

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 10, 1975

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

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Glenside Hospital (Redevelopment, Stage II),
Marine and Harbors Department Building, Port
Adelaide,
Port Pirie Sewerage Scheme Extension.

Ordered that reports be printed.

PETITION: DAYLIGHT SAVING

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE presented a petition signed by 142 residents of South Australia stating that the effects of daylight saving as previously experienced in South Australia were harmful to elderly persons in that they were deprived of sleep and their necessary rest by the longer period of daylight so caused.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. MILLHOUSE presented a petition signed by 1 518 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.

QUESTIONS

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

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

In reply to Mr. SIMMONS (August 28).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are about 8 500 justices of the peace in the State. About 425 applications are received each year, but this figure does not include telephone and letter inquiries which never reach application stage.

SAMCOR CHARGES

In reply to Mr. GUNN (August 19).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague the Minister of Agriculture points out that operating expenses of Samcor continue to rise and, of necessity, many of these increases must be passed on if the abattoir is to remain viable. During the past 12 months, costs have escalated by more than 20 per cent, whilst increases in fees have been restricted to an average of 10 per cent. Substantial financial assistance is already provided to Samcor from State resources for the benefit of producers and there are limits to the extent to which the general taxpayer can or should be expected to contribute funds for that purpose.

MOUNT LOFTY RESERVOIRS

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (August 27).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Development of potential storage sites in the Mount Lofty Range has been carefully examined. On the western side, three further possible sites are available after the completion of the Little Para reservoir and based on presently conceived demands could

be developed over the next 35 years. These could be used for supplying water to metropolitan Adelaide. On the eastern side, six sites have been examined but of these only two are envisaged as being economically viable and would not be expected to be needed for some 20 years or so. The only potential catchments that may be of use for supply to Monarto are those of the Marne, Preamimma and Bremer Rivers. At present the Preamimma site is favoured as a balancing and emergency storage supplied from the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main. The development of every available site in the range does not necessarily offer the best solution. An integrated approach is required that combines the economic and proper use of Mount Lofty range run-off, Murray River water, and available ground-water basins.

TAILEM BEND POWER LINE

In reply to Mr. ALLISON (August 28).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The electricity transmission system from Adelaide to the South-East is duplicated, except for a short section between Mobilong and Tailem Bend. This section will be effectively duplicated early in 1976 when a 275 000-volt transmission line under construction from Para to Tailem Bend is completed. The maximum power demand in the South-East has long since exceeded the capacity of the Mount Gambier power station which, even at full output, could meet only about a third of this demand. The closing down of the power station over the Christmas and New Year period when most industry is shut down will therefore not greatly affect the reliability of electricity supply to other consumers. In the event of a major breakdown of the unduplicated part of the transmission system, the power station could, if necessary, be brought back into operation within a few hours.

RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Dr. TONKIN: Because of the announcement today that the Government's Industrial Research Institute at Frewville will close in November, will the Premier say what alternative action the Government intends taking to support small businesses in their present desperate struggle for survival? The matter of the institute's closing was referred to by the member for Davenport yesterday. The Government's decision comes at a time when private industry is facing one of its worst crises in the form of unemployment that it has ever known. Industry needs all the help, especially Government help, it can get. It has been reported that the Commonwealth Government's policies have forced 3 000 small business operations to collapse, a matter far from reassuring. That has happened as a result of Commonwealth policies, and it is expected that these policies will have a significant effect in South Australia.

The Premier obviously realised that private industry, especially those small concerns, needed to have expert advice they could call on, and that is why the Research Institute was set up. Its Chairman is reported as saying that the organisation has gone a long way to achieving the Government's guidelines, and it should be allowed to continue. The Premier has an obligation to industry and those employed by industry to keep the institute going or otherwise to provide alternative forms of help.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Before this Government came to office there were some employees of the Premier's Department who were engineers and who gave some engineering advice over a period to small concerns in South Australia. The report of the department and of the Public Service Board, and previously of the Commissioner, on

this work was that it was not actually or adequately giving the kind of service that was needed by industry, and we looked at alternatives. The Government introduced a provision for the Industries Research Institute, and at that time I was the Minister of Development and Mines. The Leader is wrong in implying that the sole purpose of setting up the Industries Research Institute was to provide assistance to small businesses in South Australia: it was not. That was one of its functions, but it was intended that the Industries Research Institute would in fact undertake and organise research in a number of areas in which it was itself taking considerable initiative in researching processes and products which it would be useful for South Australia to develop. At that time it was conceived that it would take some time for the institute to achieve its objects. Unfortunately, however, over the past four years the rate at which the institute has been achieving the objects originally set out has not, in the Government's view and on the reports to it, justified the kind of increases in expenditure which the institute's budget has set out.

Mr. Dean Brown: The reports came from whom?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They have come from officers of the department.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask honourable members to cease asking further questions. This is Question Time, and only one question is allowed to be asked.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has naturally enough kept a watch on the work of the institute, as it was bound to do and as we do with all corporate bodies that we are funding. That constant watch is undertaken by officers of the department who are directly involved in the work of the bodies concerned. Over a period, unfortunately, we were not able to achieve the objects and, in saying that, I do not in any way reflect on the members of the council of the institute. We are now faced with a situation where the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories, which is a very considerable facility established in South Australia and is considerably funded by this Government, has, through the decline in the amount of work available from the mining industry, considerable unused capacity. We are having to keep funding the AMDEL organisation, and at the same time we have work to be undertaken in environmental research. The view of the Government ultimately was that the most economic way in which we could work industrial research, minerals research and environmental research was to centre it in one organisation. I point out to the Leader that of course there has already been an association between the institute and AMDEL. The photograph in this morning's paper of a building was not the building of the Industries Research Institute at all.

Dr. Tonkin: Whom do you blame for that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot blame the honourable member. I am simply saying that the story in this morning's paper in suggesting that this particular building in fact was closing down as a result of the institute's decision was not an accurate picture to the public. We believe that we can work the whole of the assistance given by the Government in these areas in a more economic way, and that that is something that the Government is bound to do. I point out that it is certainly not the intention of the Government to deprive small industry in South Australia of assistance in industrial research. We believe, however, we will be able to concentrate this around the work of AMDEL. We may have to negotiate with the other parties to the AMDEL arrangement for some widening of AMDEL's scope, and the executive committee

which has investigated the closing down of the institute is looking at means of integrating the full-time staff of the institute with the work at AMDEL. It is not a question of cutting off assistance to industry in South Australia at all: it is simply a question of getting a more economic organisation with the total of our work in this sphere.

I should add that I am very sorry to note that in this morning's paper Dr. Melville, for whom I have the very highest regard, should have stated that he considers that I have been guilty of grave discourtesy to him. I certainly would not willingly, or wittingly, be guilty of discourtesy to Dr. Melville. So far as I can understand his complaint, it is that I originally urged him to take on this job as Chairman of the institute (and I did) but that it was not I who spoke to him about the Government's decision in the matter.

Mr. Dean Brown: Why didn't you consult him?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Speaker, I am answering this question. The fact is that, at the time that I invited Dr. Melville to undertake this work, I was the Minister of Development and Mines. When the Government had made a decision on reorganisation, which was made after reports to the Government by its officers, an examination by Cabinet and a report by Treasury, the Minister who was responsible then saw Dr. Melville. As it was his area of responsibility, I was not going to tread in on that. I do not think that the fact that the Ministerial responsibility had changed and that, therefore, it was another Minister who had to see Dr. Melville was, in the circumstances, any discourtesy to him. However, if Dr. Melville feels that it was, I am sorry, because I had no intention of being discourteous to Dr. Melville, whose work and assistance to the Government in this area are very highly valued.

TROUBRIDGE

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Transport consider implementing yesterday's decision to reduce the cattle and sheep freight rates on the *Troubridge* by administering the scheme through the loaded-trailer avenue rather than by remittance of the empty-trailer rate? I have been requested by the Kangaroo Island growers generally to convey appreciation to the Minister for the understanding and sentiment expressed in his official letter in reply to my questions of August 6 and 28 respectively on this matter of surplus stock transport from Kangaroo Island. However, some problems have emerged with regard to practising the intent of the Minister's announcement. His reply to me on Monday, September 8, and later as reported in the *Advertiser* on September 9, states that the Minister has now approved of the variation in cargo rates for the transport of sheep and cattle from Kangaroo Island to Port Adelaide until further notice. The Minister went on to say in the letter that the charge previously incurred in returning empty trailers to Kingscote would be remitted. He also made this significant statement relating to the reduction:

This will effectively reduce *Troubridge* freight charges by approximately 25 per cent.

It was that written intent and sentiment expressed in that part of the correspondence that is so greatly appreciated by all concerned. However, as I have said, putting the scheme into operation has not worked out, because the opportunity to freight empty trailers to Kangaroo Island under the present transport system is minimal and, therefore, although the offer has been made, the community at this stage is unable to enjoy the benefit. I seek no greater reduction in this respect from the Minister but wish purely for the scheme to be administered so that we may now enjoy its intent.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Assistant Commissioner of Highways indicated to me just before Parliament sat today that there were some problems in giving effect to the decision in the way in which it was taken, and sought my advice whether the department should be enabled to give effect to the spirit of the decision in the way it saw fit. That approval was immediately forthcoming.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The SPEAKER: I have today received from the honourable Leader of the Opposition the following letter:

I hereby give notice that it is my intention this day to move that the House at its rising do adjourn until 1 p.m. tomorrow for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that this House condemns the Government for its announced intention to adjourn the sittings of Parliament between October, 1975, and June, 1976, since by this action it will effectively suppress the traditional rights of all members of Parliament to exercise their freedom of speech on behalf of their constituents, to advance private members' business, and to examine and question the Government's administration.

Does any honourable member support the proposed motion?

Several honourable members having risen:

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until 1 p.m. tomorrow,

for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that this House condemns the Government for its announced intention to adjourn the sittings of Parliament between October, 1975, and June, 1976, since by his action it will effectively suppress the traditional rights of all members of Parliament to exercise their freedom of speech on behalf of their constituents, to advance private members' business, and to examine and question the Government's administration. This serious motion is brought forward in a serious manner. I believe that it is a disgraceful situation if the intention of the Government has been reported correctly, and it does not intend to have Parliament sit again until next June after it gets up at the end of October.

Once again the Premier has been revealed as a superb confidence trickster, a superb con man. When we started this Parliamentary session we were told that we had a full programme—I think it was called "a substantial legislative programme". Moreover, the Premier made a Ministerial statement in this House on August 20 relating to private members' business. On the first day when private members' business was to be considered (August 20), he said that he wanted to make the Government's attitude towards private members' business quite clear; he considered there had been far too much private members' business put on the Notice Paper during the last session of the last Parliament and virtually said that there should not be an excessive amount put on the paper during this session. In addition, he said that, well before the end of October, private members' business should be advanced to a stage where a vote could be taken.

This is a deplorable state of affairs. At first we believed that the pressure that had been put on the Opposition to maintain the legislative programme (pressure which I might add was successful in persuading at least one or two of our members not to speak during the Address in Reply debate) had been exerted because the Government had such a heavy legislative programme. However, we find now that that was not the position at all: it was simply that

the Government wants to adjourn. The Government wants to leave the floor of this Chamber and govern at long range—by remote control. The relations in the management of this House have not been of the most cordial nature in the past few weeks. The constant pressure exerted has not been helpful to debate. It has certainly not been helpful to the understanding of the legislation that has come forward so far. This last statement that the Parliament will not resume until it is forced to do so, presumably because of Supply, next June, is the last straw indeed.

Opposition members believe that if this programme is followed the House could sit in this session for as few as 36 days and possibly no more than 40 days, and that is a disgusting position. If we look back (and honourable members have already mentioned other times) over the last eight years, we see the following position: in 1967-68 there were 59 sitting days in 20 weeks; in 1968-69, there were 70 sitting days in 24 weeks (with a Liberal Government); in 1969-70 there were 60 sitting days in 20 weeks (with a Liberal Government). Then we get to the years of Australian Labor Party Government. In 1971, there were 75 sitting days; in 1972, there were 74 sitting days; in 1973, there were 58 sitting days; in 1974, there were 69 sitting days; and in 1975 there were 77 sitting days. That is not a bad average—not a bad record. As a member of the House in that time, I did not begrudge any time I spent in this Chamber debating legislation. That is as it should be because not only should we debate Government legislation: this House exists for every member of Parliament. It is a forum in which every member of Parliament can put forward his views and the views of his constituents and is not solely for the Government's use. It is about time the Government woke up to that situation. Traditionally, we have freedom and rights in this House.

You will remember, Sir, when you presented yourself in another place and demanded on behalf of the members the undoubted rights and privileges of the members of this House. Those rights and privileges include freedom of speech, the freedom to ventilate private members' business, and the freedom to question and analyse the administration of this State, and to consider the Government's performance. This is the traditional basis of the Westminster system of Parliamentary democracy and, if this House persists in spending nearly eight months away, I believe this Government is making a mockery of the system of Parliamentary democracy. Much of the legislation that has been considered by this Chamber since the Labor Party has come to office has given widespread and sweeping powers to the Minister in each department in respect of each piece of legislation. Widespread regulation-making powers have been given, and it seems apparent that the Government believes that it has now got itself into a position from which it can administer this State by regulation, not by legislation.

It is almost as though it is turning the whole system into a dictatorship (a mild dictatorship certainly but, nevertheless, a dictatorship) by using regulating mechanism, rather than legislation. I believe that the Premier is running scared for several reasons. First, he is running scared because he believes that he could be defeated on the floor of the House at any time.

Mr. Duncan: No way.

Dr. TONKIN: I am interested to hear the honourable member repeat the Labor Party election slogan "No way". Perhaps the honourable member will remember that in future. The Government could be defeated on the floor of this House; we have already seen that happen once.

Admittedly, it was not a very big victory, as we took the business out of the Government's hands for only five minutes, but we did it and the repercussions in Caucus, I understand, were considerable. This could happen again, and it may happen when it is rather more important. Let us see why the Premier does not want Parliament to sit any longer than it has to. I have referred to one reason why he is running scared.

The next conclusion one must come to is that he is running scared of public scrutiny of his administration. Parliament provides for the Opposition in particular, but for all members of Parliament, an opportunity to probe, to question, to dissect, and to find out from Ministers the various details of the administration of their departments. Admittedly, the standard of reply that we get from this Cabinet is not particularly satisfactory. Ministers dodge questions and talk around the point more now than Ministers have ever done before. It is obvious that they wish to avoid the scrutiny of the public that can be turned on them by turning on the searchlight of Opposition inquiry. The case of the Budget, I think, shows that quite clearly. I should like to consider an extract of the policy speech delivered by the Premier before the last election. Having announced his proposals, he said:

This is a full programme. We have shown that we work and achieve for South Australia. We want your vote to let us get on with the job.

It got the vote, just by the skin of its teeth, with the help of the people of Port Pirie and the Independent member. It got the vote, but is it getting on with the job? This is just another of its election promises, which it is not living up to, because the Government is not willing to get on with the job. It has made it patently obvious to the people of South Australia that it is not willing to get on with the job. I do not think, from what I have heard this morning, that the people of South Australia are very pleased about it. I hope South Australians will remember this when the time comes for the next election, and that could be sooner than the Premier thinks.

Mr. Millhouse: Not if he can help it.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, that is the whole purpose of the exercise. It has become obvious that the Premier has run out of ideas. This Government, having run a term in office, has now become stagnant, flat and lack-lustre. All the wonderful new ideas and innovations that it was to introduce when it was first elected have gone. The Government is totally devoid of initiative, and that is the message that is coming through loudly and clearly as a result of the decision to adjourn Parliament and to keep it up as long as possible. Indeed, the Premier in this morning's *Advertiser* virtually admitted that by saying:

I have achieved the major part of my legislative programme and now intend to proceed at a more leisurely pace and concentrate on administration.

I do not quarrel with the latter part of that statement; the Premier should concentrate on administration because his administration has been shown to be absolutely appalling, a good example of this being the Budget papers currently before the Chamber. If it is true that the Premier has achieved the major part of his legislative programme (and it is becoming patently obvious that it is so), it is about time he stood down. Perhaps it is time someone else took on his job, if we are not to have a change of Government.

Members interjecting:

Dr. TONKIN: I understand that the Minister of Transport thinks he could do a fairly good job in the

position. If that suggestion cannot put the Government out of its present trouble, perhaps it could go to the people again and see what they think about it now after its miserable performance to this time. It is no good and does the Premier no credit to blame a delay on the people responsible for drafting legislation. It is a poor and petty reason.

Mr. Millhouse: It's untrue, too!

Dr. TONKIN: It is totally and absolutely untrue. This has never been a problem to this Government before. We have only to look at the size of the Statute Books, as the Premier would say, to see how well the people who draft legislation have kept up with the sometimes excessive and unreasonable demands made on them by this Government. The Parliamentary counsel have risen to the task and performed it well, so that cannot be an excuse. The Premier is running scared; he is scared that he will be defeated on the floor of the House; he is scared that his administration will come under continuous scrutiny (as it should); and he is scared that the people of South Australia will realise that he heads a Government that is now totally devoid of new ideas and new initiatives. I repeat that the action proposed by the Government (and I have no doubt that the Premier is serious about it) directly contravenes all the principles of the Westminster system of Parliamentary democracy, and the Government should be condemned for it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have sat here for the past few minutes being subjected to the searchlight of Opposition scrutiny, and I must confess that I found it an extremely weak light. The Leader may fulminate at great length, but the business of Parliament is to get legislative work done, and the business of Government is not necessarily to legislate constantly, so he should not confuse these two elements. The Leader is a member of a Party that has constantly extolled the administration of the period of Government in South Australia before Labor took office in the last decade. In that time, if I go back to 1955—

Mr. Gunn: That's history.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: True, but it is interesting history. In 1955, in a Liberal Government that was supported by the only Opposition members now in this Chamber who have survived from that time (and they are about the only two on that side who have had Ministerial experience)—

Mr. Millhouse: The member for Torrens was not here in 1955.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well the member for Mitcham was here. A little later I will come to the period when the member for Torrens was here, and I think it will all be instructive. In 1955 we sat at the end of May, during part of June, and from August (not July) to November. That was a total of 59 days. I point out to honourable members that at that time evening sittings did not occur until about the last six weeks of the session.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: No, I'd say the last four weeks.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, I am being generous in saying it was six weeks.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They got up at half-past five.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was not normal for us to sit in the evening during those periods. In 1956-57, we sat for 48 days. In 1957, we sat in June and from July to October, a total of 41 days. In 1958, we sat in

June and then from July to November, a total of 51 days. In 1959, we sat in June and then from July to December, a total of 56 days. In 1960-61, we sat in May, did not sit in June as had been usual, and then sat from August to November, a total of 56 days.

In 1961-62, we sat in June and from July to November, a total of 43 days. In 1962, we sat in April for a few days and then from July to November, a total of 48 days. In 1963-64, we sat in June, then from July to November in 1963, and then we sat for a few days in February, 1964, a total of 52 days. In 1964, we sat in June and from July to October, a total of 37 days, and that included very few evening sittings.

Dr. Tonkin: What did you say to the Government during that period? Did you support it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I thought we ought to have been sitting on more days and, of course, that is what Parliament will do under our Government, in any event.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And for many more hours.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It will sit for many more hours. We come now to 1965-66, when we sat from May to December and then from January to March, a total of 82 days.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Who was in government then?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was a Labor Government.

Mr. BECKER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is smoking permitted in the House? I notice that the member for Ross Smith has a cigarette.

The SPEAKER: Smoking is not permitted in the House. I take it that the honourable member for Ross Smith is not smoking. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In 1966-67, we sat from June to November, 1966, and for a few weeks from February to March, 1967, a total of 73 days. Again, in 1967 we sat from June to November, a total of 57 days. In 1969 we sat from June to December, and we sat in February, 1970. That session was of 68 days' duration. In 1969-70 there were two sessions. In April there was a session of three days, and then from June to December we sat for 64 days. Of course, during that period we did not sit late in the evening often, because then the Liberals were relying on the vote of a Speaker who did not want to sit late in the evening, Mr. Speaker. Consequently, the session was a little extended in days, but not in hours.

Then the Labor Government took over in 1970 and we sat from July to December of that year, and in February and April of 1971, a total of 75 days. In 1971-72, we sat from July to November, 1971, and then we sat from February to April, 1972, a total of 74 days. In 1972, we sat from July to November, a total of 54 days. In 1973-74, we sat in 1973, in June, and from July to November and, in 1974, from February to March, a total of 69 days. In 1974-75, sat from July to December of that year, and in February and to March, 1975. We came back in June, 1975, making a total sitting time of 74 days. Under a Labor Government, Parliament has sat for very much more time, both in days and in hours, than was the wont of Liberal Governments to have it sitting.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you tell me when you made up your mind to curtail the session of Parliament?

Dr. Tonkin: Not long ago.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We made up our minds about what we would aim at for the sittings of Parliament when we had completed an examination of the legislative programme.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Honourable members will find that it is a legislative programme that is of considerable—

Mr. Millhouse: I asked when was it—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask honourable members to refrain from asking questions. The honourable Premier has the floor.

Mr. Millhouse: He slid off the answer.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

Mr. Becker: He does that, particularly when it is embarrassing.

The SPEAKER: I must warn all honourable members of this House to cease this constant interjecting. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The fact is that we have a very considerable legislative programme that members will be asked to give their attention to, and I think they will find that there is much meat in it and that we will accomplish a very considerable legislative programme this session. I point out that it will be accomplished under new Standing Orders, which are allowing us to achieve a greater rate of passing legislation in the House than was previously the case when there were no time limits on speeches and no provisions for agreement about time tabling.

We can get through the work more efficiently and, in consequence, at this stage the Government does not see the need for an autumn session. That does not mean to say that there may not be one: there may be one. I can only say that at this stage it is not the intention of the Government to call such a session but, if we find it necessary to do so, we will call it. Regarding the Leader's complaint, I must confess that I find it extraordinarily hollow. The record of Liberal Governments in this State or anywhere else in Australia has not been to have Parliament sitting when the Government did not have business for the Parliament immediately to deal with.

Mr. Mathwin: What about private members' business?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was not the case that either Mr. Hall or Sir Thomas Playford called Parliament together to dispose of private members' business. If the honourable member believes that that is the duty of a Government, I can only say that it is a doctrine that most constitutional writers would find entirely novel.

Dr. Tonkin: The Government has a duty to make sure the Opposition gets a fair hearing, though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It gets a better hearing than the Opposition in other States.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A fair hearing will be available to all members of this House. I point out that, so far from proceeding with any form of dictatorship, mild or otherwise, this Government has given overwhelmingly more facilities to members of this Parliament than has any other State Government. We have given to the Leader of the Opposition facilities that were denied to me by Liberal Governments when I was Leader of the Opposition. We have done that to let him have heard his voice and the voice of those whom he represents. We have given him the best possible facilities. No other Opposition in

Australia gets better facilities than does the Opposition in this State, nor does it get the availability of time in Parliament that the Opposition in this State gets. It is the duty of the Government to deal with Parliamentary business in an efficient way and to ensure that we have the opportunities of consolidating the work of Government and administration, given the enormous amount of legislative achievement that this State has seen in the past four years, and the Government intends to do just that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the motion. The Premier has spoken about the Leader's putting a weak light of scrutiny on the Government, but I have seldom heard the Premier at the poor advantage that he has been at in this debate. He made two points. The first was that it was not the constant function of the Government to legislate. That has certainly not been the impression that the Premier has given by way of the Governor's Speech and the public announcements that the Premier has made from time to time. He goes on the public media and brags about a heavy legislative programme, saying, "Under my Government we will sit late at night, as we have a heavy programme to get through." This is what happened before the recent election. As the Leader has rightly pointed out, it was the tenor of the election speech of this bustling new-broom Government. Unfortunately, the dealings I, as manager for the Opposition, have had with the Deputy Premier give a lie to what the Premier has been trying to say this afternoon. The only point the Premier made was to refer back to 1955, the horse and buggy days to which he often refers, to make comparisons, but that was 20 years ago. Most of the Premier's time was taken up by reading a series of statistics of sitting times, but all of those times exceeded the period for which the Premier intends the House to sit this session. The Premier said he had given the Opposition some perks; I suppose by that he expects to buy our silence. The Leader of the Opposition was given a staff of two. However, the Premier has built up his press corp to astronomical proportions and has spent a large sum of money on press secretaries for Ministers. When I was appointed Deputy Leader of the Opposition, one of my tasks was to try to negotiate with the Deputy Premier about the sittings of the House but, unfortunately, my dealings with him give the complete lie to what the Premier has been saying. We were supposed to enter into rational and civilised negotiations with the Deputy Premier at the Monday conferences, which were the brainchild of the Hon. L. J. King (now Justice King), in order to sort out the business of the House. We thought the Deputy Premier had changed his style somewhat as a result of a complaint we made about three weeks ago. However, at some inconvenience, last Monday I arrived at 11.45 a.m. for the meeting, because I had not been notified that it had been cancelled. The Whip saw me and told me that the meeting was off.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Did he tell you what time I rang him?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He said that the Deputy Premier rang about mid-morning. I had been charged with this responsibility, I came down here, but there was no meeting. The Deputy Premier said that all we were to deal with this week was the Budget. The Government has never pushed a Budget through in one week previously, and it will certainly not do so now if we have any say about it. At one conference, the Deputy Premier told me that he was under tremendous pressure from the Ministers, because the Government wanted to introduce 90 Bills: that would be five a day. He said, "We will have to sit on Thursday evenings."

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I understood this was confidential.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not confidential, because I have to report to my Party what you say. This is a discussion between the Opposition and Government.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Then we won't discuss anything, if that's the case. That's the finish!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Deputy Premier is calling the discussions off, but I am relating to the House the results of discussions I had with him. There was to be a legislative programme of 90 Bills, and the Deputy Premier undertook to provide a list so that we could plan the workings of the House, but that list has not eventuated. Lord knows when it will! He has tried bluster and everything in the book to shove us into late sittings in the evening, because of his story about the tremendous legislative programme. Obviously, as the Leader said, the Government is scared of sitting in the House and is willing to deny the proper working of democracy in this place.

Mr. Langley: Like Sir Thomas Playford did.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We have had a change of style with this new-broom Government: those days are said to be the bad old days. The Government says that the amount of work has increased so much that it has been necessary to enlarge the Ministry from eight to 13 Ministers. The Public Service has grown by 25 per cent during the five years that the Labor Party has been in office, and now we are to have rule by bureaucracy and regulation. What chance will people have of having their voices heard in this place? It seems that the Government intends, by this phony proposition to compress the sittings, to deny the proper working of democracy in this State. Obviously, one main reason for this proposition is that the Government has to go off on a junket to Penang in October, at a cost of about \$177 000! This sort of thing makes a complete farce of the operations of this House. Business of some importance is to be introduced by private members, but this will be compressed into a month or so, yet the Premier has the gall to say that we are not to debate private members' business because we must consider pressing Government affairs. Government members used half of private members' time recently by filibustering, thus making a mockery of the functioning of this House.

The Government seeks to blame the Parliamentary Counsel. The Parliamentary Counsel and his officers have been working under extreme pressure because the Government has had a legislative programme that it tried to compress into an unreasonable time scale. Now, that has been exaggerated out of all proportion. The Premier's excuses are completely at variance with the facts. The Deputy Premier can call off the conference if he wishes. From the way he has been carrying on, we have concluded that they are a waste of time anyhow. However, we were prepared to persist. The Premier tried to tell us that we had nothing to do, so we could go home, yet the Deputy Premier castigates us for not approaching the conferences realistically and honestly. They cannot have it both ways. The Government is making a hollow sham of the operation of this Parliament and of democracy in this State. I support the motion.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I am really impressed by the remarks of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition! I seriously ask members how anybody could confer with a fellow like him: one says things in negotiations, things are talked about, and he then comes into the House and relates those things word for word.

I do not want to embarrass him, because I do not intend to do the same as he did. I could tell members something that he said that would make a complete mockery of this debate. I would not be bothered, because it is not worth it. How can I continue to confer with a character of this type? I think the very basis of negotiations is that the confidentiality of those negotiations in that arena, not what flows from it, will be treated with some respect. However, confidentiality has never been followed ever since he has been a party to the negotiations. That never occurred when the member for Torrens was the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. No confidences were then broken. I expect to be able to approach the Opposition representatives openly and honestly and tell them what the situation is. I promised them that, as soon as Cabinet had approved them, I would give them a list of the Bills that would be introduced. I would probably have been able to do that within the next week or so, when I would have been able to give some idea of exactly how long this current session would last. It might surprise the honourable member to know that the Premier was not firm in his predictions, because only last night the Parliamentary Counsel, the Minister of Transport and I were involved in an exercise that gave us some idea of how long we would have to sit to get through the legislation that we think will be approved in Cabinet next Monday. In fact, I think the matter is listed for discussion after Executive Council tomorrow.

Members of the Opposition have stood up here this afternoon and have tried to make great play of the fact that the Parliament will not meet for eight months. We cannot blame them for that: it is good politics. But let us get down to the nitty-gritty and the facts. The Premier mentioned the number of days Parliament sat in the past. I want to examine the situation from the point of view of the change in times that have been brought about by the alterations to Standing Orders, which in my view leads to much better debate in this House, because at least people have to sit down when their time has expired. To say what they want to say in the 30 minutes allowed to them, they prepare a speech. That was not always the case previously. I can remember listening to drivel for three to four hours in this place, and I do not care which side it came from. I was just as critical of one side as I was of the other. I can remember saying to the honourable member for Mitcham shortly after I came into this House that it seemed totally and completely unnecessary to have people wandering on and drivelling on, as they did in this Chamber, and I can remember that he agreed with me. That is one thing to take into consideration. The other thing to take into consideration, as the Premier has said, is the number of hours we sit in a day. I came into this place only in 1962, but I well remember that we did not start night sittings for four weeks (the Premier said six weeks) before the session ended. Certainly we did not sit much later than 9.30 or 10 o'clock.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you remember how long Question Time took in those days?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Two hours.

Mr. Millhouse: Like fun it did: about 20 minutes.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It could go for two hours.

Mr. Millhouse: It could go on for that long, but it never did.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In my experience, Question Time was fully occupied. At least 1½ hours anyway. The House used to rise at 9.30 p.m., and certainly

before 9.45 p.m., because if it went any later taxis had to be provided for the staff, and the Government of the day did not like doing that. I can well remember that.

Members opposite must admit that the hours of sitting have changed completely and that very, very early in the session, almost from the first day, the House commences to sit in the evenings. If members want to look at this matter objectively they should look not at the number of sitting days but at the number of sitting hours. In fact, when I work out a programme I look at hours, not days, as it is on hours that I base the programme.

The legislative programme that will be produced by this Government for this session will certainly equal anything that was ever brought into this House, not only in terms of quantity, but also in terms of quality, and certainly in terms of weight of legislative material. It will equal anything that was ever brought into this House by the Hall Government or the Playford Government. I do not know what members are complaining about. In fact, the autumn sessions, as we sometimes refer to them, were an innovation of the Labor Government. I know that the Hall Government on one or two occasions may have sat during autumn: I think on one occasion it sat for three days, but the Party opposite had never heard of such sessions before. The House usually sat in June, adjourned to July, and then sat until the end of October or the beginning of November. The House was invariably up by the beginning of November. What has happened all of a sudden that causes members opposite to see such evil in the fact that we can contain our legislative programme within that period or thereabouts. As I emphasised, no firm date has been yet decided. What all of a sudden has made it so evil to do this, apart from the fact that members opposite are trying to secure a political point? I do not blame them. We would have done the same thing and we did do it in Opposition to the Playford Government in the same way as members opposite are doing it now?

Mr. Venning: Then what are you grizzling about?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am simply pointing out that members opposite are carrying out an exercise that we, if we were in Opposition, would have done. I am not criticising members opposite for doing that: I am just pointing out that they are quite wrong and are being fallacious in doing it. That is my complaint. I do not want to say any more than that. I am terribly disappointed to think I can no longer talk to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I shall be pleased to talk to the Opposition Whip, who I believe has always respected those parts of the conference that should remain confidential. I will discuss with him in future what we are going to do. So far as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is concerned however, he has shot his bolt. He has had it, because I do not intend to go to conference and talk to him. How can anyone be expected to talk to him knowing full well that anything that is said is likely to be spat at one in the House. I cannot and do not intend to accept that. So far as I am concerned, that is the end of the matter.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support this motion, and I support it strongly. I must say that the Deputy Premier has said nothing at all that is relevant to the motion, and I therefore have nothing to say in answer to him, but I do have a few things to say in answer to the Premier. I will give the complete answer to what he said in the House this afternoon and what he put in the paper this morning—and it is in quotes, although, like Mr. Dunford, maybe he will say it is wrong and that he was misquoted. The report states:

I have achieved the major part of my legislative programme and now intend to proceed at a more leisurely pace and concentrate on administration.

If that is how he feels about things, why did he not say so during the election campaign? Not one word was said there. He was going to have a lot of legislation in this Parliament, just as the Deputy Premier is still saying the Government is going to have it. Why did he not have His Excellency the Governor say it in the Opening Speech instead of the following:

In addition to the measures already referred to, my Government intends to lay before you a substantial legislative programme.

Not one word was said then that Parliament was to be up at the end of October. Of course, the answer is that it is since then, after the Government found things could be a bit uncomfortable because it does not have a majority, it decided to take this action. I interjected and asked a question of the Premier a moment ago about when the Government decided to do this. I did not get a straight answer: I never do when I ask him a difficult question, but I warrant that this decision was made the night on which the member for Playford was found asleep upstairs and missed a division. I will bet that was when the Government decided to curtail the thing. No doubt it had thoughts about this before then, but that was the time. Until now we have had not one suggestion publicly to the people of this State that the legislative programme of the Labor Party is finished and the pace can be more leisurely. I do not understand why for once in his life the Premier cannot be truthful, honest and frank, and admit that he is sitting in a very awkward and difficult situation in this House, having to depend on you, Sir, because he does not have a majority on the floor of the House. It is perfectly obvious. Why can he not be honest enough to admit it to the people of the State and say, "We are not going to sit for a moment longer than we have to, because we are frightened of being beaten." That is perfectly human and natural. That is the complete answer to the decision now so casually announced for not sitting. It was lucky for the Premier that I had had prepared the list of sitting days. It is significant, of course, that I went only as far back as my own joining of this place in 1955, but the records show that the Playford Government did sit on two occasions, in the first 10 sessions that I was here, in February and frequently in May, and the record is there for anyone to see. Let us go not as far back as that but only to the time when we were in the same position as the Government is in now, namely, 1968, 1969 and 1970.

In 1969 and 1970, we sat early in the year and introduced during that Parliament some of the most controversial and difficult legislation that has ever been introduced here. I will refer to only two measures to show that we had the courage to face the House, even though we did not have a majority. We introduced the electoral reform legislation that changed the face of this place: we introduced it in the teeth of bitter opposition from some of our own members, and we got it through. We introduced the legislation to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act on abortion. Those two pieces of legislation were, in their different ways, some of the most controversial legislation that has ever gone through this place, and we did it at a time when we did not have a majority here. If when we were in precisely the same position as that in which the present Government is in, and we could do that, it ill becomes the Premier to say that under Liberal Governments we did not sit,

as he said this afternoon, and it is entirely cowardly of him to suggest that it is because the Parliamentary Counsel cannot keep up with the legislative programme that the Government is not willing to sit.

There has been no change in the staff of the Parliamentary Counsel's office in the past year: I have checked on that. It is cowardly for the Premier to blame a public servant by implication for not being able to keep up the flow of work when, during the past five years while the Government has been in office, there has been an enormous burden of work with which the Parliamentary Counsel has been able to cope. Those are the facts of the situation, and I shall say only a couple of things more.

Do members realise that, when Parliament is not sitting, it is impossible for any local government by-law to be altered? The by-law must lie on the table of this House for 14 sitting days before it can take effect. Do members realise that any regulation made by the Government speaks until it is disallowed here, and we are not to get the opportunity even to scrutinise a large body of legislation by delegation that we now have here in this State? Those are some of the effects of not sitting for eight months.

I conclude on one matter of supreme importance: one of the functions of Parliament (one of the most important and basic functions of Parliament) is to act as the protector of the freedoms and rights of the individual citizen. The only way that can effectively be done is through questioning in this place during Question Time or by motion and debate. We, and the people of the State, are to be denied that protection for a period of eight months. It is a scandal; it is a disgrace, and it is utterly dishonest of the Government not to accept the real reason why this is to happen! It is obvious that this Government is on the down grade; there is no doubt whatever about that, and in this matter it is following the advice of Mr. David Combe given to the Federal Government, and his report after the Bass by-election, that Parliament should not sit but should depend on administration and get out and sell its programmes in the community. By accepting that advice in this place, this Government is acknowledging that it is in the same parlous state as its federal colleagues, and I say that it will soon pay the price for it.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the motion and most of the comments that have been made by Opposition members. There is no doubt that private members have been disadvantaged by changes that have taken place in Standing Orders during the past five years. Those changes may have helped speed up the processes of Parliament, but for the Government to be arrogant enough to suggest that we should shorten the times of sitting to suit it as a political Party, after accepting that the Opposition is being disadvantaged and individual members are being disadvantaged by changes to Standing Orders, I believe is wrong. Let us be honest. There would be no member here who could claim that we do not live in a different world today from the world of 20 years ago. Business moves more rapidly; Government departments have many more problems and people to deal with, and there is always the necessity for changes to be made to existing laws, both old and new.

To say that we can walk away from this place for eight months during this fiscal year, thus being denied the opportunity to introduce new legislation or to amend existing legislation, is wrong, let alone the other facts the member for Mitcham emphasised that the Government can introduce regulations that cannot be changed by any

Parliamentarian on the floor of this House—the place where they should be challenged, and rejected if the numbers are here to support their rejection. There is no way of challenging the Government except by running along to a newspaper or radio or television station and, if it is not an emotional issue, they are not interested, anyway. Once they are gazetted, they are law until such time as Parliament rejects the regulations. That means that we could have a law that disadvantages someone in the community unfairly operating for eight months before it can be challenged by any Parliamentarian who shows concern for the individual or group of individuals. That is an unjust situation.

We also know that the Premier has said for the past three or four years that Parliaments must sit for long periods to pass more legislation and to attempt to keep up with the speed with which our society is moving and with the changes that take place in our society. Suddenly, however, because of an election on July 12, the Premier changes his mind and says that it is unnecessary to sit for so long. If it is so unnecessary to sit for so long why do we stay here until 10.30 in the evening? Why not sit only for a reasonable and respectable time and go home at 9 p.m. or 9.30 p.m. and sit through until the first week in December? Why do we have to sit late at night? No other group in the community that works for a living, so our Government friends tell us, works these hours except on shift work? If we wish to preserve the health of members (and some member are feeling the strain in the House; I know that one Minister is resigning because of the pressure he is under) why not extend the number of sitting days instead of the sitting hours in a day. That is a ridiculous approach, when considering the health of members and the pressures on them, and there is no merit in that argument.

The argument of the member for Mitcham and the Leader is factual: the Government is afraid of being defeated—that is the only reason for the short session. There is no other logical reason. Yet, the Premier is supposed to be the man who fights and wins and who stands up for the rights of individuals and justice within society. The man who will make the move he is making now is a hypocrite, if he makes this kind of move to try to stifle Parliament and take away from Parliament the opportunity for elected members to question, challenge and test the Government, which is what the Premier is setting out to do. Unfortunately, each and every member behind him backs him and I suppose that, if it came to a vote, you, Mr. Speaker, would also back him. I believe it is a terrible thing that elected members should set out to stifle other elected members by this method. This Parliament should sit for more days and shorter hours if the Government has not enough legislation to keep us occupied during the longer hours. The motion is an important one, and I support the Leader fully in his comment that it is a cowardly act by the Government to run away.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung, the motion was withdrawn.

CONCORDE AIRCRAFT

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That this House object to the Concorde aircraft using Adelaide Airport as an alternative landing site on a regular basis.

I consider it is the responsibility of the Government and the Parliament to ensure that the environment is protected at all times so that people may live and continue

to live where they choose. After all, that is one of our basic freedoms. People who live in the vicinity of Adelaide Airport have chosen to do so for many reasons. Since they took up residence there they have been subjected to development and expansion at the Adelaide Airport, and the introduction of jet aircraft. They have had to tolerate the tremendous increase in noise level at the Adelaide Airport. The introduction of the Concorde aircraft to Australia on a regular commercial basis will create many problems. Test flights have proved that perhaps they can fly over certain parts of Australia without causing much damage to the Australian environment, but this will have to be proved. The results of the tests made by the Australian Department of Transport and our own Environment and Conservation Department have not yet been released. The Australian Conservation Foundation used the services in Melbourne of L. H. Challis and Associates, (the aircraft noise measurement company) and Mr. J. L. Goldberg who deals with noise measurement at the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation.

Noise levels were taken of the approach of the aircraft to Tullamarine Airport one nautical mile from the airport on a three degree glide slope, which is the normal approach, and the noise level reading was 119 decibels, which compares with the approach noise level reading of 120 decibels for the Boeing 707 and the D.C. 850 of 117 decibels. A document put out by Communicator Public Relations (New South Wales) Proprietary Limited promoting the Concorde aircraft and its flight to Australia stated that the noise level reading on the approach of the Concorde would be 115 decibels. We were also told that at takeoff the noise level reading of the Concorde was slightly less, at 114 decibels. However, the Australian Conservation Foundation has been told that on August 4 when the Concorde took off from Tullamarine Airport 4.8 kilometres from the runway the noise level reading was 128 decibels. Any increase of 10 decibels or more could be almost ear-shattering.

It is fair and reasonable to assume that the Concorde can be two or three times louder than the Jumbo jet. On August 5, another reading of the Concorde taking off from Tullamarine was 125 decibels. This depends on the atmospheric conditions at the time of the approach and the taking off of the aircraft. As I wish to have these noise level readings confirmed, I need the figures of the State Environment and Conservation Department and the Australian Government Department of Transport, and they have promised to supply me with these figures. For this reason I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

RURAL LAND TAX

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, rural land tax should be abolished.

It is interesting to note that land tax in South Australia was first levied in 1884 under a measure that called it simply "the land tax", stating:

A tax is hereby imposed on all land in South Australia with the following exceptions—

and it refers to land of the Crown which for the time being shall not be subject to any agreement or sale or right of purchase, park lands, public roads, public cemeteries and other public reserves. It also refers to land used solely for religious or charitable purposes, or used by any institute under the provisions of the Institute Act. The rate of land tax at that time was levied at the rate of one halfpenny for every £1 sterling in the amount of the taxable value thereof.

That is the history of the measure. In comparing land tax in South Australia with land tax in the other States I refer to the 1975 annual taxation summary in *Taxpayer* which is produced by the Australian Taxpayers' Association. At page 125 there are useful facts on land tax, referring to the situation of land tax in Victoria. Dealing with "exempt land" the report states:

"Land used for primary production". The term means lands used primarily for:

- (1) the cultivation of the land for the purposes of selling what is produced from the cultivation; or
- (2) the maintenance of animals of poultry on it for the purpose of selling them or their natural increase or bodily produce;

It goes on to state that all land used in that way is totally exempt from State land tax in Victoria. On page 123, referring to New South Wales, the report states:

Primary production land is exempt when: Provided the land is not jointly assessed with a company in whose hands primary production land would be taxable, any land used for primary production is exempt if owned by:

- (1) individuals, partnerships or a trust estate—

In Western Australia we find that improved land, owned and used solely or principally for the purposes of agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, avicultural, grazing, pig raising, or poultry business is exempt from the payment of land tax entirely. So much for those three States. Tasmania has a rebate on rural land, and Queensland also has a substantial rebate on rural land, but does not exempt it entirely. That is the situation in other States. The situation with regard to land tax in South Australia is well known to all members. There has been a recognition in this State of the anomalies regarding rural land tax, and all Governments have been aware of this and have provided for it from time to time.

I have in my possession land tax assessment notices for 1970. Almost all rural landholders at that time appealed against the assessments they received, and a further assessment was made in 1971 because of the savage increase that the 1970 assessment had made and the fact that it was out of proper relationship with the viability of rural holdings. That 1971 assessment was supposed to have been an equitable and proper readjustment for rural land across the State. However, members are all aware that, despite that readjustment, it was necessary for this Government to introduce a Bill last session to correct the disastrous effects of inflation on unimproved land values. We now have an equalisation factor, which this Government brought in to try to correct the anomalies applying to rural land tax assessment. The list of equalisation factors was printed in the *Government Gazette* on June 26, 1975: it refers to an equalisation factor for the District Council of Barossa, for instance, of 2.64; for the District Council of East Torrens of 3.29; for the District Council of Marne of 3.50; and for my own District Council of Minlaton, an equalisation factor of 1.9. All these equalisation factors have the effect of raising the unimproved value of the land for assessment under the new values.

I have done an exercise on assessments, and the 1971 value of a normal sized rural holding in my area was \$37 050. As a result of that equalisation factor now applying, it is valued at \$70 395. Whatever happens to the rate that applies to that valuation does not concern me so much as the fact that the valuation so applied and now applying is quite inaccurate and inappropriate for present conditions. I cannot accept that that is an acceptable equalisation of value. Inflation is still with us and, if land tax remains, present rates and values will once again be out of kilter in another year or two. A report in the *Advertiser* on March 19 states:

Outside the House, Mr. Dunstan said this would not mean a reduction in the Government's revenue from land tax. However, it would mean that the total revenue would increase by very much less than it would have increased under the old system of taxing.

What the Premier is really saying is that the Government is now merely sugaring the pill and spreading the effect of it, so that I presume we are not supposed to notice its effect so drastically. However, this matter will always be inequitable, and indeed unnecessary. I refer now to the policy of the Liberal Movement on the matter of land taxation—indeed, to the matter of State taxation altogether. My Leader, the member for Mitcham, said in that policy speech:

Right across the board we are not satisfied with our present system of State taxation. It has become most complex and needs simplification.

Later in that policy speech he said that the Liberal Movement would abolish rural land tax to bring South Australia into line with all other mainland States. I have already quoted from the publication *Taxpayer* that most other mainland States are exempt from this iniquitous tax. In that same newspaper article in the *Advertiser* of March 19 this year, Mr. Grant Andrews, who is Secretary of the United Farmers and Graziers organisation in this State and whose organisation would represent most rural landholders in South Australia, states, at the close of that article:

We hope it will be possible eventually to see rural land tax abolished as is the case in other States.

That clearly indicates that he knows what ought to happen. It also indicates that he speaks with some backing—the backing of the farmers union, so to speak, of South Australia: our trade union organisation. We hope that the Government will show our trade union organisation the same respect it shows its own overlords.

I emphasise that abolition of rural land tax is the only logical course to take. Most other States, as I have said, accept this as the proper treatment for rural land. In justification for my claim (should justification be necessary, and I do not believe it is), I believe that rural landholders in South Australia already subsidise the community sufficiently to be relieved from this burden on land tax. All members are aware that the local consumption price for wheat is such that the flour that goes into our bread costs the consumer much less than it would if it were levied locally at export parity. To emphasise my argument further I quote an article that appeared in the *Chronicle* on August 22 this year under the name of Ronald Anderson, the noted agricultural economist and journalist. It is headed "We have nothing to complain about." That heading has nothing to do with farmers complaining about rural land tax: he is speaking on behalf of the Australian consumer, and states:

By world standards, at least, Australian consumers cannot complain about either the level or the rate of increase of prices in most farm-produced food lines. I recently plotted comparisons of the prices of 18 food lines in 15 capital cities around the world. The data, which included Canberra prices—

from memory, I think one member in this Chamber recently said that, next to Adelaide, Canberra was the highest capital for food costs in Australia—

The data, which included Canberra prices, was collected by the foreign agricultural service of the United States Department of Agriculture last month. The results of the comparison are rather startling. They show, for example, that in the 12 months to the beginning of June this year, Australia had the second smallest change in its domestic food price index of the 15 countries surveyed . . . The lines in which Canberra prices were relatively low by world standards were cheese (second lowest); boneless roast chuck beef, butter, apples, rice and sugar (all third lowest); boneless sirloin steak and pork chops (fourth lowest); and brown onions (fifth lowest).

So it can be seen that consumers in this country have little to complain about regarding food prices. Land tax is, in effect, a consumer subsidy and, more than that, rural communities relieve the taxpayer generally by being willing to work for the amenities they need. Per capita, their direct support for hospital, aged persons' homes, kindergartens, playing fields, and the like are such that would entitle them to total relief from this State charge on their resources. I therefore believe that rural land tax should be abolished.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should immediately state a case to the Industries Assistance Commission calling on the commission not to recommend any further extension of reductions in the rates of duty which reduction would be to the disadvantage of Australian industry.

I move this motion with a great sense of urgency because I believe the industrial future of South Australia is at stake. Naturally in referring to Australian industry (as I do in the motion) I am referring especially to South Australian industry. However, because the motion relates to a Commonwealth Government decision, it is obviously necessary that the whole of Australia should be considered. Members on both sides will recall vividly the chaos that followed earlier tariff decisions, especially those that were made concurrently with the decision to devalue the Australian currency.

The genesis of this motion relates to a reference given by a former Special Minister of State (Mr. Lionel Bowen) on May 30, 1975, to the Industries Assistance Commission following Australia's participating in negotiations earlier this year in Geneva at what has been described as "multi-national trade negotiations" where attention was focused on "tariffs, non-tariffs, barriers, and other measures used to protect local industry and agricultural production". The Associated Chambers of Manufactures of Australia highlighted its fears about what could happen as a result of this measure going to the Industries Assistance Commission, and did this in the lead article of *Industry News* (volume 3, No. 4) of July 30, 1975, under the headline "Australian manufacturers in jeopardy". The first sentence of the report states:

The A.C.M.A. is gravely concerned that the Federal Government intends to use the Australian manufacturing sector as an expendable pawn at the bargaining table of the multi-national trade negotiations.

If any honourable member were to say that the future of this State's industry was not important, I would refer him to action taken by the Premier regarding a previous I.A.C. report on the motor vehicle industry in Australia. The Premier's action was supported by the Opposition, which believed his action was totally desirable and in the best interests of South Australia. The action that was important then is equally as important today, because of the deteriorating unemployment position and the increasing inability of Australians to purchase products made in Australia. In addition, because of the gross reduction in the number of exports from vital South Australian industries, it is important that the Government comes face to face with the reality of the situation and takes the action I am suggesting.

South Australia should be heard constantly in defence of every arm of its industry. We must maintain a continuing brief for South Australian industry because by so

doing we are fortifying or assisting future employment in this State. The press almost every day indicates the difficulties encountered by local employers. I will refer to only three of the most recent press reports, which were written two or three weeks ago when it was intended to debate this motion. Under the heading "Kelvinator, Simpson 'at wits end'" in the *Advertiser* of August 13, 1975, the following appears:

The managements of Simpson Pope Ltd. and Kelvinator Australia Limited were "at their wits end" to find ways to keep their factories in Adelaide at an economical level, a Liberal M.L.C. claimed yesterday.

The report went on to say:

The directors had blamed this poor result on "the impossibility of raising prices to combat rising wages due to competition from overseas products."

Mr. Nankivell: Is that why Simpson Pope are sending knocked-down white goods to Penang and Malaysia for reassembly and local sale?

Dr. EASTICK: General Motors-Holden's used to send a complete knocked-down vehicle to Korea, but was instructed to send everything other than the engine to Korea because the Koreans had started to build engines. Not long after that G.M.H. was told to send everything but the engine and transmission, because transmissions were being developed and built in the Philippines. With the fairly massive increase in General Motors providing spare parts and accessories for motor vehicles in Malaysia, it is clear that the quantity of exports from South Australia or, indeed, Australia will diminish accordingly. What the member for Mallee has said is true. There is an ever-increasing erosion of the ability of South Australian industry to participate in overseas markets as an integral part of viable industry here. The *Advertiser* article of August 13 continues:

"I refuse to accept that the best solution is for these companies to run down their activities in Adelaide and redeploy their assets by building factories in South-East Asia or near the large markets in Melbourne and Sydney." If further inroads are made by foreign imports on South Australian industry, that industry will deteriorate further. Another report in the *Advertiser*, this time under a Canberra dateline and appearing on August 19, states:

Imported car figures climb. Figures issued yesterday said 8 062 new cars were imported, an increase of nine per cent on the June total of 7 386 . . . There were substantial increases in imports from Sweden, Italy and the United Kingdom but a decrease in imports from Germany. Despite all the action taken to protect the Australian motor car industry it is a fact of life that in July this year, with rapid changes being made by altering the sales tax provision (which was only a stop-gap measure), once again the industry is in difficulty. Another report from Canberra appeared in the *Advertiser* of August 26, headed "Controls urged on built-up cars" and stating:

The Federal Government should restrict the number of cars assembled locally from imported components, General Motors-Holden's recommended yesterday . . . The restrictions should replace tariff quotas and should form only 10 per cent of the market in 1976, 1977 and 1978 . . . The company says sales of imported cars in Australia will total 228 000 this year . . . The Government planned to reserve 80 per cent of the market to the local industry, but tariffs alone would not achieve this aim . . . Without this action by the Government, we foresee the major share of the market being taken up by completely built-up and completely knocked-down imported vehicles, which will not achieve the Government's aim.

That shows that there is a real threat to the future of industry in Australia, more particularly in South Australia, because in this State 11 per cent of our total work force is directly involved in the motor car industry. If we have regard to the number of people involved in ancillary

activities associated with that industry, we find that about 16 per cent of the total work force in the State is involved in that vital industry. In the press of Sunday, August 31, in a report written by Cassandra, it was indicated again that there were real problems and real difficulties arising because of the issues raised in this reference of powers by Mr. Bowen to the Industries Assistance Commission.

There have been several other significant contributions on the matter that I have raised. I refer first to an article by Professor F. H. Gruen, of the Research School of Social Sciences at the Australian National University, who is also involved with the Prime Minister's Department and Cabinet. His contribution is reported in the *Australian Quarterly* of June, 1975. It is entitled "Twenty-five per cent tariff cut; was it a mistake?" and states:

Within the last nine to 12 months the tariff decision has come under increasing attack and there is now a fairly general view that the cut was an unwise one. For instance, the recent Liberal-Country Party National Economic Programme 1975 talked about the "ill conceived" 25 per cent across the board tariff cut which caused the "destruction" of labour-intensive industries. Nor is this belief confined to one side of politics: there are plenty of Government back-benchers who share the view that the across the board tariff cut was ill conceived and largely responsible for our present unemployment problems.

There are problems, and that is not a writing by a Liberal on a vital issue: it is a report by someone who has a real knowledge of the subject. He subsequently explains some of the background to the tariff decision and states:

During the early months of the Labor Government it became obvious that there would be great and growing demands on the productive capacity of the Australian economy. Apart from private demands, the Government had very ambitious social objectives (for instance, the Karmel report on education was tabled in Parliament in May, 1973). In these circumstances, the greater the proportion of total community expenditure spent on imports, the easier—or at least the less difficult—it was likely to be for Government to fulfil its social objectives. In this situation, imports had the virtue that they added to the supply of things to buy in Australia without creating additional incomes from production and thus extra demands. Referring to the Rattigan report which had been before Cabinet and which was a prerequisite to the Commonwealth Government's decision to cut the tariffs, he states:

However, the main stress in the report was not on dampening price rises but on the possibility of increasing imports and thus making more supplies available locally. This is indeed clear from the heading of the report of the Rattigan Commission.

Professor Gruen gives the reason and purpose for the decision by the Treasury or by the Prime Minister. I refer to the Prime Minister, because it was indicated that it was a decision by three people, namely, the Prime Minister, Doctor Cairns, and, I think, Mr. Crean. The writer then highlights the Treasury critique of the proposals, and these are under three headings. He states:

First and perhaps most important, it was argued that a tariff cut would prejudice the possibility of a further revaluation. . . . Second, they believed tariff making to be an area in which justice not only should be done but should be seen to be done. . . . Thirdly, the real effects on employment and on industry were uncertain. . . .

These facts plainly have come about in no small measure. The Professor proceeded to give some particularly cogent reasons for and against the various decisions and the actions that then arose. I refer to the pertinent conclusions to which he came. On page 18 of the report, he states:

1. The most obvious conclusion I think is that the effects of the 25% tariff cut have been exaggerated both by those, like myself, who favoured such a move and even more so by those who opposed it.

2. In the light of our present difficulties, it is fair to conclude that exchange rate changes and tariff cuts can only

act as a supplement to and not as a substitute for the control of inflation through fiscal, monetary and wages policies . . .

3. In the present circumstances, with some recent reversals of the tariff cuts, it might be argued that the July, 1973, decision has damaged the cause of rational tariff reform.

He then refers particularly to the motor industry and states:

In the case of the motor industry, a good deal of protection arose not directly from tariffs but from local content plans. These have been liberalised somewhat and imports in greater volume than in any year before 1973-74 are being permitted. In spite of this, the level of effective protection for this economic activity is very high.

The motor vehicle industry was the subject of an article, under the heading "Government policy for automotive industry", in the magazine *Developments in Manufacturing Industry* which was published in the June, 1975, issue and which states:

The I.A.C. presented its report on the passenger motor vehicle industry to the Government in mid-July 1974 . . . The commission assessed that the effects of its recommendations would be to reduce the number of high-content manufacturers of "medium" and "large light" vehicles to no more than three. It saw these manufacturers dominating the medium market and holding a large part of the "large light" market with the Japanese supplying most of the demand for light cars. The commission estimated that Australian vehicles would incorporate about 85 per cent to 90 per cent local content . . . The commission considered that, in the following 10 years, about 15 000 jobs would disappear, but 13 000 new jobs would be created by natural growth in more efficient sectors of the industry—a displacement of 2 000 jobs. Because of the high labour turnover in the industry (33 000 separations in 1972-73) and estimates of 1 500 000 more jobs throughout Australia by 1980, no great problem in employing the displaced labour was foreseen.

We have to ask ourselves whether the assumptions made in that report, which was brought down in mid-July, 1974, are valid today when unemployment has increased beyond a total of 300 000 and we are constantly being told of the major difficulties arising in every area. The author went on to indicate the action taken by the Government, as follows:

In October, 1974, the Caucus Economic and Trade Committee recommended that the Government should have regard to the following guidelines:

- (1) that Australian employment in the motor vehicle industry be safeguarded and encouraged into areas of greater technological skills in engineering and design;
- (2) that the economy of the State of South Australia be maintained and where possible developed by the Government policy;
- (3) that the Australian consumer be provided with more economical, more appropriate, safer, pollution-free, cheaper motor vehicles;
- (4) that the Australian industry be developed into areas where its existing skills in componentry can best take advantage of wider markets in the region, including Japan;
- (5) that the Government's new policy on non-metropolitan areas subsidies be applied where appropriate to allow a transitional period for capital intensive enterprises to adjust to the new policy, in particular those located in Albury/Wodonga and Launceston;
- (6) that the aim of the Government be to set a framework which promotes business confidence; allows planning for ten years ahead with certainty; involves a minimum of bureaucratic interference; provides for Australian equity; and provides by the end of a decade a stronger, more flexible industry meeting fully the national interest.

We must ask ourselves whether all of the activities that have taken place in the interim (which are the responsibility of or have been caused by the Australian Government) allow for the industry to proceed as was hoped and as

was contemplated in that report. Against the point that I made relating to the South Australian motor car industry, we must ask—

At 4 p.m., the bells having been rung, the Orders of the Day were called on.

Later:

Dr. EASTICK: When the bells rang at 4 o'clock, I was discussing the various aspects of the motor vehicle industry. I had pointed out that the Government had taken certain action and that one of the Government's guidelines was laid down specifically for the purpose of ensuring that the South Australian motor vehicle industry would be viably maintained. The Government's short-term approach on this issue is referred to on page 28 of the report, which indicates that the 1974 conditions laid down by the Government were measures which involved the following:

(1) Reducing sales tax from 27½ per cent to 15 per cent on passenger motor vehicles and 15 per cent to 5 per cent on commercial motor vehicles, until May 1, 1975, after which the rates were to be restored gradually to the former levels (by September 1, 1975).

(2) Repealing the decision to impose a tax on the net standby value to employees of the use of company cars.

(3) Imposing import quotas on passenger motor vehicles during 1975 at a level of 5 500 vehicles a month for February, March and April; and thereafter 7 500 vehicles a month.

Indeed, I said it was apparent that the Commonwealth Government's guideline of admitting 7 500 vehicles was exceeded during July. I am led to believe (although I have nothing to substantiate the claim) that the August figure will show a further increase; in other words, another of the Commonwealth Government's action is deficient. The report continues:

(4) Imposing import quotas on commercial vehicles at 1974 levels.

Apart from those actions and the short-term activities a more telling and true indication of how quickly the game can change (and why it is important that we consider urgently the measure that the Government keep a constant vigil on all matters relating to the industry) is dealt with in the same report which relates to conditions undertaken by the Government, and which states:

... a sharp fall in new orders was being reported by the industry from about the middle of May and there was renewed apprehension about sales, production and unemployment prospects for the second half of 1975.

Indeed, subsequent public statements in the local press express grave doubts about future employment prospects in the motor vehicle industry. I am referring now only to that industry and not the other important white goods area of industry which is important to South Australia. I previously indicated that 11 per cent of the work force and a further 5 per cent or more of the work force engaged in indirect services were associated with the motor vehicle industry, which clearly indicates why the Government's earlier action was lauded and supported.

Recently the Minister for Manufacturing Industry, Senator James McClelland (at least he was the Minister in June), addressed a group of people at the Harvard Club in Sydney and is reported in *Developments in Manufacturing Industry* for June, 1975, under the heading "A rational approach to tariff reform" as follows:

... a great deal of my time has been caught up in dealing with the immediate problems presently confronting the manufacturing sector.

He there acknowledges the grave difficulties that exist in that vital area of industry. He continues:

Since assuming office 2½ years ago the Australian Labor Government has endeavoured to use the tariff as an instrument to bring about a better allocation of resources in the manufacturing sector. We have tried to move in the desirable direction of achieving a manufacturing industry less reliant on the tariff than before. These endeavours have, in general, represented a significant departure from past practices. And they have, I might add, not been universally welcomed by the manufacturing community, whether management or trade unions.

I refer to that because obviously the difficulties associated with the whole approach to industry, tariffs and other measures that are involved are controversial at political and manufacturing levels and, because of the controversy, the position must be watched closely so that an *ad hoc* decision is not made that will permanently disadvantage any sector of the industry. Senator McClelland continues:

Indeed the term tariff policy has virtually been synonymous with what one might call "industry policy".

He gives as an example the discovery, exploitation and export of our enormous mineral resources, and states:

... we do not have the same kind of problems with the balance of payments that have plagued us in the past.

I suggest he believes that industry is becoming of secondary importance to the important overall mineral position, but whether that claim can be maintained is another matter. He introduces that suggestion in his address, which continues:

Whilst it might seem strange that a Labor Government is interested in the health of the private sector, the fact is that the achievement of the nation's social objectives and the raising of living standards demand that there should be an increased rate of growth in real income levels. In this context the Australian Government believes the best prospects for growth must lie in those areas of production where Australia is, or should be, better suited.

Therefore we believe industry should be encouraged to concentrate its development increasingly in those areas where we have a cost or natural advantage, or where at least our cost disabilities are least. This will involve a movement of resources away from those activities that are relatively high cost, or highly protected by world standards, to those that fit in more with the kind of guidelines I have just mentioned.

I have referred to some of the points of that address because it is extremely important that we recognise that in South Australia, because of a number of actions of this State Government, the cost advantage that used to exist no longer exists. We must ensure that, at a time when the Commonwealth Government is trying to change its industrial policies (and is perhaps using them at the barter table), the South Australian sector of industry is not further disadvantaged. The Labor Party has suddenly recognised that there is a place in its vocabulary for the word "profit", which is no longer a dirty word. The Labor Party has now accepted the word as being important. Senator McClelland's speech continues:

We will continue with the progressive review of the tariff, which commenced just before we assumed office, and began by dealing with those tariff items that had relatively high levels of duty and had not been reviewed for many years. ... While I do not propose to forecast what these may be in each case I believe that, as a general proposition, it would be desirable to look to a reduction in high rates of protection from imports.

Mr. Millhouse: I understood this was going to be finished before 4 o'clock.

Dr. EASTICK: When any person other than the honourable member gets on his feet, apparently he must be confined to a period, but when the honourable member gets on his feet evidently he may go on for any period that suits his purposes.

Mr. Millhouse: You are not the only one.

Dr. EASTICK: Nor was the honourable member on the last occasion when private members' business was before this House. Nevertheless, in due deference to the Chair, I will conclude my remarks in this important issue. It is extremely important for the future of South Australia that no arm of our industrial base be eroded. At present there are differences of opinion in the motor vehicle industry as to the advantages and disadvantages of having an engine plant at Lonsdale. Having had discussions with General Motors and Chrysler in America, I have no doubt that one of the very important requirements of the industry now and in the future will be the size of through-put. If the through-put of General Motors-Holden's and Ford is to be reduced to the advantage of Chrysler, it will naturally be to the disadvantage of General Motors-Holden's and Ford. The total situation must be balanced. It is recognised that in the foreseeable future there will be a decrease of at least 2 000 in the number of people associated with the motor vehicle industry in Australia; this assumption was made at a time when it was believed that the motor vehicle industry's future was rosier than it has proved to be.

If it was important (and I believe it was) for the Government to refute the assumptions in the Industries Assistance Commission's first report on the motor vehicle industry, it is equally important for the Government now to accept the responsibility of stating a case on this important issue to the commission and to maintain the presence of one or more officers at any discussions before the commission that are likely to affect the future industrial base of this State. I look forward to the support of all members for this measure, which seeks to guarantee our survival and our economic future.

Mr. EVANS seconded the motion.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PETRO-CHEMICAL COMPLEX

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Dean Brown:

That this House view with grave concern the indefinite postponement of the construction of a petro-chemical complex in South Australia and the subsequent effect that this will have on employment opportunities; furthermore, this House condemn the South Australian and Australian Governments for their gross mismanagement of this development project and for their failure to uphold the A.L.P. State election promise of 1973, and call on the State Government to table immediately in the House all Government documents and correspondence relating to the petro-chemical complex.

(Continued from August 27. Page 498.)

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Minister of Community Welfare) moved:

That the debate be further adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, Max Brown, Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne (teller), Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown (teller), Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mrs. Byrne. No—Mr. Gunn.

The SPEAKER: There are 22 Ayes and 22 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: That the adjourned debate be made an Order of the Day for—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On motion, Mr. Speaker.

Later:

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I move:

That debate on Order of the Day, Other Business No. 1, be now resumed.

The Government, particularly the Minister of Mines and Energy, who took the adjournment, has had two weeks in which to prepare its reply. Last week, in private members' time, the Opposition allowed adequate time for the member for Elizabeth to put through an entire Bill, and Opposition members gave him a fair amount of assistance. Regarding this motion, which relates to employment in your district, Mr. Speaker, I find that the Government is not willing to put its case. One can only assume, therefore, that it is willing to support the motion or that it has no case in its defence. I therefore believe that debate on the motion should be resumed immediately, and urge support for the motion.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): Owing to an unfortunate circumstance and the fact that I had an important meeting with certain people in my office (they are there at present) I was not back in the Chamber at 4 o'clock and, consequently, missed getting the call to continue with this debate. The facts of the matter are that the Minister of Community Welfare moved that the debate be adjourned. Consequently, I lose the right to speak further in the debate. I had intended to move an amendment to the motion and, because of my missing the call, certain difficulties have arisen. I do not think that I could object to the debate being resumed, but the motion to adjourn was moved only with the intention of enabling me to continue to speak. However, in view of the peculiar circumstances, that is no longer possible. I think that that ought to be explained, because I had no intention of avoiding the debate. I am quite happy to be involved in the debate and only regret the unfortunate circumstances that prevent me from participating further in it. It may be possible to work something out so that the debate can be continued by other speakers. I do not know whether that will be possible; it may need a suspension of Standing Orders.

That is why this difficulty arose, and I ask the member for Davenport and other members opposite to understand that. I have to go back to my office to continue this important meeting, which is of sufficient urgency for me to do so. I know members on this side of the House wish to speak in this debate. I know that the Minister of Education, who has been involved as the previous Minister concerned with the Redcliff development, and the Premier both wish to speak and other members, particularly the member for Stuart, may wish to take part in this debate. I am sure the member for Light and the Leader of the Opposition will want to take part in the debate also. I do not think the Minister of Community Welfare wants to speak immediately, but some members opposite may want to take part in it and perhaps some arrangement could be reached that would allow me to take part in it at a later stage. Unfortunately I cannot do so immediately; that is the problem.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): The member for Davenport is keen to have the matter voted on today and, if the Minister wishes to speak on the matter later today, I believe we could resume the debate now. One of his colleagues could talk on the matter, which could be adjourned on motion, and later on Standing Orders could be suspended

to allow the Minister to put his Party's view. We could allow enough time at the end of private members' time to do that; we could negotiate to achieve that. My suggestion is that the debate should now be resumed, according to procedure, and later this afternoon we will suspend Standing Orders to bring the matter back on and, by that suspension, allow the Minister to speak. I suggest members support the resumption of the debate to get that procedural matter into process.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I do not oppose the motion but I want to make sure that my own position is safeguarded since the little dust-up over the Industrial Code Amendment Bill. I have spoken to the Minister who told me he will be willing to speak and to indicate the Government's attitude, if not to finish his speech, at 5.15 p.m. I want to make certain that in this procedure the Minister will be given that opportunity to speak this afternoon and say whether his Government is in favour of or against the abolition of trading hours. So long as that is understood on both sides of the House, I certainly support the motion. I believe it is now understood that is what the Minister is willing to do.

Motion carried.

Mr. EVANS: I support the motion of the member for Davenport and seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

The SPEAKER: The adjourned debate be made an Order of the Day for—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On motion.

Later:

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): I rise to oppose the motion. It is not inappropriate that I should have some words to say in this debate as I was until recently Minister of Development and Mines and therefore was responsible for the carriage of this project as far as the South Australian Government was concerned. I do not know of any project that has absorbed the time and energy of Ministers and officers of the Government more than has this project. I do not want to dwell on this matter, because I should like to take up some specific aspects of the case. However, if the energy and enthusiasm *per se* which the Ministers and officers of this Government put into the furtherance of the project could have been successful in getting the project off the ground, I have no doubt that that would have happened. It would be of great benefit to members opposite to have been privy to some of the detailed and prolonged negotiations that we had over the Indenture Bill, which was drafted largely in the furtherance of this project. I have here to pay much respect to the amount of work that was done by our officers on that occasion.

Turning now to the motion, I see in it at least two basic assumptions. One is that in the light of the subsequent collapse of the project it was improper of the Premier to make public the fact of the project at the 1973 election. The second is that, somehow or other, this Government and the Australian Government are responsible for the failure of the project. I take issue with both those contentions.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I assume that members opposite, by way of their interjections, are not disagreeing with my interpretation of the motion that those two assumptions lie behind it. Let us have a look at them. First, the project is designed to bring large-scale employment and diversification of industry to the major industrial areas of this State outside of the metropolitan area. Secondly, it was designed to bring to that area a project which, in

terms of public knowledge, whatever might be the true facts of the situation, was environmentally extremely sensitive.

This Government has been under attack in this House in the previous Parliament because of what was called, by certain Opposition members, its insensitivity to the environmental implications of the project and its apparent unwillingness to be completely frank with the public about the environmental implications. The point I want to make is simply this: it would surely have been extremely improper of the Premier at that stage not to have made public that the Government had this project in mind. Members opposite seem to assume that there was something in it politically for this Government to get the matter off the ground. However, I point out to them that, in view of the environmental objections to the project, that is by no means sustained. There are those in the community who possibly resile from their support of the Government because of its support of the project.

It was entirely proper for this Government to have made known to the public its intentions, and it would have been completely improper for it not to have done so; first, because of the sensitive environmental implications of the whole thing and, secondly, because of the potential for employment that it had in the area. I have no doubt that, if the Premier had not made that information known to the public at that time, the Government would have been under attack from members opposite for trying to sweep something under the carpet that might possibly have been embarrassing to it from an environmental point of view.

The second point is the so-called responsibility of the Australian and the State Governments for the failure of the project. I suggest six areas in which the two Governments, in concert, influenced or sought to influence this project. I ask members opposite whether, in any of those six respects, the Government or its Commonwealth colleagues were acting in an improper way. The first is that we insisted that the project be situated in a certain area of the State. I rather gather that there is some disagreement with the Government from members opposite about that decision. However, we stick completely to this decision and challenge members opposite to repeat their contentions that the project should be relocated somewhere within the greater metropolitan area.

The Premier has already spoken at length in the House on this matter. The emission of liquid or gaseous effluent from the plant can be completely controlled. Regarding the output of light and noise from such a plant, it is totally inappropriate that it should be located in any metropolitan situation, just as it is totally inappropriate, it is totally inappropriate that it should be located Port Pirie or Port Augusta. It is strategically situated in a situation in which it would be convenient to both centres in relation to employment, at the same time not generating any nuisance to the residential areas of either of those centres as a result of the generation of light or noise.

If members opposite want to suggest that such a plant should be stuck in the middle of, say, Lonsdale, a small industrial area in my district close to which there are many residences, let them continue to do so. I guarantee that I will get them the maximum of publicity in my district for those contentions. The second contention (and I am not putting these in any sort of chronological order but just as they come to me) that came from both Governments, particularly from the Australian Government, was the open inquiry that was conducted into this project. Do

members opposite oppose the concept of such a project, or do they consider that in any way that inquiry jeopardised the success of the project? As I understand it, members opposite were willing to support the concept of an environmental inquiry because, as I have said previously, they have, when it has suited them in the House, charged the Government with a certain environmental insensitivity in relation to the whole project.

Mr. Venning: But you didn't know—

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am not going to listen to the member for Rocky River because his interjections are never to the point or pertinent; in fact they are completely impertinent. It does not seem to me that the environmental inquiry, which was the second aspect of Government intervention, is something to which honourable members would object or that it in any way damaged the prospects of the project. The third point raised consistently throughout the project was that a 50 per cent Australian equity should be maintained in the project. Again, is that opposed by honourable members opposite?

Do they believe that that was one of the things that led to the demise of the project? I remind members opposite that I personally was under attack from the member for Mitcham in this House, because he claimed I would have been prepared to sell out for less than that 50 per cent Australian equity. I do not go along with that contention; I resisted it at the time from the honourable member, but that was the attitude of one member of the Opposition, as loosely regarded, anyway, at that time (I cannot recall whether it was before the separate formation of the Liberal Movement or not) and it was a position that would have been maintained by other members of the Opposition Liberal Party as well. So this is another way in which Governments were involved; yet it seems to me it is a way that members opposite would have regarded as perfectly proper.

The fourth way in which Governments were involved was that the Imperial Chemical Industries consortium was given the nod rather than its competitor, the Dow petro-chemical company. If members opposite feel that that in some way contributed to the eventual breakdown of the project, I would be happy to hear them on that; but they have been silent on it. I point out to the member for Davenport, if he wishes to dilate on that matter later, that it is not unconnected with the previous point I made, on 50 per cent Australian equity, because this Government and the Australian Government could get no guarantee from the Dow people that they would be prepared to offer a 50 per cent Australian equity in the project, whereas I.C.I. was prepared to do so. So points Nos. 3 and 4 hang together.

The fifth point was that an indenture should be introduced. Much of the time of my officers was taken up in negotiating the various points of that indenture. Do honourable members opposite think it inappropriate that we should let the petro-chemical consortium off an indenture? Do they think the sort of thing we had in mind was inappropriate? I should be interested to hear what members opposite have to say on that. It is the history of this State that, for significant projects of industrial development, an indenture, an agreement, is signed between the Government and the people behind the project. This indenture would have been somewhat different in spirit from some of those that were signed in previous days. I recall the one for the Port Stanvac refinery, negotiated with the Playford Government. We can go farther back to the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's indenture, as my colleague from Stuart reminds me. This would have been considerably

different in spirit from those things, but different in a way that would have had the complete support of the people of South Australia.

The last way in which we were generally involved was that certain finance would be available from public sources, both from Australian Government and from the South Australian Government, for the project to proceed: sufficient finance for the consortium not to have, for example, to build the pipeline to bring the hydrocarbons from the Cooper Basin to the plant. I need not itemise all the other things that the Governments have committed themselves to. I honestly believe that, if the consortium had indicated its willingness to proceed with the project, finance would have been forthcoming from this Government and the Australian Government. I know that the Minister for Minerals and Energy in the Australian Government had the appropriate recommendation ready to put before his colleagues once the appropriate maturity had been reached in the project. I am sure that that money would have been made available because of Mr. Connor's complete support for the project.

I am happy to go on record as saying that, as far as the period when I was Minister of Development and Mines is concerned, we had no greater supporter in Canberra for this project than Rex Connor, who was prepared to do all he could with his colleagues to ensure that the project got off the ground. I know it was part of a much larger design that the Minister had in mind for the total utilisation of the natural gas resources of Australia, but to suggest, as was once suggested, that the Australian Government was prepared to set this aside in the interests of a much larger project on the north-west shelf is utter rubbish. I can emphatically deny that, because of a personal conversation between Mr. Connor and me at that time. The petro-chemical complex was an important ingredient for the Australian Government in the total energy picture that the Department of Minerals and Energy had produced.

If we were to increase the utilisation of the dry gas reserves from not only the Cooper Basin but also fields in the Northern Territory, it was necessary that the wet fractions be used economically, and that could occur only by the development of a petro-chemical plant. The only proposition available at that time was the petro-chemical project. For the Australian Government to set that aside and say, "We will change horses and back something in Western Australia" would have been to set the whole thing back many years, because part of the whole strategy for the north-west shelf involves the building of a pipeline so that those reserves can be locked in with the general reserves in Central Australia and on to the markets in the Eastern States. That grand design of Mr. Connor has been opposed from time to time by the honourable gentlemen opposite and their colleagues in Canberra, but the petro-chemical plant was all part of the one package, and was an early part of it.

I emphatically deny that the Department of Minerals and Energy or its Minister was running dead as far as that project was concerned. I have tried to suggest six ways in which the Government was certainly involved and have asked the question of members opposite whether in any way they disagree with these ways in which we were involved—whether they thought they were in any way appropriate; and, secondly, whether any of these things contributed to the downfall of the project. If the member for Davenport wants to sustain this motion, he must specifically answer both questions. I oppose the motion.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) moved:

That Standing Order 179 be so far suspended as to enable him to speak again on the motion.

Motion carried.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I thank the House for its indulgence and shall endeavour to be relatively brief—

Mr. Gunn: Do not abuse your right.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —in making some further remarks. May I first move the following amendment to the motion:

To delete all words after "House" first occurring and insert "support the efforts of the State Government to ensure a productive use of the Cooper Basin liquids which would encourage employment and decentralisation of industry in the Spencer Gulf area."

I do this because the member for Davenport, in moving his motion, paid scant attention to the requirements of decentralisation and was prepared to contemplate the development of a petro-chemical complex in Adelaide rather than in the Spencer Gulf area, with the claim that this would be a more economic proposition. I have pointed out on previous occasions when speaking that that was not the reason the I.C.I. and the consortium gave for withdrawing from the project. They said that, in their opinion, it was an adverse factor although, in that connection, it should be well understood that the Dow Chemical Company never regarded the location of the petro-chemical complex at Redcliff as something that was adverse to the project. Dow never took the view, as the I.C.I.-Mitsubishi-Alcoa consortium did, that a possible site in Adelaide would be preferable. All producers have made it clear that, if any petro-chemical complex is to succeed, it must be of a large scale, that there are significant economies of scale in this area, and that it is not possible to contemplate a smaller-scale unit than the ones proposed either by the consortium or by Dow. Certainly that is still the case.

In fact, this brings me immediately to one of the chief difficulties in relation to the project, namely, the availability of feed stock. The availability of feed stock (the necessary liquids to ensure the effectiveness of the petro-chemical scheme) limits the size of the complex, and a very necessary factor in any future development that may take place will be the provision of additional discoveries. The petro-chemical proposal as initiated, if it had continued with the Dow Chemical Company, I believe would have got off the ground because it had an earlier start on the project and could well have been able to ensure that the producers on the field had the necessary funds to undertake further exploration work. However, the combination of circumstances produced a situation whereby the consortium was given the go-ahead by the Australian Government, and Dow bowed out. In turn, the delays that had been involved over the period and the problem of the producers on the field in financing their own exploration have resulted in no more feed stock being available now than was the case two or three years ago, and that is a serious problem.

It is a serious problem not only from the point of view of the plant itself, but also from the point of view of the provision of infra-structure. It must be understood clearly that, if a plant of this nature were to last only between 10 and 12 years, it would be a serious problem indeed for any local community that relied on such a plant for employment. The reaction on that local community would be serious if an industry were built up and if additional housing and additional commercial concerns were established as a consequence of that industry, and then after between 10 and 12 years the industry folded. Those who have been associated with the project have believed all along that that would not have

occurred for several reasons. First, they believed that additional discoveries would be made in the Cooper Basin (and I think that that belief is still held by supporters of the project, by the producers and by the Mines Department).

In addition, the Mereenie-Palm Valley supply could be locked in with the Cooper Basin to provide an additional source of liquids from Palm Valley; and thirdly, once a petro-chemical complex was established and depreciated over a 10-year period, if the local feed stock was no longer available, the plant would be kept going as a going concern if it had been paid for by the use of imported naphtha; that was always an aspect of the thinking of both the I.C.I.-Alcoa-Mitsubishi consortium and Dow. Nevertheless, the absence of further discoveries of liquids and of ethane from the Cooper Basin over the last two years was a factor in the consortium's ultimate decision. I want to confirm the remarks that have been made by the Minister of Education with respect to the role of the State and Commonwealth Governments in promoting the Redcliff scheme, because the attitude taken in the House and outside the House by the member for Davenport is incorrect. Mr. Connor, as the Minister of Education has said, has always been a supporter of the scheme. He regarded it as an integral part of the grand design and, in relation to his requirement—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Mitcham is becoming one of the most insistent interjectors. He does not want to listen to anything.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Connor was willing to make appropriate arrangements.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask that honourable members cease interjecting, because it prevents the Minister from making his point. The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Connor, as I have said, has been a supporter of this project because he saw it as part of an overall grand design to ensure the ultimate connecting up of Mereenie-Palm Valley and the north-west shelf with the South Australian pipeline and the pipeline to Sydney, and he was clear all along that the Redcliff scheme was a means of encouraging further development in the Cooper Basin and encouraging ultimately the development of the Mereenie-Palm Valley field. The member for Davenport has made some play of the requirement that was imposed by the Federal Minister that liquid petroleum gas should not be exported but converted to gasoline, and said that this put the project at some disadvantage.

Dr. Eastick: It did.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not think that members appreciate sufficiently that he said that he was willing to ensure that the price for this crude oil that would be so produced would ensure that neither the producers nor the consortium would be disadvantaged by his requirement.

Mr. Dean Brown: He wouldn't set a price.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He made that statement to the consortium and to the producers. He has made that statement to the Minister of Education (when Minister of Development and Mines) and to me, and I have nothing to suggest that Mr. Connor is a liar. I am unwilling to indulge in the kind of irresponsibility that is the favourite tactic of the member for Davenport.

Mr. Venning: That's not true.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Let me come to the member for Davenport on the question of responsibility, because I am afraid that he has some inner irresponsibility in his make-up which means that he is willing to say almost anything, and it means that people generally have to be warned about him that nothing he says can be relied on. I believe that last Friday week he said, I think on Channel 10—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The chatter among members is becoming so audible that it is almost impossible to hear the speaker. The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I believe that the member for Davenport made an accusation which he had not made in the House but on television last Friday week—

Mr. Venning: That's all right.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —that there was a conspiracy between the State and the Australian Governments to defeat Redcliff in order that the north-west shelf project could go ahead instead. If there is a conspiracy, someone conspires with someone else. With whom did the Commonwealth Government conspire? Did it conspire with the State Government? Is that what the honourable member is saying?

Mr. Dean Brown: I said that they conspired with the people concerned with the progress of the company.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Evidently they conspired among themselves! I shall certainly check the honourable member's detailed statement about that matter to see whether or not that is what he, in fact, said on channel 10—that Whitlam, Cairns, Connor, Cass and company conspired to defeat the project. I assure members that, if that was not what the honourable member said, I will raise it again in this House and, if there is any suggestion in the actual reported remarks of the honourable member that the State Government was involved in any way, I hope he will assure us now that he will apologise for any such implication.

Mr. Dean Brown: I didn't ever say that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am glad to have the honourable member's assurance that the State Government was not involved in any conspiracy.

Mr. Dean Brown: But the State Government was incompetent.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member, having relieved us of the charge that we were involved in a conspiracy, has now said that we were incompetent. The honourable member has demonstrated his incompetence by talking throughout his speech about a smaller petro-chemical complex to be located near Adelaide; as everyone associated with the industry knows, that proposition is rubbish. One or two people who were in the gallery and who heard the honourable member's remarks said, "That is just rubbish." The project is not a goer, because it must be of a minimum size to assure its economic viability. One of the problems associated with the Redcliff scheme is the provision of enough liquids to ensure a sufficient economic size.

When I saw Mr. Connor recently, he immediately agreed to the establishment of joint studies to seek out what possible alternatives there were for us, in the current situation, in relation to the establishment of a petro-chemical complex at Redcliff with some other people involved and in relation to a modified scheme that might involve the direct export of liquid petroleum gas, which would again involve a liquids pipeline and a fractionating plant to be located in the Spencer Gulf area. Mr. Connor agreed with

this immediately and informed me that he was very disappointed at what had happened in relation to the consortium's pulling out. He assured me of his continuing support in relation to it, and he has made officers available to work in conjunction with South Australian officers in carrying out the necessary investigations. I know it is good game at present to say what one likes about Mr. Connor and to expect to be able to get away with it, but I do not think members should indulge in the practice of saying anything that comes into their heads just because it suits them, and that includes the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Millhouse: Mr. Connor is going to be the Acting Prime Minister, isn't he?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Connor would still do more benefit to this country than the honourable member could ever do as Leader of the Liberal Movement. Thinking a person is politically unpopular or disliking a person is no ground for making unfounded and unjustified accusations about the person. The member for Mitcham and the member for Davenport have displayed an inner irresponsibility in so doing. They have lowered the standards of this House and of political discussion generally by that kind of tactic. The member for Mitcham, in particular, is known to play every horse for what it is worth, no matter whether it is consistent with what he said previously or not. We have previously heard the honourable member in this House on the subject of Australian equity. He never recalls the fact now that he supported Mr. Connor's attitude to Australian equity. As soon as that matter is raised, the honourable member goes away and hides. The honourable member also previously raised the environmental issue, although he now would not accuse the Government of anything on the environmental question, except possibly to say that, because of our attitude on the environmental question, we might have been responsible for stopping the scheme. It is important to ensure a productive use for the Cooper Basin liquids, and it is even more important to get exploration going again in that area, so that new discoveries—

Mr. Dean Brown: They stopped under your Government.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I know the honourable member does not really want me to continue speaking, but it would assist matters if he could keep his big mouth shut, for just one little bit. It is important to ensure extra discoveries in the Cooper Basin and additional exploration. The hiatus in that area has largely arisen because of inflation. There are other difficulties, too, but inflation has been a critical factor in the Cooper Basin area and in the overall petro-chemical project. It was the effect of inflation in Australia, which occurred at a faster rate than that overseas, coupled with some relative depression in the markets for the products to be produced from the petro-chemical complex, that was the fundamental reason for the consortium's decision to pull out. If the rate of inflation in the price of ethylene dichloride in the world market was higher than the general rate of inflation in Australia, inflation would not be an adverse factor in connection with this project; indeed, it would become a favourable factor. It is the relative rates of inflation that upset the apple cart; this was the basic reason for the withdrawal.

If, in future, the world becomes so short of ethylene dichloride that any sources have to be tapped, the price of that product and associated products may well increase sufficiently to ensure that a project like the Redcliff project gets off the ground, even if there are heavy rates of inflation in Australia. Recession overseas, which lowered

expectations of price increases for ethylene dichloride and associated products, coupled with inflation in Australia, rendered unprofitable a project previously thought to be profitable. The State Government will continue to ensure that every effort is made to get a project off the ground that will benefit the Spencer Gulf area. It is important, when we have the possibility of decentralisation, to go ahead with it and to promote it. It is not good enough to pay lip service to decentralisation and then, when the crunch comes, to act otherwise. This is something that can go ahead, not just for the benefit of South Australia but also for the benefit of the Spencer Gulf community. It is important that we keep that in mind, and not listen to the argument that the member for Davenport has advanced, which suggests that Spencer Gulf should be scrapped, that we forget about any development there based on the Cooper Basin, and that we should seek development in Adelaide instead. My amendment is designed specifically to avoid that situation and direct our attention specifically to the need to encourage employment and decentralisation of industry in Spencer Gulf. I ask all honourable members to support it.

Mr. KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 27. Page 503.)

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

That this debate be further adjourned.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Come on! You've had two weeks to consider this.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The House divided on the motion.

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill, Max Brown, Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

Noes (22)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mrs. Byrne. No—Mr. Gunn.

The SPEAKER: There are 22 Ayes and 22 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER: That the adjourned debate be made an Order of the Day for—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On motion, Mr. Speaker.

Later:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): It is good to see the member for Mitcham in a happy frame of mind again, after the incident this afternoon, when we witnessed one of the worst displays of temper that has ever been seen in this House. I have never seen even the member for Davenport as savage as the member for Mitcham was this afternoon. However, when I was able to explain the situation to the honourable member he accepted my explanation, we reached a compromise, and I suppose our relationship has returned to normal, whatever that is: I am not quite sure.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I wonder whether I will be given the opportunity to speak to this Bill or not, or whether I will be as rudely interrupted as I am every time I get on my feet. The member for Eyre is one of the worst offenders, but if he will let me continue I will try and tell him something about shopping hours in South Australia, and why the Government is opposed to it on many grounds.

Mr. Millhouse: Opposed to what?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: We are opposed to any extension of shopping hours. We are opposed to the motion.

Mr. Millhouse: It's a Bill, not a motion.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Government is certainly opposed to it. The first and most essential point to be made is that public opinion must be examined in this matter.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am not sure what the laughter is about. Certainly, no-one has complained to me about shopping hours in this State. I do not know whether honourable members opposite have received complaints or not.

Mr. Mathwin: What about—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I would like to continue, if the member for Glenelg will let me. The only official census that has been taken in this matter was the 1970 referendum, and all honourable members know what happened on that occasion. Despite all the forecasts that people would vote in favour of an extension of shopping hours in this State, what happened after one of the most extensive campaigns ever conducted in South Australia on this subject, certainly in the post-war years, was that the people of South Australia decided that there should not be any extension of trading hours.

I make the forecast that, if a referendum were held now, exactly the same result would obtain: there is no doubt about that. In fact, this is a rather humorous point. Honourable members opposite laugh at my reference to the 1970 referendum, but no-one has been calling for a referendum to establish what course should be taken now. Members opposite know where the people of South Australia stand on this issue. However, for political purposes the Liberal Party or the Liberal Movement is always jumping on the bandwagon supporting a few dissidents who want to look after themselves. There is no doubt so far as the Government or I am concerned that a majority of South Australian people do not want shopping hours extended. The only people I know of who want shopping hours to be extended are shopkeepers operating at the eastern end of Rundle Street.

I should like now to examine the situation there. These shopkeepers made no approach to anyone, including the Premier or me, about whether or not we would consider any extension of shopping hours. These shopkeepers just flagrantly and abusively decided to go out and break the law. There was no communication from those people. They merely decided that they would break the law, and the humorous part of the situation is that of the 26 shops that were opening at night in the lower Rundle Street area (and at least two of the leaders of those shopkeepers who were opening their shops and breaking the law had exempt shops), only six were not entitled to open their shops. I say "were opening" because they are not opening now, and I will explain the reason for this shortly.

The other 20 shopkeepers whose shops were open in this area had exempt shops and were selling exempt goods. No restriction was placed or is placed on those shopkeepers

whatever. However, six shopkeepers were selling non-exempt goods and were breaking the law by opening their shops. On the first occasion when the shopkeepers opened their shops, many people attended on that opening night.

Mr. Slater: It was the novelty value.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: True, it was something new. Many people had never seen it before in that part of the city, and they decided to travel from many parts of Adelaide to examine the situation.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Every other shop—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will come to that point. True, some people did attend Rundle Street on that night. Some people say 2 000 people were there. Following that flagrant abuse of the law, and after I made a public statement, for which I make no apology (and I say again that anyone else who breaks the law will get the same treatment), shopkeepers decided—

Mr. Gunn. Except trade unions.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: When I said that these people would be prosecuted under the provisions of the Act, we saw an abrupt about-face. Something strange happened down at the east end of Rundle Street. The shopkeepers decided that it was about time they had some communication. Having decided that they were not going to stand over me and the Government, they decided to telephone me and see me. I only wish they had done so initially, as we might have solved many of the problems that have occurred. Nevertheless, they came along and I gave them the interview they sought and explained the law to them. As the shopkeepers were not satisfied with that interview, they went over my head and asked whether they could go to the Premier. That was arranged for them, but the Premier gave them no further information than I did, except to tell them that they should approach the trade associations, of which there are three in Adelaide. In Adelaide three organisations represent shopkeepers, both big and small. All shopkeepers can join these organisations. They were told to obtain the opinion of the associations, to see what other shopkeepers were thinking, because the associations were speaking on their behalf. These shopkeepers were told in no uncertain manner by the Retail Traders Association that, so far as the association was concerned, any extension of shopping hours was not on. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MEETINGS)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972, as amended. Read a first time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I intend, not following the precedent of the speaker immediately before me, to be brief in explaining this Bill, which is in the same form as one I introduced during the session last year. If members want to see the speech I made then, they can see it at page 1377 of *Hansard*. I will not go over all that again, but merely say that the object of this Bill is to provide that, if at any properly constituted meeting of a trade union there is a request for a secret ballot to decide any question, that request must be met and the question must be decided by secret ballot. This is in line with the Liberal Movement's policy, which I stated during the last election campaign. The following is what I said on industrial relations:

43

We believe firmly that trade unions have a valuable role to play in the life and development of this nation. We support them and encourage those in various occupations to join and participate in their appropriate unions. However, we do not support compulsory unionism. The problem today is that union leaders have grown too powerful. Union officials are now dictating to Governments, industry, and the community alike with complete disregard for the effects of what they are doing. No single piece of legislation can stop this happening, but we are convinced that a secret ballot will do a lot to help.

We will alter the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act to make it obligatory to have a secret ballot for the election of union officials and to decide any question at a union meeting, if such a ballot is called for. This will give all members concerned an opportunity to vote on an issue and make it easier for them to do so, free from intimidation. We believe this will help to improve the industrial situation in this State.

I have not gone all the way with that policy. I have provided, as I did last year, only for a secret ballot at a meeting if that should be called for. Those members who are interested enough to look at the Bill will see that it inserts new section 135a in the principal Act and amends the second schedule. The Bill provides that the rule in the second schedule shall be deemed to be a rule of the association; that rule provides that there should be a secret ballot if such a ballot be asked for. In today's *Advertiser*, in a report on the most unfortunate and damaging strike at Rainsfords, just this point is made. The article, headed "Secret ballot urged at factory", states:

Strikers at the Lonsdale plant of Rainsfords Metal Products Pty. Ltd. would return to work immediately if a secret ballot was held, it was claimed yesterday.

The company's Supply Director (Mr. R. G. Rainsford) then makes a statement about the matter, and is reported as follows:

"It is our belief that if a properly-conducted secret ballot of all union members was held there would be an overwhelming majority voting in favour of an immediate return to work." He said the afternoon shift workers had been denied the right to take part in the vote to continue the strike because they had earlier disagreed with the strike action.

It is interesting to note that in his answer Mr. Scott of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union does not directly answer the point made by Mr. Rainsford, merely saying it is a red herring. He ignores it, because he knows he cannot answer that point. It is a perfect illustration of the need for the provision that I intend to insert in the Act by this Bill. I do not think I need say any more in explanation of it than that.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT secured the adjournment of the debate.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the Pay-Roll Tax Act, 1971, as amended, should be amended to raise the exemption from such tax to \$48 000 per annum.

I have referred to this matter on several occasions during the present session, and this motion is part of Liberal Movement policy, which I outlined at the last election. I intend merely to quote from my speech in explaining the motion, because I think that that is sufficient to explain the matter. I said:

Pay-roll tax is the second area where I propose relief. We will immediately raise the exemptions from \$1 733 a month to \$4 000 a month, that is, to \$48 000 a year. This will do more than justice and, we hope, stimulate the economy of South Australia.

Later on in the speech I dealt at greater length than I had in that part, which was the televised part (I merely wanted to get the point across, and I did get the point across), with what I had in mind. I said:

I now deal with pay-roll tax. The problem is the same as with succession duty. 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.

Of course, with inflation the exemption from pay-roll tax has become utterly unreal; it means virtually nothing at all.

Mr. Coumbe: More people come into it than ever before.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course they do, yes. I further stated:

I give two examples: first, of a small business; and, secondly, a voluntary organisation, which has a small full-time staff.

Then I went on to say that it is not easy for a State Government to do anything to stimulate the economy, but this was something that we could do. I continued:

There are many business men now who are desperate because they see failure ahead of them. The L.M. believes that the economic well-being of these people is quite vital to the community. We will do whatever we can to help them. One thing which is within our power is to raise the exemption for pay-roll tax.

Secondly, I mention voluntary organisations. They have traditionally played a valuable part in our community life. They have meant diversity in the pattern of life, providing for all sorts of activities, sporting, cultural, social welfare, and so on. They have also given an opportunity to people for voluntary service. Now many of them are on the verge of collapse, because Federal and State Governments just do not value their important place in the community.

I say that despite what the Minister of Community Welfare announced yesterday. I gave an example of the National Fitness Council, and I went on to say:

Voluntary organisations, too, are being squeezed out by lack of funds to meet enormously rising costs. This should not be allowed to happen, and we must do what we can to help. Pay-roll tax is such an area.

I give the example that I gave last night, because it is such a striking example. This is a voluntary organisation, a youth organisation in our own South Australian community. I stated:

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.

That is the Girl Guides Association. I have checked those figures, and that is what the Government is doing to voluntary organisations, yet it mouths platitudes about helping them. There has been an increase from \$54·70 to \$1 135. That is how pay-roll tax has increased in three years with the same staff numbers. I continued:

What we propose—

and this is what I put in this motion—

is that the exemption from pay-roll tax should be raised significantly. Believe it or not, the present exemption of \$20 800 was fixed as long ago as 1958. It has not been altered since then, even though the consumer price index figure for this State has more than doubled, and wage levels have gone still higher in that time. The present exemption works out at \$1 733 a month. We will make it \$4 000 a month, \$48 000 a year. This will do no more than justice and, we hope, stimulate the economy in South Australia.

I stick by that. If any member can show that I am wrong in any of the figures I have given or in any of the reasoning I have put into that statement, I will be indebted to him. The only argument advanced against this matter by the Treasurer when he has been asked in this House about it is that we have to maintain uniformity with other States and, if we do not, there will be a rat race for industry or development. I regard that as utterly paltry.

Mr. Coumbe: It's coming out of the Grants Commission, anyway.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right. It is a State tax and, if there is any power left at all in the States, surely to goodness in such an area as this we can make up our own minds about what the level of taxation should be. This situation is utterly unjust and iniquitous because of inflation, and it is having a disastrous effect on small industries, small businesses in this State and, as I say, on voluntary organisations. My motion is abundantly justified and, if the Government has an ounce of fairness and justice left in it, it will support it as well. I commend the motion to the House.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. EVANS: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Those for the question say "Aye", those against say "No". The Ayes have it.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Glenelg.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am asking whether I am entitled to move that the debate on that motion be adjourned.

The SPEAKER: The question has been put.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Surely at some stage I am entitled to move that the debate be adjourned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The chance has been missed. I must impress on the honourable Minister that I put the question. There was total silence, and the question was put.

Mr. Millhouse: And passed.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Glenelg.

CADET CORPS

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I move:

That this House disagree with the decision of the Commonwealth Government to abolish all Army Cadet Corps in Australia, because it will take away from the youth of Australia another opportunity to develop self-confidence and responsibility; and call upon the Commonwealth Labor Government to rescind its decision to abolish School Army Cadet Corps forthwith.

It is apparent that the Commonwealth Government has again got its priorities mixed up in its decision to abolish Army cadet training. I seek the support of this House for my motion. I ask again what is the policy of the Dunstan Government on this matter, and I should be interested to listen to the Minister's reply to the debate. This organisation is of benefit to the State, to the public, and to the young Army cadets concerned. We have 1 668 cadets in South Australia, and there are 35 000 throughout Australia, although there are fewer cadets than there used to be. At present the young boys and the schools in question do not realise what is going on, and do not know whether the cadet corps will be wound down. This cadet organisation has been operating for more than 100 years. In New Zealand it was abolished but was restored after only six months because of public pressure. In that country the organisation now is back to what it was originally. The Army is the only organisation that can provide the accommodation, feed the cadets in such numbers, and supply transport for them. The colleges, the private independent schools, provide about 1 000 cadets, who go to camp in a two-phase operation. The organisation is controlled tightly and the boys must abide by the military safety regulations, which are much more strict than any other regulations. Therefore, when the boys go on an operation that will involve boats or water, an ambulance, lifeguards, etc., must be standing by. The

safety factor is better covered by the Army, the military authorities, than it could be covered by any other organisation.

The basic training of these young men includes training in first-aid, and we know the advantage of young men being taught first-aid. Such training is a decided advantage, not only to them but also to the State. The boys are also taught field craft, which involves living in a field and being trained in camouflage, setting up a camp, and learning to cook for either themselves or many people. This is good training for all young men. They are also given training on the latest weapons. They are trained particularly in fire safety and the handling of weapons. On the first day on which they are introduced to the rifle or other guns, they are taught to handle them, and on that day they fire 40 rounds, so this is good training for any young man. They are taught S.L.R. rifle firing and also how to handle the Bren gun. The other matter in which they are given basic training is navigation, which includes map reading, the use of the prismatic compass, and bush craft. This training is essential and it is of much advantage to anyone in this country.

Second-year and third-year boys receive advanced weapon training at advanced courses. They are given a course in watercraft, so that, for example, they could go down the Murray River on an assault craft. They are also given rope instruction, which does not involve knots and lashing as I thought it might: it is instruction in climbing or going down a cliff face with the aid of a rope. They are also given a driving course, and have the opportunity to go on a band course if they so desire. One of the important things is that these young people are also taught discipline and cleanliness. Being a cadet certainly is a personality developer. On the reports that I have read, I find that most parents agree on the advantages that these young boys receive. Further, probably one of the other important factors is that underprivileged boys are given the opportunity to participate in this sort of exercise.

Mr. Slater: What do you mean by "underprivileged" if they go to private schools?

Mr. MATHWIN: I am referring to the underprivileged young people from large families who would not have a chance to go perhaps to another State or on a camp, because their parents could not give them the necessary money. I regard those people as being underprivileged, the poorer class. If the honourable member has no underprivileged in his district, he is fortunate. I am sure the member for Semaphore and the member for Price have a few in their districts, and I have in my district young people who would not have an opportunity to go on this type of activity or holiday.

Mr. Slater: Holiday?

Mr. MATHWIN: It is a holiday, and at least they get good training. I suppose the honourable member would prefer them to stay at home, playing tiddlywinks on the carpet. Doubtless, these young people are helped, because they are trained in leadership, teamwork, and self-reliance. I understand that 16 schools in this State have cadets. The Marion High School, in the District of Mitchell, first had cadets in 1956. At St. Peters College, as the Premier would be well aware, the cadet organisation commenced in the 1940's.

Mr. Becker: That's when the member for Mitcham joined.

Mr. MATHWIN: I do not know whether it was, but he has risen to a high rank. You would be familiar with the Port Pirie school cadet organisation, Mr. Speaker.

There are also cadets at Glenelg, in my district, as well as at Findon, Nuriootpa and also Broken Hill. Also included are Sacred Heart, Prince Alfred, Rostrevor, and Christian Brothers Colleges. Many of the schools involved are independent schools, and one wonders whether this is part of the idea behind the Commonwealth Government's exercise, because it is another thump at the private independent schools. This could be one reason why the Commonwealth Government has seen fit to take the action it has taken.

The cadet organisation gives teachers the opportunity to educate in other fields, and they are able to discipline these young people. Perhaps this may be one of the underlying factors behind the move by the Commonwealth Government, and I will be interested to hear whether the State Government supports the move. I am referring to the fact that these young men are subject to discipline, which is lacking in many fields at present, particularly in this State. Until now this State Government has not encouraged discipline, and I will be interested in what the Minister concerned says about the matter. I understand that the former Minister of Education was not very pro-cadet minded, although I do not know the views of the present Minister of Education.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How do you understand that?

Mr. MATHWIN: I was given to understand it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: By whom?

Mr. MATHWIN: Some friends of the Minister told me he was not that way inclined. I would be interested to know the views of the present Minister of Education. These young people are well trained and could be used for civil defence, but if the system is lost we would find a gap in the school curriculum. If that were to occur, presumably the recommendations of the Karmel report would be carried out and schools that lost cadet training would apply for innovation grants, thus creating more costs in education, because more finance would be needed. Presumably, this would be the only avenue left to schools that lost the cadet corps at present in operation.

The Miller report on Army cadet corps was published in June, 1974, and on page 25 of the report we see the recommendation that the present cadet corps system should be retained, with modifications, and on a totally voluntary basis during peacetime. It is obvious from the recommendations that the Army supports the report. If additional finance was not available, girls and boys in co-educational schools should be able to compete for places in cadet units. The Miller report did not recommend that school cadets should be disbanded, but indeed recommended that the scheme should be further enlarged to attract girls.

If members are honest with themselves, and I assume they are, they will realise the colossal advantages of such training for young people. This would be especially obvious to those members who have had experience in the Armed Forces. The movement helps comradeship and provides great satisfaction through the *esprit de corps* that is promoted. The Returned Services League supports the scheme, as was evident from the report in the *News* on August 26, which stated that the National Secretary of the R.S.L. (Mr. A. G. Keyes) described the Government's decision as a tragedy and said that the Army had always favoured retaining the scheme. It is supported, too, by the parents; indeed, it has all-round support. The Miller report mentions a survey in which people were asked whether they were for or against cadet training for boys at schools, and the figures showed that 76 per cent of those questioned were in favour of the training, 18 per cent were against, and 6 per cent had no opinion. When people were further

asked whether they were for or against cadet training for girls at schools, 56 per cent were in favour, 37 per cent were against, and seven per cent had no opinion. Even the general public is in favour of retaining the system. I ask the House to support the motion in order to strengthen the hand of the Minister, who no doubt will approach the Commonwealth Government for a reassessment of the situation, asking it not to abolish the organisation.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. BECKER: Yes, Sir.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I was amazed to hear this motion moved this afternoon because of what had happened earlier when members were complaining bitterly that there was not sufficient time for private members' business. Here is a matter that rests entirely with the Australian Government. The State Government can do nothing to vary any decision the Australian Government may make in the matter, and I am surprised that the honourable member has not directed his objections to his Commonwealth colleagues, so that his representations can be heard. I do not know what he wants the State Government to do in the matter. Does he want us to say the Australian Government is wrong? I, for one, would not enter into any detail in this debate without first looking at the reasons for and against this course of action. The honourable member has quoted a report, but I would also want to know the reason why the Australian Government has decided to abolish the cadet corps. I am given to understand that one of the reasons is that the scheme involves about \$7 000 000 a year in expenditure.

Mr. Mathwin: But only \$1 000 000 in S.A.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know, but I think the figure is \$7 000 000 a year throughout Australia. I would like the honourable member (and I intend) to look at whether we are receiving value for money through the cadet corps. The honourable member may not be aware that, during the course of my Army career, I served at Warradale for about 10 or 11 months, or perhaps a year, as an instructor with the cadet corps. During that time I saw many things that I thought could have been done without. The honourable member mentioned first-aid. I did not see effective first-aid taught to the people in camp. They were not there for a sufficiently long period to be properly instructed, and first-aid was never carried on in the schools because, while the instructors might have been qualified with weapons and other things, they were not qualified to teach first-aid.

I suggest that many established organisations in our community are better equipped to teach first-aid to students and to children of the age of those in the cadet corps. I intend to seek leave to continue my remarks, because I want to look carefully at the matter and to give my views on whether or not we are getting proper value for the money being spent, or whether that money could be spent more effectively in some other direction. The honourable member mentioned the Karmel report, and I would want to be convinced that the suggestion made there was not a more effective way to give the training, apart from weapon training. The member for Glenelg mentioned instruction on the Bren gun, but I would remind him that the M60 replaced the Bren gun in 1960. If cadets are still being taught to use the Bren gun, what is the use of that?

Mr. Mathwin: You were taught the Lewis gun in the last war.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Wrong again! I was never taught to use the Lewis gun. The honourable member may recall the Lewis gun, but I do not. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 9. Page 621.)

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): When I sought leave to continue my remarks last evening, I was quoting from a report in the *News* of September 2, 1975. That report continues:

A Canberra report today says individuals appear to have escaped the financial ruin which has hit more than 3 000 Australian businesses so far this year. While companies are closing their doors in record numbers, the level of personal bankruptcy is well down on previous years. I assume that that is because of the increase in and escalation of wages. The report continues:

Meanwhile, in Sydney the New South Wales Government is expected to ease the pay-roll tax burden for hundreds of small companies reeling under the effects of inflation and increasing wage costs. The New South Wales Premier, Mr. Lewis, said today, "Even Blind Freddie can see we have got to take some action in regard to pay-roll tax."

This is a start, particularly in view of the motion carried in this House this afternoon regarding increasing the statutory exemption for pay-roll tax. I am pleased that the Premier of New South Wales and this House agree that consideration should be given to increasing that statutory exemption. I should also like to quote a report in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of August 26, 1975, regarding this same matter. It is a report of a statement of Professor Geoffrey Meredith, Head of the Department of Accounting and Financial Management at the University of New England, Armidale, New South Wales, and it states:

Another bugbear of the small business man is pay-roll tax, which the Federal Government passed to the States about 18 months ago. As this tax was originally mooted, Professor Meredith says small business-owners were supposed to be exempt from paying it. But because of wage rises, many are having to pay the 5 per cent rate on total salary payouts of \$400 or more a week, even though they have only two or three employees.

Professor Meredith defines a small business as one which is independently owned, possibly by one to three people, often a family, who have to make all the management decisions and rely on outsiders, such as accountants or solicitors, for specialist advice. A small business usually operates in a highly competitive environment and has a relatively small share of the market in which it is involved.

Of small businesses in Australia, some 98 per cent employ fewer than 100 people and 90 per cent fewer than 20. Yet collectively, Australia's 250 000-plus small businesses employ about 40 per cent of the work force.

In another report in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on the following day, the Executive Director of the New South Wales Retail Traders Association (Mr. Griffin) is reported to have stated:

The most vulnerable shops are those in small country towns, he says. They are relatively large employers in the regions and are important to the local economies. When they are forced to close it indicates serious trouble in the district. Clearly, the crisis which has erupted in Australia's small-business community is of major proportions—and to ease this crisis swift Government action rather than soothing words is needed.

Pay-roll tax can be alleviated, and I hope that, with the suggestion by the Premier of New South Wales (because this tax applies on a uniform basis throughout Australia) and with the motion we carried today, action will be taken

to help the small business man. In the past two years, 1 880 people have been brought into the net and confronted with this tax.

Mr. Langley: Would you do it if you were in Government?

Mr. RUSSACK: Yes, I would see that some move was made to alleviate the situation for the lower bracket. This has not altered since the inception of pay-roll tax in, I think, about 1940.

Mr. Langley: 35 years ago!

Mr. RUSSACK: There had not been the escalation in the wages spiral that there has been since the present Commonwealth Government took office in 1972. That was where the trouble started, and no-one can deny that. The Treasurer, with a bold front and a false air of optimism, has presented this balanced Budget, but what is the position today? We read in the newspapers of the closing of the South Australian Government Industries Research Institute, at a saving, we are told, of \$167 000 a year, but then we look at the estimates of payments for the year and find that there is to be a return visit to Penang. I do not know who will go to Penang, but the visit will cost \$10 000 more than the saving of \$167 000, and I hope that the benefit that the State derives from the expenditure of this money will be better than that which we are losing with the closure of the institute.

To show the real position in this State at present, I should like to refer also to the monthly summary of statistics for August, 1975, issued by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. In June, 1973, in South Australia 9 339 persons (both men and women) were registered as

unemployed, and the number of job vacancies was 5 152. Those figures on unemployment include figures for the Northern Territory, but the figures that I will give now exclude the Northern Territory and apply only to South Australia. The additional number of persons unemployed in South Australia in June, 1973, was 1 348, and the amount paid in unemployment benefit was \$480 840. At that time the number of persons receiving the benefit was 3 437.

In June, 1974, the number of persons unemployed was 7 983 and the number of job vacancies was 4 899. At that time the number of persons admitted to unemployment benefits was 1 513, and the expenditure was \$471 282. The number of persons receiving benefits was 2 829. In June, 1975, the number of persons unemployed in South Australia and the Northern Territory was 19 976 and the number of job vacancies was 3 012. The number of persons admitted to unemployment benefits, in South Australia alone, was then 4 999. The amount paid in unemployment benefits in that month was \$2 403 588 and the number of persons receiving benefits was 14 228.

In May this year, the amount of money paid in unemployment benefit in South Australia almost equalled the payments for the whole of 1971-72, and that was the last full year in which the Liberal and Country Party Government was in office in Canberra. Since the Labor Government has taken office in Canberra, we have seen this decline. I refer also to page 26 of the same booklet of statistics, where figures are given regarding the consumer price index. As time does not permit me to read it in detail, I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX, ADELAIDE
Base of each group, 1966-67 = 100.0

| Period | Food | Clothing and Drapery | Housing | Household Supplies & Equipment | Miscell- aneous | All Groups |
|------------------|-------|-------------------------|---------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|------------|
| 1970-71 | 109.5 | 112.6 | 115.9 | 105.4 | 118.1 | 112.5 |
| 1971-72 | 113.6 | 119.5 | 124.4 | 109.2 | 128.3 | 119.2 |
| 1972-73 | 123.1 | 127.2 | 133.3 | 113.0 | 133.7 | 126.5 |
| 1973-74 | 148.3 | 144.2 | 150.6 | 121.9 | 146.5 | 143.9 |
| 1974-75 | 163.7 | 173.8 | 185.3 | 142.5 | 178.9 | 169.7 |
| Quarter— 1972 | | | | | | |
| March | 114.5 | 119.8 | 125.8 | 109.6 | 129.7 | 120.2 |
| June | 114.1 | 122.5 | 127.8 | 110.0 | 131.2 | 121.1 |
| September | 117.5 | 123.3 | 129.7 | 110.9 | 132.4 | 123.0 |
| December | 118.7 | 125.6 | 132.5 | 111.6 | 132.8 | 124.3 |
| 1973 | | | | | | |
| March | 123.9 | 126.9 | 134.2 | 113.4 | 134.0 | 127.0 |
| June | 132.1 | 132.8 | 136.6 | 116.0 | 135.6 | 131.6 |
| September | 140.7 | 135.9 | 140.6 | 117.6 | 139.3 | 136.5 |
| December | 145.1 | 141.6 | 148.1 | 119.6 | 146.1 | 141.9 |
| 1974 | | | | | | |
| March | 149.7 | 144.2 | 152.7 | 123.6 | 148.6 | 145.4 |
| June | 157.8 | 155.0 | 161.0 | 126.6 | 152.1 | 151.7 |
| September | 160.3 | 161.8 | 169.9 | 135.2 | 163.9 | 159.4 |
| December | 161.2 | 173.4 | 181.6 | 140.2 | 173.5 | 166.4 |
| 1975 | | | | | | |
| March | 163.4 | 176.2 | 191.3 | 146.0 | 187.0 | 173.8 |
| June | 170.0 | 183.9 | 198.2 | 148.7 | 191.3 | 179.3 |

Mr. RUSSACK: The Treasurer and this Government claim to be the champions of the small business operator and of the underprivileged, but I maintain that, even though a balanced Budget has been presented, when we consider a surplus of \$25 000 000 a miscalculation or a drift of only 2½ per cent is needed to go from a credit balance to a deficit. There is a very fine margin for allowances in this Budget. Might I bring forward the point in the Treasurer's own words on page 8 of the Financial Statement, as follows:

Stamp duties are expected to produce about \$55 000 000, an increase of \$9 293 000 over actual receipts in 1974-75. In that year rates of duty on cheques, insurance licences, third party policies, conveyances, and registrations of motor vehicles were raised, and these higher rates will operate for a full year in 1975-76. Those are the things that have the bite on the man in the street, and those are the things from which the Government is ripping off the taxation. They affect the ordinary man, the small business man, the man in the street, and this Government has written the

formula so that each year will see a natural increase in these imposts. In addition, the Treasurer says it is to be expected that there will be some natural increase in the number of transactions and also higher values in some areas. Although the Treasurer has presented, with confidence, a Budget he claims to show a surplus, I say that it is a false confidence.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I have pleasure in supporting the motion, and I wish to direct my remarks to one fairly small but very important portion of the Budget. I refer to the activities of the Attorney-General's Department and in particular to the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee of South Australia, commonly known as the Mitchell committee. Today in this House the third volume of the report of this committee was laid on the table. Three volumes are now available to members. The first dealt with sentencing and correction, the second with criminal investigation, and the third (laid on the table today) with court evidence and procedure. The greatest congratulations must be given to the people who have constituted this committee. Three have been on the committee throughout: the Hon. Justice Roma Mitchell, of our own Supreme Court; Professor Colin Howard, formerly of the University of Adelaide, and now of the University of Melbourne; and Mr. David Biles, now Assistant Director of the Australian Institute of Criminology in Canberra.

I could not overlook the assistance given to these three people by two consultants (Mr. Brent Fisse, of the University of Adelaide, and Miss Mary Dauntton-Fear, of the same university), and by the research officers, Mr. Douglas Claessen, well known to members in this House, and Mr. Geoff Muecke, who was Secretary and Research Officer throughout the activities of the committee. The report is long and complicated, and I have endeavoured to bring it down to terms which would be readily understandable in the community and, I trust, in this House.

Having congratulated the committee on the work it has done (and I believe it has been solid and helpful work), I must say that that does not necessarily mean that I agree with all its recommendations. In many cases I do not; in others, I strongly agree with and urge the Government to implement what has been said. I should say at the outset that, if we had a committee similar to this which would look at civil actions in the Supreme Court of South Australia and in the Local and District Criminal Courts and other jurisdictions, we would benefit greatly. In referring to the task before the House I was almost tempted, following the speech of the member for Kavel yesterday when he talked of a social contract, to use that term. I suppose in one way it is a social contract. The volume of material now presented to the House is such that I think it will be necessary in the next year to prepare a whole new Criminal Law Consolidation Act, a whole new Police Offences Act, a whole new Prisons Act—

Mr. Mathwin: It will take a long time.

Mr. McRAE: Yes, it will; and perhaps a whole new Justices Act is necessary. Many matters rightly are called to our attention. I have begun by drawing attention to the personnel of the committee, because I believe that Justice Roma Mitchell has been an adornment to the Supreme Court bench in her behaviour; Professor Colin Howard I accept as a person of great ability, although he and I disagree almost totally on most social and other matters, if I may leave it at that; I do not particularly know Mr. David Biles; but I certainly know and pay great regard to Miss Dauntton-Fear and to Mr. Brent Fisse, to Mr. Claessen, and also to Mr. Muecke. I think it is important that members and the general community should understand just what work has gone into the deliberations of this

committee. In 1971, the then Attorney-General (Hon. L. J. King, now Mr. Justice King) wrote to the committee, and in 1973, on the release of its first report, the committee replied in the following terms:

Dear Mr. Attorney,

On December 14, 1971, you appointed us as the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee with the following terms of reference:

To examine and to report and to make recommendations to the Attorney-General in relation to the criminal law in force in the State and in particular as to whether any, and if so what, changes should be effected—

(a) in the substantive law;

(b) in criminal investigation and procedures;

(c) in court procedures and rules of evidence; and

(d) in penal methods.

At your request we have first considered questions relating to penal methods. We now have the honour to submit to you the report of the committee on this aspect of the inquiry.

That letter is a little confusing, because it indicates that the committee looked first at the last term of reference; in other words, it looked first at penal methods, then at the second term of reference (criminal investigation and procedures), and then, as indicated by the report tabled today, at the third term of reference (court procedures and rules of evidence). The next report we can expect is that which deals with the substantive law.

The first point is that it is clear, on a perusal of these reports, that one must read the three reports together. In other words, the committee has said that, in order to give a proper report on criminal investigation, court procedures, rules of evidence, and penal methods, one must have a co-ordinated philosophy or approach, and that one cannot pick out bits and pieces here and there. One must have an overall understanding of the procedure. Every member in this House, as a private member (and I speak as a private member), will from time to time have been confronted by problems, sometimes quite serious, which relate to the administration of the criminal law and criminal justice in this State.

Dr. Tonkin: It is important that we have the Parliament sitting at those times.

Mr. McRAE: It is important. I tried to make this point at the beginning. I believe that this is a non-political area and that the Government and Opposition ought to be able to co-operate together to present the best form of legislation for the community. I have consistently advocated that in this sort of area. First, the committee examined the overall problem as a consistent chronological pattern; that is to say, the committee considered that, if one was going to look at things logically, one started off from the point of investigation of the crime or the alleged crime. One then proceeded to the examination of the offender, or the alleged offender, then to the trial, and then on to the sentencing and punishment that might result. That was, in my submission, a highly consistent and proper course to take.

Secondly, the three reports, read together, are consistent in the sense that the committee views what is said, as I understand it, as a logical whole. So, one cannot pick out and give sense to certain parts of the recommendations without having understood the three reports as a whole, and one cannot achieve the objective sought without understanding the whole. The committee has, as I see it, concluded that it would be wrong to adopt an attitude that would overthrow the whole system in a radical sense. Rather, it has adopted the attitude of reforming the existing system and with that, with respect, I agree. It also seems that the committee started with an open mind, not with any dogmatic stance or any philosophical la-di-da's,

if I am permitted that expression, in talking to the ordinary man in the street. It started with an open mind, ready to receive the evidence and facts and to come up with some conclusions.

How did the committee go about its task? That is an important question, because we all know that, just as problems arise in this area, it is the sort of area in which the most curious people come up with the most curious ideas. I believe the committee carried out its functions most effectively and well. It first advertised for submissions and, if members look at the reports, they will find that those submissions were voluminous. It then invited for interview those people who had sent in submissions. Then, it went on inspections and, in a later part of the report, urged that all magistrates and judges should inspect the gaols and other corrective institutions to which they were sending people. With that, I could not more wholeheartedly agree. The committee then went on with the preparation of work papers and discussions until it reached its final decisions.

I should like to analyse what has happened up to date. In the first report (and I realise that I must do this briefly, because there is a tremendous amount of constructive and useful material available), the committee is really talking about the duty of structuring a system of sentencing. As the committee points out, three groups are involved intricately with sentencing. The first is us: the Legislature. When we set a standard, the judges and those who must administer our standards must act accordingly and bear in mind what we thought was the maxima or minima relating to sentences. Secondly, it looked at the judicial function in sentencing and, thirdly, at the Parole Board.

Briefly, if one looks at the first report and the recommendations contained therein as set out in the summary, one gauges four things. With the first three, I wholeheartedly agree. I refer, first, to item 22 on page 215 of the first report, as follows:

We recommend the regular reporting of judgments and appeals on sentence in the South Australian State Reports. That is necessary and important. Item 23 states:

We recommend that a concise handbook of sentencing be prepared for the assistance of the judiciary and magistracy and be kept regularly up to date.

Of course, that is terribly important. We all know that it is often alleged to us by our constituents that magistrates in this area or in another are more severe or more lenient, and I think the preparation of such a document is important. Item 24 recommends that the judiciary as a whole visit the establishments to which they are sending those appearing before them. The item that would cause the most disapproval in some quarters, although I wholeheartedly agree with it, is item 25:

We recommend that the Parole Board be discontinued and that responsibility for parole release of prisoners be transferred to the courts.

With that, I wholeheartedly agree, and I hope and pray that this Government, or whatever other Government is in office, will accept it.

Mr. Mathwin: Don't you think they are inclined to be too soft?

Mr. McRAE: In a quick reply to the member for Glenelg (I do not want to lose my time), who is interjecting out of his place, I will say this: one of the main problems is that, if a judge sentences a person to six years imprisonment, when the prisoner arrives at Yatala Gaol, he is immediately told by the Superintendent, "Really, that means four years." He is then told by the social welfare worker that he has a good chance of getting out in two years. This is a system we do not want. I believe that,

when a judge sentences a person, he should set a non-parole period, and I will deal with this matter if I have time. The structure of the sentencing is to be rational and, if members would care to look (I can see that I am rapidly running out of time) at items 42 to 50, they will see that this is so. I come now to the third part of the first report.

Members interjecting:

Mr. McRAE: If members would listen to me, they would help not only themselves but also their constituents. I refer to the matter of the persistent offender (the jargon used is "recidivist"). We all know (we have all had cases) of the person with a violent temperament. He is charged once with hitting a person over the head with a steel bar and he gets six years gaol but gets out in two years. He goes out into the community and immediately there is a fight and a drunken brawl; he kicks someone in the stomach causing a ruptured liver, and he gets four years imprisonment because he did not use a steel bar this time, and is out again within one year. He is back again because he has hit an innocent taxi driver over the head with a steel lever. That sort of person must be dealt with differently from other sorts of offender.

That is a point where I disagree with the committee, which thinks that the concept of the habitual criminal could be revised. In that sense, I agree that the concept of the habitual criminal serves no purpose, but I believe that, where we have a persistent offender, we must reach a stage where that persistent offender, who is no longer capable of rehabilitation in the eyes of responsible people—

Dr. Tonkin: He's incurable.

Mr. McRAE: He is incurable, like a terminal case, as the Leader would know. When I say that, I do not intend to be jocular: I am being serious. He must be (it is a cruel word) "warehoused". In other words, I believe (although I fully supported then and I still fully support now what the present Mr. Justice King put forward in his reforms on the criminal law) that we have gone too far with the violent offender. The system has worked out (we did not intend it that way) that the violent offender is now sometimes being given a bag of lollies. I was told of a case where a person charged with murder, who happened to be a juvenile—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McRAE: I hope to get through this speech, into which I have put a lot of work. A person charged with murder happened to be a juvenile. He was a violent and dangerous person, known to the police as a killer, to such an extent that two special police were assigned to him when he was dealt with in the juvenile court; he was called by his Christian name. I will not use his real Christian name, but we had the ludicrous spectacle of the juvenile court judge saying, "Dear Claude, that is the prosecutor, that is the judge, and that is your advocate." "Hello, Claude," says his advocate, "we will have to have a chair for you." We believe in rehabilitation but not in stupidity.

Mr. Mathwin: That's a case—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must remind the honourable member for Glenelg that he is speaking out of his place.

Mr. McRAE: The next part of the first report was that prison sentences should be dealt with in such a way that those prisoners who deserved to could actually gain from the prison sentence: in other words, nearly everyone knows (especially those of us who have been in the sphere of criminal justice) that 90 per cent of offenders are one-time offenders who will never offend again. For those

people, if they have to go to gaol, their period in prison should not distort their minds but should elevate them. To do that, two things are necessary. First, they should be given responsible work that will induce them to better things in the future; secondly, they should receive some pay as an inducement. There will be all sorts of arguments about this from the trade unions and others. Periodic detention, which is often weekend detention, is recommended, and this is highly suitable, for instance, for a truck driver convicted of an offence where he is sent to prison.

The last recommendation of the first report refers to the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act. Whereas the members of the committee said that this should be looked at, I say that those who suffer from attacks by criminals should be treated as we treat our injured workers: in other words, they should have full compensation. But we must understand that all of us must accept the tax that goes with that. I fully support that. The second report dealt with criminal investigation. Briefly, I congratulate the committee on item 59, which deals with the abolition of the general search warrant. That has been a disgrace to the South Australian system of criminal justice; it should never have existed.

I turn now to the third report, which was tabled today. The first matter is, I believe, most important—that, if a person is acquitted, he is entitled to his costs. In just the same way as the victim of a criminal should not receive a trifling \$2 000 when he has been made a paraplegic or been permanently damaged in the brain or other vital organs of his body, a person who has been acquitted of a criminal charge should not suffer the whole of the legal costs involved in the process. They should be paid by the State, but again it is a matter of taxation and, to be realistic, we must say that, if we want justice, we must sock the whole community, including ourselves. We will have to pay for it.

I turn to one other aspect that is important, dealt with in the third report. It appears at page 214 of that report. It is something that has been so necessary for so long: it relates to preliminary hearings. I know that some gentlemen of the press will say that, because of the Pentagon papers and the Watergate proceedings and other proceedings, the whole idea of investigation reporting would go against this aspect of the report. I know, too, that there is selective reporting, that Bloggs, who has committed a horrific crime of violence but is not a public figure, has nothing said about him in the press; but I remember a dear friend of mine, since deceased, who committed the horrible crime of driving without due care! He was one person out of 50 000 people in South Australia in that year, and his name appeared on the third page of the *Advertiser*; it ruined his practice. That was disgraceful. Therefore, I fully support what the committee has to say. The recommendations are these:

72. We recommend that it be an offence to publish evidence given upon committal proceedings except with the consent of the accused.

73. We recommend that it be an offence to publish, except in a court list, the name of any person charged with committing a summary offence until after conviction for such offence.

74. We recommend that it be an offence to publish, except in a court list, without his consent, the name of a person charged with an indictable offence until he is convicted of such offence or committed for trial in respect of it, whichever first happens.

75. We recommend that a report of the trial of a person in which his name appears and where he is subsequently acquitted be deemed an unfair and inaccurate report for the purpose of the Wrongs Act, 1936-1974, unless the fact of his acquittal is published in as prominent a position as the report of the trial.

That gets us to the substance of it. In 15 years of practice in the criminal courts, very often for the Law Society of South Australia (although I take no special credit for that; many of my fellow practitioners have done likewise) I have seen the press so often determined that it will selectively report the name of a public figure even at the committal proceedings stage (that is, the stage where the court decides whether or not a case has been made out). I have also seen the situation where at the committal proceedings the press has given elaborate detail and, in fact, almost malicious coverage to what has gone on at the committal, but it has ignored the fact totally that, at the subsequent trial of that person, he has been acquitted. Almost nothing has been said about that; only a bare paragraph has been given. In other words, when he was brought before the magistrate the headlines were prominent, whereas when he was acquitted there was nothing. That is a disgrace, something which should be obliterated, and I hope that it will be obliterated. I cannot see that any harm is done to the press by the recommendations which have been made.

The only possible harm that could be done is if there was some corruption at the committal proceedings stage, but at that stage I believe it is important and indeed inevitable that, if we want to maintain justice in this State, we must suppress the name of the accused until a case to answer has been made out and until he faces the Supreme Court or District Court, and then something can be done. As I understand it, a fourth report is forthcoming. I have been asked by the Leader whether this is something that would justify the sitting of Parliament: indeed, I believe that it does. I think the fourth report would have to lie on the table for some months. I believe it is something in which any responsible Minister of the Crown or Government would invite the Opposition to join with it in studying it for the benefit of the whole community. If only we could have just as good a report on civil matters.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I compliment the member for Playford on the contribution he has made to the debate; I found his speech most interesting. I believe that he aroused the interest of every member. Without doubt, his speech on this subject will be referred to in future. I thank him for his speech. On August 29, the day after the presentation of the Budget, I picked up the *Advertiser* expecting to find the Budget referred to in bold headlines across the front page, but that was not the case. The Budget was not on page 2 or page 3: it was dealt with on page 6. I think that signifies the way in which the people of this State have accepted the Budget. The headlines signified that the Treasurer had presented a modest Budget: "The Premier handed the State a lean Budget yesterday."

That has been the reaction to the Budget throughout, with all reports in a similar vein. In fact, it has been a non-event. It was the presentation to the House of a set of figures about which there has been considerable speculation during the past year. At times the Treasurer was crying because there was going to be a deficit at the end of the financial year. Then there was to be a surplus, then a deficit again, and then the railway issue came into the picture. Throughout, there was a manipulation of figures, but in the end the Treasurer has presented a balanced Budget to the House. The Treasurer claimed that South Australia was entering the 1975-76 financial year in a better financial position than any other State. He also said that it was unlikely that the public would see growth and improvements equal to this year's. I think that that could be a valid remark. However, although our estimated receipts will increase

by \$222 000 000, or 28 per cent above the estimated receipts for the 1974-75 financial year, the actual working effort and the result we can expect to see will be negligible.

I predict that the effective result of the Budget will be reduced because of today's inflationary trends. Increased allocations to education, community welfare and other Government departments are small and will largely be swallowed by rising costs and salaries, and that backs up my statement. Despite the Treasurer's announcement this week that he planned to contain wages, he has set aside a record \$82 000 000, or about 8 per cent of the Budget, for possible Public Service wage increases this year. This, to me, is a significant sum, inasmuch as the Government has allowed that large sum to be set aside for the Public Service. In round figures, that means that the additional wage expenditure throughout South Australia will be about \$200 000 000, working on the assumption that the Public Service represents almost 40 per cent of the State's work force.

This is a matter on which the Government has taken the lead, and it has set the figure of what it expects the increase in wages will be. The Treasurer said that the aim of his Government was to develop flexibility to cope with changing requirements and yet maintain long-term financial stability. That is an unusual phrase, particularly coming from the Treasurer of a Labor-governed State. It was possibly the most conservative statement ever made by a Labor Treasurer. In fact, this is the phraseology one might expect from the most conservative of conservative Governments in the presentation of a Budget of this nature.

However, when we look at the actual incomes and expenditures we find that there will be an increase of about \$50 500 000 in taxation. This aspect worries me because I believe that the way in which the Government collects the revenue is sectional. There will be an increase in motor vehicle registration and licence fees. Land tax, which was increased as a result of recent legislation, will return an increase of \$6 400 000, despite the fact that we had been assured by the Government that land tax would be reduced. When there is a massive increase of that nature, one can hardly say that it has been reduced. In my area, which is mainly involved in primary production, there will be a 75 per cent increase in taxation. Stamp duty has risen by about \$9 300 000 to \$55 000 000. Pay-roll tax has increased and is expected to return total receipts of about \$126 000 000.

It is interesting to note that the Auditor-General's Report states that the past financial year was the first year in which Government departments became liable for pay-roll tax, and an increase in receipts of about \$47 000 000 has resulted. That means that over the past two years the increase to the State from pay-roll tax has been about 100 per cent. Petrol tax, despite the abolition of the franchise tax, will in the first quarter yield about \$4 900 000 when added to payments outstanding. Cigarette tax for the full year should return \$6 300 000, and higher liquor licence fees will yield an extra \$2 100 000. The cigarette tax, the higher liquor tax, and the betting control tax are taxes on the social activities of the people. I also refer to the additional allocation for tourism, recreation and sport in connection with small lotteries, dog-racing and the control of totalizator licences. The only other sector of the community that has been hit has been the private sector. The petrol tax, pay-roll tax, stamp duty, land tax and motor vehicle tax primarily hit the private sector, and they cause great concern because they place small businesses

and self-employed people in an awkward situation. The Labor Government's Budget has sown the seeds of destruction for thousands of small business men and farmers throughout South Australia. These are the small people whom the Labor Party once cared about, but it is now destroying them. No sector is more seriously hurt than the small business sector, which is fully Australian owned. Unless the Government changes its attitude, these businesses will go to the wall soon.

A recent survey shows the shattering result that two-thirds of these businesses are in danger of collapse or bankruptcy in the next 12 months; if this is correct, between 20 per cent and 30 per cent of the Australian work force is facing unemployment. If the survey is only half correct, unemployment of between 10 per cent and 15 per cent represents a shocking indictment of the Labor Party's pursuit of its doctrinaire socialist philosophies. Since the Government has been in power, many small businesses have gone broke and thousands are hanging by their fingertips, hoping for a change of Government. The position has been worsened by the activities of the Commonwealth Labor Government. Small business men had hoped that this year's Budget would restore economic sanity so that the private sector could gain confidence, but more needs to be done. There is an urgent need for the State Governments and the Commonwealth Government to develop a policy approach to ensure the viability of small businesses, which are the backbone of Australia's private enterprise system. The Government should establish a special section within the appropriate department to deal specifically with the problems of small businesses. South Australia must follow the example of America, Canada, Japan and West Germany, which have taken seriously the need to sustain the small business sector. A report, headed "Figures grow worse for small firms", in the *News* of September 2 states:

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.

So, almost as many businesses have ceased operation in an eight-month period this year as ceased operation last year. The article continues:

Business leaders said today that most of the company failures had been among small businesses unable to cope with tight liquidity and inflation.

This has been a growing trend throughout Australia, and it comes back to the basic philosophy of the socialist Government. There is an increase of \$110 000 000 in the Australian Government's allocation. The proportion contributed by the Australian Government is 42 per cent, meaning that 42 per cent of the control of this State has automatically gone to Canberra, and we must also take into account the other services provided by the Australian Government. This points to the loss of power in South Australia and to the State Government's lack of effectiveness. So, the State Government's grasp is slipping to an increasing extent. Of the \$222 000 000 of estimated receipts over and above the actual receipts of last year, half comes from the Australian Government and one-quarter comes from direct taxation; this affects the private sector far more than it affects any other sector of the community.

At present we are facing a housing crisis, which is not the fault of the South Australian Housing Trust; indeed, I compliment the trust on the manner in which it has stood up to the pressures confronting it, pressures that have been brought about by socialist philosophies. No

longer is there an incentive for people to own houses: indeed, they cannot own them because of the increased labour and material costs involved in building houses. Only a few years ago it was the ambition of every young couple to acquire their own home. Most people first acquired a block of land and later built on it so they could set up a family unit, but today that is not the case. Very few people enter married life nowadays with the basic object of setting up their own home. They would much prefer to go to the State and get a Housing Trust house, because it is much easier to do it that way. This places pressure not only on the trust but also on the total accommodation position throughout the State. In Adelaide there is a shortage of accommodation and there is almost a racket in connection with charges for rental accommodation. This situation has arisen from the socialist philosophy, which has created an increased demand for housing; when the State-supplied housing is exhausted, free enterprise accommodation comes into the picture and, because of the demand on that kind of accommodation, prices are boosted for free enterprise accommodation, and the whole exercise becomes fruitless because people cannot afford the accommodation.

Many people today are living in substandard housing; one does not have to go far to find examples of that. All members would be aware of areas in their own districts where this kind of situation applies. During the past few months people have approached me about the housing situation and have set their problems before me because their names have been on the Housing Trust's waiting list, and in some cases there is a wait of several years. Guest house accommodation is available for \$40 a week for full board, and unfurnished flats are easy to get for a bond of \$100 and \$40 a week, with a month's rent in advance, plus the cost of gas, telephone, and electricity, making a total of nearly \$500 just to move in. Unfortunately, this is today becoming too much an accepted way of life. People rely too much on excessive rates. Why do people accept this? Why do they not complain? Unfortunately, accommodation is at a premium, and people must take what they can get. They do not complain because they are thankful that they can get any accommodation at all. Why do not owners complain? They have no reason to complain, especially as they are obtaining such good rents for their houses.

The additional pressure on housing accommodation has resulted from the reduced expenditure on homes for the aged, as well as reduced expenditure by private enterprise on rental houses and speculative houses. This total reduction makes housing less available to the people in the community who are most in need. Moreover, in the work force, few people can undertake renovations or similar work, especially on old houses to make them habitable. Tradesmen today are basically engaged in new construction work, and the competent type of handyman, although in demand, is seldom found.

The Budget also deals with succession duty. I am most concerned about this tax, because it is a tax that no Government should ever tolerate. This tax must rank as one of the most barbaric taxes in what is supposed to be a humane and welfare society. Succession duty does nothing short of sneaking in and undermining the welfare of a widow and children after the breadwinner of the family has died from, say, cancer or an accident. Invariably, this tax hits most the young married families and other people least able to afford it. If a person lives a normal life, he is able to plan his estate accordingly, and consequently the greatest contributors to this tax are

people in the young married category who are widowed, still without sufficient resources to continue any venture in which the deceased may have been engaged. In late 1974 there was a tragic accident on the West Coast. A young lad lost his life in a shark attack, and the *Sunday Mail* report dealing with the accident covered the full front page. It stated that the lad's father had died of cancer only five months earlier. The father had devoted his life to developing a farm and training his children to work on the land.

The children, who were brought into this world in good faith, with the parents accepting responsibility for them, cost society nothing: they had no access to child-care centres, welfare organisations or any other organisations. In 1972 Mr. Whitlam said that a Labor Government would provide equal education for all children, irrespective of where they lived. However, in this instance we find that a Labor Government has merely sent in men to take away from the estate much of what the father had provided for his family. What kind of welfare is this from a hypocritical humane society? How many of those who are responsible for such laws and administration would have the intestinal fortitude and ability to do what that widow was forced to do for the sake of money—blood money at that?

Similar cases can be found throughout the country, and in most cases the bereaved do the best they can; the matter is not aired because of the futility of so doing and because of the exposure of personal situations. Will the Government explain why such widows and children should be exposed to the inevitable embarrassment and harassment which results because they have prematurely lost their breadwinner? Is not the mental turmoil and suffering sufficient? In another case with which I was associated, the father, who died aged 44, had a daughter still at school. His widow, who was confined to a wheelchair, was so ill that she died two years later, and the estate had approximately one-fifth of its value taken by the various vultures that came along when the daughter sold the property to pay duties and went to live in another State, with near disastrous results.

We must face the fact that death duties were supposed to be a means of breaking up big estates. In reality, they create big estates and hit the small ones. Death is a windfall for undertakers, who provide an \$80 box and \$200 to \$400 worth of artificial dignity. Valuers, trustee companies, lawyers, and Government, all obtain their fees or other charges according to how high they can build up the gross value of an estate: in short, picking the bones of the dead.

It does not behove any member of a responsible Government to be party to such an iniquitous tax. Petitions are currently circulating in relation to succession duty, but they go only part of the way. I believe in the total abolition of this tax. In the Budget about \$16 500 000 is estimated to be received by the Government as revenue from this tax, and this sum represents an increase of about 22 per cent on the estimates from the previous year. While the \$16 500 000 may appear to be a significant amount, it represents only about 1.6 per cent of the total State receipts. Therefore, we have a Government which, on the one hand, has estimated a figure about \$222 000 000 in excess of its estimated receipts last year and which, on the other hand, retains a succession duty which it estimates will amount to \$16 500 000. In other words, succession duty represents about one-thirteenth or one-fourteenth of the estimated total receipts of the State to be derived through inflation and from various taxation measures.

This tax cannot be tolerated. Although I appreciate that moves made by Government and Opposition members do go part of the way towards alleviating the problem, they do not go far enough. As I have previously said, the people able to pay this tax invariably evade it through the use of company set-ups and by other means. Until such time as we can hold our heads high enough to avoid taxing people in such unfortunate circumstances, we must take a long hard look at our own integrity.

This Budget has been referred to in many ways by members, but basically it is a non-event. It is a non-descript Budget, merely tagging along with inflation, and ignoring the plight of the private sector. In fact, the increased revenue the Government expects to receive from taxation will come primarily from the private sector of the economy. Consequently, I cannot accept that it is a responsible measure in trying to promote self-sufficiency, productivity, and incentives in the State. I support the second reading.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill, and my main purpose in speaking will be not to refer in detail to matters affecting my district, because I think I have spoken sufficiently about sewerage, schools, roads, and other things that are lacking in the District of Fisher. However, I support all the members who have stated that this Government, even though it can claim that it may be in the black at present, has taken this State on a downward trend economically. Each year we have more difficulty in meeting our commitments, when we should be finding it easier if we chose the right priorities. I will refer to part of a letter I have received from a constituent, because I think that his comments state the feelings of many people in the community regarding the present state of South Australia's economy and how it affects the individual. This person states:

I believe I could take my house, car, watch and chain, and pet dog (an expensive meat eater) to "uncle's"—

in other words, pawn them—

and come out with a nice cheque, but when I trudge 10 miles (no car) in my underpants without canine companionship to get tucker, I could retire to the bank of the Torrens . . . with a glance at my wrist watch . . . to see how long the Government takes to move to reduce charges and get value for our dollar. I think . . . I should have kept the chain: it is a treasured symbol of the convict days!

I believe that that is happening with legislation in this State. We are gradually tying every citizen up so that he cannot manoeuvre without filling out a form for some department, the form having on the bottom of it a threat of imprisonment or a substantial fine if the requirement is not met within a specified time. If people in private practice made threats on every paper that they sent out to customers, this Government, which claims to be interested in the average person in the street, would automatically implement legislation to stop that practice. However, every department under this Government has those threats on its documents.

About two years ago South Australia set up an organisation known as the South Australian Land Commission and I should like to refer to that organisation briefly. It was going to suddenly throw on the market many thousands of good building allotments at an extremely low price so that the average man in the street would be able to acquire an allotment. I am thankful that I received a reply of a sort from the Minister of Works last Tuesday to some questions that I had asked. I had asked the Minister for the locations and number of serviced allotments that the commission has totally developed from broad acres. The reply to that

was a straight-out statement that there was none. The Land Commission has not developed one allotment in two years from broad acres to a stage of being ready for an individual or company to build a house on it!

The Minister did say in the reply that 298 serviced allotments had been completed after being acquired from private developers. These were completed by the commission and made available to the public. I will never know why the commission stepped into the field at that stage. It could have made an arrangement with the company involved so that there was no excessive profit. There is that power, if there was a wish to use it. If not, the commission could have leaned on the owners, saying, "If you do not keep it within reason, we will acquire it." Do not let us think that the Government would not support that sort of pressure being applied, because the present Government has done it previously. However, the commission moved in to spend money in an area where the allotments were about to come on to the market, instead of moving out to acquire the broad acres that could have been developed and made available so that people could build houses on them.

With some thanks, I tell the commission that I appreciate its courtesy in sending me pamphlets stating the number of allotments in the Happy Valley subdivision and showing the design. The subdivision is in two parts. The commission stated that in part 1 it had 130 allotments, 98 of which were priced at less than \$6 000. The commission states that 62 allotments were sold by September 1. Part II comprises 168 allotments, only 32 of them being priced at less than \$6 000, and 24 allotments have been sold. If those blocks are so cheap and so magnificent, having regard to the environment in which they are set, why are they not selling?

They were placed on the market before the recent State election, and I ask why the highest price asked in the first group of 130 allotments was \$6 200, while in the adjoining area on the same subdivision, with the same type of land and allotments of the same size on average, the average price was \$6 700, an average increase of more than \$500 in a few weeks. On what basis does the commission assess that it should be allowed to charge that much extra in such a short time? Is the commission profiteering? Is its action worse than the action of private subdividers who were operating previously? What is the real size and type of allotment? Some allotments are as small as 13.72 metres wide and, on average, are about 34 metres. What a ridiculously small size for an allotment! The allotments are all cramped up, with the reserves on the outer perimeter, not in the centre of the subdivision or as close as possible to the centre so that people can enjoy them. Yet, that great State body set up to create the right environment for people to live in, at the right sort of price for a reasonable allotment, comes out and—

Dr. Tonkin: Subject to Commonwealth Government direction.

Mr. EVANS: That may be it. The commission has jammed small allotments into a small area, with no reserves to break the area up so as to give people the sort of environment that modern town planning can create. The commission's record after two years of operation is not good. In the question to which I have referred, I asked in what areas the commission owned land and I asked for the size in each location. I will refer only to the information given regarding land available for housing and will not refer to open-space areas. The information given was as follows:

| Location | Area (ha) |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Tea Tree Gully | 1 263.32 |
| Meadows | 170.67 |
| Salisbury | 187.06 |
| Munno Para | 604.22 |
| Noarlunga | 870.05 |
| Marion | 117.07 |
| Port Adelaide | 1.22 |
| West Torrens | 0.76 |
| | <hr/> 3 214.37 |

The commission set out to spend all its money on buying land, never giving a damn about the shortage of allotments in the State. For two years it has been buying property and not worrying about making available blocks at a reasonable price. The Treasurer and the Minister of Housing have made the point in this House that when considering the average price one should take into account only those areas where new development is taking place. I do not agree, if we are suggesting that the average allotment is similar to that in new areas being created by the South Australian Land Commission, because blocks on average are too small for the better type of subdivision, and we need to consider in average pricing some of the better subdivisions and better areas. The average price of land in South Australia is nearer \$7 000 than \$6 000, and no member can deny that. The Land Commission also has the power to sell land to licensed builders. I hope that, in Committee, the Minister will be able to say how many allotments the South Australian Land Commission has sold or has agreed to sell to licensed builders. The regulations covering such sales are strict. The relevant document is entitled "Sale of building allotments to licensed builders", and states:

The South Australian Land Commission, upon request and after discussion with licensed builders, will at its discretion allocate to such builders a number of allotments in each of its subdivisions. Where a builder intends to commence immediate erection of dwellings the commission will release direct to that builder a working proportion of the allotments out of the builder's overall allocation. A contract shall be entered into and, upon execution, a 10 per cent deposit of the total selling price will be required from the builder. As soon as foundations have been poured the builder will be entitled to sell the land (plus improvements erected thereon) to an end consumer at a figure not exceeding that permitted under the Urban Land (Price Control) Act, 1973. The builder must provide the commission with a certificate signed by both himself and the purchaser of the dwelling setting out:

1. The type of house being erected/sold.
2. The basic price.
3. Extras itemised.
4. Price of land being transferred.
5. Total cost.

Foundations must be poured within six months and substantial completion of the dwelling to lock-up stage within 12 months. A continuous supply of allotments from the overall allocation will flow to the builder as performance by him is achieved.

Mr. Venning: How many would it sell under those conditions?

Mr. EVANS: I believe some builders are waiting for the opportunity, but are receiving no opportunity from the Land Commission. I should like the Minister to make a statement on that aspect in Committee. Let us worry about private developers who wish to develop land. The Land Commission has hogged all the land around the city and held it back so that it can capitalise and profit from inflation. How much land has the Land Commission made available to private developers to create allotments? Will the Minister give that information in Committee? An important aspect of the functioning of the Land Commission was to buy land being held as an investment by individuals or companies and get it on the market

as allotments so that supply would exceed demand and the price would be kept down. That has not happened, and one of the reasons is that the Land Commission has not made the land available for individuals to develop housing allotments.

Mr. Venning: Do you know why?

Mr. EVANS: Because it is a Government instrumentality and it is socialist philosophy to stifle private enterprise and, if possible, private ownership as much as possible, forcing people into rental accommodation. But the Government cannot even supply rental accommodation except to a few favoured people who do not pay the correct rental for the type of home in which they live, even though they are on full incomes. Private developers also have another problem. A recent article in the *News* referred to the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the conditions placed on the planting of trees in new subdivisions. One cannot plant some trees because they will interfere with the sewer mains or pipe services for reticulated water. However, with the modern methods the department uses for sealing its pipes, that argument is a lot of hogwash. The E. & W.S. Department has not upgraded its regulations in relation to trees, although it has upgraded its methods of installing drainage pipes and water mains. It needs to upgrade its thinking about the types of tree that can be planted in the subdivisions.

The dry Adelaide Plains were denuded of large trees in the past, except for the areas along the creeks. On such plains, we should encourage the planting of trees growing to greater heights. In the summer months now, more green foliage is apparent on the plains than has been apparent in the history of the area, but we need to plant many more trees. To tell a subdivider that he cannot plant trees that will grow more than, say, 6 metres is ridiculous; he should be encouraged to plant the larger types of eucalypt that do not have root penetration that will cause problems in sewerage or water services.

I turn briefly to the Highways Department and one of the actions taken by that department in recent times. I am sure the Minister of Transport will pick this information up from others. A company known as the Eagle Signal Company is operating in South Australia, supplying, installing, and (until recent times) servicing traffic signal lights. The Highways Department decided, as one of those great empire-building organisations, to take over the servicing of the lights. Then it decided to take over their maintenance. Not satisfied with that, it also wanted to take over the personnel of the Eagle Signal Company. The department took away the company's business by not giving it the contracts, then it wanted to take the company's personnel. It achieved that, and the next move is to organise supply by some other method so that the company goes out of operation.

The company is not a big organisation, employing fewer than 20 people, but all the trade is being forced to the head office of the department, and this small company is being pushed out of existence. Naturally, the Highways Department can entice men away from the company because they see that the company is being crushed by the department. We do not want great bureaucratic systems set up by Government departments. We need to cut Government spending and divert that spending to the private sector, where we get better value for the dollar. I hope the Highways Department understands that great bureaucracies do not help efficiency; that has been proved many times. Referring now to the South Australian Film Corporation, I do not question its expertise in film making—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Have you seen the film "Picnic at Hanging Rock"?

Mr. EVANS: I have not seen anyone hanging, although I can think of someone that I would like to see hanging by different parts of his body. I believe that within a short time either the Auditor-General or the Public Accounts Committee should conduct a special investigation into the South Australian Film Corporation's accounting methods, to ascertain how accurate its records are and how much doctoring of the books goes on from one section to another to make it appear as though everything is safe and sound and that there is no problem. My attacks on the Film Corporation have, all along, related to administration.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Have you any evidence of that?

Mr. EVANS: That is a difficult thing to obtain, because one needs to be in a position to go through all the corporation's books to pick this up. Also, perhaps the person who has been concerned with what has occurred in the organisation has recently left it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Can you be more specific?

Mr. EVANS: I can, and I hope that, when the Bill is in Committee and we are dealing with the South Australian Film Corporation, I will have the evidence to enable me to be more specific. If I cannot obtain that evidence then, some time between now and the end of the session, I hope to have what I am looking for.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Wouldn't it be wiser to shut up until you've got something? At this stage, you're just—

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

Mr. EVANS: If members have any doubts, they should express them. I now refer to the Adelaide Railway Station. I have received a letter from a constituent who makes a complaint regarding a matter at the Adelaide Railway Station. She states that she took her little grandson to the toilet at the station and found in the ladies toilet a sign saying that no boy over 5 years of age, although accompanied by an adult female, is permitted in the ladies toilet. My constituent states:

I looked at my little grandson and thought that in just a few months this little chap would be expected to go alone into the men's toilet. The thought horrified me and I worried about it so much that I rang the railways. The gentleman I spoke to was very understanding and agreed that it was not certainly right, but it appears that this is the way it has always been and that no-one seems to want to change it. Surely this is a dreadful state of affairs. We all know what "odd bods" there are about now, and I, for the life of me, cannot understand why a little fellow up to eight years of age cannot go with whom ever is looking after him into a ladies toilet.

I suggest that my constituent means any adult female that is looking after a child, because one can think of some odd male bods that would be likely to take a little boy into the women's toilet. My constituent's letter continues:

I would like to see a regulation saying, "No boy under the age of eight years may enter a gentlemen's toilet unless accompanied by an adult male."

Members interjecting:

Mr. EVANS: I know that it may sound trivial to some people, but I believe that a real risk is involved if one thinks about the things that have happened to some children recently. I believe that my constituent has a genuine complaint and I would honestly support increasing to eight or 10 years the age up to which a child is permitted to enter a female toilet with his mother or an adult female.

The Budget contains a reference to the SPELD organisation, which deals with specific learning disabilities. In the past, children with such problems have been ignored in Government Budgets. I am therefore pleased to see that this year's allocation has been increased from \$500 to \$5 000. One matter that annoys me is that neither the South Australian Film Corporation nor the Government is willing to spend money on producing an Australian film to help these young people with their learning difficulties. Every film that is available to SPELD in this State is an American film with "Yankee" accents.

Mr. Keneally: That's being unkind.

Mr. EVANS: It is not. We have many young people experiencing difficulty in learning, and we are trying to help them with a film produced in another country. Immediately, these children experience difficulties because of the accents of those in the film. If ever the Government and the Film Corporation had a responsibility to find about \$25 000, they have it in this area. The Government is able to find money for Government departments, and those departments are compelled to go to the South Australian Film Corporation. It has a monopoly and can charge whatever price it likes for the films it produces for Government departments. Not one Minister can submit the making of a film to private contract to see whether he can get a better deal. This is the area in which I return to the corporation and some of the things that I believe are unjust in this respect.

Finally, I believe the member for Playford made a magnificent contribution to the debate this evening. His theme in relation to the payment of compensation to people injured by criminals was good. This matter was raised on this side of the House and was rejected by the honourable member's colleagues. Indeed, we went even further: the Opposition believed that, if property was damaged by persons who had escaped from Government custody, the owners should be compensated for that damage. If they claim on their policies, their insurance premiums increase. Indeed, some companies, even the State Government Insurance Commission, will not insure a property if it is near a Government institution. I believe it is important that compensation should be paid, and I congratulate the member for Playford on that aspect of his speech.

Also, I believe that we can no longer support professional organisations being a judge of their own kind. The Law Society is an example of this. We need a legal board (if I can use that term) comprising independent members of the profession. If desired, the profession could have the majority representation. However, other people need representation so that, when it is necessary to discipline a member of the profession, not all of his own kind are dealing with the matter. In that way, someone would be assessing the matter from an angle other than the legal one. We would have much more respect for most professions if we had independent boards. At one time, all professions were looked up to, but gradually their credibility has deteriorated because they have sat in judgment on their own kind. I hope that we can have a board which can, to a degree, be independent from the Law Society, and which can judge those in question. The Government does not have a good record, having lived on the hard work done by previous generations. However, the honeypot is running out and the Government is in a sticky situation. It does not want Parliament to sit for long, but I am sure that the Government's better conscience will tell it that it must do so, because the public will take action against it if it does not. I support the second reading.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): My colleagues have spoken at length and with much knowledge on the Bill. I recommend to members the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition. He made a thorough and thoughtful contribution to the debate on this important document. I will take two lines in this debate tonight: the first relates to the Unit for Industrial Democracy, and the second to the specific line dealing with the allocation to the Industrial Research Institute of South Australia. I refer first to the Unit for Industrial Democracy. First, I make the small point that it was initially called the Quality of Worklife Unit. It is interesting that in the past two or three months this name has been thrown aside and instead the name Unit for Industrial Democracy has been adopted. It is also important to see in the Budget document that it has been taken away from the Minister of Labour and Industry and given to the Treasurer.

In this year's Budget there is a total allocation for salaries and operating expenses of just over \$80 000 for that unit. I refer now to the policy of the Government and to the document passed at the 1975 Annual State Convention of the Australian Labor Party, held from June 13 to 16, 1975. That paper is called the Working Environment Committee Report and Recommendations. I briefly outline what those recommendations were in relation to industrial democracy. In passing these comments, I do not intend to give a full critique of the entire report. To do so would require much time to cover a whole range of different areas. What I will do this evening is refer specifically to the industrial democracy policy. I start by briefly outlining what that policy is. I take as my source of reference a speech given by the Treasurer to the Rotary Club of Adelaide on August 6, 1975. Basically, their policy is in two different areas. I refer first to the board of companies. Under this policy, the board of companies will be composed as follows—firstly, of representatives of investors; in other words, representatives of the shareholders. Under their policy, shareholders will be allowed to appoint one-third of the directors to the board; workers in the organisation would also be allowed to appoint one-third of the directors, and the final third comes from public management officers, appointed no doubt by the Government. It is interesting to note that, regarding public management officers, the Treasurer said:

Their duty will be to maintain community interest, reporting to the Treasury, the Companies Office, and the public.

It seems to start with that the Government is now insisting that it have its spies or informants inside any large industrial complex that wishes to have its board in this State. Of course, most companies will move their boards to other States when this legislation is introduced, as the Treasurer has said it will be, in three years time. The reason is that no company would wish to have public officers representing one-third of the board members and another third representing the workers.

In putting forward this case this evening, I wish simply to dissect the policy put forward by the Australian Labor Party. I do not disagree entirely with some of the sentiments relating to worker participation; but I disagree wholeheartedly with the policy put forward by the Australian Labor Party. The other aspect of the policy is as follows:

They would set up joint workshop committees, with appropriate area joint consultative councils containing a representative of each major functional group in the area concerned; secondly, an employee council composed of representative employee members from either workshop or area council, and union representatives; and, finally, a

joint management council appointed half by the employee council and half by the management, with the approval of the board.

I wish to debate two areas at some length: first, the composition of the board and, secondly, the setting up of a joint management council and the effect it would have particularly on the representatives on this council. I reiterate that this joint management council would have its members half appointed by the employee council and half by the management, with the approval of the board; one-third of the board members would represent the shareholders, one-third would be public directors, and one-third would represent the employees or (as I will shortly come to) the trade unions. Some emphasis is made in the document put forward at the conference that the so-called representatives of the employees are not there representing the employees but are there representing the trade unions, which would then in turn represent the employees. That is an important aspect of the policy, because in effect it is stating that the trade unions, not the employees, shall have one-third of their members on the board of the company. The whole policy is, therefore, adopted for the benefit of the trade unions rather than for the benefit of the employees. That is against the whole sentiment of so-called worker participation and involvement of the workers in the decisions they are making within their working environment. I quote two brief extracts, the first being on page 1, as follows:

Industrial democracy must be developed on a single channel of representation—the trade unions.

I think that indicates that they are there to represent the trade unions rather than the employees. Then, on page 7, under the heading "Industrial Democracy", the document states:

In fact, industrial democracy must be an additional instrument for trade unions through which they can play a direct part in workers' self-determination.

So it is not industrial democracy for the workers within that plant: it is industrial democracy for the trade unions. There lies the fundamental weakness in the entire policy put forward. It is interesting, in looking at this policy, to see the views of the people within the Premier's Department and also the Labour and Industry Department on the views expressed. First, I take the views of Mr. Lyndon Prowse, who is the so-called leader (if there is a leader in such a unit, because I understand it works as a team, and a team does not necessarily have a leader) and who was the major spokesman at least, and I quote from the statement in the *Advertiser* of October 17, 1974, as follows:

The head of the Government's Quality of Worklife Unit (Mr. L. J. Prowse) has advised State Cabinet not to use legislation to force worker participation on industry and unions.

That is a significant statement, because the head of the present Unit for Industrial Democracy has come out and said that legislation should not be introduced; yet the Treasurer, in reply to a question I asked on notice, which is recorded in *Hansard* and which also appears in his policy speech at the last election, has said that in three years time the State Government will legislate for the introduction or implementation of these policies. So there is a clash between the Treasurer, who is the Minister who represents this area of worker participation and industrial democracy, and Mr. Prowse, who represents the actual functioning or implementation of this policy. There is a basic and fundamental clash there: Mr. Prowse says "No legislation" and the Treasurer says "Legislation".

The other basic conflict comes from the Secretary for Labour and Industry, Mr. Lindsay Bowes. I will quote from an article printed in the *Journal of Industrial Relations*,

in June, 1975, two months ago (the very month in which the Labor Party adopted this recommendation at its annual conference). At page 133 of the journal, he said:

The Committee on Worker Participation in Management (Private Sector) expressed the view that many problems could arise from the introduction of worker directors in private companies.

That was a committee set up by the Government with union representation on it. The people were actually nominated by the Government to that committee, and they advised against workers being represented on the boards of companies. However, Mr. Bowes went on to say (and this is his personal opinion) the following:

As yet there is little real demand for such appointments. What is certain is that any attempt to introduce worker directors without other changes in organisational structure and workplace operations would not bring the advantages to workers that the proponents of such action suggested would be achieved.

Therefore, we have the Secretary for Labour and Industry saying that the sort of policy adopted by the Labor Party at its annual conference and by the Treasurer in recent speeches would not work. We have three important bodies directly related to implementing the Government's policy which are in direct conflict with that policy. I suggest that the Minister, who is trying to interject, that he should refer to his Party's recent policy speech, in which it is stated that, as a result of the lessons of the next three years, we should be able to lay down rules (that means legislation) so that South Australians can grapple with this problem which has development in industrial society.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why does it necessarily mean legislation?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: How else does a Government set rules?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It can lay down guidelines.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: They are not rules, and the Minister must realise that. If the Minister is debating this point, I suggest that he refer to the answer the Treasurer gave to a recent question I asked him, as reported in *Hansard*. I will now refer to the West German system, which the trade union, and particularly the Treasurer, upholds as the system that has worked so well in the area of industrial democracy. I refer to an article in the *Australian Quarterly*, volume 46, printed in December, 1974, by the Consul for Commercial and Social Affairs for the Federal Republic of Germany. The article outlines the systems that apply in West Germany. The author points out the fundamental principles involved in the West German system and some of the characteristics that apply to trade unionism in West Germany. I think I should point this out because it points up the complete difference between the environment for the adoption of such a system in West Germany compared to the situation here.

When one looks at it one will see that the West German trade unions are a cohesive small united body, whereas the trade union structure in Australia is the most archaic structure one could find anywhere in the world. The author points out that there is a remarkable lack of Government interference in industrial relations in Germany. Secondly, he states that they work on collective bargaining rather than on arbitration and conciliation as we do here, and that, therefore, such strikes as wildcat strikes are virtually unknown. Thirdly, he points out that there are only 16 trade unions for the whole of West Germany and that there is only about a 30 per cent membership of those unions. Fourthly, he points out that they have a somewhat unique legal system for dealing with any disputes that

arise through local courts, and this tends to save some of the more State-wide industrial strife that we tend to have here.

The author goes on to point out that West Germany has two types of policy. First, a works council, which has nowhere near the same power as the Treasurer would have the management council have in his own industrial policy, is set up. The works council has certain rights of co-determination, and they are restrictive. They apply to such areas as daily working hours, work shifts, rest periods, pay days, annual leave arrangements, etc. (the trivial issues that can come up in a company). There is also a right of consultation, and a works council must be consulted on any major policy issues the company adopts. Therefore, we see an entirely different approach here: the works council has a major say in the running of the company, whereas in West Germany it is largely through consultation, with a small degree of co-determination.

The other applies to the board system in Germany. The German system is a two-tier system with a general meeting of shareholders, who are the sole people represented. The second tier is the supervisory board, and on that board the shareholders still have two-thirds of the representatives, the employees having only one-third. In this State the shareholders would have only one-third of the representation on the board, whereas in Germany the shareholders have two-thirds of the representation, and there is also the two-tier system, which does not apply here.

I will now specifically dissect the policy put forward by the Labor Party. First, as I have said, the board system is a one-tier system, instead of two-tier system as applies in West Germany. Therefore, I am sure that it will not work in this State under the one-tier system, as there will be no meeting of shareholders where the shareholders have a majority point of view. The second point is that on the joint management council proposed by the Labor Party and the Treasurer, the workers, through their trade unions, as I have said, would have the majority say. They would have half the nominees, and the other half would be nominated by management with the approval of the board. Let us not forget that the board consists of one-third trade unionists as well. Therefore, for the actual appointments to the joint management council, the workers, through their trade unions, would have effective say for 66 per cent of the votes.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How do you work that out?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I will point that out later. If the Minister cannot understand fundamental mathematics, I will leave that up to him. I have already pointed out that the employee council would appoint half the people, and the other half would come through the board with the approval of the board. The employees have one-third of the say on the board and, therefore, I assume, would have one-third of the representatives nominated by the board. Under its policy, the Government is effectively setting up a joint management council where the trade unions, in appointing the representatives on the council, would have two-thirds of the say. The third point I make is that the emphasis under the South Australian proposal is for the trade unions rather than the employees to be the representatives. I have pointed out that, under the policy, the trades unions will be there instead of the employees. This representation is there not for the benefit of the employees but for the benefit of the trade union movement and, therefore, the Australian Labor Party. The West German system exists for the benefit of the employees. That is another reason why the proposal will fail here in Australia.

The fourth point is that the Labor Party's whole proposal is inconsistent. To start with, the employees are on the so-called shareholders board, but the shareholders have no representation on the employees council. So, the policy is totally inconsistent. The fifth point is how any board, one-third of which represents shareholders, one-third of which represents trade unions (not necessarily people working in the plant), and one-third of which consists of Government directors, can devise common objectives and guidelines for the company? Obviously, a board with representatives from three distinctly different areas will not be able to come to common and meaningful objectives for the organisation to adopt.

The sixth point is that the policy shows the Treasurer's arrogant hypocrisy. If he was really sincere in putting forward this policy, he would apply the same principle to the highest board in the State, the Cabinet. He would ensure that one-third of the members of Cabinet came from the Ministry, one-third from the Public Service, and one-third from the taxpayers of this State. Of course, such representation does not apply. The seventh point is that the policy is nothing more than nationalisation of private industry through the board room and through the joint management council via the trade unions. Nationalisation has been rejected by the Australian people previously. One only has to consider the 1947 Commonwealth election to see that, and we will see nationalisation rejected again at the next Commonwealth election. The eighth point is that the West German system, which applies under entirely different conditions, has been evolved over at least 25 years or 30 years, yet the Treasurer is trying to reach the same stage in three years, with no prior experience in this area.

Finally, this whole policy depends on legislation to be introduced in three years time, yet the most fundamental point is that worker participation must be adopted voluntarily; unless it is, worker participation will not succeed. I therefore agree with Mr. Lyndon Prowse's statement that, if the policy is to be implemented through legislation, it will be disastrous.

The Budget documents show that last year \$120 000 was allocated to the Industrial Research Institute, and \$167 000 has been allocated for 1975-76, yet before the Budget was prepared Cabinet had decided to disband the institute. This shows the lack of co-ordination and the haste with which the Cabinet decision was made. The decision was made so quickly and secretly that not even the Treasurer had time to amend the Budget documents. The letter sent by the Treasurer to Dr. Melville, the Chairman of the Industrial Research Institute of South Australia, clearly indicates that the Treasurer is disbanding the institute because it is allegedly not being patronised by small businesses. However, in the introduction to the institute's report for 1974-75, Dr. Melville says that the main trouble that the organisation had was that it had insufficient staff to cope with the number of inquiries received. Dr. Melville says:

The year's experience had enabled it to consolidate its activities and its procedures, and it had in hand official requirements and other suggestions for far more work than it had been able to attempt.

That indicates that the institute was suffering from a shortage of staff rather than a shortage of inquiries from private industry. One can therefore realise that there was a lack of thought and planning behind the Cabinet decision. The Treasurer has claimed that Amdel will take over much of the institute's work, but the Treasurer's claim was a weak excuse; he was struggling to explain how the institute's work would be carried out in the future. Amdel's policy guidelines show that it carries out work in the field of

mineral exploration and research, yet most of the work carried out by the Industrial Research Institute was for small manufacturing companies outside the mining area. So, unless there is a complete change in the structure and financing of Amdel, there is no chance of its taking over the functions of the institute. The Treasurer's reply today was therefore simply an attempt to whitewash the controversy.

The Cabinet decision will be unfortunate for small companies trying to survive in this State. Many small companies do not have the financial backing to carry out their own research and development, and they do not have immediate access to research facilities, which are commonly available in Melbourne and Sydney; the whole purpose of setting up the institute was to provide such facilities, yet the Treasurer, in disbanding the institute, has threatened the long-term existence of small companies in this State which are already under threat. The member for Gouger said that more than 200 small businesses had gone into voluntary liquidation so far this year, and many more businesses will do so in the future, because their competitive position with companies in other States will gradually be eroded.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for the Environment) moved:

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

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Broomhill (teller), Max Brown, Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mrs. Byrne. No—Mr. Allen.

The SPEAKER: There are 22 Ayes and 22 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier) moved:

That the debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (24)—Messrs. Abbott, Boundy, Broomhill (teller), Max Brown, Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Venning. No—Mrs. Byrne.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. ALLISON: It is with some reservation that I support the Bill, because the Budget does nothing to assist industry and commerce to restore employment. It does not restore business confidence and has no provision for remission of tax, at a time when businessmen no longer can maintain their productivity, and they are standing off staff or hesitating to replace staff that has already been retrenched. According to the Associated Chambers of Manufactures (and I believe the member for Flinders has made a similar comment earlier this evening), two-thirds of small businesses

in Australia are at present in danger of collapse. One source of advisory assistance of which they may have availed themselves (namely, the South Australian Industrial Research Institute) is to be closed down soon, and we have been told that this is for economic reasons.

This point probably is a minor issue in the present economic circumstances but it is significant. It represents the frame of mind that the Government is in at present. It is also significant that small businesses employ 42 per cent of our work force, and it is no secret that bankruptcies and voluntary liquidations are at an all-time high level. The lack of incentives in this State is making Victoria, for example, a much more attractive proposition and a more attractive State for industry and commerce. We should be considering offering similar incentives to the ones that the Victorian Minister (Mr. Murray Byrne) is offering in the form of decentralisation, offers of cheaper land, and remission of rates and of certain taxes for specified periods. At least in rural cities we had hoped for some similar assistance, especially when one recalls that past promises made by the Treasurer have stressed the importance of decentralisation in South Australia.

We must compete with other States on equal terms if we are to prevent the loss of business to other States. Indeed, South Australia's having a slightly lower level of unemployment by comparison with other States may in part be because workmen are seeking employment in other States, being unable to find it here. Our population growth rate certainly is nearer to zero than it has been at any other time since the Second World War. Although employers bear the brunt of taxation, they are in a small minority. For example, in Mount Gambier 6.6 per cent of the work force comprises employers and 8 per cent comprises persons who are self-employed, the remainder, nearly 86 per cent, being employees, so some taxation relief for that small minority would help to safeguard the jobs of the vast majority, but the Budget before us takes no such action.

Political leaders in Government and in Opposition are making gloomy economic predictions. Business and banking forecasts only this week pointed out that the slight economic upsurge of May and June probably was only a natural rebound from the record low in February, and that private sector spending, on the upsurge for July and August, was again diminishing, with another down-turn imminent. By January, 1976, the Department of Labour and Immigration expects, there will be 30 000 South Australians out of work, including at least one-third of school leavers (5 000 out of 15 000). Prospects are bleak indeed for the young people in obtaining employment in industry. On the other hand, inflation was about 15 per cent in the May-July quarter of this year and has been predicted to reach "only" 18 per cent within a year, despite the Commonwealth Government Budget approach of tightening funds, creating more unemployment in the private sector, allowing for increased growth in the public sector, and including in budgeted figures a 21 per cent increase in taxation revenue in expectation of an 18 per cent inflation rate.

This is a natural result, we would assume, of the Commonwealth Government's inability to control inflation. Our Budget contains none of the aids to industry and commerce that were sought earlier this year by the Metal Trades Association, which employs 46 per cent of the manufacturing work force and which predicts massive retrenchments and cut-backs. A spokesman for the association stated that any action now was survival action, and his association sought a 10 per cent reduction in company tax, an increase in depreciation allowances, restoration of the

investment allowance to 40 per cent, and urgent action to reduce inflation. Extravagant Government expenditure has placed us in an almost inextricable dilemma. According to United Kingdom economist Arthur Shenfield, who visited Australia in an advisory capacity earlier this year, inflation is caused only by Governments who initially like it because it automatically finances their economies and pays for "free" social reforms, but no Government has been able to control inflation easily. The child of government's creation has proved to be a monster.

Shenfield has said that unemployment in Australia is unavoidable in our present situation. Unemployment is a natural outcome of inflation, as confidence is destroyed and business closes down. It is also a by-product of the Government's present cure for inflation, namely, the freezing of funds. Shenfield states:

Sound, uninflated money is essential if prosperity and a high level of employment (not so-called full employment, which is a mirage) are to rest upon stable foundations.

Having ridden to power on the back of inflation and grandiose social spending programmes, Shenfield says, such Government's usually blame the workers, the unions, foreigners, speculators, etc., and create more money because the taxpayer cannot meet the bills for social reform. The brakes must be applied somewhere, first by reducing the Government's own spending and, above all, by careful accounting to ensure that full value is obtained for each \$1 spent. Shenfield also points to two areas very relevant to the Budget before us. The Treasurer already has stated his intentions to impose wage restraint legislation soon.

Shenfield points out that all attempts in history at wage and price controls have failed. He refers to the periods of Diocletian over 2 000 years ago, Robespierre during the French revolution, and Great Britain since the Second World War. He also refers to the period of President Nixon in 1971. Shenfield says:

Freeze wages and you have employers offering other incentives—

the sweetheart deals we have heard of recently—

Workers envy other workers and unions oppose unions, depending on whether an increase was achieved or missed before the freeze, and union activists breed and flourish in this environment.

Already we can see examples of this in the current reactions of unions to the Treasurer's statement. Price controls lead to blackmarket, poorer service and quality, and pruning by manufacturers who cannot raise the price and so take other alternatives. Queues, delivery delays, erosion of business profit and a slackening of investment all follow price control.

One must assume that the Treasurer, capable Treasurer as he is, is well aware of all this. One therefore has to assume that the steady expansion of Public Service growth is intentional and that the series of mini-Budgets that raise motor vehicle licence and registration fees, land tax, stamp duty on cheques, third party insurance charges, conveyance fees, tobacco franchise tax, liquor licence fees, petrol tax, and the massive \$13 000 000 increase in income from water rates, plus the expected 21 per cent increase from pay-roll tax receipts (a total of \$126 000 000 being expected) are predominantly to meet Public Service needs at the expense of the private sector, which does carry the taxation load.

The Leader of the Opposition already has adequately quoted statistics on projected growth of this sector in the current year, and I do not intend to repeat them. Suffice to say that, in the Treasurer's own department, there is evidence of need for restraint but little evidence of restraint. It is a minor point but, again, is indicative of a state of mind. It is interesting that, while the Engineering and

Water Supply Department rates will bring in an additional \$13 000 000, that department's own expenditure, quoted in the same document, is to increase by only \$5 600 000. Therefore, like the electricity service, water supply is another revenue provider of increasing importance to the Treasurer. The Budget for 1974-75 had an estimated expenditure of \$774 600 000, and actual expenditure was \$829 000 000. The estimated expenditure for the current year is \$1 051 000 000, an increase of 35 per cent on the estimated expenditure for the last year and 27 per cent on the actual expenditure for last year. These figures are far, far ahead of that earlier quoted expected inflation figure of 18 per cent given by banking officials earlier this week.

So, we are making tremendous provision in the current Budget, and there does not seem to be any logical reasoning behind it. We ended up this year \$8 000 000 in credit because of additional tax revenue of \$15 000 000, public works additional revenue of \$13 000 000, and grants from the Commonwealth of \$44 000 000. These were not the Treasurer's management figures from the beginning of the last financial year, but were rather fortuitous, and we must add, of course, the sale of the railroad. One hopes that the current year's actual expenditure will be much closer to the estimated expenditure. Certainly, there is provision for a remarkable \$82 000 000 increase in salary and wage rates in expectation of wage restraint not being effective. However, there is a great deal of guesswork involved, and businessmen are faced with the same guesswork dilemma at the moment; they cannot budget accurately for wages, taxes, superannuation, long service leave, and so on, because the Full Bench of the Arbitration Commission in Melbourne has been sitting already for seven weeks to decide whether to grant a 3.5 per cent increase for the June quarter (that is, the last financial year), based on the consumer price index for that quarter. When will the current quarter's index be decided? So much for the intention of brief quarterly hearings to fix wage increases.

One must make specific reference to Medibank and its impact on our Budget. The Commonwealth Treasurer is fresh back from the United States of America, where he has been attending an International Monetary Conference. He is predicting a gloomy situation for the coming year, saying that recovery will be extremely slow. He is having problems financing Medibank, as we had predicted earlier. Today, it is reported from Canberra that already Australia has a \$1 000 000 000 deficit for July and August. Based on those figures, it will be a \$6 000 000 000 deficit by the end of the current financial year, and that is not a slow recovery, but a fast decline. Here in South Australia we are told that the financial problems of the 1975-76 Budget have been eased considerably by the State's entering into an agreement with the Australian Government to conduct and finance its hospital system under Medibank agreements. Under the agreement the Australian Government and the State each meet half the net operating costs of recognised hospitals. I have grave doubts as to the accuracy of cost estimates for 1975-76 in view of the Commonwealth Treasurer's present gloomy approach to Medibank finance.

Dr. Tonkin: They are not going to get the money, and they will be left in the lurch.

Mr. ALLISON: That is quite a subtle point. I have grave doubts as to the accuracy of Medibank costing and, in view of apparent errors in Commonwealth costing, the bill for Medibank has not even begun to be repaid. Even now we are paying for our hospitalisation through local government rates (they have not been remitted), State taxation, Federal taxation, and hospital fund contributions which I have been told to keep up and which I feel sure

I am wise to keep up, because otherwise I would have to meet the additional 15 per cent that Medibank does not cover. While this may be a point for members opposite to laugh at, I have three pensioners lobbying me in Mount Gambier because they were not told they would have to pay the extra 15 per cent not covered by Medibank. These people are pensioners, deserted wives, who have a bill for seven days hospital accommodation at \$20 a day, a total of \$140, because they had not been told that, if they asked for their own doctor to attend them, as had been their practice previously—

Mr. Keneally: Have you explained this?

Mr. ALLISON: I have, yes, but they were not told by the authorities, either Federal or local, and they have a bill for \$140. It is shameful. Under the previous pension system they would not have had such a problem, but they have it now. The only certain conclusions are that costs here will continue to rise, that the Budget before us represents an admission by the Treasurer that inflation will not be controlled in the next 12 months, that Federal policies in relation to inflation and employment are also South Australia's policies, that private enterprise will not be lifted from its current acutely depressed state, that creation of non-productive Public Service jobs will continue unabated and, concomitantly, our gross national product will continue to fall as it has done for the past 10 years, that we—

Mr. Keneally: For the last 10 years?

Mr. ALLISON: Yes, it has been dropping for 10 years. Just check the statistics, which are easily produced; they are in the Parliamentary Library. We alone continue to emulate Britain which, almost alone of European nations, is suffering from an excess of social welfare; in our case, it is too much too soon, while in their case it is too much for too long. Also, like Britain, our solutions to inflation and unemployment should have been implemented far earlier, far more vigorously. We ignored the signs. I only hope that this State does not get a reputation of having that famous old-time signature tune:

Once we had a railroad, now it's gone.

Buddy, can you spare a dime?

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I wish to make only a few comments in relation to the Budget. First, it seems to be, at least outwardly, once of the most responsible Budgets we have seen in this House for the past 10 or 15 years.

Dr. Tonkin: Outwardly, yes.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I say that because it is a balanced Budget. It is the first time that we have not been pretending we can find money on trees and that we can continue spending money we do not have, hoping miraculously to recover it either from reimbursements from the Commonwealth Treasury by way of direct grants or through the Grants Commission. The Budget shows a \$25 300 000 effective surplus, and in the Budget papers the Treasurer states that he hopes to set this aside for the year 1976-77. However, we are looking at a Budget of \$1 051 000 000 and so we need a shift of only 2½ per cent in costs to completely wipe out that \$25 000 000.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: But those costs have been taken into account.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Thank you; the costs have been taken into account. Let us look now at the rest of it.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I can see you are in trouble.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am not in trouble. According to the Budget papers, we are up for an expenditure of \$953 000 000, and we have allowed \$80 000 000 for increases

in salaries and wages and \$18 000 000 for increases in costs and charges. That money at this moment is set aside, not committed. It amounts to only 11 per cent of the Budget. If we add 11 per cent and 2½ per cent, if we have an inflationary factor of a modest 13½ per cent, we have dissipated the funds set aside and also the reserve we hoped to have for next year. I believe there is every possibility that this will happen. At page 3403 of *Hansard* on June 17, 1975, in reply to a question by the member for Elizabeth in relation to the Railways (Transfer Agreement Bill), the Treasurer said:

As to 1975-76, papers sent to the Australian Treasury for the purposes of the Premiers' Conference forecast, on the present basis (without special arrangements), a deficit of \$58 000 000 for 1975-76, on the assumption of an increase of 22½ per cent in wage rates.

Referring to this matter in the Budget papers, the Treasurer said:

We are budgeting on the rate of a 21 per cent increase in costs and wages during the year.

So, we are budgeting for a 21 per cent increase in the rate of inflation, and have set aside 13½ per cent to counter it. The Treasurer also made the interesting comment, when introducing the Budget, that pay-roll tax was expected to be \$126 000 000. That is based on the assumption that the rate of increase in salary and wages will be 21 per cent. If it is not 21 per cent but only 14 per cent as allowed for in the Budget, we will be well and truly down the drain in relation to these surpluses. Although outwardly the Budget seems to be a good one and to have been balanced, certain assumptions are being made concerning possible income and reserves.

The total outcome of the whole exercise is that, if inflation does not occur at the rate of 21 per cent, the State will not get its income from pay-roll tax. If the rate of inflation exceeds 14 per cent, the Government will have dissipated the reserves that have been set aside for contingencies. I should like to make another point about the Budget, and this applies to all Budgets: there is always an element of doubt regarding the accuracy of the Budget papers that are presented to Parliament. I say that because of the practice that has been common in the Public Service of looking at what has been spent previously, adding a factor of, say, 15 per cent or 21 per cent, or whatever it is (in most cases they seem to have allowed 21 per cent this year), and then advancing that as the expenditure that is considered necessary in relation to the department concerned for the current financial year.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That is not a reflection on the Treasury when you say that, is it?

Mr. NANKIVELL: No, it is not.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Or the Public Service?

Mr. NANKIVELL: No, the Public Service merely puts forward the proposals. However, it is not responsible in this regard and, if the Minister cares to continue reading what the Auditor-General has to say on this matter, he will know that this is not my assumption but the statement of a servant of this Parliament regarding these matters. On page 1 of his report, the Auditor-General says:

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. If the Minister wants me to, I will reflect on those departments, as well as on his own department, if he is not careful, with the authority of the Auditor-General. The Auditor-General continues:

Consideration of these matters now falls within the province of the Financial Management Advisory Committee which was appointed by the Public Service Board.

It was indeed a forward step by the Public Service Board in setting up that committee, the members of which are available to advise departments if requested to do so. However, they have authority to give advice only when it is requested, and I have heard that their advice is not being sought and, indeed, that their presence is not always appreciated. The committee has been set up by the Public Service Board, which has, as I understand it, the responsibility of overseeing the efficiency of Government departments. It must ascertain whether appointments are warranted (containing appointments in the Public Service), and ensure that money is properly spent.

I suggest that, progressively, if the Financial Management Advisory Committee is listened to, the Treasury is able to put pressure on departments, and notice is taken of what the Auditor-General says, the system of budgeting that is applied in the Public Service will be similar to that which applies in the private sector, in which each section of a department is asked responsibly to set out what its estimates of costs and expenditure will be, and it is then accountable for any variations from that figure. This does not happen at present, and any amount of examples are referred to in the Auditor-General's report, pointing out the weaknesses in budgeting in departments and the need in most, not all, departments for more care and consideration to be given to this area. Regarding the Education Department, the Auditor-General says on page 73 of his report:

In the preparation of the annual estimates for submission to the Treasury, the requirements of the individual schools are not used as a basis, the broad allocations of expenditure mentioned earlier being used generally.

In other words, we get a generalised, not a specific, Budget. One takes the total budget for a section of a department and it is not itemised. No assessment is made of what it will cost to run a certain school. This is probably not known and, if it costs more and something goes wrong, there is no means of accounting for it. If we are to run government as efficiently as we claim we are hoping to run it, we will take our budgeting responsibilities down to this level.

The Minister for the Environment has, unfortunately, now left the Chamber. I told him that I would make specific references to his department, and I am sorry that he is not now here. Dealing with budgeting and control of expenditure in the Minister's department, the Auditor-General said:

In relation to comments on this matter in my previous report, the department has introduced certain new budgeting procedures to improve control. These are still under review, and consideration is also being given to certain other related matters which I have since raised with the department.

This department will be the subject of a report to be tabled in the House, I presume tomorrow or next week, by the Public Accounts Committee. If members read that report regarding the committee's inquiry into budgeting control in this department they will find that, although outwardly the department is trying to implement a system of control, it has not achieved the desired objectives. In fact, it probably leaves much to be desired and, as will be seen when the report is tabled, the committee has been critical of the department. I refer also to the State Government Insurance Commission, which this year had an excess of income over expenditure of \$414 644, a great improvement on the previous year's deficit of \$323 789. But in arriving at that figure, which we are told is virtually the profitable return from State Government insurance, the Auditor-General says:

Expenditure shown on the following statement includes certain items but does not include any charges for use of premises, telephones, electricity and cleaning.

It is strange that this sort of thing crops up frequently in the Auditor-General's comments regarding certain departments. He makes specific reference to this under the heading of "Public Buildings Department", when he says, at page 201:

Irrespective of the better control being exercised by the department, it is still considered that the costs of works carried out by the Public Buildings Department should be charged against budgets of the client departments, which would then be responsible for the expenditure involved.

Looking at that figure, we have no idea whether or not the State Government Insurance Commission has shown a profit. We do not know what the costs are of hiring of premises, of telephones, or of other incidentals relating to the premises occupied by the commission, so the figures here are not figures in which we can place much confidence. They show initially that there was an excess of income over expenditure for the year.

I now refer to the Hospitals Department, which is one of the largest departments administered by the Public Service. On page 130, under the heading "Internal audit and control", the Auditor-General states:

The lack of effective internal audit and controls over many activities was commented upon in reports to the department during the year. With the growth in volume and the scope of activities of the department the necessity for internal audit has increased. Internal audit should inform management whether laid down procedures are being followed and are effective for control purposes, enable remedial action to be taken where necessary before a situation gets out of hand and carry out a continuous check on the collection of receipts, validity of payments and general accuracy of the accounting records.

In this department there is a tremendous amount of expenditure and all sorts of things can happen. The Auditor-General refers to the fact that unnecessary expense is incurred in hiring taxis for the use of patients when other forms of transport could be used. Outwardly, this Budget looks to be a good Budget, but I believe that, at the end of this financial year, unless inflation is held (as it may well be with a change of Government), there will inevitably be a deficit, notwithstanding the apparently good situation we find ourselves in as a result of having sold out the railways and having entered into what is initially, anyway, a reasonably good proposition for the Government in respect of Medibank. I say only "initially": we have an initial benefit that will be gradually whittled away because of the added responsibility the State has had to accept—the capital costs of building improvements of all recognised hospitals, which in itself has meant an increase of about \$27 000 000 this year in the Budget, and these costs will continue to escalate.

Also, some of the remissions we previously received from the Commonwealth in respect of pharmaceutical benefits as well as half the cost for hospitalisation of tubercular patients will not now be paid; so the position will not be all that good in the end. As was said by the member for Mount Gambier, in an excellent contribution to this debate, the Medibank fees do not cover the cost of a bed. In the Royal Adelaide Hospital the cost is \$20 a day for a bed and all that is paid towards the cost of a bed is \$16, the patient being billed for the other \$4; so there is no free hospitalisation, even in a Medibank bed in a Government hospital.

Dr. Eastick: Are you suggesting the Government went in for something it did not understand?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am suggesting it did not have a clue. In the long term, if we are not careful, we shall find that it is an incubus around our neck: instead of being a bonanza and of benefit to the State, the people will find it will cost the State more and they will get a second-class medical service.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. NANKIVELL: I wish to say something further about the accuracy of this statement with respect to Government department costing and budgeting. We have been very careful, except in the Hospitals Department where an exception is made, to show pay-roll tax and any terminal leave payments, in addition to long service leave payments. We are being very careful with these things but, whereas we are showing these sorts of costs against a department, we are not showing the ordinary day-to-day running costs of a department. Unless a department occupies its own premises, we have no idea what its costs are, because the whole of the building, the lighting, the repairs, the maintenance, the telephones, the carpeting, etc., is provided for the respective departments by the Public Buildings Department and at this moment, to the best of my knowledge, no charge is made for these services by the Public Buildings Department to the client. The Public Buildings Department carries all of that and, until there is an apportionment of these costs to the respective departments, notwithstanding some of this other information we are getting, such as in respect of pay-roll tax, for instance, which is an extraordinary thing to put in here because, after all, we are only taxing ourselves (we are putting it here to try to show what the department is actually costing), we shall not have a factual costing of what most of the buildings now occupied by Government departments, or leased premises, are costing.

We may get a nearer estimate with leased buildings, because we should know what is being paid for the respective leases; but, where floor space is being hired by a Government department, and until some costing is made and it is shown as a debit against the department, we shall not know what it is costing to run that department, in the true sense of the word.

The member for Davenport mentioned the reference made by the Treasurer to the Unit for Industrial Democracy. That sounds very good, but there is only a modest amount of money set aside for it. I noticed another interesting figure. I do not wish to be uncharitable, but I noticed in the provision under expenses for the Premier a sum of \$50 000 for overseas travel. I suspect that this would be an interesting area for the Treasurer to investigate—in West Germany and in the Scandinavian countries where, as the member for Davenport says, this principle is developed to some extent. However, \$50 000 is a lot of money to set aside for travelling. It is three times the amount that was allocated to the Leader of the Opposition for travelling overseas. My point on this is simple: there is every reason to involve the work force in decision-making as far as the operation is concerned.

I believe that there is job satisfaction in being able to participate in a decision on how to carry out a certain job in which a person is involved. I say advisedly that, from experience, once a member is moved from the floor, as we call it, to the board room, he ceases to be a member of the movement to which he originally belonged. He moves into an area in which he has no friends: he does not belong to the board people, because initially he associated himself with the workers, and the workers do not want

him, because they do not trust him as he is on the board. That is not the only problem.

The biggest problem today for management is that it is charged with the responsibility of efficiently operating a company, of initiating plans, working out and costing projects and submitting them for approval, endorsement or rejection. The principal function of a company is to operate productively. Let us be honest: it must operate profitably. What we are faced with today is many unprofitable companies and, because they are unprofitable and no capital investment is taking place, job opportunities do not exist. One of the problems we will have to face up to when it comes to putting workers on the board is that we will have a conflict of interests straight away: we will not reconcile those interests.

People on the board will be actually representing individual views that are not necessarily in the best interests of the company. After all, if the company fails, the worker has no job, and if the company is unprofitable, no-one wants to invest in it. That is one of the greatest dangers in this kind of exercise. If we place people on a board representing union movements and promoting a special section over and above any others, we will not reconcile the interests, because they will be promoting their own interests. I am involved in this, and I know: there will be a conflict of interests that is not in the best interests of the worker or the company but, at a lower level of decision-making than the board, there is much room for involvement. I believe that much more co-operation is needed in this area. When we get to the top level, the conflict of interests will be such that it could destroy the company.

This Budget sinks or swims on the fact of certain things happening. We have the commitment here of substantial moneys from the Commonwealth Government and, if we do not get those moneys, we could be in serious difficulties. At the moment, we can see just by looking at the Estimates of Revenue the sum of \$83 000 000 (outside reimbursements under the Financial Agreement), namely, \$75 000 000 for hospitals and \$8 000 000 for education. If anything should happen to interfere with the payment of those moneys, I believe that the Budget, even though I have said that outwardly it looks good because it is balanced (although I have criticised certain aspects of it), may not be worth the paper it is printed on. I support the second reading.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen) moved:

That the debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Vandepeer, Venning, and Wotton (teller).

Noes (26)—Messrs. Abbott, Boundy, Broomhill, Max Brown, Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Eastick, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne (teller), Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wardle, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Mathwin. No—Mrs. Byrne.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. WOTTON: I support the second reading, but I am extremely unhappy about the effect that the Budget will have on primary production in South Australia. The Budget will do nothing at all to solve the problem of inflation, nor will it provide the incentives to primary producers that are so vitally needed. Some time ago I

was amazed to hear a learned speaker on agriculture say that he did not know why young people were leaving agriculture and leaving the family property. I do not confess to being a learned man, but I think I know why young people are leaving agriculture: there is no incentive in primary production today. In the dictionary, "incentive" is defined as being something that arouses a feeling for action or something that stimulates enthusiasm. Very few people today have the feeling for action, and there are very few whose enthusiasm has been stimulated. Today, "success" is almost a dirty word. We have reached the stage where the complete removal of incentive has resulted in there being no encouragement for people to lift themselves above the average.

Primary producers are not willing to expand production, because of the lack of incentive. Young people leave the land because they are not encouraged to stay there. This lack of incentive has occurred because of the inflationary situation and because of the massive increases in direct State taxation, death duties, succession duties, stamp duties, land tax, and gift duty, and because of the long hours and the high cost of labour. Why should primary producers work harder? Why should they risk their money? Why should they develop ulcers while they seek to improve their businesses or their family properties? Why should they make their properties more efficient or employ more people? They realise that, if they do those things, more money will go to the Government.

Primary producers' problems are different from those of other producers. Many primary products are sold at world parity prices. As a result, the primary producer cannot pass on to the purchaser the increased cost of production. It is extremely important that, while Australia is suffering from vast inflationary pressures, we should establish a degree of cost stability in the rural sector. It is vitally important that rural producers today be given back the incentive to increase production efficiency. I wish to refer to a letter to the Editor published recently in the *Advertiser*. The letter was written by a constituent of the member for Stuart; I wish the honourable member was here now. The letter, from a Port Augusta resident pointing out some of the problems that country people are facing today, is as follows:

"You are so lucky to live in the country." How often this is heard. It was a good life, but those days are past. The rise in all costs, and the inability to pass them on, is all but destroying the means of country people to make a living. Do city dwellers, while certainly having to worry about their own financial affairs, ever consider what costs and difficulties country people have to face? Their only means of communication is by post or telephone—charges for these are increasing. Goods and stores have to be carted by rail or road—extra cost and imminent rises. To go anywhere, they have to travel by car or public transport—fares are increasing.

Prices for cattle, sheep and wool are down. Labour is hard to get and mostly inexperienced, hours are long. Goods ordered often take weeks to arrive; no-one seems interested once an order has been placed.

There is a solution—move all the country people to the city, where they could work a five-day week (or less); join in stop-work meetings and strikes; go to, and participate in sport if they wish; see films, plays and concerts, have access to all services. See their friends instead of telephoning or writing, and send their children to State schools and not have to worry about board for them, or teaching them by correspondence.

So much for the good life in the country! Whatever happened to the word "incentive"? I shall turn now to problems associated with the beef industry. I was going to say that last Monday and last Thursday I had the "pleasure" of attending the markets at Mount Barker and Strathalbyn; however, I believe that those two markets

were anything but pleasing. It gave no-one satisfaction to see \$6 and less being paid for yearling beasts that dressed at about 110 kg. Other producers received accounts for handling charges. Some beasts were virtually given away, with costs, and some were sold for \$2, with \$1.75 being deducted for freight. Many beasts that went through that market did not even realise the auctioneer's fees, let alone freight and feeding costs. There were reports of farmers feeding calves to pigs because they could not give the calves away. Is that incentive? Is that encouragement? There is certainly no enthusiasm there. How can there be incentive when calves are given away or sold for 20c? They were not even worth sending to the market. We have been told by the Chairman of Dalgety Australia (Mr. Vines) that we can expect another difficult year in relation to beef export markets, with little prospect of any price improvement. I refer to a report in the *News* of August 26, which stated:

Food costs more in Adelaide than in any other capital city.

Reading more of that report, I found that the biggest price increase in food in Adelaide was for meat, T-bone steaks having increased by 6.7c to 106.2c a pound. The Commonwealth Government arranged for the sale of 40 000 tonnes of Australian beef to Russia, and the shipping costs of \$6 000 000 were paid by the Government, but producers were forced to accept 9c a pound for their product. We often hear that an increase in the cost of living results from an increase in the price of potatoes or onions, and that a decrease in the cost of living results from a reduction in price of those same commodities.

Last year a tonne of potatoes cost \$300, while this year a tonne costs only \$60 or, if we are lucky, \$80. Last year onions were \$250 a tonne and this year, if we are lucky, it will be \$100 to \$120 a tonne. What about the extra labour costs? What about the increase in cost of fertilisers, seeds, sprays, and the overall costs of production? How can there be any incentive for farmers when prices go down so drastically from one year to the next? We have received a report from the Past President of the South Australian Stud Beef Cattle Producers Association (Mr. Norris), who said that beef could be imported to South Australia from the Eastern States and sold in our local markets more cheaply than South Australian beef could be sold. He went on to say that this situation was partly caused by massive killing charges.

Regarding wool, Mr. J. A. Mitchell, the new Federal President of the Wool Textile Manufacturers Association of Australia stated that further amalgamation and factory closures were inevitable in the wool industry, because of the lack of profitability in the industry. He said this could precipitate further cuts in employment, especially in country centres. I repeat, this Budget will do nothing to help primary production in South Australia. Primary production suffers even more through falling crop yields and higher production costs. This problem will increase if the superphosphate bounty is not restored. This bounty is not a handout: it is a basic factor in the future pattern of agricultural production in Australia; it can be classed as an encouragement.

Much has been said in this debate about small business, and I should like to make a few points. Several speakers have said that the Budget does little to encourage small business in South Australia. Those of us who have been involved in running a small business realise how much inflation has put small companies under extreme financial pressure. In this Budget the Government has taken no steps to help the private sector, and the people involved

will acknowledge the importance of effective competition as an incentive to creativity and productivity. Small businesses provide the opportunity for the expression of independence, initiative and enterprise. They foster competition and encourage special talents and technical skills.

Much of the industrial structure on which Australia has grown as a nation depends on supporting facilities, which are provided by small business. The first step towards success in any occupation is for one to be interested in that occupation, to have the incentive to do a good days work, and to be rewarded accordingly. The impact of increased taxation on salaries, along with the struggle to keep pace with inflation, is certainly affecting the attitudes of South Australians to their jobs. Not every Australian wants to learn new skills and improve himself or his position, but those who do soon begin to wonder whether their efforts are worthwhile if they do not reap a certain reward.

People with incentive and encouragement will use their skills, determination and enterprise, and they will become prime movers in starting new businesses, employing other Australians and paying the wide-ranging Commonwealth and State taxes to help this nation. People without the incentive, who realise that their rewards are not worthy of their effort and are aware of the risk involved in small business will seek jobs that give more satisfaction and demand less responsibility. These people may become involved in large organisations. Governments and their agencies: they will leave small businesses. For this reason, small businesses run the risk of losing their thinking workers, yet these are the people that small businesses can least afford to lose.

It is generally regarded that inflation destroys the long-held belief that the greater the effort by the individual the greater his reward in the form of higher standards of living. People in Australia, as well as in South Australia have the potential, and we have the human resources, but until we as primary producers, or any other people involved in business, get back our incentive we will not be fulfilling our proper role in the community. Only with incentive will we become more prosperous as individuals, as South Australians, and as a nation.

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): I rise to support the second reading with much apprehension about its effect on our community if certain aspects of the Budget are implemented. I refer, first, to the funds South Australia will receive from the Commonwealth Government, to which the member for Mallee has referred, and, secondly, to the inflationary trend on which this Budget relies. As has been stated, a 2 per cent error in calculations can severely affect the Budget. The Budget does not relate to the productive capacity of our State. This is something that the Government does not seem to understand. I would dearly like to run my business or farm on similar lines, but unfortunately there are certain people to whom I would have to answer and who would not allow that to happen: bank managers and stock firms would soon be telling me to pull my horns in and look at my production.

On examining the Budget documents as a newcomer to this House, it seems that budgeting in the State is an exercise that has little regard for good housekeeping, the thought in mind being that, if we have trouble, we appeal to the big boss in Canberra to help us out of the trouble. Then we come back from Canberra and, if we are in trouble again before the end of the financial year, we go back there. For many years we have heard of the annual trek by State Treasurers to Canberra. It seems to be quickly developing into a six-monthly trek, and it may become a

three-monthly one. In fact, if it continues in this way, we will be down to a monthly trek or perhaps even a weekly one, and then we will have the inevitable Canberra take-over.

Being a man from the country, I must mention the iniquitous land tax that is being increased by a further \$6 434 000. We in the country know what land tax has done to us in the past year or two, with land valuations having increased by 200 or 300 per cent. In many cases the tax has increased by as much as 10 times, and that has been a colossal increase at a time when people cannot find the money to meet it. We were led to believe that equalisation would bring some relief, but the only thing that it has relieved has been the Treasury, because, instead of increasing land tax in one-fifth of the State in one colossal jump, it equalised it out and increased it over all the State in a nice little jump. Equalisation was a misnomer to us when we found out what had really happened.

Education is of much interest to us all, and expenditure on education is very high. I do not deplore increases in expenditure on education, provided they are kept within reason and we begin to see something for the money that we spend. These factors must be considered always and we must provide a balance in educating our young people in the best of conditions, with the best of well-trained teachers and with ample support equipment to enable the teachers to educate our children in the best possible way. However, the increases taking place in this field at present cannot really be absorbed by the departments concerned without wasting money. Colossal organisation is needed to absorb the infusion of capital amounts of the kind being forced into the Education Departments at present. While these large amounts are being pushed into education, the book allowance for children has been increased to a maximum of, I think, \$35 a child.

If I remember correctly, some time ago an election promise was made that there would be free books for schoolchildren. Considering that promise and the huge infusion of money into education, I think that raising the book allowance from \$32 to \$35 is paltry, mean and miserable. It is typical of the present Government's attitude. Pre-school education is to be improved and, in many respects, made free by the end of the decade. That is very worthy, and I commend the Government on that programme. I hope it adheres to the programme and gives the children the pre-school education that our Party also has promised them.

Our programme on health must be continued, and other members of my Party have explained the problems that are arising with Medibank. The welfare programme also is being expanded. I do not begrudge expansion in welfare, but I think it deplorable that, in a country like Australia, which has one of the highest living standards in the world, we must recruit social welfare workers from overseas. Where will they be recruited from? I suppose the Government will take them out of the slums of London or Sheffield or from somewhere in Germany, where they are needed much more than here. For a Government to do that (a Government devoted to the welfare state and socialisation and to helping the less fortunate nations) is, I feel, utter hypocrisy.

It is high time we considered the system that we are using to train people in this country. They are the ones who can do most good, and we should draw the social workers from here. To recruit them from overseas is as bad a policy as was the policy that was suggested of recruiting doctors

from South-East Asia to help Medibank, again recruiting from countries that needed them more than did our society, with one of the highest living standards in the world. I repeat that I consider that that type of attitude on the part of the present Government is utter hypocrisy.

I must refer to housing and the complete failure of this Government to honour its old-time promise to provide housing for people, for workers. That has been one of the big catchcries of the Labor organisation for many years, and it is commendable. We do need such housing, but the Government has failed miserably in this approach. The problem of housing will be one of the biggest problems that my district will have to face in the next few years. There has been much talk about low-cost housing for the workers but, when I see the housing that has been provided in my district to a commendable standard when it was built, I feel that we could not provide low-cost housing any more cheaply or lower standards any further. Otherwise, we would be in dire trouble with the development of slums and lower-class areas. Our average standards are not sufficiently high now, without their going any lower. We need a completely new appraisal of housing and house construction. Perhaps we need to bring the think-tank theory into the construction of houses, to look from a radical angle at means of constructing houses in the future and of bringing in concepts much more modern and advanced than those in use today. We need a radical look at housing construction to see whether we can do something about providing people with houses at costs lower than those pertaining today. At the moment, housing costs are escalating rapidly, making it impossible for people to own their own houses. What is more, if we look at the matter carefully, we realise that it is becoming impossible for us to have houses at all. If we cannot build houses and own them ourselves, the Government will have to do it, and someone must pay. We should never forget that, no matter what we do, someone must pay.

I support the remarks of the member for Heysen regarding the lack of incentive in the agricultural industry. I was surprised to find, during the recent Royal Show, that two of my friends who spent some time there told me that they were surprised and concerned about the attitude found amongst farmers at the show. Several farmers said, "What the heck: if it doesn't rain, does it matter? We have no incentive to work." They looked at the big machinery and said, "We can't afford it, but again, does it matter? We have no incentive to work or to produce." That philosophy is extremely dangerous, and I mention it as a general trend in agriculture today.

The Beef Industry Assistance Scheme has been a complete failure. No assistance seems to be forthcoming. Almost \$3 000 000 is available in the kitty to assist but, because of the restrictive conditions for receiving assistance, little of this money is being used. The matter should be looked at with a critical eye to see whether beef producers can be assisted. I suggest that we should look at the tuberculosis and brucellosis eradication campaign and perhaps move some of the money not at present being used into that campaign to speed it up, to have action where it is badly needed. A revitalised disease eradication campaign would use a considerable amount of labour, the effects would be spread throughout the industry, and it would be an extremely good investment with stock values at such a low level.

What better time could we have to remove diseased stock from our herds? Compensation for the animals would be low, work would be provided, and the average standard

of our stock would be raised. This must be done at some time if we are to regain our export markets. Let us look ahead, for a change, and do it now. Research generally in agriculture is sadly lacking, and money is not being provided in many fields. South Australia has been a leading agricultural State, largely because of our forward-looking approach to research.

One aspect sadly lacking finance at the moment is research into the sitona weevil. This little insect pest attacks legume crops in South Australia and throughout Australia. It attacks lucerne crops in the South-East, as well as seed crops and fodder crops. It attacks all the medics in the cereal-growing areas. These plants are the basis of our pasture and cereal production. The legume story should be known to all, and I shall not recite it now. The farmers of South Australia know full well how important is the legume. The sitona weevil was brought in from overseas countries 10 or 15 years ago on a ship that had not been properly fumigated, and it was let loose in a climate it found most acceptable, with none of its natural predators about. It is playing havoc with our nitrogen-producing legumes in a manner that is most deceiving. Scientists have told me that no-one really knows just what the impact of this insect will be in the next few years. It attacks the leaves which are visible, but, more importantly, when it is not attacking the leaves of the plant it is attacking the nitrogen-producing nodules on the roots. That is one factor that is missed by many people. They forget about the weevil, but when it is not working on the leaves it is under the ground destroying the nitrogen fixing nodules.

Research in this field is badly needed, although it has been commenced. I understand the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation is doing excellent work in France, looking at the predators of this insect, but in South Australia we have been delayed by the transfer of a scientist to Western Australia, and we are now falling behind. I ask the Government to look closely at this situation and to promote more research in this subject. It is of vital importance, and no-one knows what impact it will have. The pest has arrived at a time when farmers are using a considerable quantity of artificial nitrogenous fertilisers, and it is possible that they are covering up the effects of the insect by using this nitrogen. One day it will hit very hard, when we realise how much we have lost with the loss of our legumes. We cannot grow our cereal crops or our pastures purely by using artificial fertiliser, and research money is badly needed in this direction.

The fishing industry has been promised a 100 per cent increase in research money. While that is a commendable approach, when we look at the matter carefully we find that practically all of this money has been provided by the fishermen themselves from pot licences, boat registrations, and other licences. Part of the programme of licensing was to provide research money, and I find, from looking at the trust account, that it contains a considerable sum of money. If all these fees are added together, it can be seen that the Government will still have money in hand. I hope it can continue, with the money in the kitty, with research for the fishing industry, to enable that industry to expand. Perhaps the Government will be a little more generous and find some Loan moneys to help the industry. We are dealing with the State's productive capacity. The sitona weevil, to which I have already referred, and the fishing industry all come under the heading of production, and primary industries are the real breadwinners for this State. Indeed, they are export income

earners and are so vital to our economy. It is the usual story for the Government to forget this productive capacity; it just will not understand it. The attitudes of country men and rural producers, who play such a large part in this production, are also forgotten.

The Budget is riding on an inflationary trend at a time when inflation needs to be severely curbed. What effect this will have in future remains to be seen, but inflation in this State and in the Commonwealth generally has worried all of us for a considerable time, and it is dangerous to introduce a Budget that relies so much on an inflationary trend. I hope that in the next year the Government will see fit to follow the trend of the economy and, as time passes, adjust its Budget and bring the State back to some good housekeeping. This must be done with responsibility and an attitude that the Budget must be based on the State's productive capacity. With some trepidation, I support the Bill.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the first line.

The SPEAKER: I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that the House is debating the second reading of the Bill, not the first line.

Mr. VENNING: I believe that to be so. I support the Bill. I have listened with much interest to my colleagues on this side of the Chamber.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Which ones?

Mr. VENNING: Each and every one of them, and probably one from the Government benches: the member for Playford. It was like a breath of fresh air to hear a decent speech from the other side. Opposition members have already expressed their appreciation, recognising as they do a decent speech, irrespective of who makes it. Many Opposition members who represent rural areas have expressed their concern that the Budget does nothing for the man on the land, and I confirm what has been said in this regard. The Budget contains no incentive for the primary producer. We have heard over a period of years that generally Australians like to own their own house. Today, some of the luckier Australians own their own house and are buying perhaps 8 or 12 hectares away from the rat race of the metropolitan area. Generally speaking, however, because of the present financial position, the people are unable to buy a house today.

The Government has said that it wants this Bill passed this week. I believe the Opposition has a responsibility to the people of South Australia to speak on the Bill so that the public will know exactly what is the State's financial position. If we allowed this debate to finish in the limited time that the Government has allotted to it, the public would not know what was the financial position. Time and time again one hears the comment in country areas that certain aspects of legislation were not known. For this reason, I believe we must take responsible action and spell out all aspects of this State's financial position. Really, it takes the Opposition to give the true picture of this situation.

I looked forward with much interest, having heard so much about the State's finances, to seeing how the Treasurer would present the Budget. Before the election, the Treasurer said that those finances were in a shocking condition. The Treasurer also said that, when he went to Canberra for the Premier's Conference, he knew what the position was on the federal scene. As a result, he pushed on the election, realising that there would be no better time at which to hold it. We all know how close the Treasurer went to becoming Leader of the Opposition on

that occasion. I remember the member for Light saying before the election, because of the indefinite situation regarding the State's finances, the Opposition would not know exactly what it could do in Government to give relief in certain areas. However, the Treasurer has come up with a planned surplus of about \$25 000 000. That is indeed a small sum of money in relation to the total Budget, and only minor irregularities in the Estimates for the various departments will be necessary for the Government to find itself in a serious financial position. I turn now to Medibank, regarding which the Treasurer said:

The financial problems of the 1975-76 Budget have been eased considerably by the State entering into an agreement with the Australian Government to conduct and finance its hospital system under the Medibank arrangements. Under the agreement the Australian Government and the State will each meet half of the net operating costs of recognised hospitals. Under the previous arrangement the State had been responsible for almost two-thirds of operating costs and, with the continued escalation of costs, it had become increasingly difficult to raise fees in order to avoid an increase in the proportion of cost falling on the Revenue Budget. The net financial benefit to the State in 1975-76 is estimated to be of the order of \$25 000 000 but for a number of reasons—

and this is the important part—

it is not possible to give this estimate with confidence.

In this evening's *News*, on the first page we see the following:

The Federal Government has run out of money and an election now seems certain before Christmas. This follows the sensational disclosure by the Opposition Leader, Mr. Fraser, today that the Government is having trouble financing Medibank.

How shall we fare if the Commonwealth Government at this early stage is having trouble with Medibank? Looking back to the Commonwealth Budget, we find that 37 per cent of the Budget was involved in financing the Medibank scheme. What a high percentage of taxation is required to finance Medibank! On the local scene, those people who have been in hospital have received little assistance from the Medibank scheme. If people sought to have a private room in a hospital, little assistance came from Medibank. I am amazed that the Treasurer, with the ability he has in certain directions, should have been hoodwinked or conned into the Medibank scheme. The people in this State will live to remember with regret the day they elected a Labor Party in this State.

One of the critical lines in the Budget concerns pay-roll tax. I mentioned this in the House a few weeks ago in a question to the Treasurer, who said that he would do something about it. The Auditor-General in his report states:

During the year amending legislation increased the rate of tax payable from 4½ per cent to 5 per cent.

When the Commonwealth controlled pay-roll tax, it was 2½ per cent but, since it has been handed over to the State, in a short period it has increased from 2½ per cent to 5 per cent. Coupled with inflation, what has it done to business in this State? Members can work that out for themselves: the effect of pay-roll tax in this State is tremendous. The Auditor-General also states:

At June, 1975, 8 328 employers were registered under the Act compared with 7 329 at June, 1974.

That is an increase in 12 months of about 1 000 who have been encircled by this web created by the effect of inflation, which has brought those additional 1 000 employers into the net of pay-roll tax. On August 6, 1975, I asked the Treasurer a question about pay-roll tax. There had been much consternation in the industrial part of my district about the effect that pay-roll tax was having on country businesses.

Consequently, I told those people I would seek from the Treasurer his reaction to being asked to consider increasing the level of exemption before this tax became payable. I asked:

Will the Treasurer consider increasing the exemption figure at which pay-roll tax becomes payable, in the light of the effect that inflation has had on true financial values and particularly in the light of his statement this afternoon that the State's finances are robust? I believe that the exemption figure, after which pay-roll tax is payable, is currently about \$20 000, and it is many years since that figure has been increased. With inflation as it is today, I believe there is room for the Treasurer to consider increasing the exemption level. Before the most recent election, he said that the State's finances had never been better and that we had money in the bank.

For that reason, I asked the Treasurer to consider giving some relief, and in his reply he said:

Immediately I have money in the bank the honourable member apparently wants me to spend it. As members opposite have from time to time accused me of being spendthrift, I am afraid I am unwilling to take up the suggestion. In relation to pay-roll tax exemptions, a study is taking place among Treasury officers of the various States. Pay-roll tax is virtually uniform throughout Australia.

I then interjected:

It doesn't have to be.

The Treasurer continued:

If it were not uniform, we would run into a number of difficulties. If the States do not agree on the uniformity of the incidence of pay-roll tax, people in other States will stop using the general principles of uniformity and competition will arise in certain areas of exemption designed to attract developments to a certain area. It was agreed from the outset by members of all political Parties in government in Australia that pay-roll tax should remain uniform. The question of the exemption level is now being discussed by Treasury officers. South Australia has been willing to raise the exemption level, but the other States, while looking at an increase in that level, believe that, with an increase in the exemption level at the lower end of the scale, the amount of tax paid at the higher end of the scale must be increased to offset the exemption. That is what is being discussed now.

If the Treasurer is honest about the situation, he will consider raising the exemption level on the basis that the member for Mitcham used in the House today when he successfully moved a motion that, in the opinion of this House, the exemption should be raised from \$20 000 to \$48 000. It would be only an honest approach for the Treasurer to do just that. I mentioned that the rate had been increased from 2½ per cent to 5 per cent in the short time since the States had taken it over, and the sum that the pay-roll tax will bring in to the Treasury during this period is astronomical. Dental health has exercised my thoughts during the past few days. Regarding dental health particularly, school clinics are under the strict supervision of the Federal Minister for Health and, as the Commonwealth finances the training of students for clinical work and largely finances the capital cost of establishing clinics throughout the State, it has a great influence on where the clinics are established and the manner in which they are established. I believe that a greater amount of co-operation and financial assistance is necessary to push the development of school dental clinics throughout the State.

The Minister of Education has said that the department plans to make facilities available by 1980 for all primary schoolchildren, but that is another five years from now. So, many children in the next five years will pass through our primary schools and not receive the dental attention they should receive. This matter needs to be closely watched. On conducting a survey in my district during the past week, I found that nowhere in the Rocky River

District were dental facilities available for children; so they must go outside the district to such places as Peterborough, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, and Adelaide to receive dental treatment. This position must be watched carefully, and the Commonwealth Government should be more sympathetic towards the State in the assistance it gives and the way in which it stipulates how the money should be used. Much has been said in this debate about housing, and I compliment the member for Fisher, who has always been genuinely concerned about housing in this State.

This State's housing position is critical and, as recently as a few weeks ago, Mr. Ramsay said that the \$10 000 000 made available under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement (as reported in the *Advertiser* on February 1) would merely keep the show on the road. That is the problem in many Government departments: the money available to them from Commonwealth and State sources is merely keeping the show on the road, and we are not getting any great productivity from those various departments. The Housing Trust is unable to carry out any long-term planning but can plan only for day-to-day requirements, whereas a few years ago (particularly under Liberal Governments), the trust was able to plan years ahead. The trust could buy 20 hectares, if necessary, for the future development of the State's housing programme, but what is the position today? All that the trust can do is to buy sufficient land for this week, a little for next week, and so on. This is most unfortunate, because one's home is an important place (and it is a pity that we are not all there right now; Opposition members have for the last two hours indicated their wish that that is where they should be).

Unless the Government is willing to accept the Auditor-General's recommendation on Housing Trust rents (and I agree entirely with him and with the comments of the member for Fisher about trust rents), I know what the position will be. A tenant can live in a house for 30 years and very little is done to increase the rent to present-day values until the house is vacated and becomes available to a new tenant. It is only then that the trust can to any degree increase the rent to present-day values. Unless the Government is willing to attend to these housing matters there will continue to be a shortage of houses in this State.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What do you charge the blokes who live in the houses on your farm?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. VENNING: Thank you, Sir. I want your Government colleagues to get their little spoke in. The late hour of evening is having its effect on them and, in order to see it out, they need to be considered.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: They are not my colleagues when I am in the Chair.

Mr. VENNING: Evidently there has been a split. Housing is one of the State's major problems, and various other aspects are associated with this problem. Earlier this evening, the member for Fisher referred to the Land Commission, and the State Planning Office can also be mentioned here with regard to the delay in building houses. The only people who suffer are the people of the State, the people the Government are supposed to be worrying about and showing so much concern for. We have heard about the quality of life, but the quality of life has never

been worse than it has been under this Government, and the people must wake up to the situation.

Mr. Gunn: They will at the next election.

Mr. VENNING: Yes, and the Government will get a rude awakening. I know that Opposition members are doing their best to get through the red tape being generated by the various bodies in order that houses may be built to the degree to which they have been built in the past. The number of houses being constructed in this State by the Housing Trust is now about 1 500, whereas the last figure under a Liberal Government was over 4 000. Today, with the more modern techniques we are supposed to have in house building and more up-to-date design, instead of 1 500 houses being built, the figure should be between 8 000 and 10 000 houses because, after all, about 16 000 applications are made each year for Housing Trust houses. For the sake of the people of this State, I hope the Budget holds. Of course, this depends very much on the Government's Commonwealth colleagues. As a result of an article in this afternoon's *News*, I fear that anything could happen at any time with regard to the financial situation. There could be serious repercussions on this State's finances.

There has been immense involvement of the Commonwealth Government in South Australian matters, particularly in connection with sport and recreation and the Regional Employment Development scheme. It would be interesting to see how the Commonwealth Government and the State Government would prune their expenditure if things became worse. For the sake of the people of this State, I hope that the projected surplus of \$25 000 000 materialises and that the people will not be further taxed to prop up this State's finances. At election time the Treasurer says that things have never been better, but immediately after an election the financial position seems to deteriorate; water rates and electricity charges increase, showing that the Treasurer has been pulling the wool over the people's eyes. Unfortunately, the people's memories are short. This has been going on ever since the Treasurer has been in office. Of course, he came close to losing office last July. I hope the present financial position does not get worse.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the comments made by my colleagues. Because only one Government member has spoken in this debate, one wonders whether Government members are not allowed to make speeches or whether they cannot contribute to the debate. The Treasurer has gone to some lengths to say that the Government has not increased taxation and that he has provided for a balanced Budget. That sounds very nice, but it is different from what the Treasurer said during the election campaign, when he referred to a tremendous surplus, resulting particularly from the sale of the South Australian non-metropolitan railways. On one occasion the Treasurer said that the benefit would amount to \$800 000 000.

Since the Labor Government has been in office, it has drastically increased taxation. Since 1970, when the Labor Government came to power, it has increased taxation by 350 per cent. For every dollar that a person was paying in State taxation in 1970-71 he is now paying \$3.60, yet the Treasurer proudly says that he has not increased taxation. Actually, he has been vicious in his taxation measures previously, but it all has to come to an end. He cannot continue milking the cow and expect milk to be left for the future. Obviously, if the Government stays in office, the people will be brought to their knees. Because the Government is budgeting for an inflation rate of 20 per cent, it must rake in more revenue through charges levied on the people.

The Treasurer has failed miserably by not undertaking a complete review of the whole taxation structure in this State; such a review is long overdue. We have far too many forms of taxation in the State field and in the Commonwealth field. While many forms of taxation do not bring in much revenue, they are complicated, time-consuming and inconvenient. It is high time that the Government investigated the State taxation system so that the people can be relieved of some of the burden. I do not know whether the member for Price is sleeping or whether he thinks this is funny; perhaps he does not agree with what I am saying. He and the Labor Party may be happy with the taxation system but I am not, and I do not think the public is happy with it. It would be interesting to know how many forms of taxation we have in this State and how many different charges are levied. If the Government does not adopt my suggestion, after the next election the next Liberal Government will do something about it. The Treasurer referred to the salary increases that the Government would have to account for; he budgeted for an increase of \$82 000 000 in this connection. The Treasurer probably based his calculation on the legislation that he intends to introduce in relation to wage indexation. Salary increases will be kept within the bounds of the Arbitration Commission's decision on wage indexation.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That legislation is already under control for Government employees.

Mr. GUNN: At page 488 of *Hansard* the Treasurer clearly lays down the guidelines that the Government expects to take effect in the next 12 months. A report, headed "Labor M.L.C. attacks Dunstan clampdown", in the *News* of August 29 states:

Labor member of the Legislative Council, Mr. J. E. Dunford, today attacked the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, for the clampdown on sweetheart deals between unions and employers.

Dr. Eastick: But he didn't say it!

[Midnight]

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member has been good enough to remind me that the Treasurer claims that Mr. Dunford has claimed that he did not make the statement. I would expect the gentleman, if he did not make the statement, to take appropriate action to clear his name. I do not believe the Treasurer's statement in relation to Mr. Dunford's attack. A few days later a report, headed "Sweetheart wage deals", in the *Advertiser* stated that the unions had rejected Mr. Dunstan's plan.

It is obvious that the Trades and Labour Council does not intend to accept the Treasurer's proposals, and I just wonder what will be the ultimate conclusion to this matter. Will we have a confrontation between the Treasurer and the T.L.C.? Will the Treasurer be allowed to continue with his plans or will the T.L.C. exercise its strong influence over the Labor Party? I believe that we should know the position, especially when it is a matter of this nature. I believe the House should be properly informed on what the Government's attitude will be towards the course of action that the unions have adopted. Obviously, if the unions will not accept the situation that obtains, we will be taken towards a course of industrial action which will only create misery and hardship in the community at large.

We saw today the Minister of Labour and Industry putting his heavy hand on the little shopkeepers of Rundle Street. Of course, he is not willing to take any action in relation to the dispute at Rainsfords, or anywhere else, where some people are preventing others from being

gainfully employed. The Treasurer and the Minister of Labour and Industry have two sets of standards: one for the trade unions, and the other for every other sector of the community.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That's not true.

Mr. GUNN: It is. The Minister is willing to put his heavy hand on these shopkeepers, but not on the unionists at Rainsfords, such as Mr. Scott: the imported stirrers who have wrecked the United Kingdom. The Government wants to bring them here, and the Minister has not the courage and conviction to stand up to these unionists on behalf of the South Australian people. Who is running the State?

The Hon. J. D. Wright: People picketing aren't breaking the law.

Mr. GUNN: The Minister can say that it is all right for a small group of irresponsible people to hold the South Australian public to ransom.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Tell me what law they are breaking.

Mr. GUNN: I will repeat this for the benefit of the Minister. He believes that little shopkeepers should be trampled on, but that union members, who helped put him here, should have the right to create chaos in the community. I am glad that the Minister has adopted this attitude, because I am sure that the thinking people in our community will judge the Government on that attitude, and I am pleased he put his view on record.

I should now like to refer in greater detail to the matter of the export of livestock from Australia, which I referred to yesterday evening. In looking at the Budget I have been disappointed to see the small allocation provided to the Agriculture Department. South Australia has the poorest record in Australia regarding funds allocated to the department. On previous occasions I have given to this House the relevant figures, and I will not do so again. However, on a percentage basis, South Australia's figures are the lowest in Australia, and it appears as if the Labor Party in South Australia will continue along these lines. This is unfortunate, because the department has an essential role to play in the protection of our great agricultural industry. Most members will have received—

Mr. Langley: Are you the shadow Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. GUNN: For the benefit of the honourable member, yes, I am. Indeed, if the honourable member would like to know anything about this, I shall be happy to discuss any agricultural matter at any time with him.

Mr. Whitten: How does medic clover grow in your district?

Mr. GUNN: It depends on what type of medic clover the honourable member is referring to. There are several varieties.

Mr. Whitten: What varieties are there?

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the honourable member back to the debate.

Mr. GUNN: I shall be happy to discuss with the member for Price this matter on any occasion, although it is not appropriate tonight to go into detail in regard to the growing of medic clovers. However, for his benefit and for the benefit of other members opposite, they have helped to transform mallee country in South Australia and other parts of Australia.

Dr. Eastick: If you can use superphosphate with them.

Mr. GUNN: True, if one has enough money to afford to grow medic clovers and to apply heavy doses of super-phosphate. This is of great benefit to agricultural land. I do know something about the growing of medic clovers.

Mr. Whitten: You know nothing about trade unions, so I thought you might tell us about medic clovers.

Mr. GUNN: For the benefit of the honourable member, I have once been a member of a trade union. Most members will have received through the post a copy of a document provided by Australian National Industries Limited, dated August, 1975. I believe the member for Kavel referred to this document last night, and I am sure that members opposite would have read it. I heard this document discussed at some length in Commonwealth Parliament, while I was driving around my large district last week. There is one section I would especially like to refer to, because I think it is relevant to the matters which I wish to raise this evening. On the first page of his article, in heavy black print, Mr. Paul Johnson states:

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 interest 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.

Consider the results that will occur in this country if we are not willing to take a proper course of action. We could follow exactly the same course that the unions have forced on the British people. They have destroyed the economy, created rampant inflation and virtually brought the country to its knees. In Australia today we have a small group of unions doing everything in their power to prevent the export of live cattle and sheep. I believe that, if these unionists are not made to realise the damage that their actions will cause, they will be judged harshly in the future. They will cause a confrontation.

Australian rural producers have been a responsible group, but I do not believe that they will again tolerate a situation in which their produce is prevented from going to market. They took steps earlier this year in relation to a ban that was imposed. I believe that if that ban had been enforced, there would have been a confrontation. This Government (especially the Minister of Labour and Industry) should use its influence to inform those people that the actions they are taking are not even in their own interests, because producers who wish to sell their stock will not be able to continue unless they have a regular turnover so that they can get rid of their surplus stock.

This Government, in 1972, took action to alter the metropolitan abattoirs. It amended the existing Act and changed its name to the South Australian Meat Corporation Act. I refer to the Auditor-General's Report at page 45, where I was interested to see what has taken place since then. At June 30, 1975, the corporation owed \$12 469 000. Yesterday a question was answered which showed that the South Australian Meat Corporation ran at a loss of about \$200 000. This is a shocking situation, and producers have had to suffer huge increases in costs. These increases have greatly reflected on the prices they have received for their stock. South Australia is only a small meat producer, but nevertheless a large number of people are dependent on this industry and the function of this organisation in order to make a reasonable living.

I believe that the Government should institute an immediate inquiry into how it can best solve the problems which the Samcor operation has created. Samcor has virtually a monopoly, and its actions have destroyed, to some degree, the Naracoorte abattoir, and its actions are making the position difficult at Port Lincoln. Recently when in Western Australia I had the opportunity of inspecting the Government abattoir at Midland Junction.

Mr. Venning: It was a treat.

Mr. GUNN: It was. The Midland Junction abattoir does not have an absolute right to control the killing of meat. It does not have the power to restrict killing.

Mr. Venning: There has been no industrial strife at Midland Junction for five years.

Mr. GUNN: True, and that abattoir runs an efficient organisation. Samcor ought to look at the Western Australian operation and, if it does, it may be able to put its own house in order. That organisation has not spent thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money: it has spent only a limited amount. It got the system operating and has kept it operating. It has adopted a traditional Liberal policy of employing subcontractors, and all the meat deliveries are made by owner drivers. That has considerably reduced its costs and the number of people that it has to employ. No licences operate there. This Government ought to take a course of action similar to that taken by the Western Australian organisation. The Government ought to put a producer on the board of Samcor, which at present is not representative. When the Government changes, this matter will be rectified. If it is good enough to put a representative of the trade union movement on the board, why is it not good enough to put a representative of the producers there?

I am disappointed that the Government has not outlined any taxation reforms. The whole tax system in this State ought to be reviewed and the Commonwealth Government must alter the whole structure of the Financial Agreement so that State Treasurers will know how much money they will get and so that we have a more satisfactory arrangement. I hope that the Government will drastically alter succession duties and other capital taxation that is affecting the economy. If this Government and the Commonwealth Government want to beat inflation, they must get the private sector going. Further, young people must be enabled to pay for their own houses. However, this Government and the Commonwealth Government have set the clock back. South Australians want to defeat inflation and get rid of unemployment, and incentives must be given to the private sector and to people so that they will work. In that way, productivity can be increased. Otherwise, we will not win the battle against inflation. Trade unionists in the United Kingdom have proved that because of their inefficiency and their ridiculous claims. They have destroyed the economy of that country, and they will achieve the same thing here, because people are being brought here and put in charge of trade unions. There are people such as Mr. Scott and his colleagues in the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union.

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): I, too, support the Bill and am pleased to know that at least this Government can balance the books.

Mr. Becker: It hopes it can.

Mr. BOUNDY: Yes. As the Budget has been presented to us, the Government is confident that it can do that. I suppose we can say that the ability to use inflation as a revenue outlet is effective financial management, but it cannot be described as responsible financial management.

Inflation is crippling private industry and small businesses and, until the Commonwealth and State Governments take realistic action, particularly regarding interest rates, it will be impossible to defuse the damaging inflation that is infecting our economy. Inflation may have saved the situation for the Government but it has not done that for many organisations. Many members on this side have fully and effectively covered the areas of mismanagement by this Government and the fact that it has contributed to galloping inflation by way of raising extra revenue from succession duties, land tax, and all the other levies to run the State. It is unnecessary for me to canvass those matters further, because I agree with many of the things that have been said. Some areas have been particularly affected by inflation, and I refer to voluntary and welfare organisations in the State. A report in the *Advertiser* on Wednesday, July 9, headed "Cashbox crisis in welfare" states, in part:

The big and small welfare agencies are facing a cash crisis. The Society of Sponsors has a mere \$270 in the bank, the Service to Youth Council is facing a \$20 000 deficit, and the Crippled Children's Association was forced to take an unprecedented step and repeat a "once only" fund-raising drive . . . The Service to Youth Council has been forced to retrench four of its salaried workers, has cut programmes substantially, and will still be in the red at the end of the next financial year. "Spiralling costs with no significant balancing increase in income have directly aided the crisis," said the Service to Youth Council Director (Mr. Max Kau). The council had continued its work because of an emergency grant of \$15 000 from the Federal Government's special fund for voluntary social welfare agencies which had been affected by inflation . . . "With newspaper publicity of our plight, money has been pouring in from people of goodwill who do not want to see agencies such as ours disappear . . . But this can be regarded only as a spin-off and not as a continuing benefit," he said.

This shows that the community recognises the need for these voluntary organisations, if the Government does not. Further in the report we see the following:

The Education Division of the Marriage Guidance Council of S.A., Cope, is in similar financial difficulties, with a decrease in its State Government grant and a threefold increase in demands on the agency in the past eight months. Later in the report the Acting Director of the organisation states:

We think it a pity, as money spent on education in a preventative area will save so much money for a crisis situation in the future. We deal in human relationships, the way people interact, how people communicate, all in a preventative area before there are serious breakdowns. Cope has a small and dedicated salaried staff and a volunteer staff of about 85.

There are people in the community who are willing to work voluntarily to aid the social welfare programmes of this State if the Government will help them with the basic funding. The article continues:

I think it important that agencies such as ours survive, as we have several unique services.

The Society of Sponsors is in similar trouble, and to show its dedication to the work done, the article states:

"We shall carry on as normal as long as there is any money at all," said the secretary-social worker, Mr. Lester Ferguson. "We have been promised between \$500 and \$600 in private donations, but we desperately need a Government grant of about \$3 000 to survive."

That is the "Cashbox crisis" of voluntary organisations in this State, created by the inflationary policies of this Government. I turn now to a voluntary organisation referred to in the first article, the Service to Youth Council. I have in my possession a copy of its publication *Caring*; what better title for a social welfare organisation? This is the newsletter of August, 1975, which states that the organisation has made progress, having had some grants that have

allowed it to continue with its work; it was feared that the work would be seriously curtailed, but a small grant had enabled it to continue. The report states in part:

This project has only been made possible by the assistance that has been given to the S.Y.C. by the Western Adelaide Regional Council for Social Development, allocating funds under the Australian Assistance Plan. The project will run for 12 months and, hopefully, its success will ensure the renewal of the grant from the Australian Assistance Plan or from some other source.

That organisation, too, is looking for State Government funds. Bob Johnson, the Chairman of Directors of the Service to Youth Council, states:

At last the S.Y.C. will be able to put its new priorities into effect. There is no doubt that the S.Y.C. has the relevant skills and experience in the provision of a street-work programme for youth. To have these skills and to be unable to put them into practice has been one of the S.Y.C.'s greatest frustrations over the past 18 months. I feel sure that a return to the streets will have significant effects on the lives of many young people and their families—

and this is the significant part—

. . . young people who would not normally go anywhere near a helping agency.

The organisation expresses its knowledge of the problems of the young, and the same publication states that at present 7 000 young people are registered for employment in the metropolitan area and that no jobs are available for them, another indication of the terrible effects of inflation and of the effects of Government policy on private industry. The figure of 7 000 young people registered for employment represents four times the number of young people out of work in Adelaide at this time last year. About three times as many young people as adults are out of work. It appears that this number will not only be maintained but will increase when this year's school leavers join the ranks of unemployed youth. That is the effect of so-called financial management, an indication of the need for social welfare work in this area. The publication goes on to mention the difficulties and states:

However, the S.Y.C. stands at the mercy of granting bodies and funding organisations, as well as of the community at large. We can only do the work we have the resources to provide.

So, the people of that organisation admit that they have to go cap in hand to the community and to the Government to provide the services they have so amply demonstrated are needed and will continue to be needed in this community. I refer now to the policy of the Liberal Movement on the matter of social welfare. In his policy speech at the time of the recent election, speaking of voluntary organisations, the member for Mitcham said:

They have traditionally played a valuable part of our community life. They have meant diversity in the pattern of life, providing for all sorts of activities, sporting, cultural, social welfare and so on. They have also given an opportunity for people for voluntary service. Now many of them are on the verge of collapse, because Federal and State Governments just do not value their important place in the community. Unless they get some sympathy and help, within a couple of years, most voluntary organisations will have disappeared.

Further on, the member for Mitcham refers again to the fact that voluntary organisations are being squeezed out by lack of funds to meet enormously rising costs. He said that this should not be allowed to happen and that we must do what we could to help. That referred particularly to postage and telephone charges, and so on. The Community Welfare Department in this State is quite rightly concerned about the need for social welfare funding. In the *Advertiser* of August 29, under the heading "Crisis centre—a first for South Australia", appears a report stating that the Minister of Community Welfare had announced that the department

would conduct interviews in the United Kingdom to recruit up to 50 social workers. He said there was a serious shortage of qualified community welfare workers in South Australia. Now this fact is accepted, but I suggest that there is tremendous potential in this State for these voluntary caring organisations to carry out work in the field on a voluntary basis if funding could be provided for them. Not only do we need what the Community Welfare Department is anxious to provide from other countries but more money is needed to aid these organisations.

In another news item, the Minister of Community Welfare is reported as having said that resources in the community were not being developed because of inadequate communication between those needing the services and those able and willing to provide them. Further on in the same report, the Minister said that it was not intended to compete with existing voluntary agencies for voluntary workers. I fear that this has happened and those people, who are prepared to work on a voluntary and part-time basis in these experienced community organisations such as S.Y.C. and others, have been channelled away from the front-line activity. Returning to the publication of the Service to Youth Council, I quote a further extract, as follows:

So you think increased postal and telephone rates will hurt your pocket! As far as the S.Y.C. is concerned we look forward to September 1, with some trepidation. With more than 120 volunteers, scattered all over the city, one of our most important means of communication is by letter and telephone call. We have allowed in our budget for 1975-76 a provision for inflation, but how could one possibly predict that both postal rates and telephone costs would increase by 80 per cent each!

Here again, Government action has put community services well and truly in the corner, and the survival corner at that. I suggest that voluntary agencies are a vital social resource which has suffered somewhat from competition from Government agencies. Their only deficiency in relation to more effective involvement in the community is a deficiency in funds. It is in the Government's power to remedy that deficiency. I now turn to another area of concern that does not directly involve money, although money has an effect on it. An *Advertiser* report of September 8 entitled "Police Stir Aborigines-report" states:

Police relations with Aborigines are appalling throughout Australia . . . Bored country policemen travel around Aboriginal reserves "stirring up the boongs" just for something to do.

Mr. Johnson, the Commonwealth Minister, said he was concerned that any investigation should not turn into a cop-bashing exercise. That is also my area of concern, because I believe that this is a most serious allegation to make against our Police Department. The activities of the South Australian Police Force in Goyder District, and particularly in the Point Pearce Community Council area, are of the highest order, and it would be appropriate if the Treasurer went into print stating that, whatever might happen in the Eastern States with regard to "boong bashing", the South Australian Police are above reproach.

I have seen the police in my district dealing with juvenile crime, involving not only Aborigines but others as well. All members agree that the rehabilitation of juvenile offenders, particularly first offenders, should be our prime concern. Some juvenile offenders can be described almost as habitual criminals (although that is not the word used in relation to juveniles), when they have committed repeated offences and, having left correctional institutions to which they have been committed, have repeated crimes. Our police are frustrated, because the young people concerned are repeatedly involved in thefts, particularly of

motor vehicles. Each weekend in my district, three or four cars are likely to be stolen and sometimes damaged.

Mr. Mathwin: Have they had yours yet?

Mr. BOUNDY: I still have got mine. Cars are mainly involved, and no-one in the community feels safe. We are all concerned that these offenders should be rehabilitated, although the police are frustrated because the same young people are involved. I know of a case in which two boys were caught following some car thefts, and their apprehension resulted in the solving of 22 vehicle thefts. Although I am not certain of the figure, I understand that one of the boys had 44 previous convictions.

We should still be concerned about rehabilitating these young people but, having committed adult crime repeatedly, their rehabilitation should be conducted in such a way that they are restrained from going out into the community and committing the offence again.

Mr. Becker: How would you solve it?

Mr. BOUNDY: I do not know that I have a certain solution to this problem, although I have listened to members on this side of the House, and particularly the member for Rocky River, who referred to the closure of the Gladstone Gaol. The most important thing with juvenile offenders is to segregate first offenders from habitual offenders—

Mr. Becker: That's done now.

Mr. BOUNDY: —more so than is done now. The Gladstone Gaol seems to be an excellent venue where these young people could be confined and learn a useful trade, perhaps to return to society better for the experience. The Government could provide finance to enable this to be done not only for the benefit of the offenders involved but also for Gladstone itself.

I realise that the whole question of juvenile offenders, as well as the cases to which I have referred, is not easily answered. It is a difficult area in which one can easily be branded a racist if one labels Aboriginal offenders. This is a problem involving many young people, whatever their racial background may be. I have raised the matter mainly as a result of the press report relating to police and "boong bashing". I hasten to the defence of the police officers in my district, being aware of their understanding of this vexing problem. These two matters are the total of what I wish to raise in this debate this evening. Regarding social welfare, I suggest that the Government and its policies have seriously affected the effectiveness particularly of voluntary organisations and that the Government could effectively channel some of its money into the area dealing with juvenile crime. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for consideration of the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I have a number of matters on which I wish to speak this evening, the first and most important of which is the ridiculous situation in which we now find ourselves in this Chamber at 12.40 a.m., faced with the prospect of pushing the Budget through this House in three days. At least, that is what I think the Government wants done. Particularly is this a ridiculous situation when we consider the announcement that was made today and the matters that have been ventilated in the House during today's sittings: the Government is anxious for Parliament to rise at the end of October and not to sit again until next June. This

matter has already been well ventilated. This is absolutely appalling. Indeed, it is a despicable act and, if one needed any convincing at all of the reasons why this Government wants to get up and away from this Chamber as fast as it can, we have been given confirmation of that this evening. The fact is that the Government does not want its deficiencies highlighted by any form of Opposition query.

Dr. Eastick: They can give it but they can't take it.

Dr. TONKIN: That is so. I do not really think that the Government can have much pleasure at all in this sort of situation. It is a despicable and cowardly action that speaks louder than volumes of words. It has run out of ideas; it is afraid its administration will be shown up, as it is beginning to be shown up, and is not prepared to stay in this House any longer than it can help; and, because of that, it is prepared to gag the Opposition, to reduce the time the Opposition has to grieve and ventilate these matters. It is deplorable and despicable and not worthy of the Government.

That is the first matter. The second refers to Medibank and medical services in the Elizabeth area, with particular reference to the Lyell McEwin Hospital. In the adjournment debate on August 26, the member for Light referred to country hospitals which were recognised hospitals under Medibank and which were not able to provide the services of a medical officer for Medibank patients. He pointed out, rightly and properly, that it was not the function of the hospital board in each case to find a medical practitioner who would provide those services, but that the hospital boards were being forced into the impossible situation of having to act as agents for the State's Public Health Department, which in turn was acting as an agent for the Commonwealth Department of Social Security. The honourable member referred particularly to the Kapunda and Keith Hospitals, but he also mentioned the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

There are many hospitals which, having attained the status of recognised hospitals, cannot provide Medibank services and, considering the developments on Medibank we have seen in the past few days, that may be just as well because those hospitals may be much better off if they have not been able to enter the scheme. There are many hospitals without those services, and the Lyell McEwin Hospital is one.

Medical practitioners have every right to choose the way in which they will provide their services and to decide what they will do and have the major say, anyway, in the conditions of service under which they will work. They will choose, and it is their right to choose, whether they will work in private practice or whether they will work in full-time hospital practice. That is their right to choose, just as it is the right of any other citizen in this community to decide whether he will work for one employer or another, whether he wants to work for the Public Service, or whether he wishes to work in the private sector. It is his right to decide that, and the unions would be up in arms if anyone tried to regiment any worker in this State and tell him how, where and for whom he should work. That is precisely the situation in which medical practitioners in this State and in Australia are being placed, and particularly are they being placed in this position in the Elizabeth area, where the Lyell McEwin Hospital, under the instructions of the Minister of Health and the Director-General of Health (Dr. Shea), has been closed to private patients and then opened to private patients again, where the doctors have been unable to obtain admission for their

patients and treat them, and they are being stood over and pressures are being exerted on them in this way to achieve the very regimentation that the member for Whyalla agreed, by nodding across the Chamber a moment ago, was totally wrong. I agree with him; it is good of him to agree on that.

Mr. Max Brown: Broken Hill Proprietary Company carried out that policy too.

Dr. TONKIN: Having agreed that it is undesirable to have regimentation and that doctors have the same right as any other citizen in the community to determine how they shall work, I will say that the member for Elizabeth has written a vituperative, arrogant and rude letter to members of the medical profession in his area. Apart from that, he has written that letter in answer to a letter from the members of the medical profession suggesting discussions to try in some way to rectify the situation.

The doctors in that area report they have been receiving threatening telephone calls, as have their families, too, and I understand that now there is some talk of a demonstration march being organised in Elizabeth on the hospital, and the name of the member for Elizabeth has been mentioned to me also in that connection. Whether that is a true connection or not I do not know.

Mr. Duncan: That is so.

Dr. TONKIN: I understand from the honourable member by interjection that it is true: his name has been mentioned and he confirms that he is connected with it. The doctors, the medical practitioners, and many of the residents in the area of Elizabeth are most concerned that these sorts of standover tactics should be used.

The medical practitioners have been pressured beyond endurance by the attitude of the Minister, the Director-General and the Administrator, and in spite of that pressure they have every right to decide how they will practise. They and their families are being harassed by an irresponsible minority, and I do not think that even the member for Elizabeth would agree that people who make anonymous and threatening telephone calls are responsible. They feel threatened by this group of people, which they believe is trying to raise a mob regardless of the facts. They feel that, if they are in that sort of odour and if that is the threat under which they are to live in the area—

Mr. Duncan: How many of them live in the area?

Dr. TONKIN: I understand that the member for Elizabeth may well find that no medical practitioners will be residing in the area and the whole area will soon be without medical services. If that happens, the people of Elizabeth can thank the member for Elizabeth, and no-one else.

Mr. Duncan: Who is standing over whom?

Dr. TONKIN: I am merely reporting facts. If the member for Elizabeth thinks that, by adopting these standover tactics he can force or regiment people into working where they are told and in the way they are told, which honourable members opposite have agreed is deplorable, all I can say is he has only himself to blame. I mention this to him in the faint hope that he may adopt a more responsible attitude to trying to get some sort of agreement and negotiation instead of choking it off by his attitude before negotiations can start.

Another matter I raise is the confidence trick being played on the people of South Australia once again by that ace of confidence men, the Treasurer. I refer to the statement he made on July 5, 1975. It was rather like the statement he made at the Women's Year function at the Festival Theatre, when he suddenly decided that all Government forms should contain the appellation "Ms" as in

"plums". It came right off the top of the head: that was apparent, listening to it, and I suspect this one came off the top of the head, too. This was the exploration made by the Treasurer—"Put house in joint names".

Mr. Becker: A think tank job.

Dr. TONKIN: I do not know it was a think tank job; I still believe it came off the top of his head.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You are jealous of his ability.

Dr. TONKIN: I am not jealous of his ability. It depends on one's interpretation of "ability". The report states:

Couples married or living in a *de facto* relationship were advised by the Premier yesterday to register their houses in joint names. He said they should do this to take maximum advantage of the new succession duties recently approved by the Cabinet. Mr. Dunstan said a matrimonial home valued at \$70 000 would be exempt from succession duties if held in joint names and there were no other assets. "Should the house be worth less, other exemptions from duty would apply to assets in the form of bank balances and investments," he said. "Should the house be held only in the name of the deceased, however, the entire value of the house would be included in the estate and the survivor would be liable for considerably more duty."

I should like you to remember that statement, Mr. Speaker. The report continues:

The new succession duty laws provide for a general statutory amount of \$18 000 which would be exempt from duty in all but the largest estates. "A further exemption of up to \$17 000 would apply where a matrimonial home was involved."

Mr. Dunstan gave two examples of cases where no duties would be payable:

A widow or widower who succeeded to \$18 000 of assets in the nature of bank balances, investments or car and a \$34 000 house held in joint names.

A widow or widower who succeeded to a \$70 000 house held in joint names, and no other assets.

They are generous, tremendously generous! Everyone in the community was very impressed until the talk-back programmes started and people started to find out what it all meant. Suddenly the penny dropped. A considerable amount of Commonwealth gift duty is involved for sums over \$10 000. Various charges are necessary in the whole system and, indeed, when it was analysed it was found that under the scheme it was, in many cases, more expensive to transfer the property into joint names than to leave it be. For instance, on a house valued at \$26 000 with a bank mortgage of \$18 000 and a second mortgage of \$2 000, no gift duty is payable on the actual \$3 000 which is half the balance of \$6 000 after the first and second mortgages, but we find that, under the old scheme of straight gift the registration and stamp duties payable amounted to \$147. Under the new scheme, with the valuation now insisted on by the Stamp Duty office, we get \$105, plus \$97.50, and \$12, making \$214.50.

Mr. Duncan: That's not correct.

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased to hear that, but that is the information I have.

Mr. Duncan: You don't need a valuation. The valuation used is the State Government valuation.

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased to hear that, but the saving is less. One still has to pay for documents and registration, and that costs money, but not much less money than it would anyway. That is, if no valuation is necessary, it will cost considerably more.

Mr. Langley: You say it will save nothing?

Dr. TONKIN: It will save little. Also, the whole status of the Act is in doubt, and there is no doubt at all that the question of a gift with reservation comes in,

particularly if the surviving spouse stays in the home. This is the point: if the transfer is being made to avoid succession duties (and that, basically, is what the Treasurer has been advocating), the Commissioner is bound to take that into account as a gift with reservation when the time comes to wind up the estate, and there will be no saving in succession duty.

Mr. Simmons: If the spouse dies within a year.

Dr. TONKIN: Or longer if the spouse continues in the home. I suggest that the member for Peake get opinions from his legal colleagues on this matter. That is what I have done, and the feeling in the legal and accounting communities is that that promise or suggestion of a moratorium on stamp and gift duties to allow people to take this action is not worth very much and will not help anyone. Once again, it is a political hoax and confidence trick perpetrated by the Treasurer in his usual inimitable style. We are getting used to that, because it is what the Treasurer does all the time. I do not think it is fair enough. I think the Treasurer has obviously misled the people or in some way fallen into the trap of not having done his homework; I suspect the latter, and that it came straight off the top of his head, mostly because he is devoid of ideas. He had to come up with something in the election, and this was a good catch for the election policy: that is about the long and short of it. We have seen enough of the Treasurer's broken promises. I do not have to go through them, because we know them all off by heart: Redcliff, Monarto, motor engines, etc. He makes promises and never keeps them.

The Treasurer has today admitted that he has come pretty well to the end of his legislative programme. He has pretty well exhausted his ideas and his think tank, and I do not think that getting a new one will help him. He has a complete lack of principle and of ideas, and this Government by its activities today and by the disorganised way in which it conducted itself during the afternoon bears ample evidence of the fact.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): One matter of considerable concern arose during the proceedings earlier in this sitting. The Leader has already alluded to the ridiculous situation whereby we find ourselves here at 1 a.m. to get through a Budget debate in a record minimum number of days. We have looked through the records, and they show the farce the Government is making of the operations of Parliament. However, the matter of concern to me is that the Deputy Premier now refuses to meet—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: With you!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In effect, with the manager for the Opposition, and if he refuses to meet with me he is refusing to meet with the Opposition. He cannot dictate to the Opposition to whom he will talk. The Opposition nominates someone to manage the affairs of the House from this side, and the Deputy Premier refuses to meet him. If there is a personality clash, that is too bad.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I can't trust you. I won't discuss anything with you.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Deputy Premier is now trying to suggest that the meetings of managers are secret.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They're not.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Treasurer came into the House during today's sitting and said, in effect, "Mr. Speaker, the Government does not have a legislative programme. One of the functions of Government is to legislate. We have got that all off our chest, so we have nothing to do. We will go into recess". That is all it amounted to. The matter I rightly took back to my Party

was the fact that the Government had a heavy legislative programme to get on with and so we needed to sit late. If he suggests that that is breaking a confidence, the Deputy Premier had better have his head read. The Deputy Premier has now called off those conferences. He is not going to indicate to the Opposition with whom it will deal, and, if he refuses to meet me, he has scuttled the conferences.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Are you speaking for the Leader in this matter?

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the honourable Deputy Premier that he will have the right of reply if he so chooses.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will remind the Deputy Premier of what I think was one of the most despicable things that has happened in this House since I have been a member; that was when the Leader of the Opposition complained about the activities of the Minister of Labour and Industry repeatedly calling Opposition members "dingoes", "fascists", and so on. When a question arose about these tactics, the Treasurer tried to defend the indefensible behaviour of his larrikin Minister; I am glad to report that the Minister has moderated his behaviour a little. In trying to defend the Minister, he said that the member for Mitcham used bad language around the House. The Deputy Premier, getting up to defend the Minister, quoted an incident that occurred when he was going out of the front door, when the member for Mitcham had called him a bastard. I would hate to repeat here the language that the Deputy Premier uses. Let me refresh the Deputy Premier's memory of what happened on that occasion. The Deputy Premier has chastised me for relating to the House the impression he gave to me in my capacity as manager for this side of the House. He has the gall to say that I broke a confidence. He either grins or blows his top; now, he is grinning. On September 30, 1971 (at *Hansard*, page 1838), the Deputy Premier is reported as saying:

The member for Mitcham has challenged the Premier to cite an example of his referring to any Government member as a "bastard" outside the Chamber. I am not in the habit of talking about things that happen outside the Chamber, but I feel compelled, in defence of the Premier, to do what I am about to do.

What hypocrisy! The Deputy Premier continued:

I draw the attention of the member for Mitcham to the evening, I think last week, of the law dinner, when the Deputy Leader returned to the Chamber after the House had arisen, and I was walking along the lobby toward the front door. The trap door in the main door opened and in came the member for Mitcham. As he entered, he noticed me fairly close to the door and said to me, "I ought to shut this in your face". My exact reply was: "It would not bloody well matter if you did." As I walked through the door the Deputy Leader held it open for me and simply remarked "Bastard", and I said, "Goodnight". I never object to being called by that word if it is used in endearing terms, but I assure members that it was not used in endearing terms. I want to defend the Premier, and I think that other examples could be given. I cite that instance to the House, and I am pleased that it will be recorded in *Hansard*.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You have not described the circumstances that led up to that statement.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You have not said why it occurred.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It occurred because the then Leader was complaining about the behaviour of the Minister of Transport in calling Opposition members dingoes and fascists.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: When did the Minister of Transport do that? Come on!

The SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will look that up. We will take the opportunity later.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Quote it or withdraw it!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I certainly will not withdraw it, because I know he did it. All members who were here then know it.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You are just wrong.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No. We will prove it. The Minister is trying to distract me from my point. Does the Minister want me to thumb through this volume?

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call a halt to this type of interjection. I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to continue with the grievance.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We will find it for the Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to continue with the grievance.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Deputy Premier quoted a private conversation that occurred while he was passing through the front door. It was one of the most despicable performances I have seen in this House, yet he comes here today and says he will not deal me because I have broken a confidence. When we went to the conference we were told that the Government had a heavy legislative programme and that we would need to sit late. I could say much more but, if I did, I would indulge in the same sort of exercise that the Deputy Premier indulged in. He refuses to discuss the business of the House and he refuses to discuss the matter with me. It is not his prerogative to decide to whom he will talk. The Opposition has chosen me to manage the affairs of this side at these conferences.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You beat John Coumbe by only one vote.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In effect, the Deputy Premier has called the conferences off. I do not in any way believe that I broke any confidences. I reported to my Party the tenor of the discussions we had, as was my duty. In view of the lies that the Treasurer peddled in this House earlier in the sitting—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that statement.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In view of the falsehoods and misleading statements that the Treasurer made earlier in this sitting, I had no alternative but to give members the information that the Deputy Premier had related to me and the Whip regarding the legislative programme. I hope the Deputy Premier will in time come to his senses and follow a rational course in his dealings with the Opposition and with this House.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): The accounts of the State do not truly reflect the amounts outstanding by the Government. It is very difficult, with the form of accounting practised in South Australia and in other Parliaments, to know precisely what all the outstanding accounts are at any time. In recent weeks I said that many sums were owed for a long time to people who had provided goods and services to the Government. It was stated on television that a letter from the Auditor-General had said that the number of accounts outstanding was no greater than it normally was and that they probably did not involve more than \$2 000 000. Quite apart from what the amount was at that time, some accounts have been outstanding for

a considerable period. I shall give an example; I will not mention the name of the organisation involved, although I am willing to pass on that name to the responsible Minister.

An account of about \$400 rendered against the Education Department in February, 1975, is still outstanding. This sum is for services rendered by an engineering organisation on an order form from the Education Department. Although numerous requests for payment have been made and although the Government has not denied that the money is due and payable, the debt has not been settled. When will the Treasurer tell the truth about this whole matter? If South Australia's financial affairs are so healthy, as he claims, surely the debt should have been settled many months ago. Following the confrontation before the television cameras, I was told there were numerous identical occurrences in connection with lack of payment. At this moment I do not have other examples, but the existence of one example is a black mark against the Treasurer and the Government. I refer to the position outlined in the document provided by the Treasurer yesterday in answer to a question on electoral affairs. It was interesting to find that of the

771 414 people who were on the electoral roll on July 12, the number of electors who voted was 721 770, leaving a deficit of 49 644. That was the equivalent of 6.44 per cent of the eligible voters, if one can accept the roll as having been correct at that time.

Against that we find the admission that, in the period since the election until the time this answer was prepared, at least 255 persons had indicated to the Government that they had failed to vote on a specific roll because they had voted on another roll. We do not know exactly how many people are involved, because of the number of people who did not vote. The Government indicated that 25 199 people had been asked to explain their position. That number represents 50.76 per cent of the total number of voters who failed to vote. I find it strange to understand the great variance existing in the various districts in the number of people who have been asked to explain their failure to vote. The document to which I have referred is lengthy and is a supplementary reply to the information provided yesterday and, because of its statistical detail, I seek leave to have this material inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

ELECTORAL STATISTICS

| House of Assembly district | No. of electors on roll (a) | No. of electors who voted (b) | No. of electors not voting (c) | Percentage of total (d) | "Please Explain" notices sent (e) | Percentage of non-voters asked to explain (f) |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| Adelaide | 17 483 | 15 940 | 1 543 | 8.83 | 603 | 39.08 |
| Albert Park | 18 520 | 17 282 | 1 238 | 6.68 | 650 | 52.50 |
| Alexandra | 13 075 | 12 224 | 851 | 6.50 | 493 | 57.93 |
| Ascot Park | 16 906 | 15 919 | 987 | 5.84 | 415 | 42.05 |
| Bragg | 16 364 | 15 026 | 1 338 | 8.18 | 616 | 46.04 |
| Brighton | 19 990 | 18 814 | 1 176 | 5.88 | 526 | 44.73 |
| Chaffey | 12 416 | 11 652 | 764 | 6.15 | 396 | 51.83 |
| Coles | 21 003 | 19 892 | 1 111 | 5.29 | 642 | 57.79 |
| Davenport | 19 277 | 18 006 | 1 271 | 6.59 | 385 | 30.29 |
| Elizabeth | 19 595 | 18 053 | 1 542 | 7.87 | 1 122 | 72.76 |
| Eyre | 10 073 | 9 004 | 1 069 | 10.61 | 566 | 52.95 |
| Fisher | 21 040 | 19 670 | 1 370 | 6.51 | 710 | 51.82 |
| Flinders | 11 832 | 11 185 | 647 | 5.47 | 360 | 55.64 |
| Florey | 21 858 | 20 525 | 1 333 | 6.10 | 629 | 47.19 |
| Frome | 8 612 | 7 889 | 723 | 8.40 | 324 | 44.81 |
| Gilles | 19 187 | 17 939 | 1 248 | 6.50 | 564 | 45.19 |
| Glenelg | 18 650 | 17 353 | 1 297 | 6.95 | 588 | 45.34 |
| Gouger | 10 594 | 10 039 | 555 | 5.24 | 251 | 45.23 |
| Goyder | 10 776 | 10 310 | 466 | 4.32 | 173 | 37.12 |
| Hanson | 19 784 | 18 325 | 1 459 | 7.37 | 679 | 46.54 |
| Henley Beach | 20 744 | 19 436 | 1 308 | 6.31 | 773 | 59.10 |
| Heyden | 12 932 | 12 092 | 840 | 6.50 | 400 | 47.62 |
| Kavel | 10 850 | 10 344 | 506 | 4.66 | 249 | 49.21 |
| Light | 12 199 | 11 519 | 680 | 5.57 | 243 | 35.74 |
| Mallee | 10 772 | 10 231 | 541 | 5.02 | 318 | 58.78 |
| Mawson | 33 440 | 31 435 | 2 005 | 6.00 | 1 134 | 56.56 |
| Millicent | 11 607 | 11 080 | 527 | 4.54 | 105 | 19.92 |
| Mitcham | 17 341 | 16 181 | 1 160 | 6.69 | 738 | 63.62 |
| Mitchell | 17 880 | 16 886 | 994 | 5.56 | 395 | 39.74 |
| Mount Gambier | 12 452 | 11 805 | 647 | 5.20 | 347 | 53.63 |
| Murray | 12 136 | 11 530 | 606 | 4.99 | 273 | 45.05 |
| Norwood | 18 010 | 16 335 | 1 675 | 9.30 | 586 | 34.99 |
| Peake | 17 277 | 16 225 | 1 052 | 6.09 | 535 | 50.86 |
| Pirie | 11 095 | 10 537 | 558 | 5.03 | 316 | 56.63 |
| Playford | 25 412 | 23 762 | 1 650 | 6.49 | 1 004 | 60.85 |
| Price | 16 915 | 15 891 | 1 024 | 6.05 | 913 | 89.16 |
| Rocky River | 10 394 | 10 030 | 364 | 3.50 | 111 | 30.49 |
| Ross Smith | 16 646 | 15 499 | 1 147 | 6.89 | 506 | 44.12 |
| Salisbury | 19 075 | 17 696 | 1 379 | 7.23 | 861 | 62.44 |
| Semaphore | 18 740 | 17 822 | 918 | 4.90 | 608 | 66.23 |
| Spence | 16 680 | 15 515 | 1 165 | 6.98 | 512 | 43.95 |
| Stuart | 14 692 | 13 624 | 1 068 | 7.27 | 802 | 75.09 |
| Tea Tree Gully | 30 764 | 29 105 | 1 659 | 5.39 | 840 | 50.63 |
| Torrens | 17 302 | 15 905 | 1 397 | 8.07 | 574 | 41.09 |
| Unley | 16 422 | 15 195 | 1 227 | 7.47 | 562 | 45.80 |
| Victoria | 11 093 | 10 390 | 703 | 6.34 | 341 | 48.51 |
| Whyalla | 11 509 | 10 653 | 856 | 7.44 | 461 | 53.86 |
| Total for State (All districts contested) | 771 414 | 721 770 | 49 644 | 6.44 | 25 199 | 50.76 |

Dr. EASTICK: In Adelaide only 39.08 per cent of the people who failed to vote were asked to explain yet, in going down this list, I find that in Henley Beach 59.1 per cent of the voters were asked to explain why they did not vote, and in Mitcham 63.62 per cent were asked to explain. Indeed, in the seat of Price 89.16 per cent of the people who failed to vote were asked to explain why they had not voted. In Norwood 9.3 per cent of the people who were eligible to vote failed to vote, but only 34.99 per cent of this massive number of 1 675 people received a "Please explain" notice. I want an explanation for this.

Mr. Keneally: What was the figure in the District of Light?

Dr. EASTICK: In Light 35.74 per cent were asked to explain, and 5.5 per cent failed to vote, but that is immaterial to the point I want to make now. In the figures provided by the Treasurer at the date of compilation of the answer the number of electors who replied to the notices sent and who claimed that they had voted was 3 715. I believe that all members (and I have checked with the majority of members on this side) have received complaints from constituents that they had received one of these "Please explain" notices when, in fact, they had voted at the election.

An important issue which arises here involves the expenditure involved in obtaining information from persons who had voted. This has been a cost against the affairs of the State. The Treasurer indicated, for example, that 25 199 notices had gone out. They were sent when the cost of a letter was still 10c, so \$2 519.90 was spent on postage alone, plus the cost of preparation. At the time of the referendum into shopping hours the wrong button had been pressed on the computer and large numbers of people were asked to explain why they did not vote, even though their name had been taken off the roll by virtue of their having voted. It is wrong that such activities or failures can occur on yet another occasion. I believe it is important to have proper efficiency and for the people of this State to have confidence in the electoral system, and that errors which have become so apparent from the figures provided by the Treasurer are not permitted to occur again. I believe that it is a necessity of Government in administration to ensure that such actions are taken to offset a continued further breakdown of this nature.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I wish to draw the attention of the House to an item in the Auditor-General's Report which is of great concern to me and which deals with shortages and thefts suffered by the State in its different Government departments. I refer to this matter in case members opposite do not feel inclined to read this large report. In the Attorney-General's Department there was a cash shortage of \$20, but, referring to bigger game, there was a theft of cash and cheques from the Community Welfare Department at various times totalling \$2 166.98. Forged cheques amounted to \$258, and cheques issued under false pretences amounted to \$807. At page 378 of the report, dealing with the Agriculture Department and Northfield, we see that two sprinklers and a hose disappeared at a cost of \$59.44. Returning to the Community Welfare Department, I draw the attention of all honourable members to other interesting items. There was a theft of electrical equipment amounting to \$1 579.68, and a further \$2 990.33 for other sundry items.

I am disappointed that the Minister of Community Welfare is absent because I am referring to the line dealing with a Magill organisation (I presume that is the McNally

Training Centre) and the disappearance is reported of six colour television sets costing \$2 921.40. This reference could be to the Magill Home for the Aged; exactly which institution is referred to is not clear. Therefore, I would like whoever is in charge of this House (and I presume it is the Minister of Works) to let me know which institution is involved. Of course, the position regarding offenders at Magill is well known, and the Government has probably given colour television sets to that institution, even though there are boys there who know how to get rid of them, and do it well. In the particulars regarding the Education Department, the disappearance of \$10 784 is reported in relation to 100 thefts from 79 schools of tape recorders and tapes, record players and records, speaker systems, and other items. There is a report of the disappearance of goods to the value of \$4 820.10, covering 32 thefts from 28 schools of audio-visual equipment, cameras, projection equipment, and so on. It is further reported that five thefts of television sets from five schools resulted in the loss of \$845. Television sets are in season at present, it seems.

Still dealing with the Education Department, there is a report of thefts from five schools of office equipment valued at \$93.30 and a loss of \$2 347 as a result of 33 thefts of sporting equipment from 31 schools. There were 100 thefts amounting to \$7 696 of classroom equipment from 75 schools. I have picked out from the Education Department list the larger items that have disappeared and have not been recovered.

In the field of the Minister of Works, a lawnmower was nicked from the Engineering and Water Supply Department at Bolivar and the value was \$275. There is a further item of \$2 653 for electric lamps, tools, and so on and another \$6 590 for an air compressor and tools from Salisbury Heights.

Mr. Keneally: Read the rest of it. They were all recovered.

Mr. MATHWIN: All right. It is all right for the potential thirteenth Minister, who delayed this House one day for four hours. He was outdone and outshone today by the member for Playford. The member for Stuart has no show after the excellent speech that the member for Playford made, and he can get back in the woodwork.

Mr. Keneally: Read the rest of it.

Mr. MATHWIN: Another lawnmower, valued at \$120, disappeared from Springfield, and a meter valued at \$625 disappeared from Bridgewater. We see, in the section dealing with the Hospitals Department, an item of \$250 for 15 metres of carpet. There are other minor items from the Royal Adelaide Hospital, totalling \$361. A self-retaining screwdriver, at a cost of \$104, disappeared from that hospital. It must have been a fair screw!

If we go on to Glenside (and this is where some people will end up), we see that \$3 750 worth of clothing was stolen from the canteen bulk store. One chain saw valued at \$310 disappeared from Snowden Beach. I do not know what they went there for. Another chain saw valued at \$234 disappeared from Port Adelaide. There is also the report of the disappearance from Flinders Medical Centre of carpet and torches valued at \$161. Another item covers the disappearance of 76 sleepers valued at \$76. There was a theft from Mulpata of a gas refrigerator, stove, and linen, valued at \$350. A further 27 sleepers disappeared from Pillana Siding, and they cost the State \$27. Monarto cost the State a further \$45, because some diesel fuel disappeared from there.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I did not know that South Australia had so many thieves. When I came to this House about 11 years ago, at the end of the Playford era, and when the late Frank Walsh was Premier, we were told that we would sit long hours and perhaps for nine months of the year. We did just that and we saw a situation similar to the present one obtain. We had rather long sittings and I remember coming up from Naracoorte unshaven and not having taken my shirt off for three days. That was the ordeal to which we were subjected in this new era.

In an urgency motion this afternoon, in protestation from this side of the House we castigated the Government for closing this place down for eight months. It is the Government's business whether it does that, but it is the Opposition's business whether it says something about it. This is the last opportunity that I, the shadow Minister of Fisheries, will have to speak on behalf of those people who are striving to earn their living from what they raise from the sea. I have a letter dated September 1 from the Minister of Agriculture which states:

In June 17 last in the House of Assembly you inquired regarding long-term financial assistance to the fishing industry—

I think I also inquired again on August 20—

and I have delayed replying in the hope that some relief may have been possible from Australian Government sources.

I got a terrible shock today when I saw a headline in the *News*, because we were looking for succour for the poor unfortunate fishermen. The Minister continues:

However, up to the present time, I have not been made aware of any Federal Government allocation of funds for this purpose; and State funds are not available at present for long-term assistance to fishermen in financial difficulties. Following the decision of the South Australian Government to allocate additional moneys to the Fisheries Department for the 1975-76 financial year, the department has been authorised (subject to the passing of the Estimates by Parliament)—

I am sure the Minister did not contemplate, when he wrote that, that the Government would have such difficulty in getting its Estimates through.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Will you tell the fishermen how you delayed it?

Mr. RODDA: We will tell the fishermen how we made a General Custer last stand to get a word in for them in the hiatus involved in the adjournment for eight months. They are the same fishermen who are Director-less and headless. I think the Deputy Premier coined a phrase about the headless chook, and we have a headless chook in the department that is administering the affairs of these people. No wonder the Minister for the Environment is resigning. The Minister of Agriculture further states that he proposes to extend economic surveys into rock lobster and abalone fisheries to include investigation and recommendation of management measures necessary to improve the profitability of the fisheries.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Could a bloke have made about \$30 000?

Mr. RODDA: Not in the South-East. The average earnings of crayfishermen would be about \$13 000, of which 25 per cent must go to the deckhand, 25 per cent would be left for the boat owner, and the balance would be required to run the vessel. The Minister pointed out that permits would be issued, licence fees paid, royalties and a buy-back scheme would be investigated. That scheme interests me, as it interests fishermen. Obviously, the fisheries are over-exploited and we must see some rationalisation of the industry.

The funds involved in the Fishing Research and Development Trust Fund last year, according to the Auditor-General's Report, amounted to about \$133 000. That was spread over a wide field. The Shark Fishermen's Rehabilitation Scheme received no appropriation last year, but the amount allocated in the previous year was \$39 300. Those are the fishermen who are in a difficult situation because of the mercury content of the fish, and the Minister must give this matter due consideration. I acknowledge that the former Minister of Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Broomhill) made a cogent appeal on behalf of the fishermen. The allocation for prawn fisheries in 1974 was \$14 000, and that for last year was \$6 663. The sum for general fisheries was \$18 000, as against \$7 000 the previous year, and nearly \$3 000 was spent on an ecology study for Redcliff. I voice a protest when we see money being expended in this way on such a proposal. The abalone fisheries received an appropriation last year of about \$7 000; that branch of fishing calls for special physique and expertise. In the little time remaining, I must make a plea on behalf of the fishermen of this State. I would hope that a Director of Fisheries would be appointed to give the department the spearhead it needs.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Are you available?

Mr. RODDA: The Minister who has made that inane interjection has asked 37 people that question.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): Several matters in the Financial Statement of the Treasurer still concern me. The first relates to the transfer of the non-metropolitan railways. It was stated that the time taken to complete the arrangements for the transfer of staff and associated matters would be considerable. One associated matter is that of superannuation. Having asked a question in the House, I received a sketchy and hesitant reply from the Treasurer. How will the scheme be implemented? As I see it, the Treasurer originally promised the superannuants in the Railways Department that they would be looked after. This was a verbal promise given in April, at which time it seemed that there was every indication that Federal legislation would be introduced to protect those people. That Federal legislation (one of two alternatives) was not forthcoming. It was knocked out by the Senate earlier this year. The only other alternative is to have the Commonwealth Government declared a registered employer under the terms of the South Australian Superannuation Act, so that it can be treated as an employer.

That would appear not to be on because, if that happened, all Commonwealth employees in South Australia would be advantaged over the rest of the Commonwealth employees in Australia. In view of the apparent hesitancy on the part of the Government to state exactly how it will implement this protection in the superannuation scheme, surely a simple and straightforward statement from the Public Actuary (who is, after all, the person in charge of superannuation in this State) would resolve the problem. I support the Government's intention; there is no dispute there. I want South Australian Railways superannuants to be protected. I simply want to know how it will be done. They are still on the South Australian Estimates, and we do not know whether they are being superannuated by the Commonwealth or by the South Australian Government.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: They haven't made their choice yet.

Mr. ALLISON: It is not made clear. The second point that appears a little odd is that, on page 6 of the Financial Statement in the summary of major financial

factors, the Treasurer claims that he has allowed for a modest expansion. How would the Prices Commissioner view any expansion in prices of more than 30 per cent in one year? The Treasurer states that this modest expansion does not require any increased or new taxes, but on pages 7 and 8 he outlines a list of those mini Budget taxes which were introduced from October 1 last year, and which increased a whole range of charges. They were not included in last year's Estimates nor in this year's Estimates, so it appears we have had two relatively modest Budgets, but in fact we have increased Estimates by more than 30 per cent in one year. The Prices Commissioner certainly would not support any business concern that tried to increase prices by a similarly modest amount.

The third point is that the Treasurer has declared that the Opposition's decision to prevent the passage of the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Bill made his action of abolishing the franchise tax on the sale of petrol impossible. That seems to be a specious remark, because it was not the Opposition's decision at all; it was the Treasurer's decision from the steps of Parliament House in Canberra, and it was triggered off by the Opposition's request for two or three minor amendments that would have protected certain sections of South Australian industry. These amendments were not forthcoming, and the Treasurer is here placing the blame entirely on the shoulders of the Opposition when, in fact, it was his unilateral decision to call the State election. This seems to be most unfair. Was that tax really necessary, when we finished up after all with a credit of \$8 000 000?

The fourth point about which I should like to complain is that metropolitan and district councils in South Australia have been lobbying the State Government for an answer on whether they are still to pay their hospital contributions. In the case of the Mount Gambier council, the contribution for the current year will be about \$33 000. The State will receive the relatively minor total sum of \$900 000 during the coming year.

Mr. Mathwin: I asked the Treasurer and he said "No".

Mr. ALLISON: True, they are not going to get any reimbursements at all. Although that is a minor amount for the State Government, it is a major amount for the councils, which need every cent they can get to help them through the coming year. When the State Government is allowing for about a 30 per cent increase in income this year, and councils are trying their hardest to keep rates down, it seems that some consideration should be given to the renewed requests being made by councils.

Mr. Mathwin: What about Medibank?

Mr. ALLISON: We are assured that Medibank is designed to give the people a much more advantageous health system.

Mr. Mathwin: People are buying more lottery tickets, too, aren't they?

Mr. ALLISON: Yes, that involves a \$11 500 000 subsidy. The fifth point is that it seems that in 40 years a young man will need about \$2 000 000 from his superannuation scheme if he is to retire on the same benefits that his counterpart receives now and if we are to keep pace with inflation. How on earth can the Government or any other superannuation fund invest the money that is being put aside at present at a rate that will provide an adequate amount for superannuation in 40 years time? Of course it cannot do so. We would have to invest at 22½ per cent to meet the present 22½ per cent wage increase being allowed for in both the Commonwealth and State Budgets. That cannot be done.

I do not know of any business man who can invest superannuation money at that rate. If he could, he would invest whatever money he had and get out of his business straight away. Yet here, the State Superannuation Fund provision has been increased to \$15 000 000, with \$2 250 000 being required just for cost of living adjustments alone in the coming year. Of course, the State Government will impose additional taxes to cover this year by year, but the business man cannot. This seems to be a tremendous anomaly. What is good for one is certainly not good for the other.

Another point is that the Treasurer has seen fit to recognise that the cost of books has risen substantially in the past 12 months, and has increased the book subsidy to \$35. However, that nowhere near meets the increase of 40 per cent in the cost of books this year. So, the recognition of book price increases has not been met by adequate book subsidies, and people will have to pay far more for school books this year out of their own pockets, despite the Government's promise a few years ago that gradually all school books would be provided free. Once again, it is the old inflation story. We are not containing it or even keeping pace with the social welfare programmes that have been promised.

I return again to health. I complained earlier this evening that pensioners and disadvantaged people in my district, such as supporting mothers, are being forced to pay bills to the Hospitals Department that they have not had to pay previously. These people were pensioners last year and obtained these services free of charge. However, this year they have received bills of \$20 a day for hospital services with which they have been provided, simply because they nominated their own doctor, and they had not been told that this automatically put them on the private patients list, \$20 a day therefore being payable for hospitalisation with their own doctor and \$30 a day if a private room was required. This should have been made much clearer by the Medibank organisation to its pre-installation propaganda (as one might call it). So many things were unstated in an attempt to sell Medibank to the people that it does not bear thinking about. Now, pensioners are asking whether it is really true that they have bills of \$140 and \$200 to pay when Medibank was supposed to be free and when they were told that they would be much better off under Medibank. So the story goes on.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I rise to continue with my earlier comments regarding the concern confronting rural industries today. I refer back to what the Prime Minister had to say at the end of last year when addressing the Australian Farmers Federation in Canberra, telling farmers that their worries were all over. On that day the Prime Minister was reported as having said:

I see no reason why farmers should lack confidence in their future under a vigorous and sympathetic Government. Let us look into this matter. I have already spoken tonight on the situation of rural industries in this State and the unrest and many troubles that they face. This is not something that is happening in South Australia alone: it is Australia-wide. It has been reported that in Western Australia at present farmers and business men are threatening not to pay their taxes. They have issued an ultimatum to the Prime Minister that they will not pay unless he reorganises primary and primary-based secondary industries. These men have sent Mr. Whitlam a signed declaration of a state of emergency in their district: it is, they claim,

that primary produce is being priced out of the market by middlemen and a top-heavy and unco-ordinated mass of minor secondary industries.

They say that decisions and the indecision of the Commonwealth Government are accelerating their critical financial situation to one of emergency. In the face of this emergency, radical action is the only course that will stimulate the Australian Government into a total reorganisation of the outdated system. The 220 farmers and 30 business men then vowed to withhold all payments due from them to Commonwealth Government departments and to local government. In Victoria, the farmers are threatening to withhold their beef stock from market for one day to highlight what they consider is a critical situation in the beef industry. Another statement that the Prime Minister made at the end of last year was as follows:

You can be sure that more than ever as time goes on the world will need and demand your products.

Another statement was:

There is every reason to hope that the worst days for Australian farmers are over. The severe recession of the early 1970's need not happen again, provided we adopt the right policies now and for the future.

What about the Hayden Budget? Has that done anything for rural industry? It was completely and utterly ineffective as far as rural industry is concerned. That Budget has failed to halt inflation and unemployment, to help the rural industries, or to help solve the general financial problems. A constant deficit Budget can only escalate inflation. The cost of servicing the debt is the killer. It is useless to imagine the situation when the Government continually estimates its revenues and then plans to spend more. Taxation is crippling free enterprise and rural industry. Another statement by the Prime Minister is as follows:

Our policies to raise the living standards of all Australians will attack the crucial problems of rural poverty. We cannot ignore the chilling facts shown in the interim report of the Commission of Inquiry into Poverty that one of four families in country towns lives in poverty or near-poverty. A report in the *Advertiser* has stated that an income survey carried out states that 142 000 people living in rural areas were earning less than the poverty line. The survey found that a large amount of poverty existed among rural workers, and the report urged both the Australian and the State Governments to join together to provide rural workers with a minimum wage. The report said that the most efficient and equitable way to do this would be through a guaranteed minimum income scheme.

Another problem area for the rural sector was welfare and personal services. The report found that both these services were generally inadequate. That shows something of the difficulty that primary production faces today. Mr. Whitlam went on to say that the Australian Government was determined to make country people equal partners in a strong and prosperous Australia; that farm incomes, despite a recent down-turn in wool prices, would continue to expand; that in the recent Green Paper on rural industry we had the best and most comprehensive basis for informed Government policies on rural industry ever drawn up in Australia.

If we look into this situation, we realise that many Commonwealth Government decisions will have to be reversed if Australia's rural industry is to prosper. The Government's response to serious problems being experienced by farmers is poor, to say the least. Farmers are becoming very angry, because the Government is not behaving responsibly towards rural industries. There is growing unrest in country areas, and this I am sure, will continue if things are not seen to improve soon. Both the

wool and the meat markets have collapsed, and farmers are faced with the prospect of a 50 per cent drop in their incomes. During recent months, industrial disputes throughout Australia have disrupted the killing of meat, the export of grain, the production and distribution of petroleum products, and the availability of farming plant and spare parts.

It is important that the Government provide services required for the economic operation of the rural industry. It should provide incentives to encourage the improvement of its efficiency and productivity. It should help develop and maintain markets for its products. The Australian Government and the State Government should provide rural industries with a reasonable level of protection, taking into account the protection given to industry in other sectors. In consultation with industry, it should take practical steps to combat instability due to market fluctuations and climatic and other unpredictable factors.

Last of all, the Government should encourage responsiveness and flexibility in farm management so that the resource allocation could respond quickly to the demands and opportunities of the market place. Mr. Whitlam went on to say:

In our Industries Assistance Commission you have the most expert and efficient instrument for guaranteeing the strength and stability of our rural industries ever appointed in Australia.

Some weeks ago, I asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture relating to the dairy assistance scheme. At this stage, I have received no answer. This concerns me greatly. The complexity of the form and the effort that people have to exert in trying to fill it out complicate the matter tremendously. This should be looked into immediately so that people can receive assistance in this vital sphere. I look forward to receiving an answer from the Minister in due course.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I shall raise three matters. One is that we, as Parliamentarians, have advocated that racial discrimination should not be practised in our community, and we have moved in the direction of preventing it. I raise with Government members the opportunity for them in the future to rectify the practice by representation to the Treasurer, even though the organisation does not come under his direct scrutiny: I refer to the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement Incorporated. In advertising for a field officer in the *News* of August 30, 1975, the movement used these words:

The successful applicant, who must be of Aboriginal descent, will be employed to represent in legal matters and arrange legal assistance for Aboriginal people and to assist lawyers acting for Aboriginals.

There are other matters in the advertisement relating to the qualifications necessary and the salary that can be received. I make the point that, if we are to stop racial discrimination, using the measure which was designed mainly to help some of the minority groups that were adversely affected and discriminated against by most of the community (and the Aboriginals were one of those minority groups), likewise they should not use racial discrimination in advertising for people who would work in their organisation. That is a blatant example of racial discrimination by the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement. If it wanted to make the final decision that the person should be of Aboriginal descent, it did not have to advertise the fact; it could have organised it through the discussions that took place during the interviews. The Premier should make representations to that group saying that that type of advertisement is unfair and not warranted in the State.

Another area with which I wish to deal is that of the insuring and registering of vehicles such as Land Rovers, and I will show how people are adversely discriminated against if they happen to own certain types of Land Rover. There is a lesser insurance paid for third party insurance on private motor vehicles as against commercial motor vehicles. If one looks at the conditions laid down by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles (Mr. G. C. Strutton) for a vehicle to be considered as private, passenger carrying, a Land Rover, short wheel base, is acceptable on five of the six conditions, but not on the sixth. I believe that that is ridiculous. I should like to have recorded the details of these conditions laid down by the Registrar. The circular, referring to station sedans, station wagons, estate cars and estate vans, etc., states that the "Motor Vehicles Act does not specifically define a vehicle commonly referred to as one of the above or of somewhat similar type." The Land Rover comes into the "somewhat similar type", and several other types of vehicle are similar to the Land Rover. The Registrar's circular further states:

The above classes of vehicles are assessed for registration and insurance purposes as "passenger carrying", and are charged at less rates than "goods carrying" vans and utilities. Before a "van" originally constructed for the carriage of goods can be accepted as having been altered to a station sedan, etc., it must provide passenger comfort to a degree not less than is found in a station sedan, etc., of the same or similar make. Subject to this, the undermentioned specifications may be taken as a general guide of the conditions necessary to satisfy the department that a vehicle qualifies for reassessment.

(1) Vehicle must be under two tons unladen weight.

The Land Rover qualifies on that count. The Registrar's circular continues:

(2) Vehicle must have a rigid roof.

The Land Rover qualifies on that count. The Registrar's circular continues:

(3) The area to the rear of the driver's seat must be permanently fitted with a row of cross seats, fixed or folding, which must be upholstered or sprung, with back rests similarly upholstered or sprung, attached to the seat or side or floor of the vehicle.

The Land Rover qualifies on that count. The Registrar's circular continues:

(4) The vehicle must have windows in each side, a minimum of 2sq.ft. in area, and windows at the rear of the vehicle a minimum of 120sq.in.

The Land Rover qualifies on that count. The Registrar's circular continues:

(5) The distance between the rear-most part of the steering wheel and the back rests of the seats specified in paragraph (3) must be at least one-third of the distance from the steering wheel to the rear-most part of the floor of the vehicle.

The Land Rover qualifies on that count. The Registrar's circular concludes:

(6) The vehicle must have four doors or be so constructed that entrance to the rear seat can be gained from the side of the vehicle by means of a folding seat in a manner similar to the class of passenger vehicle commonly referred to as a "two-door" sedan.

That is the only point on which this vehicle is excluded from the "passenger-carrying" list, to gain a benefit in registration, and more particularly third party insurance. I will give an example. A 1973 Chrysler sedan with a mass of 1370 kilograms power weight is in the first-class insurance category, and the insurance on that vehicle is \$58. The Land Rover, with a power weight of 1320 kilograms, which is 50 kilograms less than that of the Chrysler, is put in the third-class insurance of "commercial," and the insurance is \$70 a year, a difference of \$12 a year. What utter hogwash! Because a person cannot get into the rear seats other than through the back entrance

of the vehicle his vehicle has to be classed as "commercial" and he has to pay the extra \$12. That is particularly unjust, when the Land Rover's power weight is nowhere near that of the Chrysler, which I believe is really a Valiant sedan. These are insurance premiums through the State Government Insurance Commission, which of course is not divorced from the Government. The Registrar is under the control of the Minister of Transport, and this serious injustice could be rectified if the Minister chose to take the necessary action.

In the case of registration, insurance and stamp duty combined for the two vehicles, the person with the Land Rover has to pay \$115 in total, as against \$112.40 for a Chrysler. In other words, the registration fee for the Chrysler is \$51.40 because of its power weight, and for the Land Rover it is \$42, a difference of about \$9. The Minister recognises through his department that the Land Rover is less in power and weight and gives a \$9 registration benefit but, in the insurance field, that is not done. There is an injustice here, which I believe should be rectified. Land Rovers and vehicles which have the side windows and all the other qualifications should be considered as passenger-carrying vehicles, because it does not matter whether one gets in the side or the rear of the vehicle; if it is used mainly for passenger carrying that is all that counts. This anomaly has existed for some time and I hope that one of the Government members is sufficiently wide awake at 2 a.m. to take the matter back to Caucus and have it rectified.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I wish to put the record straight on something I said earlier this evening in relation to a complaint, where I was quoting the Deputy Premier in connection with bringing into the House what I would normally consider to be a confidential matter. The circumstances surrounding this matter were not exactly as I implied to the House, although certainly the imputation was there. I attributed to the Minister of Transport the statements he made in connection with this reference, using the words "dingoes" and "fascists". In fact, the then Leader of the Opposition was complaining in Question Time of the statements of Government members in reference to Opposition members, and the statements I attributed to the Minister of Transport were made by other members. The statements which were made were as follows: the member for Unley referred to members of the Opposition by saying, "You are only a snake." The next reference came from the former member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) and was "You are a lot of fascist dictators over there."

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the explanation seems to me to be further substantiation, if that is the appropriate word, of the kind of argument the honourable member was using earlier this evening and does not rate as a personal explanation except in so far as he is explaining that his statement with respect to the Minister of Transport was not correct. I do not think that the honourable member should go on and start to quote a whole series of other things that members said.

The SPEAKER: I must uphold the point that the Deputy Leader has made—that it was not the honourable Minister of Transport whom he had previously accused. Obviously it was other honourable members, and I think there is no point in pursuing the matter regarding who the other honourable members were.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I was challenged by the Minister of Transport to put the record straight. That I am trying to do, and the only way I can do it is by way of a personal explanation. The Minister of Transport did not use the word "dingo".

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister called the member for Davenport "a dirty little bastard", but I am putting the record straight, and I say that in no way does it weaken the point I made in reference to the quotation by the Deputy Premier. If it will satisfy the Minister of Transport, I apologise to him for attributing to him remarks made by other members on his side.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): It is most unfortunate that Opposition members should be forced into a grievance debate at this hour. It makes the behaviour of Ministers look completely stupid, particularly when we remember the allegations recently made by schoolchildren about behaviour in the House. In insisting that the sitting must continue, the Treasurer and his colleagues have acted like juvenile twits. And let us realise that on the previous day it was announced that Parliament would not meet for eight months. This shows how totally irresponsible the Government has been. It is behaving like an illtempered juvenile, perhaps because it was defeated in the House yesterday.

I want to comment on the plight of universities and colleges of advanced education for four main reasons. The first reason is that in the Commonwealth Budget these institutions have been given no promises of financial allocations after June, 1976. Therefore, they cannot plan their financial expenditure for all of 1976. As a result, Adelaide University has frozen all staff appointments. The entire planning and programming of university expenditure has been stopped, and no new capital works can be started. Colleges of advanced education find themselves in exactly the same sort of dilemma. The second reason why universities are in strife is that the Australian Research Grants Committee grants for research work at universities have been drastically slashed. For 1975, \$9 000 000 was given to universities throughout Australia. Actually, Adelaide University received about \$1 000 000—more than its fair share. For 1976 the Commonwealth Government has allocated only \$3 040 000—about one-third of what it allocated last year. This sum will not even pay the salaries of the staff currently employed under Australian Research Grants Committee grants. Throughout Australia there will have to be a reduction of 350 out of the 600 people currently employed under these grants. Adelaide University employs 80 people, but it will have to dismiss between 48 and 50 people. This is most unfortunate, because it will create an intellectual and research void that this country cannot afford.

The third reason why the universities are in a dilemma is that the National Health and Medical Research Council grants have also been drastically reduced. For 1975, these grants amounted to \$8 000 000, but for 1976 they have been reduced to \$4 000 000. After much stirring and publicity, the Commonwealth Treasurer eventually decided that he would grant an increase for 1977, when they will be increased to \$6 400 000. Even so, in 1977 they will still be receiving only three-quarters of what they currently receive, and we must take into account that in that period inflation will be of about 40 per cent to 50 per cent. The final reason why universities are in a dilemma is that the Prime Minister has said that the Australian Universities Commission and the Colleges of Advanced Education Commission will be combined into one tertiary commis-

sion in Canberra. This threatens the autonomy of universities throughout Australia which, until now, have had a high degree of independence.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You don't really know what will be in the Commonwealth legislation.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: But the Prime Minister has said that this is his policy. No legislation is yet proposed.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Do you know whether the Australian Universities Commission supports it?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Adelaide University, at least, will not support it.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: What about the colleges of advanced education?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am talking about universities throughout Australia.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You referred to colleges of advanced education, too.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: For too long there has been a continual brain drain from Australia to other countries as a result of the lack of finance for research and development. It would be a shame to see that brain drain increased further as a result of the Australian Government's having little or no regard for the maintenance of research programmes, simply because it wants to cut expenditure. Areas of expenditure that directly affect the Ministers themselves have not been reduced. One has only to look at the State Budget and the Commonwealth Budget to see the way in which the political Leaders of the Labor Party are willing to line the pockets of their own departments in connection with departmental expenditure, but they starve other important areas, such as university research, thereby putting people out of jobs. A classic example is the Government's decision to disband the Industrial Research Institute; this will mean that several people will be out of a job, even though the Treasurer gave an assurance that the people might be able to get employment elsewhere.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What has that got to do with universities?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Commonwealth Government has reduced the allocation for research, and the State Government has closed down a research institute; this will have the same sort of effect. One reason given by the Treasurer in his letter to Dr. Melville, the Chairman of the institute, was that there was a tight financial position at present. The Australian Government's policy towards research in our universities is most unfortunate, as is the Government's entire policy towards the funding and independence of Australian universities.

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): I rise to grieve on drainage rates charged to landholders in the South-East. This iniquitous charge is another burden being carried by landholders in this area, and I had hoped that the Government would see the light and take its cue from our Party's policy speech, which dealt with the abolition of these rates. In the coming year it is intended to raise about \$110 000 from this most unfair blanket charge.

Difficulties were experienced with the previous rating system and, if a more equitable system could not be devised than currently exists, at least this system should have been thrown out. At present, many people who do not have any drains and who receive no direct assistance from drainage are forced to pay drainage rates on their wet lands. The drainage system in the area is of no advantage to them, yet they must assist in paying for the drains. As only \$110 000 is collected, the cost of collecting this sum would not bear investigation. The sum

was reduced as a result of successful appeals by some landholders, but when appeals have been unsuccessful the landholders have no further avenue for appeal. The decision of the appeal board is final, and people in many areas (I refer to Kalangadoo and the northern section in particular) are unhappy about the situation as they receive no benefit whatever from drains, and they do not consider they should have to pay these rates.

The blanket charge has been one of the most unpopular charges introduced in the South-East for some time, and it will continue to remain unpopular. In examining the Budget documents I notice that a \$25 662 refund is referred to. I would be interested in a break-down of this sum, although I see that part of it comes from the refund of betterment rates. Some people have completely paid out their betterment rates; sometimes a figure of \$40 000 was involved. How is this \$25 000 made up? If anyone has received a refund of betterment rates many more could or should receive a refund, and I shall be looking into this matter in the future. I wonder what these people will think when they learn that some people have had betterment rates refunded. This figure is small in comparison with the amounts that have been paid in betterment rates, so I imagine that only part of the rates that have been paid have been refunded. What happens to the remainder of the rates that have not been refunded?

I also refer to the impending increase in unimproved values of land. Although we have yet to see what effect this will have on our drainage rates, it will be considerable, and will only add to the complaints that I am now receiving. The system to strike the change has been difficult to organise and estimate, and I believe that the best move would be its complete abolition. I hope that the Government will examine this matter, sympathise with local landholders, and act accordingly. I now turn to the wool industry and the 250c a kilogram guaranteed price. I refer to the relationship of this 250c a kilogram with the old fantastic price of 240 pence a pound.

Mr. Venning: £1 a pound.

Mr. VANDEPEER: True. It is surprising how many people relate the 250c to the 240 pence and consider that producers are getting a wonderful price. Perhaps it should be done by grower organisations, but this situation has not been emphasised by the press. The 250c is for a kilogram of wool, and 2.2 lb. makes up a kilogram. This brings the price down to just over 100c a pound, which can be compared with the old price of 240 pence a pound. Apart from this, the price is estimated on clean weight. The price is based on 250c a clean kilogram.

Mr. Venning: There is a great difference.

Mr. VANDEPEER: There is a great difference, yet I believe in the public eye the difference is not known. The public believe that producers are still on the band wagon, obtaining a good price for their wool. Therefore, I bring to the attention of members on both sides that some advertising is needed to bring to the notice of the general public the true situation of wool growers, who have a guaranteed top price of about 70c for top wool, which is an average of about 50 pence a pound in the old weights. Producers have been receiving this price for 10 or 15 years, and with the large increases in costs of production over that period it is absolutely impossible to continue producing wool at that price.

In many areas the shearers' quarters, shearing sheds and other facilities are not being repaired and maintained at the appropriate standard. Indeed, they will not be repaired,

and standards will not rise while producers are asked to produce wool at this extremely low price. Currently, many shearers' quarters are not being used, as the trend today is for shearers to drive out from local towns to shear sheep. This is a deplorable situation, and I bring it to the notice of all honourable members. I refer to the anomaly of the public's not realising that 250c a kilogram clean has no relationship whatever to the old wonderful price of a £1 a pound.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): The matter that I bring forward has been prompted by a letter that I received recently from Rev. D. Haynes, Secretary of the Yorke Peninsula Methodist District Synod, who states:

The Yorke Peninsula Methodist District Synod met at Bute recently and discussed many things, including road safety. The following resolution was carried unanimously:

That in the interest of reducing the road toll, the Synod make representations to the State Government that major country hospitals be required to take blood alcohol samples from all accident victims.

As part of our Church Synod area comes within your electorate will you please bring this matter before Parliament when opportunity arises or as soon as possible.

Other inquiries have been made about this matter. In April last year I received from a doctor in the Kadina area a letter which states:

Under this Act—

that is, the Road Traffic Act Amendment Act of 1972—

Walleroo Hospital has been designated the only hospital in this area in which it is compulsory for doctors to take blood specimens for alcohol estimations from road accident victims. There are two other hospitals, namely, Moonta and Kadina within 10 miles from Wallaroo where the Act does not apply. Casualties are admitted to either of the three hospitals. All the doctors in the three towns have access to the Wallaroo Hospital, besides the hospitals in their own towns. The decision on where a casualty is to be admitted rests largely with the doctor called to the scene or standing by. In practice this means persons suffering injuries in or near Wallaroo are admitted to the Wallaroo Hospital, where they are subject to the Act, but in nearby Moonta or Kadina areas accident victims are not liable to have blood taken when admitted to the local hospitals unless the doctor or ambulance from Wallaroo attend at the scene. All casualties in a road accident are not invariably admitted to the same hospital, for a variety of reasons. I believe this area is unique in the State with regard to distribution of hospital facilities, because of the proximity of two private general hospitals to a departmental base hospital. It is conceivable that anomalous situations can arise in respect of the application of the Act, and for this reason I bring the matter to your attention.

I wrote to the Minister of Transport and received from him a reply, dated July 19, which states:

I refer to your letter of May 30, 1974, with which you enclosed a copy of correspondence you have received from Dr. W. F. Seith, concerning blood alcohol tests under the Road Traffic Act in the Kadina-Moonta-Wallaroo area. I am in agreement that there are inconsistencies in this regard. The list of those hospitals which are designated under the Act for the purposes of compulsory blood tests, was recommended by the *ad hoc* committee—alcohol in relation to road traffic accidents. However, at the time of determining its list, the committee stated that this particular aspect should be reviewed in the light of experience gained after the blood test provisions of the Act had been in operation for a reasonable time. I am now of the opinion that the time is right for the list of designated hospitals to be reviewed. I have therefore called the members of the committee together with a view to reporting to me in due course on this matter. I am confident that the committee will provide a satisfactory solution to this problem.

Earlier this year I wrote to the Minister, having received a request from the Chairman of the hospital board at Kadina in which the following was stated:

Reasons why patients who are suspected of drinking should be taken to Kadina Community Hospital after being involved in accidents:

(1) 90 per cent of accident cases happen on the Adelaide, Bute and Moonta roads, and the ambulance has to pass through Kadina to go to Wallaroo Hospital. Coming in from the Bute road, we pass within 200yds. of the Kadina Hospital.

(2) We have a well equipped hospital which is fully staffed. A new wing has recently been added, also a new morgue has been built, and the casualty room is most up to date.

(3) There are four resident doctors in Kadina and one is always on duty over the weekends and holiday periods. Wallaroo has only one doctor, and he is not always on call.

(4) Recently a man put his hand through a hotel window, severing the radial artery. The police ordered that he be taken to Wallaroo Hospital as drink was involved. On arrival at Wallaroo the local doctor was not available, so the Sister had to get a Kadina doctor to attend the patient. This is just one case where a man could have bled to death waiting for attention. The ambulance could have taken the man to Kadina Hospital which was only $\frac{1}{4}$ mile away within minutes, whereas it took considerable time to go to Wallaroo which is over 6 miles away.

In reply to my letter, the Minister, in a letter dated January 17, stated:

I refer to your letter dated January 7, 1975, regarding the compulsory blood alcohol testing of drivers in terms of the Road Traffic Act and requesting that the Kadina Community Hospital become an approved hospital for taking of these tests. In reply, I advise that the *ad hoc* committee which was reconvened to report to me on their observation on the first year of operation of the legislation and to make any suggestions that they may have on the future operation of this legislation, has not submitted a report to me to date. However, I do know that the Chairman of the committee is at present collating information which includes the extension of approved hospitals. I anticipate that the report will be submitted to me shortly and as soon as I have received it and studied it I will communicate with you again. In the meantime I have forwarded a copy of your letter to the Chairman of the committee.

I have not yet received any further communication and, to my knowledge, nothing further has been done. This situation is attracting attention, and we are all grateful that there has been a decrease in the number of drinking driving cases. A report in today's *Advertiser* states that Mr. Calder, Assistant Police Commissioner, Crime and Services, considers the matter so important that police are keeping a close watch on the matter. Last month there was a decline in the figures of suspensions to 568 from the July figure of 892. The situation is one of concern. The Act provides that blood tests must be taken at the hospital to which the injured person is taken, and "hospital" is defined as any institution, at which medical care or attention is provided for injured persons, declared by regulation to be a hospital for the purposes of the section. A regulation operating in South Australia sets out, apart from hospitals in the metropolitan area, the Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, Whyalla, and Wallaroo hospitals.

There is no other hospital on Yorke Peninsula or south of Wallaroo where a person can be taken to have a blood alcohol test. I bring this matter to the Minister's notice. If any report has been released or if any more hospitals have been added to the list, I am sorry that the matter has been brought forward, but, if no action has been taken, I ask of the Minister that something be done, that the report of the committee be publicised and that the list of hospitals may be extended so that the wishes of the medical profession, the hospital board, and the synod may be considered.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): My grievance, at the hour of 2.40 a.m., relates to the present unemployment situation in Australia. I am concerned that the unemployment figures could increase considerably with young people leaving

school at the end of the year. The *News* of September 10 contained a report stating that the Federal Minister for Labor and Immigration (Senator James McClelland) predicted that 400 000 Australians would be out of work in the new year, with a record number of 230 000 school leavers flooding the labour market. That would mean about 170 000 unemployed in addition to the school leavers. This figure is of grave concern to all; to the nation, to the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, and to the National Secretary of the Federated Ironworkers Association (Mr. Laurie Short), who believes that the Government should call an urgent conference of all national union leaders to deal with the crisis.

I believe conferences should be held not only with the union movement but also with the Employers Federation. Industry must play its role, just as the unions must do in trying to solve the situation. We should not tolerate the present unemployment situation; something must be done. In the Budget a sum of \$800 000 is made available to the Lands Department for metropolitan unemployment relief. We do not know as yet what this amount covers, but I hope it will help young people leaving school, although at the same time we have a responsibility to unemployed breadwinners. They must be the first people employed; secondly, young people must be given a chance to start a career or to seek reasonable employment. Earlier this year (at page 3462 of *Hansard* on June 18) I stated that at the end of April, 1975, the registered number of unemployed in South Australia was 23 776. Included in that figure was a category "juniors under 21", totalling 9 671. It was estimated that about 2 110 of those were 1974 school leavers. That is a considerable percentage of the unemployed in the group under 21 years of age, and of that group there is again a high percentage of school leavers.

What can be done to solve the problem? The predicted unemployment figure of 30 000 for South Australia next year is highly inflated; about 5 000 school leavers will be able to find employment. In the long term, however, the Commonwealth Government does not appear to have been able to arrest the situation, simply accepting that unemployment must continue for the time being. It is a matter of priorities, whether we consider employment is essential and whether we believe that the community should not be demoralised in this way. It is fair to accept statements made by Government members that the 1970's have been the era of the worker. He has had an opportunity to get on top, and to gain the true value that he believes is his, better working conditions, better wages, and so on. However, the price his fellow worker has had to pay in some areas has been completely demoralising.

While some have been able to get higher wages, industry, through sheer economics, has had to reduce the work force and switch to automation. It is all very well to go for the ultimate in working conditions and salaries, but someone must pay. It comes down to the productivity level and the ability of industry to meet the costs and wages required.

Union officials have completely missed the point in attempting to create Utopia for the Australian worker, because he has had to suffer under the Commonwealth Government Budget and through increased taxation on cigarettes, petrol and beer. The working man has been hit to leg by a Government that he believed was there to protect his rights, supported by his unions to provide for him what was his right. In fact, he has put in a Government that has treated his beliefs hypocritically and has made his lot an extremely difficult one. He may take many years to recover, or he may never recover.

Elderly citizens of the community are greatly concerned about the headlines in the daily papers. By advocating that Parliament should go into recess for eight months, the Government is dodging the issue and its responsibility to those who elect members to this place. We should be sitting, trying to solve the problems. If the legislative programme is not available, it does not matter; at least the process of Parliament is available and Parliament is free to discuss the problems surrounding people who at present are depending on unemployment relief, such as it is, for their sheer existence.

The member for Glenelg referred to the various shortages and thefts of cash, irregularities, and thefts of Government property. Over the past five years these figures have generally increased, but in the deficiency of \$4 875, \$919 was recovered, leaving a net loss to the State of \$3 956. Thefts of Government property totalled \$61 506, but \$10 629 was recovered. The interesting point is at the bottom of page 379 of the Auditor-General's Report. The Auditor-General's comment is a grave warning to Ministers and to the Government. It is so important to supervise departmental operations. The report states:

Education Department: Approval was given to the department by the Treasurer to pay accounts totalling \$110 000 without first obtaining the certificate required under audit regulation 44 that the materials were obtained or supplied.

How could \$110 000 be paid out without the certificate required under audit regulations; what materials were obtained or supplied; where were they; where are they? Obviously, \$110 000 cannot be traced by the Auditor-General. Again it raises the point that I have always maintained: that it is the responsibility of Ministers to supervise the operation of their departments. Let us hope that, if the Government is to appoint another Minister, we will not continue to see these types of statement appearing in the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I take this opportunity to say a few words regarding the lack of co-ordination between the Minister of Agriculture and his Commonwealth colleague in Canberra. As recently as last week the State Minister did not attend the Agricultural Council meeting that was held in Canberra. There are many problems confronting the rural industry today, so many in fact that it was most inadvisable for our State Minister not to have attended that meeting, irrespective of the excuses given for his non-attendance. As has already been outlined by other members this evening, many problems exist.

Earlier this morning the member for Millicent referred to the wool industry, to which I, too, would like now to refer. The Government guaranteed a minimum price of 250c a kilogram for wool. Then, for some unknown reason the Government decided that it would reduce that guarantee to 200c a kilogram. The Commonwealth Government was condemned for taking that action, to the extent that it finally decided to revert to the guarantee of 250c a kilogram. To have reduced the guarantee was most foolish because, if the Wool Commission had sold all the wool that it had purchased, it would have shown a profit. There was, therefore, no problem for the Commonwealth Treasury in relation to the money involved in the guarantee of 250c a kilogram. However, that is not the worst feature of the matter. The problem is that the confidence has not got back into the wool market since the Commonwealth Government decided, in its earlier discussions, to reduce the floor price guarantee of wool to 200c. Although that figure is back to 250c a kilogram, confidence in the industry has not got back to the level obtaining before the Commonwealth Government reduced the guaranteed price. I

condemn South Australia's Minister at that time because of his failure to put South Australia's case not only regarding what happened in relation to wool but also regarding the superphosphate bounty. This affected rural industry throughout the country and particularly in South Australia.

I know that the previous Minister of Agriculture had a special plan that perhaps the subsidy on superphosphate should apply to the first 30 tonnes of any one producer. However, this was not agreed to by the Minister's Commonwealth colleague, Senator Wreidt. Although I understand from grower organisations that Senator Wreidt has agreed on many aspects of the problems confronting the rural industry, and said that he will take the matter to Cabinet with a recommendation, we all know what happens when it gets there. It gets the chop, as a result of which no action at all is taken.

Let us examine the superphosphate bounty and the Commonwealth Government's contribution towards it. That contribution amounted to about \$60 000 000 a year. What would it have meant if the Government had continued paying that subsidy? It would have helped the industry in its production. Also, it is general knowledge that the \$60 000 000 investment would have been returned to the Treasury and, as well, would have assisted industry and all aspects of labour throughout Australia to a far greater extent than that small Government contribution. This is indeed false economy. Any economist would have advised the Government that this would have been money well spent.

I believe that the interim report of the Industries Assistance Commission recommended that the Government should continue with its superphosphate bounty for the reasons to which I have already referred. However, the Prime Minister said he knew many ways in which he could better spend that money, but that is not the point. I suppose that could be said about many things. Looking at the problem with which the rural industry is confronted today, I believe that the Australian Government, which will not be in office for much longer, has let the industry down, particularly in the light of the recommendations that have been made to it by effective grower organisations throughout the Commonwealth as well as by the Industries Assistance Commission, which took evidence on this matter. What does the Commonwealth Government do? It does nothing at all as far as primary industry is concerned.

I return to the point I am making: that this State's Labor Minister of Agriculture and his colleague in Canberra have not made even first base on many of the problems confronting primary producers. This is primarily because of one reason: the Commonwealth and State Labor Governments have no sympathy for rural industry. They know that they obtain no support from these areas. The election held in South Australia in July indicated, particularly in the South-East, that whatever support the Government might have had in rural areas it has now lost.

These things have worried me and primary producers for some time. It was common sense that the Government of the day should have done something about these matters. However, it has neglected its responsibilities and the plight of industry is as we see it today. The sooner the Commonwealth Government is changed and the new Government can listen to and implement recommendations made to it and accept its responsibilities, to the benefit not only of the rural industry but also of the people of Australia as a whole, the better it will be.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I should like to refer to the Government's conduct in this House regarding this sitting that we are now enjoying. It started at 2 p.m. on Wednesday, September 10, and I am now speaking at 3 a.m. on Thursday, September 11. I am willing to go on sitting for as long as any other member wants to speak. I should like also to refer to the Government's conduct in the earlier debate. We started with the Treasurer trying to put on the best face he could in a spirited attack on him by the Leader of the Opposition, and it was one of the weakest expositions I have seen of the member's efforts in this House—and I have seen several of them. The Deputy Premier did a little better but then, unfortunately for him, he lost his temper for a while. However, it was a very weak exercise by the Government, but the prize effort came when we got to 4 o'clock and, for some reason, someone on the Government side forgot all about the 4 o'clock bell. I have been in this place a few years and have never seen a Government more disorganised than this Government was yesterday. It was pitiful and farcical to see everyone rushing around and no-one knowing what to do.

The Government is fast falling apart. Where it was so arrogant before, it is now trying to carry on. It lost a division the week before last and carried on yesterday not worrying too much, and it got caught again. I know that Ministers have deputations to the House, but they have certain obligations. Those Ministers who are down on the Notice Paper to speak, especially on private members' day, have an obligation, I maintain, to be in the House to take the call, so that debates can carry on. I know that one of the Ministers is retiring—that is his own personal decision. I suppose we have to have some replacements. Where they will come from I am not sure, but I have been looking around and there are a lot of hopefuls opposite. I do not know whether the present incumbents are eagerly looking forward to having some new faces with them or whether the back-benchers are eagerly looking forward to joining the present incumbents. I cannot make up my mind about it. The Government seems to have run its day and is winding down rapidly. No doubt, it is looking forward not only to the eight months break but also to the introduction of an electoral redistribution Bill. However, events yesterday were leavened a little by a few disputations across the floor, but I shall not comment on that.

A matter that concerns me greatly in my area is the valuations that have gone out in my district and adjoining districts, in particular in the council areas of Walkerville, Enfield, and Prospect, some of each area being represented by me. I took the trouble, following the speeches made by the Treasurer and, I think, later by the Minister of Works on the equalisation of rates—the equalisation scheme on land tax to be introduced, which was the basis for water rating and upon which council rates are charged—to read some of the report of the two officers who were sent to New Zealand and returned with recommendations. When the Treasurer was speaking, in the last Parliament, by interjection I raised a few queries. It seemed to me then to be a little glib, because every example cited by the Treasurer on that occasion showed that the houses he had picked out had reduced valuations under this scheme.

When I saw that the Government this year, for land tax, is estimating to receive \$19 350 000 whereas last year it was \$12 000 000, I started to smell a rat somewhere, because that increase is about 87 per cent. The Treasurer mentioned some of the big city stores and said that their rates were not likely to rise; he cited a number of houses where the rates were likely to decrease. Where are they

rising? They are certainly rising in my areas. In fact, in some cases people have been in touch with me. I know there have been some increases of about 50 per cent. One person has written to me mentioning an increase of about 57 per cent. I have been told of some cases where assessments have increased by 119 per cent. I point out to the Minister that this is not a five-year assessment (I appreciate the comment made that this is a special assessment): some people there have received their second assessment in four years. Yet in some cases an increase in valuation of 119 per cent has been reported to me.

When they object to it, as they have the right to do on receipt of the valuation form from the Valuation Department, they get nowhere because they are told, as honourable members know, that under the Act it is based on local sales. The whole purport of this equalisation scheme was to give relief. Someone is getting a great deal of relief and someone is getting no relief at all. If one can call a 119 per cent increase in assessment some relief and betterment, there is something wrong with the scheme; someone is getting away with a very nice deal. I hasten to assure the Minister that, when I talk about Walkerville, he should not get the idea that every house in Walkerville is a palace. We have two popular senior citizens clubs there and there are many small cottages in Walkerville and in the adjoining areas, many of them occupied by pensioners. It is staggering to realise that the land tax to be derived in this State in this coming year has increased by 87 per cent. I know that most of this land tax will come from the metropolitan area.

The income from water has increased by about 21 per cent this year. Besides the valuation, people will cop it because the Minister of Works has increased the cost a kilolitre, so the Government is getting two bites at the cherry with regard to water—the size of the land tax and the other assessments on which the council makes its own rating. It, of course, can adjust the rate in the dollar. I express my vehement opposition to and protest at what is happening in this regard and say that the Government is crumbling fast, on its efforts yesterday.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I take the opportunity to raise one or two matters in this grievance debate. I deplore having to speak at 10 minutes past three in the morning. Obviously, the Deputy Premier and his colleagues have embarked upon a course of legislation by endurance; they want to prostitute the democratic process by forcing members to either make themselves available at 3 o'clock in the morning or not speak at all. They hope that members will not exercise their democratic right. The Opposition does not intend to be intimidated by the bullying tactics of the Deputy Premier or his colleagues. If Government members want us to sit all night, we will do so, because we believe that the Government's attitude is not doing the democratic process any good at all. I support the comments made by the member for Rocky River regarding the attitude of our Minister of Agriculture in blatantly refusing to attend an Agricultural Council meeting called recently to discuss problems in the beef industry.

While in Western Australia last week I was surprised to read about the Minister's attitude in a report in the *Financial Review* of Monday, September 1, stating that he had refused to attend that week's meeting of Agricultural Council to discuss a plan to put a floor price beef plan into operation. I understand that the Minister said that he had an extensive programme in Western Australia. I know that he was meeting with the Western Australian Minister of Agriculture, because I met the Western Australian Minister while I was there. The unfortunate

situation is that the South Australian beef producers and others involved in agriculture were denied any proper representation because of the Minister's petty and short-sighted attitude. The plan in question would be difficult to put into operation. The plans that operate in Tasmania and Western Australia are not as successful as those Governments hoped that they would be, but those States have the advantage of their geographical position. It is difficult for people to shift stock across to Tasmania, and the Nullarbor prevents similar occurrences in Western Australia, but at least the Minister could have attended and tried to discuss the problems our beef producers are facing. He could have tried to convince the Commonwealth that it ought immediately to lift all restrictions on the export of livestock for slaughter, remove the 1·6 cents a pound export levy on beef, and remove the 1 per cent levy on other meat exported.

That positive course of action could have been taken. The Government also ought to consider altering the terms of assistance to the beef industry. A recent survey was conducted into the operations of the scheme prior to August 18. A total of 110 people were interviewed, and it is interesting that 68 of them gave their reasons for not applying for assistance as follows: 32·5 per cent believed that credit was otherwise available, and 16 per cent said that they received insufficient income from cattle. I understand that other States have altered the requirements regarding the majority of income to a lower percentage. That should be done here, because I understand that only 24 applied for this assistance in June, and there had been only 41 applicants by the end of July. They applied for only \$119. Continuing with the reasons for not applying, 12 per cent believed that they were non-viable, 12 per cent believed that the debt they carried was already too great, 10 per cent believed that the old application forms were too complicated (I believe that we should adopt the form used in Western Australia, which is more simple), 6 per cent feared bureaucratic control, 5 per cent said that they lacked information about the scheme, and a further 5 per cent said that they were newcomers to the industry.

Judging by these figures, the Minister would have had plenty to talk about in Canberra with the other Ministers, particularly his Commonwealth colleague, but it appears that he is not interested in representing South Australian producers at Agricultural Council, because he has been too busy touring around Western Australia. I hope that while in that State he inspected the Midland Junction abattoir and will put into effect some of the practices adopted there. At least, he would save the producers money if he did this. I should like to know how Samcor will repay the \$12 000 000 it now owes. It is well past bedtime for the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And yours, too.

Mr. GUNN: After 10 p.m. he gets testy and tries to throw his weight around. I think he ought to go home and let someone tuck him into bed. However, he has to stay, as the Government has to keep the numbers in the House.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We don't mind doing it, either.

Mr. GUNN: We have to keep only one or two members here, really.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's the difference between you and us.

Mr. GUNN: Another matter I want to raise (and I am pleased that the Minister of Transport is present) is the deplorable condition of the Flinders Highway. I have

raised this matter several times. I asked the Minister a question earlier this week, and was disappointed at the reply I received. The people are absolutely disgusted that the Government would spend \$600 000 and allow that money to be virtually wasted, because the road has deteriorated rapidly. It would appear that the Government is not concerned about the road programme on Eyre Peninsula. No money has been allocated for five years for sealing the road between Cummins and Tumbly Bay, after tens of thousands of dollars had been spent on it. It appears that the Government will do the same thing with the Flinders Highway. I think this is disgraceful, when those people are just as entitled as others in this State to have sealed roads.

As I understand that the Minister has received extra funds from the Commonwealth, why does he not appropriate some of that money to Eyre Peninsula where the people at least deserve one or two reasonable roads? If the Deputy Premier wants to keep us here all night, we will stay.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): It is not very inspiring to find one comes on to speak at 3.17 a.m.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We are sad about it, too.

Mr. WARDLE: I am sure that it is well past the bedtime of us all, even of the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Why did you keep us here so long?

Mr. WARDLE: It is a matter of being fair to everyone, and it is our right to have something to say. Standing Orders having recently been amended, this is the only time we have a chance to grieve when going from a second reading debate into Committee, and that is quite a change. Instead of being able to speak each day we go into Committee, now is the time. The first matter I will mention is housing, involving the Housing Trust and its policies with regard to rentals and to people who are earning large incomes. This matter has been canvassed particularly by the member for Fisher, and other members have had something to say on the matter of housing.

I will talk about the design of the trust's houses and the design of subdivisions where these houses are placed. I am distressed about a recent development designed and built by the trust at Mannum. At Murray Park there are about 60 houses, of which slightly more than half are now occupied. When I canvassed this area prior to the election, I found about 20 people who had recently occupied these prefabricated dwellings. At least five people said, "We have purchased our own block of land, and we will get out of here as soon as possible." It was very disturbing to hear this from people who were in brand new houses. The reasons for their attitude are, first, that the houses are so close together that there is no privacy; secondly, the area has been designed so that even a motor vehicle has to park in the street; and, thirdly, the back yard area is about 3 m by 4·2 m or 4·5 m—a shocking compound for a child to be kept in. The asbestos fence around the back yard is between 2·1 m and 2·4 m high. So, there is no possibility of people seeing over the fence; indeed, the yard is like a gaol compound. Most of the dwellings are between 6 m and 6·7 m apart. The sides of the dwellings are glassed and, until curtains are fitted, one can see into the houses. It is impossible to raise one's voice without being heard next door.

In view of the large areas around Mannum, I believe it is a tragedy to put so many dwellings in an area such as this. All the children from the 60 dwellings will play in the one park, which has potential in connection

with the growth of grass, shrubs and trees. However, the children will not have the privacy of their own yards. Mannum already has a group of temporary houses that have been there for 30 years. Actually, they are permanent temporary houses. People have agitated for their removal, but they cannot be removed, because there is insufficient accommodation. To duplicate such houses with another 60 houses of similar type with smaller yards seems ridiculous. I am glad that the Minister of Works is in the Chamber, because some of my constituents have received excess water accounts. One man's account amounted to \$4 845.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That is a fairly small one.

Mr. WARDLE: One or two people have received larger accounts. Would it be wise for a cross-section of these people to discuss the matter with the Minister? During the flood year, when a number of landholders' pumps were under water, single pumps only could be used. Water was being sand-bagged. Large volumes of water were running out of the Murray mouth. At that time people accrued these tremendous accounts for the use of excess water. Some of these people have since had an increase in their allocation, and their water entitlement is now higher than what their entitlement plus their excess water was for the last 12 months. So, at a time when there was so much excess water about, to receive an account for nearly \$5 000 is odd indeed.

The Corporation of the Town of Murray Bridge and the District Council of Mobilong have had a very heavy hand on them with regard to planning since the decision was made to designate the site of Monarto. The councils have had virtually no say in their own destiny, and I make an appeal to the Government at least to give these councils a greater say. I refer particularly to two elderly people who are living in a five-bedroom house that they would like to vacate. They have 1.2 ha of land that they would like to split up, and they would like to build a dwelling on a small portion of their land right on the extreme north-east edge of the town. They applied to divide the area and build a new small dwelling, but their application was refused.

Motion carried.

Schedule.

Legislative Council, \$146 000; House of Assembly, \$265 000—passed.

Parliamentary Library, \$90 000.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Is the increase in the allocation for the Parliamentary Library the normal increase resulting from inflation, or has provision been made for additional research staff?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Provision was not at this stage made for the extra research staff, because the funding for it had not been estimated until a report was received from the Public Service Board. That does not mean, of course, that there will not be provision made.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the salary paid to the Parliamentary Librarian commensurate with that paid to people in like positions with like responsibilities in similar institutions?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not examined the position recently. If it is contended that the salary is inadequate, there is a means of seeking a reclassification of the position.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Would such a reclassification have to be requested by the Librarian?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Line passed.

Joint House Committee, \$132 000—passed.

Electoral, \$561 000.

Dr. TONKIN: Are accounts still outstanding in respect of the last election and other election expenses?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of any outstanding accounts for the department.

Mr. BECKER: Can the Treasurer say what was the cost of the 1975 State election above the expense of the normal administration operations of the department?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I do not have an accurate figure at this stage, I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

Dr. EASTICK: It has been established that the names of some people have appeared twice, and that the electoral rolls used in the last election were up to two months out of date. Has any arrangement been entered into between the State Government and the appropriate Commonwealth department for more up-to-date preparation of rolls for an election? Does the Government intend to make clearer requirements regarding electoral rolls in any future elections?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At this stage I cannot indicate what progress has been made, but I will get a report for the honourable member.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Treasurer has not really answered the Leader's question about election expenses. What is the purpose of the \$222 000 referred to?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It relates to fees for elections, including a provision for the Goyder by-election held in June, 1974. There is an increase in the current year for the provision of fees for polling staff, returning officers and clerical assistance regarding the conduct of elections held on July 12 at new rates.

Dr. TONKIN: In the past financial year two referenda were held at Flinders University and conducted by the Electoral Department. Is there a figure covering the cost of that activity?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think it is covered in normal wages and salaries. I have not a separate item for it.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I refer to the item making provision for Principal Returning Officer, Returning Officers for Legislative Council and House of Assembly districts, and clerical and general staff. Because of the short period between the announcement of the recent election and the holding of the election, were additional temporary staff employed by the Electoral Department to handle the many postal vote applications? I seek information about how many additional staff were employed and what was the additional cost to the State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot give the honourable member that figure in detail at this stage, but I will get a report for him.

Mr. BECKER: I refer to the item regarding electoral rolls and printing, data processing services, and other expenses. In relation to the electoral rolls printed by the computer, I understand that there was a difficulty about the size of the print used for the names of the electors on the rolls. Has the department considered adopting a process to increase the size of the print?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I know of no consideration that has been given to it, but I will take up the matter with the Electoral Commissioner.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I understand that, because of the short period after the announcement of the recent State election, there was much difficulty in getting the rolls printed. In fact, it was possible at one stage that the election would have to be put off for one week. Can the Treasurer state the cost of having all these rolls printed by outside printers? I understand that the Government Printer could not handle the task and that the rolls were farmed out. They were probably done more efficiently, but probably done largely at overtime rates. The cost must have been tremendous. I consider that the Treasurer should tell us the extra cost involved because they were done by private printers. I believe that the matter shows the haste with which the Treasurer called that election.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no such information of that kind, but I will seek an explanation for the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Perhaps the Treasurer could find out the amount spent on printing the rolls. I also wonder whether he could obtain information on what would have been a reasonable cost if they had been done by the Government Printer during normal hours.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know that I can obtain a contrast of that kind for the honourable member. What I can obtain for him is what the cost was, and I will do that for him.

Line passed.

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, \$20 500—passed.

Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement, \$4 500.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I take it that the position of Secretary is part-time. Does the Treasurer say that it is a part-time job, worth \$250 a year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Unless there is something to be paid, nothing will be paid. It is not a position that requires continuing work.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the Secretary paid on a sessional basis?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, on an annual basis.

Line passed.

Legislature, Miscellaneous, \$657 000.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I seek information concerning the \$2 200 allocated for the Leader of the Opposition to travel overseas. Can the Treasurer explain why this money has been allocated and what specific trip he has in mind that the Leader should take in the coming year? I wonder whether it is an actual allocation to send him to New Zealand and back and therefore remove his entitlement to a decent overseas trip in the next three years.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer to the latter question is "No". I imagine that this item is against some outstandings. If the honourable member has followed questions asked here previously about overseas trips, he will know that it is a long time before accounts for overseas visits of this kind come to hand.

Mr. EVANS: What was the cost of cleaning Parliament House prior to the present year? Is the substantial increase in the cost of fuel, light, rates, cleaning, etc., mainly in relation to cleaning? What is the contract price for the cleaning of Parliament House in this fiscal year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not have that detail, but I will get it for the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: The figures in relation to fuel, light, rates and cleaning show an increase of about \$25 000 over the actual payments for last year. Does this increase relate merely to cleaning charges? If the figure relates to fuel

for the air-conditioning system, surely the extra cost would not be such a large sum?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I said, I will get that detail.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the figure of \$75 000 for cleaning, etc., cover the expense of cleaning the carpet in the lift, which is marked by what appears to be an oil stain, as well as the stain along the carpet between the lift and members' rooms? The doors of the lift were chipped by goods being carried up and down, and that damage has never been repaired. Will the \$75 000 cover the cost of cleaning the unsightly mess in the lift and on the carpet in the corridor?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If it is a normal cleaning job, it would; if it is something extra to be done, it should be referred to the Public Buildings Department.

Mr. VENNING: I pay tribute to the former cleaners who had worked in this Chamber since 1939. They worked at all hours of the night cleaning this building. I do not know what recognition the lady and her daughter received from the Government, but I place on record my appreciation of the magnificent job they did for many years at all hours of the night and at a very low rate of remuneration when compared with the present-day figure in the changed situation of the cleaning of Parliament House. Were the services of the lady and her daughter recognised at the termination of their employment here?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A presentation is being made to Mrs. Bayliss and her daughter by the Joint House Committee, I think on Thursday next. I agree with the honourable member that Mrs. Bayliss and her daughter did a tremendous job over many years. They were very loyal and good servants in the cleaning of Parliament House. They were also very good constituents of mine. The cleaning matter raised by the Deputy Leader has been taken up with the Public Buildings Department.

Dr. EASTICK: I agree with the Treasurer's comment that it takes a considerable time to get accounts back in relation to overseas travel. I thank the Government for having accepted the promotion made to it from this side regarding an opportunity for the Leader of the Opposition (whoever he or she may be in the future) to undertake a tour. It is a fitting and proper recognition of the importance of the position. I thank the Australian Government, more especially the Foreign Affairs Department, for the part it played in what was in effect a guinea pig tour, it being the first arranged by the Australian Government. The assistance given in many places across the world was of considerable advantage to the group travelling, as well as in the gaining of information and access to people from whom information was required. So that there may be no misunderstanding now or in the future, the last word in the item "Overseas visit of the Leader of the Opposition, Leader's wife and officers" should be singular; it was an officer, not officers.

Mr. WARDLE: I convey my appreciation to the Treasurer and my thanks to the Government for the opportunity to make a three months study tour in Europe, United States of America, and the United Kingdom. I appreciated the opportunity immensely, and I am sure it will benefit me and, I hope, members and the community at large.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 11, at 2 p.m.