was a deliberate attempt to mislead, and I say it quite definitely.

Let us look at the Hon. Mr. Dunford's statement. It was, first of all, in inverted commas, which means, as we all know, that that was word for word what he had said to the reporter. Secondly, if he were misreported on something that was so critical of the Leader of his own Party, why was there no disclaimer immediately in the paper the next day or even in the next edition? Not a word was heard. No disclaimer of it, and that would be the first thing we would get if there were a misreporting. Let me ask another question, namely, if he were misreported, what, in fact, did he say about the matter? Is it all lies? Was it all made up by Alex Greig? Of course it was not, and we know, and they on their side know, that it was true. That is exactly what Mr. Dunford said and that is exactly how the trade union movement in this State feels about it. What has the T.L.C. now said? Of course, it is not going to back up the Government in this policy. This is a very serious matter.

I believe it is serious for there to have been such misleading statements made here and in another place, but what is even more serious is that the trade union movement in this State apparently is acting contrary to the Government's policy, its own Government, and quite irresponsibly. I hope indeed that the members here who are trade unionists or ex-unionists will do something to persuade their colleagues at Trades Hall to see reason in the interests of this State and country because, if they do not do so, their Government is in for a humiliating defeat and, worse still, the State will be irrevocably harmed. That is, I believe, a very shabby episode. I make one further point about industrial relations in this State. This afternoon I asked a question about the dispute at Rainsfords. I suggested that the Treasurer should go down there and speak to those who are striking, who are picketing, who are causing trouble.

Mr. Venning: What did he say?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He said "No". He gave the one word answer of "No". Here is the man who has a policy, who announced it in this place and who, when the Hindmarsh Building Society was in trouble last year, went out with a megaphone to try to persuade people. We saw it during the election campaign. What caused the Treasurer to leave his desk in two minutes flat was the story then, when all he had to do was to walk around and spruik in Gawler Place, but when we have a situation at Rainsfords which is crippling motor vehicle production at Chryslers, which is causing unrest, and which is entirely

wrong in every way, he will not do a thing about it. He will not give any reasons why not. He simply says that he is not going. What is the explanation of this? The explanation is that he knows that his own Party is not going to back him up on this matter and that the T.L.C. is against him. He has not the guts to say so or the courage to say it here or to face those who are causing trouble down at Lonsdale. I think it is a great pity. I made that suggestion to the Treasurer as a constructive suggestion, something which he perhaps could do to help in a most serious situation.

Mr. Keneally: When are you going down there?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will go down if I am invited to go down and put the case. Let me finally say something about the Auditor-General's Report. We heard complaints today from the Leader and I think from other members about the fact that the report had not been available. I must confess that those complaints are somewhat hollow, because for the 20-odd years I have been a member the same thing has happened, whichever Party has been in Government. The report has been presented to the Leader of the Opposition just as he has been about to get on his feet to speak, but I think he had it a little earlier today. Although I think it is a bad thing and I believe that the report should be available earlier, I do not believe that Opposition members can really complain too bitterly about it. I will refer to only one matter in the report because I have not the time to refer to any others, and that is on the question of housing, which the member for Fisher raised today, as he has on previous occasions. I refer members to page 336 of the report, which states:

Overall the table reveals a continued decline in the operating results of rental properties by \$736 000 to a deficit of \$2 549 000 in 1974-75. The overall deficit on rental dwellings was \$2 530 000 (up \$328 000). A factor contributing to this large and increasing deficit has been the failure during recent years to relate rentals more closely to operating costs. A general rent increase was approved by the Government effective from February 1, 1975, with increases ranging from \$1 to \$2.50 a week but not applying to certain pensioner tenants.

When the member for Fisher asked a question about this matter today, what did he get from that most voluble of Ministers, the Minister of Mines and Energy? That Minister said that he would think about it. Of course, again the Government illustrates the fact that it has not the courage to do something about the situation that is crying out for action. This matter has been raised not only by an Opposition member (a member of the Liberal Party), but it is referred to in the Auditor-General's Report. I hope that, when the Minister has pondered on this matter, he will decide to take some action on it.

Mr. COUNBE (Torrens): We are debating this set of Budget papers at a time when we are in a state of inflation, industrial unrest, and unemployment. I was going to speak on the matter the member for Mitcham has raised later in my speech, but I will do so now and get it out of the way, because the follow-up was related very much to Question Time today, and what a debacle it was. First, the Leader of the Opposition asked the Minister of Labour and Industry a question, and what did he get? The Premier standing up.

Mr. Evans: Both of them.

Mr. COUNBE: Yes, but the Premier prevailed, because he is the senior and is in charge of policy. What reply did the Leader get? It was an expert example of soft-shoeing. The Premier shuffled away from the question and gave no information whatsoever. This was soon followed up by a question to the Minister of Labour and

Industry, who deigned to reply to that one, and it was followed by a question from the member for Light to the same Minister. However, from all this, we did not get any information, and the whole of the question was shuffled off.

Dr. Eastick: We didn't believe the information we did get.

Mr. COUNBE: It was farcical. The Government in this regard is trying to cover up, and there is no doubt about that. Interspersed between these probing questions were, after all, two interesting questions asked by the member for Stuart and, I think, the member for Florey. Just by pure coincidence the Minister happened to have the material at hand on industrial disputes and unemployment. This afternoon's example was absolutely deplorable, and there is no doubt that the Government is crumbling and the front bench is falling apart. We are even having a Minister resigning shortly, and I do not blame him for that for a moment. A new Minister will be appointed shortly, and we will be having a twelfth Minister. There will not be any back-benchers left shortly.

Mr. Keneally: Yes there will be. I'll be here.

Mr. COUNBE: Where? Back or front bench? There are many pretenders on the Government benches.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Torrens.

Mr. COUNBE: I have said that we are debating these Budget papers in a time of inflation, considerable unemployment, and considerable industrial disquiet in the community. I think that that is plain and clear, and it has been referred to by other speakers who have spoken today, and we have not heard anyone from the Government who has defended it. I do not know whether back-benchers have actually read the Treasurer's statement or whether they have carefully considered all its implications. I should like to put a few matters to members so that they can get the true perspective.

Listening to the Treasurer introducing the Budget, one would have thought that everything was right with the world, that money was flowing out of the Treasurer's ears, and that everyone in South Australia was to get massive tax deductions and long-overdue tax relief. However, let us examine the State's balance sheet. I listened carefully to what the Treasurer said, and I have read the documents. I must say that the Treasury officers have gone to much trouble in presenting in a logical way these papers for our perusal, on which I congratulate them. But what happened last year? Receipts for 1974-75 totalled \$829 000 000 and exceeded the original estimate by a mere \$66 000 000!

Breaking that down, taxation was \$15 200 000 above estimate, public undertakings \$6 000 000 above estimate, recovery of debt services \$110 000 above estimate, and departmental fees and recoveries (and these are solid) were \$6 600 000 above estimate. One finds that territorial finance was \$86 000 below estimate, and the Australian Government's contributions \$38 250 000 above estimate, making a total of \$66 300 000 above estimate. That is a significant factor and one which the average South Australian taxpayer must pay, because, in the main, this money, except for the Australian Government's contribution, comes from him. Really, however, he pays for it all, whether the money comes from State or Commonwealth taxation: it comes out of the same pocket, and sometimes it comes out more than once. If one looks at the State's balance sheet, one can see that there was a surplus on Consolidated Revenue at June 30, 1975, of \$22 782 000, which was subject to a further

\$2 500 000 that might have been received soon thereafter. If one looks at the estimated receipts and payments for the year ending June 30, 1976, one sees that South Australia is to have a balanced Budget, estimated receipts being \$1 051 000 000, and estimated payments the same.

I point out two significant features, and refer, first, to the first page of Parliamentary Paper No. 7. The allowance for increased wage and salary rates is \$82 000 000. That is indeed a significant sum and is based upon an estimated inflation of 21 per cent a year, regarding which advice has been received from the Commonwealth Government. Therefore, we are considering a Budget which in itself is inflationary and which will generate inflation. The next item is an allowance for increased prices, because of inflation, of \$16 000 000. Those are two significant sums that have been allowed for by the Treasurer in the State's balance sheet. There is nothing whatsoever in the Budget that will tend to retard inflation in South Australia. Indeed, to the contrary, the Government is riding on inflation to make its balance sheet look good. There is not the slightest doubt that the Government is taking advantage of inflation.

I should like to go into some detail regarding the Revenue Estimates, because they are interesting. They show the sums of money that the State will receive, from one source or another, from the people of South Australia. I refer now to page 4 of the details of the Government's Estimates of Revenue for the year ending June 30, 1976, and specifically to Part I, relating to taxation. Estimated receipts for this year compared to those for last year show an increase of 24 per cent, the actual increase being 18·2 per cent. That is not a bad jump in State taxation.

Mr. Mathwin: Not bad!

Mr. COURCE: It is not bad at all. I took the trouble of working out what this meant to every man, woman and child in South Australia. I went back to June, 1970, which was about one month after the former Liberal and Country League Government was defeated and the second Dunstan Government formed.

Mr. Simmons: That was an auspicious time.

Mr. COURCE: It was. We are considering the effects of the Liberal Government's handling of the State's finances at that time, when the per capita taxation in this State was \$50. But what does this document indicate? It states that from June, 1975, to June, 1976, the per capita taxation in this State will be \$250. As the member for Peake said, that is a significant date. So, in 54 years we have had a five-fold increase in per capita taxation. I have included every man, woman and child in this State in my calculation and divided that total into the sum, to the result of which I have already referred.

Mr. Simmons: What about education expenses?

Mr. COURCE: I am pleased the member for Peake is eagerly awaiting my comments in that respect, because I will come to that matter. I now refer to Part II, relating to public works and services and other receipts in the Estimates. The total estimated receipts for 1974-75 compared to estimated receipts for this financial year show an increase of 27 per cent, whereas the actual increase was 21 per cent. They are not bad rises at all. The estimated receipts for Part III, relating to territorial finance, was about the same figure; in fact, it was almost spot on. The Australian Government's contribution to the State increased from estimate to estimate by 48 per cent, whereas the actual amount received increased by 35 per cent.

If one looks at the total receipts, one finds that from the estimates for 1974-75 to 1975-76 the increase was expected

to be 28 per cent, compared to an actual figure of 20 per cent. The 28 per cent compares with a 23·7 per cent increase in 1974-75. Therefore, we are milking from the long-suffering taxpayers of this State about a 28 per cent increase this year. This is at a time when the Treasurer, in his financial statement, says that there will be no taxation increases and tells us how lucky we are! Of course, the Minister of Works happened to increase the price of water before that statement was made. That is purely coincidental and completely overlooks the fact that some savage increases in stamp duties were levied last year. Those increases were felt over only a small part of the last financial year. In this financial year, however, their full effect will be felt. Despite these statements that there will be no taxation increases, the people of this State will have to pay about \$250 000 000 a year extra in taxes. This is apart from what is paid to the Commonwealth Government. It is ludicrous for the Treasurer to talk in that manner. Let us consider some of the taxes that have been referred to. The matter of motor vehicles was raised this afternoon when it was indicated that imposts in this area will rise by about 7 per cent this year. South Australia is not implementing new charges but is feeling the effect, multiplied, of a full year's tax as against a part of a year's tax last year, and, in addition, vehicle costs have risen.

The Treasurer made great play about land tax equalisation. At the end of the previous session I asked him to give us examples about the equalisation plan and he quoted many examples where the charges on individual houses would go down. However, he conveniently forgot to tell us where charges would go up, in some cases increasing tremendously, which is the case in my district. The Treasurer estimated that the sum to be collected last year from land tax would be about \$12 000 000 and has estimated that, for the coming year, it will be \$19 350 000. So, someone will suffer, and many people will be sluggish. Receipts from land tax will increase by 87 per cent in South Australia! How hypocritical can the Treasurer be in that regard?

Last year it was stated that stamp duty receipts would decrease but, according to the Treasurer's estimate, they will not decrease this year. I have worked it out that the Government will receive an increase of 10·7 per cent in its coffers from stamp duty. It is not known how much will be raised from succession duties, because it is not known who will die or how big the estate may be. However, estimated receipts from succession duties have increased by 22 per cent under a benevolent Government that is supposed to look after small people. Let us now consider pay-roll tax. Who would be in business today under the present State Government and the Commonwealth Government in Canberra? I assure members opposite that the rate of bankruptcies and the numbers of small businessmen going out of business are rising daily. Record numbers of people are giving up the ghost because it is not worth working, or employing people or providing job opportunities to get over the unemployment problem.

Mr. Venning: It's part of the socialist plan.

Mr. COURCE: I agree. Pay-roll tax is up a cool 34 per cent over last year's figure. Last year the Treasurer estimated that he would receive \$94 000 000, but his estimate was out (just as it was out in the Loans Estimates document, which was worthless) and he received \$101 000 000. What does he expect to get this year—\$126 000 000. Each time wages go up, up goes the amount of pay-roll tax to be paid, so fewer people stay on the list of exemptions. The Treasurer spoke about sweetheart

agreements, but it suits this Government to have spiralling wages because, by collecting pay-roll tax, it laughs all the way to the bank.

Mr. Mathwin: The Commonwealth Government is not doing too badly, either.

Mr. COUNBE: It either laughs all the way to the bank or is busy cranking the machine that turns out green notes. Regarding waterworks and sewers, the Government will get a hurry-up shortly because the first quarterly rate notice are being issued. In fact, some rate notices have already been received and people in my district have gone berserk when they have seen the increased charges in this area.

Mr. Keneally: They may eventually have good reason to go berserk.

Mr. COUNBE: People are going berserk at the Government. I invite the member for Stuart to visit some of the small cottages in my district to see what people think about paying increased charges. I see that the estimated receipts from waterworks and sewers has increased by 21 per cent. You, Mr. Speaker, will find that your constituents will be affected by this. Perhaps their increase will be more than 21 per cent because of the average under the equalisation scheme. Even the Electricity Trust of South Australia, the State Bank, and the Savings Bank of South Australia are paying increases of almost 20 per cent. The increase in the price paid for gas is shown on a separate line and indicates that people are paying more for electricity and gas. I have referred to these matters to illustrate what this warm-hearted Government is doing for the little people of this State. It is flogging them and forcing them out of business. In some cases it is putting them into grave financial difficulties as far as their personal affairs are concerned. This is the only debate during which we can refer to the Revenue Account. On the payments side the figure has jumped from \$774 600 000 to \$1 051 000 000. It is a 29.3 per cent increase over last year's payments.

There are numerous other matters contained in Parliamentary Paper No. 9 about which I could comment, but my time is running out. Last year the Treasurer said he would restrict employment in the Public Service and that he was making an all-out effort to do so. It is interesting to note that the Auditor-General says that the sum paid during 1974-75 to people employed directly by State Government departments, apart from instrumentalities, for salaries, wages, fees, etc., that are charged to Revenue, Loan and other accounts totalled \$519 000 000, an increase of \$145 000 000 over the previous year.

The Auditor-General kindly includes the number of officers of the Public Service employed during the previous year, and shows that 3 900 additional officers were employed in 1974-75, an increase of 5.32 per cent. What will it be this year? I do not know. I want members to remember that 3 900 additional officers were employed in 1974-75 when next they hear the Treasurer talking about the Public Service and pontificating about how he will reduce expenditure in this field; a field, incidentally, where my Party said there could be re-organisation or rationalisation. However, the number of officers and the cost to the State have been increased.

I now refer to the Highways Department and a matter close to the heart of the Minister of Transport: that is, freeways. Of course, the Minister dissociates himself continually from freeways. He describes them as "high-speed corridors" and all sorts of things, but until 1980 he will have nothing to do with freeways.

Mr. Mathwin: He hates the M.A.T.S. plan.

Mr. COUNBE: True, and freeways are anathema to him. However, at page 123 of his report, the Auditor-General states that in the financial year just ended about \$2 250 000 was spent on acquiring land for freeways. The Auditor-General uses the word "freeways" and he lists the freeways in detail in his report. True, some freeways go through my district, but the Minister can do nothing about the Auditor-General, who is an officer of Parliament, a statutory officer. I admire the way he presents his report, especially as his phraseology is correct.

I think one honourable member opposite invited me to speak about education. The Auditor-General states that there has been an increase in salaries of \$57 500 000, which represents a 48 per cent increase in the amount paid in the previous year, subject to a few adjustments which are set out in the report. This increase resulted from the handing down of certain salary awards, but the sum involved is a solid lump for any Government and any State to digest in one hit, in one year. I sympathise with the Minister of Education in having to face this problem. I have gone to the trouble of finding out what the teaching cost per pupil is in this State. This cost of teaching per pupil is not available for the past financial year, because the Education Department works on a calendar year.

Mr. Keneally: What was the cost per pupil when you were Minister?

Mr. COUNBE: When I was there the cost at primary school was \$187 a pupil, and last year it was \$395. I am glad the member for Stuart came in on cue and fell for the thimble and pea trick. In the year ended June, 1970 (the nearest figure I can obtain), the cost was \$170, and last year it was \$395. The secondary school cost per pupil in 1970 was \$353, and last year it was \$741. The Auditor-General made the following pungent comment:

The costs for 1974-75 are not yet available, but will show considerable increases.

We can see that the cost will increase about three-fold by the time those figures come out.

Mr. Keneally: Are you objecting to a 300 per cent increase in expenditure on education?

Mr. COUNBE: This is a problem that the Minister and the State must face.

Mr. Simmons: Do you think he should not face it?

Mr. COUNBE: That is the Minister's job, and he took an oath to do it. I wish him well, but I do not envy him. We are in a time of escalating inflation and rising unemployment, and I believe some industries must suffer further hardship. I refer especially to the motor vehicle industry, and we can trace back the difficulties of this industry to an unfortunate decision made in Canberra about 18 months or two years ago when there was a 25 per cent tariff reduction made in respect of imported cars. Despite several moves since that time, the position has not been remedied and, unfortunately, today we are seeing increasing numbers of imported cars coming into Australia from Japan and other countries to the detriment, especially, of South Australian workers. That is one of the facets about which I am concerned and, if honourable members opposite have examined the latest reports, they will see that since the reduced sales tax came into force the number of imported Japanese cars coming into South Australia has increased, and job opportunities for many thousands of workers in the South Australian vehicle industry and associated industries will suffer.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): In rising to support the Budget I say from the outset that I believe it is a

poor Budget, full of blarney which could well have been introduced on St. Patrick's Day to much greater effect. If ever a Budget was a two-bob bet each way it is this Budget. We now have the position in South Australia where we have sold half of our railway system (pawned it would be a better description), and the revenue we have obtained from that sale has offset the deficit we would otherwise have had. It has also put a small additional amount into the State's kitty, and the Treasurer gets great delight from quoting the figures and the fact that our Budget is in the black and not in the red. However, none of this money will improve the services of the railways. I refer to the situation in regard to the Christies Beach area, and the line extending through Brighton to Christies Beach. This line was promised by the Government last year, and I remember reading that we were to have a fast line to service this area, that the whole system was to be electrified, and that the system was to be the best in the Commonwealth.

What do we see now? From questions we have recently asked of the Minister of Transport, it is clear that the Government has now no intention of proceeding with that project, because it has been let down badly by its Commonwealth friends in Canberra. As I said earlier, the money it has received from the sale of the country railways is not to be spent on improvements to the remaining metropolitan railways or on the electrification of the Christies Beach line. Nevertheless, through its Land Commission the Government is encouraging people in South Australia to purchase land in this area. The Government is encouraging people to purchase land at what it describes as a reasonable rate, and not long ago the Government said people could buy land in the metropolitan area for \$5 800. If ever there was a misstatement of fact that was it. So much for the Land Commission through which the Government encourages people to buy land far on the outskirts of the metropolitan area, yet it provides no transport system to bring people to the city, where most of them work.

The responsibility is clearly that of the Government, which cannot evade it, no matter what it does. We have the situation of the development of land at Christies Beach with no improvement in the means of access between that area and the city. This Budget is of no assistance in that area or to the private sector, and I am not surprised by that, because we know that this socialist Government has little room for private enterprise in its philosophy. In fact, the opposite is the case. They do not want anything to do with it and they will do all they can to finish it.

Mr. Arnold: That is why they're in the trouble they're in.

Mr. MATHWIN: That is right, not only in this State but in Australia generally. Nothing will go well until they do something and stop talking. Recently Ministers have stated that there is room for private enterprise, but that is only talk and they do not do anything about it. This State is in as bad a position as the Commonwealth Government socialist friends of members opposite have got Australia into. The Government members will not encourage private enterprise.

The taxation in this State is going up and up. We were reminded in this House this afternoon that, for every \$1 paid in taxation when this Government came to office, tax of \$4.30 is now paid. That is a fine record that the Government responsible must be proud of! We remember the soft Budgets that we have had. Last year

the Treasurer stated that there would be no increase in taxation, as he has stated again this year. The Government was helped by the press last year and the *Advertiser* stated in large print that there would be no increase, but taxation went up and up, as we can expect from a socialist Government, a socialist State, because, regardless of how great are the benefits provided, they must be paid for, and the only people who can pay for them are the taxpayers.

Socialism and its benefits must mean high taxation. This Government exists on high taxation and taxation will go higher and higher the longer the Government stays in office. I think the Government's reign is nearing its end and that, at the next opportunity, it will be put out, as it justly deserves to be. The taxpayers will be paying an extra \$16 000 000 next year, according to the Treasurer's explanation. On page 7 of his explanation, in regard to hospitals and health, the Treasurer states:

Hospitals Department: for Hospitals Department, an aggregate appropriation of \$144 028 000 is proposed. In the absence of the Medibank agreement, the provision would have been about \$124 528 000. The difference of \$19 500 000 may be broken into two parts for ease of understanding . . . In the second place, provisions of \$4 500 000 have been included to meet estimated additional cash costs which are likely to fall on the Hospitals Department as a result of Medibank.

On page 12 of the explanation, we see the matter of Medibank again being broken up. There, the Treasurer states:

The provision of \$4 500 000 has been included to meet the additional cost.

In the other portion relating to Medibank, which is on page 6 of the explanation, the Treasurer states:

. . . the financial benefits of the Medibank agreement enable me to present a Budget which allows for modest expansion, which aims at a balance on the year's current operations and which does not require any new or increased taxes.

There is a contradiction of fact in statements on two pages of the document. At one stage the Treasurer stated that we had to provide money and at another stage he said that, according to Medibank, we did not need it. That is ridiculous. The document goes on and on but, if we continue to deal with taxation, what it means in plain facts, and what it will cost, we see on page 21 of the statement that expenditure by the Police Department, for example, was \$4 180 000 above estimate and that the cost of wage and salary awards was responsible for \$3 420 000 of this. Also on page 21 of the document, under "Minister of Works", it is stated that the cost of wage and salary awards in the Engineering and Water Supply Department was \$2 751 000.

The Treasurer also stated that the expenditure by the Education Department exceeded the estimate by \$26 601 000 and that \$22 887 000 of this amount was needed to meet the cost of wage and salary awards, the extension of leave loading to teachers, and such things as new rates for contract cleaners. In regard to community welfare, we see that the cost of wage and salary awards was an extra \$1 162 000, and expenditure on another miscellaneous line was \$345 000 above estimate. Regarding health, the cost of wages and salaries in the Hospitals Department was an extra \$15 106 000. That would mean that, obviously, the public would have to meet the extra charges and extra taxation levied.

Mr. Simmons: Why don't you look at the Revenue Estimates?

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member may look at whatever he wants to look at and speak about it. If he

wants me to look at another reference, he should give us the benefit of his great knowledge of this matter. I shall be pleased to listen to him, and I have listened to him more than once. Sometimes I have enjoyed what he has said and at other times I have not enjoyed it. Regarding hospitals, we see that the expenses incurred in normal operation and maintenance of the Royal Adelaide Hospital have increased from \$8 100 000 to \$15 300 000. The figure for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has increased from \$4 900 000 to \$7 100 000; for the Modbury Hospital it has increased from \$1 200 000 to \$2 300 000.

Mr. Becker: This is increased labour cost.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is; the figure for the Flinders Medical Centre has increased from \$200 000 to \$1 300 000. That is operational cost. Looking at the country hospitals, we see that Mount Gambier Hospital figure, which at the moment is \$400 000, will increase to \$1 000 000. Port Augusta Hospital, which is \$300 000, will increase to \$700 000; Port Lincoln Hospital, which is \$200 000, will increase to \$500 000; Port Pirie Hospital, which is \$300 000, will increase to \$700 000; Wallaroo Hospital will increase from \$100 000 to \$300 000; and Whyalla Hospital increases from \$700 000 to \$1 400 000—an overall increase of \$14 200 000 for hospitals alone, which is surely worthy of some consideration, even by the knowledgeable member for Peake, who may like to look at the hospital lines and see whether he can talk his way out for his Treasurer there. I should like to listen to the member for Peake. I am willing to stay here after hours to listen to him if he wants to talk about the hospital lines to try to get his Treasurer out of trouble and out of the mire into which he has drawn this State, which is on its knees with inflationary problems.

I turn now to the Surf Lifesaving Association of South Australia, for which the Government is providing \$20 000. This organisation will find it impossible to operate on a budget of \$20 000. It is a large organisation, as the Minister for the Environment well knows. He knows what work it does, how large it is and that it would find it impossible to operate on a grant of \$20 000. I know the Government has increased the grant since last year, but it is still chicken feed; it is not enough. The association needs a full-time organiser. This grant would be the smallest by any Australian State Government to a similar organisation.

The Treasurer has had much to say about Queensland, and particularly its Premier, but the Queensland Government gives over \$300 000 to its surf lifesaving association. That is only one State, but it should at least point out to this Government that this meagre grant to our surf lifesavers is insufficient and does the Government no credit. I appreciate the situation in Queensland is different because there the allocation is on a \$1 for \$1 basis: for every dollar the surf lifesavers raise, the Queensland Government grants a dollar. I am sure that, if the surf lifesavers of South Australia were approached, they would welcome a similar scheme to give them an incentive to raise money. If they knew that our State Government would give them \$1 for \$1, I am sure they would accept that offer from the Government; but the State Government is giving the surf lifesavers a poor go. Perhaps it will reconsider the matter, bearing in mind that the association needs a full-time organiser and that its Treasurer, its Secretary and its workers all work voluntarily, as the men who patrol the beaches do. The surf lifesavers are providing a great service to this State, a service which, if it was stopped tomorrow, would cost the Government many thousands of dollars to replace with a similar service of safety for South Australians. Someone

must provide this service and, if it was not provided voluntarily, the Government would have to provide the service for other people to carry out and pay them. So the Government should do something about this matter.

I refer now to the 51 per cent increase in allocation for the Community Welfare Department and for correctional services, relating to some of our institutions—Brookway and McNally Training Centre. I include the Glandore Boys Home, which I understand is now closed or about to close down, where many thousands of dollars has been spent on improving either the standard or the security. That building is now empty—no-one is there, so the amount of money spent has been a complete waste. I will say no more about that now but will say more about it in the debate on the lines.

In his Financial Statement, the Treasurer refers to the many millions of dollars needed to meet the increased cost of wages. As some of my colleagues have said earlier, the responsibility for that situation can be laid at the feet of the Government, because of the industrial problems that this Government has allowed to continue through the pressure (as the member for Kavel said earlier) of some of these imported trade union secretaries or bosses that the Government has been weak enough to allow to do pretty well what they like in industry in this State. We have heard much tonight about the Treasurer and his statement about the sweetheart agreements, the opposition he has met from Trades Hall and some of its members and past members (one of whom is now a member of the Upper House—Mr. Dunford) and how he is tackling it and how he feels about the situation. We know, too, the feelings of some of the Commonwealth Ministers about this and I do not believe the Treasurer, even if he wants to, will be able to do anything about it, because he will not be allowed to. His masters at Trades Hall will not allow it. So we have a situation in industry (and particularly in the metal trades industry) where there is little difference in pay between the tradesman and the unskilled worker.

The relativity, being very bad, has affected the number of apprentices entering trades. When I entered a trade I realised that, although one spent one's apprenticeship on low wages, when one became a journeyman one reaped the benefits of the years spent on low wages. However, in Australia the relativity has now practically disappeared, and there is therefore no encouragement for young people to take up apprenticeships. Surely the Government should realise what is going on. In China, people on the streets, in factories, and even in universities are all brought down to one level, and we see a similar, more gradual trend in a socialistic system, which has the same basis. It is hard to define where the pink ends and the red begins. The levelling-off in industry has been intentional, so that a janitor's salary is not much less than that of a fitter or toolmaker; this has caused much trouble.

I am sure the member for Spence would agree with me, because he has had much to do with General Motors-Holden's and Chrysler. He has often been mentioned in the Flinders University rag *Rank and File*, which is distributed at the Chrysler factory. There was a special name for the honourable member, but I will not repeat it here, because it would not be very complimentary to him. The Treasurer and the Minister of Labour and Industry, being unable to control the situation, have submitted to pressure from the Nylands and the Scotts. As a result, this situation has been brought about, and the responsibility must rest on their shoulders.

It is a pity that members did not receive the Auditor-General's Report earlier than they did. In connection

with the Marine and Harbors Department, the Auditor-General's Report shows that there was a decrease of \$175 498 in connection with wharfage. For the whole year there was a loss at Outer Harbor of \$1 300 000, a colossal sum. We have been encouraged to go and see the great terminal at Outer Harbor, but it is a white elephant. In connection with imports, in 1973-74 at Port Adelaide 1 225 800 tonnes of cargo was handled, but in 1974-75 only 979 100 t was handled, a decrease of 246 700 t. There was a net overall decrease of 654 600 t. In connection with exports, there was a net decrease of 331 300 t.

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

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): This Budget will have a similar effect to that of the Commonwealth Budget. It is very much a mirror image or a shadow of the Commonwealth Budget. When we look at the estimated receipts for 1975-76 we find that nearly 50 per cent of the State's revenue is coming from Commonwealth sources. So, the Commonwealth Government has a dominating effect on South Australia's Budget, which must mirror the situation in Canberra. The immediate effect of the Budget has been to increase unemployment, and the situation will continue to deteriorate because the Budget has done little to provide any real incentive to the private sector, from which productivity comes. Unfortunately, no effort has been made to increase productivity. Until there is some relationship between costs and productivity, the situation will continue to deteriorate and unemployment will continue to increase.

In connection with the Department of Environment and Conservation, the Auditor-General says in his latest report that in two previous reports he has commented on the inadequacies prevailing in connection with the keeping of records in that department. Although he has made this comment in two previous reports, we find that the proposed expenditure in that department for general staffing, etc., has increased dramatically by about 63 per cent. As he has made the comment for two previous years and again this year that the accounting in that department is totally inadequate, I hope that the Minister will be able to explain to me how the department has had an increased allocation for general staffing of 63 per cent this financial year. Attached to the department is the National Parks and Wildlife Section. Last year, we amended the National Parks and Wildlife Act so that money collected from hunting permits would be paid into the Wildlife Conservation Fund. Regarding the fund, the Auditor-General states:

This fund, which was established during the year pursuant to section 11 of the National Parks and Wildlife Act, is to consist of—

- (a) any moneys derived by the Minister from any donation or grant;
- (b) any moneys provided by Parliament for the purpose of the fund;
- (c) any moneys arising from any sale that the Minister is authorised to make, under the Act; and
- (d) any fees paid for hunting permits.

On looking at the revenue raised from the items listed, I find that, during the year, \$110 000 was received from hunting permits, \$5 700 from the sale of fauna, and \$3 900 from a Commonwealth grant. Payments from the fund totalled \$3 100, leaving an unspent balance of \$117 000 at June 30, 1975. It appears that the hunting permits have raised \$110 000, which, under the terms of the Act, has been paid into the Wildlife Conservation Fund, and we have a total of \$117 000 in that fund.

What does the Minister intend to do with that \$117 000? Whenever I approach him with regard to the fund for the conservation of wild life and wild life management he replies that no funds are available or that they have been allocated. If they have been allocated, I should like to know for what purpose the \$117 000 will be used or whether the money will sit in the fund and accumulate, because it could be put to better use in the field of wild-life conservation than by being left in the fund. That was the basis on which hunting permits were introduced, and I believe that the Government is responsible to see that the money is used for that purpose. I shall be interested to know precisely what the Minister has in mind for that \$117 000.

Although we have seen a dramatic increase in the sum made available for staffing in the Environment and Conservation Department, we find that the percentage increase in the Education Department for teaching staff is much lower. This is one department in which I would readily agree to an increase in funds for teaching staff. Although we have passed the stage of having a shortage of teachers and now have ample teachers to meet our needs, unfortunately the Government seems to have reached the stage where it no longer has the funds to employ the available teachers and to bring the teacher-student ratio down to an acceptable level. There are numerous instances of where, when a teacher leaves a school, the teacher is not replaced, not because no teacher is available but purely because the department now appears to have insufficient funds to employ the available teachers. The sooner the Government adjusts its priorities and allocates sufficient funds, the better. The Government has always made great play on education, but it seems to be letting this slide, and the percentage increase now is not keeping pace with some of its other priorities.

Mr. Simmons: The member for Torrens seemed upset about it.

Mr. ARNOLD: Perhaps the honourable member has sufficient teachers in his schools but, unfortunately, some schools in my district are understaffed. In some areas, we have a teacher-student ratio far in excess of the acceptable limit.

Mr. Mathwin: The member for Peake is making a good speech on his seat.

Mr. ARNOLD: Yes. His comments are worth listening to usually, they are enlightening and we can draw something from them.

Mr. Rodda: Is he going to speak?

Mr. ARNOLD: I do not know whether he intends to speak.

Mr. Rodda: Isn't he a candidate for the Ministry stakes?

Mr. ARNOLD: Whether or not he speaks, I make the point that the money allocated from revenue to the Education Department for teaching staff is not on the same scale of increase as money allocated to other departments. I consider that education is still of vital importance, as is especially the field of adequate teaching staff. It is vital that we have a correct teacher-student ratio if we are going to get effective results from our educational system.

I will now refer to the situation of uncontrolled inflation and the effect this is having on many of our industries, particularly in South Australia. The spiralling costs with which we are faced day by day, and the effect this is having on our primary industries as well as our secondary industry should be borne in mind. I instance the dried fruit industry whose output, by and large, is exported to Europe. Unfortunately, with the escalation of costs



and inflation generally, it is no longer profitable for us to export not only dried fruit but also canned fruit. We have enormous stocks of canned fruit in hand in Australia now with little chance of selling it overseas at a profit.

Undoubtedly, we can sell anything at a price, but there is no future in that if the producer is left without any return. We get to the stage where we are better off not even to process the fruit if costs become exorbitant and the world market price is such that we will run at a considerable loss. We have reached the point where we must decide whether or not to let the fruit fall on the ground and rot. Not only the dried fruit and canned fruit industry but also the citrus industry is now facing a similar problem through cheap imports as a result of low tariffs. An enormous quantity of citrus juice is coming into Australia at present at a price considerably below what it costs us to produce. Unless the situation is corrected quickly, many primary producing industries will collapse completely.

Until Commonwealth and State Governments, through their Budgets, create a situation in which there is an incentive once again to produce, in which adequate investment allowances are made so that it is worth while for companies and individuals to produce and increase productivity, and in which there is some relationship between the cost structure and the products that are produced, the situation must continue to deteriorate. For example, not only in the fields of primary and secondary industry but also in the road-making field and other fields, we cannot afford to have expensive machinery, (road-making machinery can cost about \$250 000) working for only five or six hours a day. The capital cost of and interest to be paid on these units is so high that, unless they are worked for 14 or 16 hours a day, costs will never be reduced to a reasonable figure. This is where the private sector, with work done under contract, has the advantage over Government departments.

A glorious example of this was when the Government had the Kingston Bridge and causeway constructed across the Murray River. The causeway was built under private contract, with six heavy machines working 16 or 18 hours a day. The causeway was built on schedule to the contract price, and the contractor did very well out of what was a satisfactory job. If that had been built in normal circumstances by a Government department working the normal day shift, the overall cost of the project, bearing in mind the most of the machinery involved, would have been many times greater than it was for the Government. Until we get back to more of this type of work—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: How can you prove that? You have said it but you haven't proved it. It is pure assumption.

Mr. ARNOLD: It is not pure assumption, and I am sure the member for Peake would not deny what I have said. Indeed, I am sure he would readily agree, it being a recognised fact that if an expensive machine, the interest payment on which is high, is going to work for only half the time, the unit cost for each hour that machine works will be much greater than it would be if the machine was worked for, say, 14 or 16 hours a day.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That is only one facet.

Mr. ARNOLD: It is the biggest facet.

Mr. Nankivell: It's the motivation.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That's just a private enterprise argument.

Mr. Gunn: Nonsense!

Mr. ARNOLD: There is absolutely no doubt that the cost of building under contract on that basis is far less

than it is building on day rates and working about six hours a day. It will be a long time before the Minister of Labour and Industry can convince me otherwise. The Public Accounts Committee would readily agree with what I have said in this respect. It has been estimated that 400 000 people will be out of work by Christmas. This position is largely the result of the policies that have been adopted in recent years by the State and Commonwealth Governments. Until we return to getting a balance between costs and productivity, I can see no alternative but for this figure to continue increasing.

I firmly believe that the estimate of 400 000 unemployed is one that is not to be taken lightly, and that we will, unfortunately, see that number of people unemployed. This is largely a result of the policies being fostered by the present Government. Australia, with its enormous natural mineral resources and its ability to produce primary products, should be the last country in the world to be affected to the degree that it is being affected by inflation. It is one thing for a country like Japan to have an inflation problem. That country cannot avoid it, if it must import its raw materials to produce its goods. Unfortunately, Japan has little advantage except in population. Most of its raw materials must be imported, to enable Japan to manufacture and export products. It is definitely an imported inflation problem in a country such as Japan. However, Australia should be the last country in the world to be affected by the world-wide inflation problem.

The Government keeps falling back on the argument that it is a world-wide inflation problem, but that is not a sound argument. As I have said, many countries have no control whatsoever over inflation. However, Australia has the opportunity to control it, and it is purely the policies that have been fostered by the present Governments in Canberra and in South Australia that have resulted in the inflation and the high cost structure presently obtaining here. We in this State can no longer export and sell our primary products at a payable price on world markets. In the areas in which I am particularly interested, in the fruit industry (be it dried fruits or canned fruits), or even in the wine industry, we have reached the stage where, because inflation has been allowed to run rife in this country, we can no longer export.

This makes us virtually an island unto ourselves in relation to trading. We have reached the stage where we can trade with ourselves only, and no country in the world can exist for long on that basis. Unless the Commonwealth and State Governments, through their Budgets, recognise the need to promote and foster the private sector, and encourage people once again to get out and work and increase productivity, the situation will go from bad to worse.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I rise to make some comments regarding the Budget. I do not intend to cover many of the points that have been raised by other honourable members, although there will be a few on which I should like to dwell, even though they have been referred to previously. The Treasurer, in presenting the Budget, made clear the fluctuations that occurred during the previous financial year and indicated the fortunes and misfortunes of the Treasury balance as the year progressed. I am sure the Treasurer has tried to make clear what happened during the year. On page 4 of his Budget explanation, he states:

Finally, the arrangements for the transfer of the non-metropolitan railways to the Australian Government led to the payment by that Government of additional grants of \$20 000 000 in respect of 1974-75 (and of \$6 400 000 in respect of previous years) . . . The final result of all the changing factors—



they are the factors to which I referred a moment ago—was that the actual result for 1974-75 was a surplus of \$8 400 000.

I emphasise the next sentence, which states:

An attachment to the printed Financial Statement gives details of the major movements and trends last year.

It was definite that the Treasurer wanted to set out clearly the fluctuation in the financial situation of South Australia during the year ended June 30, 1975. In his 1973 Budget explanation, the Treasurer stated:

. . . and a round sum provision of \$10 000 000 for the possible cost of new salary and wage rate approvals which may become effective during the rest of the year.

It was not just "may": it was proved that that sum was needed. In his 1974 Budget explanation, the Treasurer stated:

. . . and a round sum provision of \$30 000 000 for the possible cost of new salary and wage rate approvals which may become effective during the course of the year.

In his 1975 Budget statement, the Treasurer states:

. . . a round sum of \$82 000 000 for the possible cost of new salary and wage rate approvals which may become effective during the course of the year—

and, in addition, this year he adds—

and a round sum of \$16 000 000 for the possible cost of further increases during the year in prices of supplies and services.

With inflation, wage and salary indebtedness rose from \$10 000 000 for escalation two years ago to \$82 000 000 this year, so a great amount of extra revenue must be received by Treasury from one source or another. As was pointed out by the member for Torrens, the major source of this revenue comes from the Commonwealth Government. On page 6 of the Budget explanation, the Treasurer states:

While I am disappointed that a long-term improvement in the financial assistance grants along the lines of the States' submission was not achieved, I am happy to be able to report to the House that the approved addition to those grants, the special grants associated with the railways transfer and the financial benefits of the Medibank agreement, enable me to present a Budget which allows for modest expansion, which aims at a balance on the year's current operations, and which does not require any new or increased taxes.

As has already been pointed out, some charges have been increased. These increased charges were not announced in the Budget but arose during the year. Increased revenue arose from increased taxes, franchise legislation and from services because, in South Australian legislation, an inbuilt formula provides an escalation in charges. In his 1973 Budget explanation, the Treasurer stated:

There is a natural increase in the revenue yields from State taxes and charges.

The Treasurer admitted in 1973 there was a natural increase, and I am sure he will admit now there is an escalation in State taxes and charges because of the formula that has been devised. This is possibly as noticeable in the land tax and valuation system as it is anywhere else. In 1972-73, receipts from land tax amounted to \$10 200 000. In 1973-74, the sum increased to \$10 900 000, and last year the estimate was \$12 000 000 but receipts were about \$12 900 000. This year the estimate is about \$19 000 000. In his explanation concerning this matter, the Treasurer states:

Under an amendment to the Land Tax Act passed earlier this year, the unimproved values of all properties in the State are to be brought into line with those in the one-fifth of the State which is actually revalued each year by the Valuer-General. In this way equity between taxpayers will be achieved at any given point of time

and, in future, increases in valuation will take place progressively instead of in large jumps every five years. This year, however, many properties will be valued at figures well in excess of the valuation ascribed to them last year as the increases in land prices which have occurred in recent times have rapidly outstripped historical valuations. Having regard to this, the Government reduced the rates of tax imposed by the Act and the reductions will offset in part the effects of the higher valuations. An increase in receipts of \$6 434 000 is expected.

This year the ordinary ratepayer will be obliged to pay increased land tax because of the equalisation factor, yet I am sure many taxpayers believed that the equalisation plan would mean a reduction in the tax they paid; that has not been the case. The passage I just referred to from the Treasurer's statement means that the system will be equalised throughout the State and in various areas many people who are living in moderate dwellings will have to pay land tax, whereas they were not obliged to pay it before. For example, I refer to the municipality of Kadina, where a person owning land with an annual valuation of \$1 500 will find this year that, from July 1, the equalisation factor is 2.25 and the valuation of that land is increased to \$3 375. Section 13 of the Act provides that a person is exempt from paying land tax on a tax value below \$2.50, but in the example I have just given, before the equalisation factor was introduced, a block worth \$1 500 was exempt. With the equalisation factor and the value going to \$3 375, the owner will be obliged to pay \$3.37 in land tax, because the scale provides one cent in every \$10 of valuation for property valued up to \$10 000. We see that, in the inbuilt formula of the method of valuation, including the equalisation factor, there is a natural increase when there is an escalation of valuation, whereby the taxpayer is obliged to pay an additional tax.

I now refer to another matter that has been aired by some members. Pay-roll tax has increased dramatically in the years since it was first introduced. Not only has the rate increased but the tax revenue also has increased considerably. I refer to page 217 of this year's Auditor-General's Report, dealing with pay-roll tax. The increased amount of revenue to be received is set out. The number of employers paying this tax is also stated. In 1973, 6 448 employers paid pay-roll tax, and at June 30, 1974, the number had increased to 7 329, so that about 881 more employers were paying pay-roll tax. At June 30, 1975, there were 8 328 employers paying pay-roll tax, an increase in the last financial year of 999. In the past two years there has been an increase of employers paying pay-roll tax of 1 880. However, the point I make is that it is the small businessmen who are being caught in the net, and these small businessmen are finding it most difficult to meet these increasing costs. In the last paragraph on page 217 of his report, the Auditor-General states:

Tax outstanding at the end of the year under review was \$190 000 compared with \$140 000 for the previous year, and was principally on account of taxpayers in liquidation or under the control of receivers and managers.

The Auditor-General's Report discloses that there are people in business who are in difficulty and, to substantiate that fact, I refer to a report published in the *News* on September 2, 1975, under the heading "Figures grow worse for small firms", as follows:

A record number of South Australian firms might go out of business this year, according to figures from the Registrar of Companies. Figures revealed today that 320 firms had gone out of business so far this year—only 39 fewer than the total for the whole of last year. Business leaders said today that most of the company failures had been among small businesses, unable to cope with tight liquidity and inflation.

Adelaide Chamber of Commerce President, Mr. J. Bashford, said: "In this sort of climate the incentive for small businesses to carry on is non-existent." He said he was not surprised that South Australia was facing a record number of company closures. Mr. Bashford, a senior banking official, said there appeared to be no relief in sight for companies threatened by closures.

I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I rise on this occasion to grieve about a subject that has been referred to earlier today and I, too, have mentioned it before. The Minister of Housing failed to give me an answer today about what the Government intended to do in relation to South Australian Housing Trust rentals, so I have decided to go back through the years and put on record for the benefit of the House the operations of the trust in the rental section, and show how the trust's finances have decreased in that area over the years. In 1968, the Auditor-General in his report stated that the trust had a rental surplus of \$106 000. In 1969, there was a surplus of \$197 638. In 1970, there was a surplus of \$217 286, and it must be remembered that the Labor Party Government had just taken over on May 30, 1970. In 1971, there was a deficit of \$274 888 in the trust's rental section, and in 1972 there was a deficit of \$520 248. In 1973 there was a deficit of \$1 330 000. That was the first time that the Auditor-General started to print in prominent type this section of his report. He stated:

Overall the table reveals a further decline in the operating results of rental properties by \$810 000 to a deficit of \$1 330 000 in 1972-73. The overall deficit on rental dwellings was \$1 506 000.

There were losses in other areas not associated with direct rentals, but we had a loss of \$1 500 000 in 1973. That was the first time that the Auditor-General printed the table regarding rentals and put asterisks beside the surplus, because he realised that he would be printing a deficit figure more often than a surplus figure. In 1974 the deficit reached \$1 813 000, and this year the figure is an astronomical \$2 549 415. In his report for 1973-74, the Auditor-General stated:

Overall the table reveals a further decline in the operating results of rental properties by \$483 000 to a deficit of \$1 813 000 in 1973-74. The overall deficit on rental dwellings was \$2 201 000 (up \$695 000). A factor contributing to this large and increasing deficit has been the failure during recent years to relate rentals more closely to operating costs. A general rent increase was approved by the Government effective from March 30, 1974, with increases ranging from 50c to \$1.50 per week but not applying to certain pensioner tenants. The rentals of many houses are still unduly low—some only \$7.50 per week even for "full income" families. Certain rentals are increased on re-allotment following vacancies. During the year these "vacancy rents" were also increased and are substantially higher than the rents being paid by other "older" tenants for similar accommodation. A scheme proposed by the trust to overcome such anomalies and the unduly low rents has not been approved by the Government.

In 1974, the trust wanted to solve this problem and the Government refused to take up the challenge, yet the Government knew, as every member of this Parliament knew, that people in trust houses were essentially abusing the purpose for which trust housing was established. In his report this year, the Auditor-General again has printed in black type the amount of the deficit and the statement relative to it. That statement is similar to the one made in 1974, except that it does not make a recommendation

to the Government, because it is known that to do so would be a waste of time. Perhaps one could guess that certain pressures were put on the trust not to make that sort of recommendation in future. The Auditor-General's Report for 1974-75, at page 336, states:

Overall the table reveals a continued decline in the operating results of rental properties by \$736 000 to a deficit of \$2 549 000 in 1974-75.

The amount of nearly \$750 000 is about the cost of one primary school. The Auditor-General's Report continues:

The overall deficit on rental dwellings was \$2 530 000 (up \$328 000). A factor contributing to this large and increasing deficit has been the failure during recent years to relate rentals more closely to operating costs.

Year in and year out the Auditor-General has made that comment, but there has been no move by the Government. The Auditor-General's Report continues:

A general rent increase was approved by the Government effective from February 1, 1975, with increases ranging from \$1 to \$2.50 a week but not applying to certain pensioner tenants. The rentals of many houses are still unduly low—some only \$10 a week even for "full income" families. Certain rentals are increased on reallocation following vacancies. During the year these "vacancy rents" were also increased and are substantially higher than the rents being paid by other "older" tenants for similar accommodation.

I say again that I will stand up on this side of the House (you, Mr. Speaker, have some houses in your area in a similar category) and support a rent increase comparable to the rents paid by the rest of the community for those families in Housing Trust homes on full incomes.

I have a letter from a constituent in your district, Mr. Speaker, who states that there are persons in Port Pirie paying ridiculously low rents, with their parents, their children and their grandchildren living in the house and renting it in the name of the grandparents as the tenants, as pensioners. There are people in Port Augusta and Whyalla, Commonwealth employees, receiving fantastically high salaries and paying rentals of no more than \$10 to \$12 a week for houses that should attract a rental of \$25 a week. There are people on salaries who can afford that, whereas other people buying properties in those areas do not have that type of concession. In the metropolitan area there are people with teenage sons and daughters in three-bedroom houses paying less than \$10 a week and paying income tax possibly running into several thousand dollars a year for the family, having that cheap accommodation that should be made available to people in the low-income groups.

I make clear that I would not kick them out: I would give them an alternative. If they were means-tested and had an average income coming into the home, they would pay the rents prevailing within the community for that type of accommodation or they would be given the opportunity to buy the house, if it was free standing and not semi-detached or a flat, at a reasonable price; or they would be given a period of time in which to get out, find other accommodation, and start building their own houses. By that method, we would make full use of the cheap money made available to the Housing Trust for the purpose of helping the under-privileged. I ask the Government to take up the challenge and increase Housing Trust rentals for these full income families which at the moment are in a position where the Government allows them to abuse the system.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I appreciate the opportunity of speaking in this debate. I was amazed that no-one on the Government side spoke, but we have become used to the Government's attitude that its members are not allowed

to speak in debates of this nature. I am pleased that the member for Price is here, because the other evening he referred to my comments on succession duties and had the audacity to cast aspersions on the character and integrity of my constituents and constituents of my colleagues in country areas who, through hard work and honesty, have built up substantial assets in land and plant, and those assets, when these people pass on, are heavily taxed with succession duties. The honourable gentleman had the audacity to claim that these people obtained those assets by exploiting workers. If anyone has exploited workers, it is the trade union movement, which put the member and his colleagues into Parliament. If he was a man, he would apologise.

In the case I referred to, the late gentleman and his wife went to a scrub block in the early 1930's and worked hard without employing anyone, because they could not afford to. They developed something that has assisted this nation and, because the Labor Party dislikes rural producers and country people, it humiliates them by imposing unfair taxes. If this country is to prosper and develop as it should, this Government and its colleagues in Canberra should take constructive steps to foster primary industry instead of trying to kill it, as they are doing at present. The following is an extract from a letter, dated September 8, that I received (and no doubt other members received) from the Minister for the Environment:

During the debate on an amendment to the Planning and Development Act in the House of Assembly on June 18, 1975, I objected that the attack by Opposition members on officers of the State Planning Office Division was shameful.

The attack was not on officers: it was on the Minister. If the Minister is not big enough to shoulder that responsibility, he should get out now, instead of waiting for a few more weeks. He is the head of the State Planning Authority. I and my colleagues will not be intimidated by this type of activity by this Minister or any other Minister. Whenever we think it is right and proper to raise matters in this House we will do so. The Minister ought to withdraw the threats he made in the letter. Where else should the matters be discussed if they are not discussed on the floor of Parliament? Does the Minister want us to sneak to his office to complain there? I have received complaints from my constituents about the Minister's department, and I do not blame the officers: I blame the Minister. The Minister's attempt to place the blame on his officers is shameful. I now refer to the trade union movement's attitude to the export of livestock. This afternoon it was interesting to hear the Premier making loud noises.

Mr. Langley: You are doing that.

Mr. GUNN: The only way the honourable member makes a contribution is by way of interjection. If he wants to make a contribution, let him get up and talk about the trade union movement. I want to refer to the effects of trade union activities on the export of sheep and cattle.

Mr. Langley: At least, when I get up to speak I say something. That is more than can be said about the honourable member.

Mr. GUNN: An article, headed "Big Meat Cartel Proposed by South Australia", in the weekly publication of the United Farmers and Graziers says:

The South Australian Government is moving to create an international trading consortium with Western Australia and New Zealand to stop millions of dollars being lost through unnecessary competition in the sheep industry.

As a result of discussions I had early last week with the Western Australian Minister of Agriculture, I think it is very unlikely that the Western Australian Government will

agree to this proposition. What the Minister and his union friends must understand is that all sales of stock to the Persian Gulf and the Middle East are conducted on a private treaty basis. The buyers there will not in any circumstances accept Government intervention. They want Governments (and this what the Minister and his colleagues can do if they want to take a constructive attitude) to get trade unions not to interfere and not to threaten to stop loading sheep. On one occasion last year the meat workers planned to picket the wharves at Port Lincoln and Port Adelaide to prevent the loading of stock. Strong action was threatened by producer organisations, and fortunately those threats did not have to be put into effect. That situation caused much concern to the exporters, and since then the buyers have been looking elsewhere. The following extract from a letter sets out the concern that the industry has in relation to trade union activity:

In discussion, it was stated that other countries are competitively supplying the Middle East market. New Zealand is currently supplying killed lamb below the Australian prices, and Rumania and Bulgaria have contracts to supply about 1 200 000 live sheep each year for some six years.

This is the important part. The letter continues:

This latter contract was a direct result of union restrictions in Australia last year.

That is a market we could well and truly do with today, because of the current prices and the poor seasonal conditions operating in certain parts of the State. What the Government ought to explain to its union colleagues is that the type of stock exported is not, generally speaking, suitable to be processed and sold on the Australian market; so, all it is doing is cutting off its own nose. If it wants continuous employment in the industry, the producers who produce the stock for processing through the abattoirs must have continuity of income. If the unions stop that there will not be any producers, because the present situation is so critical in the meat industry that the producers will not be able to carry on much longer. There ought not to be any restrictions whatever on the export of live-stock for slaughter in any part of the world. The Minister of Agriculture would be serving the industry better if he supported that course of action and used whatever influence he has on his union colleagues to bring that situation about. I have been told that one company in Queensland a couple of weeks ago lost the sale of 3 000 live cattle because of trade union interference. This is a shameful course of action and one of which the unions should not feel proud.

Mr. Rodda: What's the member for Price going to do about that?

Mr. GUNN: What does he think of this situation and does he think that the same people—

Mr. Harrison: Ask him questions about it tomorrow.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Albert Park has made his second speech in five years by way of interjection.

Mr. Langley: He talks sense, which is more than you do.

Mr. GUNN: He has asked two questions! As usual, the honourable member for Albert Park has to make threats and not speeches but, if he likes, I could run through *Hansard* to see how many questions he has asked this year.

Mr. Langley: How did he go in his district in the last election?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: In conclusion, I hope that the Minister of Agriculture and the Government will look realistically at the matters I have raised and I hope that they will try to rectify the situation in the interests of the State and of the nation.

Mr. HARRISON (Albert Park): My rising to speak belies the attempt of the member for Eyre to assert that Government members do not get on their feet in this debate. As I understand the position (and this is no reflection on the Chair), I thought it was a matter of a member from one Party speaking, and then a member from another Party. Anyway, for the benefit of the member for Eyre, he is up and down like a yo-yo, but he does not contribute anything to the debate that is worthy of note. When researching my contributions in *Hansard*, I suggest that he research back to the Playford era and see how many of his Government's back-benchers spoke when he was in Government.

Mr. Coumbe: I was one.

Mr. Langley: The only one.

Mr. HARRISON: Anyway, I have received many grievances, complaints and constructive criticisms from my constituents, one being that, in future, State and Commonwealth elections should be conducted between 8 a.m. and 6 p.m.

Mr. Rodda: You want to get home to bed?

Mr. HARRISON: No, but we have heard much criticism about trade unions. Between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., about 14 hours by the time the vote has been counted, is too long for anyone to be engaged on such an important issue as an election. Another point I make for the Opposition's benefit is that they are all too ready to criticise the Government for what it does. However, they do not praise what the Government has done.

Mr. Gunn: What has it done?

Mr. HARRISON: In many instances, legislation introduced by this Government during its term of office has been the first of its kind.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Albert Park must be given an opportunity to put his point.

Mr. HARRISON: I am proud to be a Government back-bench member and to support the legislation that it has introduced. I will name one such Bill: I refer, for instance, to the workmen's compensation legislation.

Mr. Venning: What's your grievance?

Mr. HARRISON: That Opposition members do not recognise the good that the Government is doing for the people of South Australia. That is my grievance, and it is also the grievance of my constituents. I refer also to pensioners in Housing Trust houses. The member for Fisher had much to say about Housing Trust houses.

Mr. Venning: He's right on the ball, too.

Mr. HARRISON: I will fix him up in a moment. Pensioners in my district (and I can speak only for my constituents; other members must speak for theirs) appreciate what the Government is doing for them in alleviating the excess water rates that they are called upon to pay. Because they are pensioners they are permitted to have, free of charge, \$4 worth of excess water. Some of these people have been living in rented Housing Trust houses in my district for 32 years.

Mr. Venning: At reasonable rents, too.

Mr. HARRISON: And they have earned it. Having retired, these people are now pensioners. The time that they have spent on their houses to keep them up to standard is a credit to these people. They use a little excess water to occupy themselves in their leisure hours and naturally they are proud of their gardens, which results in excess water being used. I compliment the Government for allowing these people, free of charge, \$4 worth of excess water. They have merely to apply and are given this allowance.

I also draw Opposition members' attention to the establishment of community welfare centres in various

metropolitan and outer-metropolitan areas. I have heard nothing from them regarding the benefits that these centres give to the people of South Australia. However, my constituents appreciate having the Woodville Community Welfare Consultative Council and a community welfare centre operating in their area. I am sure that Government members will back me up and say that the same applies in their districts.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARRISON: One might ask what good they do. All members have their own electorate offices and must deal with their problems like I do mine. All members get unmarried mothers, deserted wives and people who have been thrown out of their homes for some unknown reason coming to see them.

Mr. Chapman: Don't you think that happens outside your district?

Mr. HARRISON: It does, and that is what I am saying. Some people have rented houses all their lives and, when the landlord dies, the house is put into the hands of a trustee and sold. The new owners then want vacant possession, as a result of which the tenants are thrown out. These people have never dreamt of applying for a Housing Trust house and are, therefore, left on a limb. They come to my office, just as other members' constituents, will go to them, and I send them to a church organisation or community centre for assistance. An appeal then goes out, and these people are then housed in one way or another.

Mr. Venning: What's the grievance?

Mr. HARRISON: That members opposite do not appreciate what this Government is doing.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HARRISON: In reply to the member for Fisher, who had a shot at people living in Housing Trust houses, I point out that I have occupied such a house for the past 30 years. I have been a member of Parliament now for about five years, but before that I received a wage comparable to the wage that enabled me to qualify for a trust house.

Mr. Mathwin: But you're a fat cat now!

Mr. HARRISON: The problem is that there are many people in the same position as I. They started off about 30 years ago by securing a Housing Trust house, raised two or three children and received a labourer's wage or perhaps worked on the assembly line at General Motors-Holden's or at Chrysler Australia Limited and have improved their position so that they are now perhaps supervisors or foremen.

Mr. Mathwin: Or members of Parliament.

Mr. HARRISON: Yes, and I am not ashamed to admit it, but I have had my problems, too. The member for Fisher is unjust in his attack on people who have been renting Housing Trust houses. Some of these houses are occupied by widows or widowers who are trying to transfer to smaller houses, pensioner cottages, flats or whatever sort of accommodation the trust is building only to find that they cannot get them because there is a waiting list as long as your arm. If the member for Fisher was dinkum in his research into the problems of housing people and transferring them from trust houses to other quarters he would agree fully with what I am saying.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 10, at 2 p.m.