

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, June 9, 1976

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

PETITIONS: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 368 residents of South Australia praying that the House would amend the Succession Duties Act to abolish succession duty on that part of an estate passing to a surviving spouse.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN presented a petition signed by 313 residents of South Australia praying that the House would amend the Succession Duties Act to abolish succession duty on that part of an estate passing to a widow.

PETITION: AGE OF CONSENT

Mr. VENNING presented a petition signed by 226 residents of South Australia praying that the House would not pass legislation to lower the age of consent to 14 years.

PETITION: MOTOR CYCLE SPEED LIMITS

Mrs. BYRNE presented a petition signed by 121 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to introduce legislation to increase the speed limit for a motor cyclist carrying a pillion passenger to 110 kilometres an hour on the open road.

Petitions received.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Baroota Reservoir Spillway Upgrading,
Coromandel Valley Primary School (Replacement),
Hawthorndene and Monalta Sewerage Scheme,
Hope Valley to Clairville Road Trunk Main,
Woodville Primary School (Redevelopment) Stage I.

QUESTIONS**UNIONISM**

Dr. TONKIN: In view of the hostile public reaction to the proposals for compulsory unionism in South Australia, as outlined by the Minister of Labour and Industry and in His Excellency's Speech, does the Premier now intend to modify these proposals in the same way as he has sought to do with his plans for worker participation in South Australia? Since the Government's intention was announced yesterday, my office and the offices of most Opposition members have received dozens of calls from people objecting to the proposals. People are incensed that their freedom to decide whether they want to join an association or trade union is to be taken out of their hands. The Government undoubtedly will stick to the view already given by the Minister that it will be the court's discretion to rule on appeals. However, it has been pointed out to me that the court cannot go behind the law, and, if the law says that only unionists will get jobs, the court cannot go beyond that. That philosophy is abhorrent—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Leader sought leave of the House to explain his question, whereas I believe that he has not been explaining the question but debating the matter.

The SPEAKER: I must uphold the point of order. It was intended by Parliament, when the Standing Orders were drawn up, that an honourable member was to be given permission only to explain his question, and not to debate it. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and to make certain of the situation I will repeat the remarks I made earlier in my explanation: I and other Opposition members have received numerous telephone calls, and I am now expressing the tenor of those calls; these are matters of fact and are necessary to the question. As the view that has been expressed to me and to other Opposition members is that the philosophy of compulsory unionism is abhorrent to members of the community, including many trade unionists, the Government, I believe, has an obligation to the public to spell out clearly its exact intentions in the matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can only say that on this side of the House our experience is not similar to that of the Leader of the Opposition, nor is it the experience of the media, because the monitoring unit has shown that talk-back programmes have not been able to stir a single report or question on the topic.

Mr. Dean Brown: They're too scared.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They are not scared at all. I imagine that the honourable member's usual group of cluckers on that particular series of programmes has not yet been able to get itself in order. The fact is that the great public uprising on this question is as non-existent as is the community's disturbance and disease on the subject that the Leader sought to debate in the House yesterday. The Government's policy is not a policy of compulsory unionism: the Government's proposals are simply to allow our courts to make orders similar to those of the Commonwealth court, which, has been able to make orders in this area for a long time and which, indeed, has made orders in respect of many South Australian unionists (it has certainly had the capacity to do so). In addition, there are two other States where similar facilities are available. All that is proposed is that a court be allowed to decide in the circumstances of a particular case that it is appropriate to order that preference in employment in that particular area be given to trade unionists who are appearing before the court.

Mr. Millhouse: Isn't that really a matter of policy that should be decided by Parliament?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. I believe it is something a court can decide on hearing the matter before it.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't you think it is a matter for Parliament to decide, not the court?

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many questions: each honourable member is allowed one question only.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is intended that Parliament decide it by allowing the court the discretion.

Mr. Millhouse: You know what "passing the buck" means.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member, whose anti-union record in this State is well known, will take the attitude constantly that if he is unable to prevent people from being members of trade unions no-one else should have the right of any discretion in that area at all.

Mr. Millhouse: No, that's not so. Abuse is no argument.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has made his interjection and has had his reply. At present I am replying to the Leader of the Opposition. The position of the Government is that it should be the right of our courts to be able to make orders similar to those that can be made by the courts with Commonwealth jurisdiction that at present govern many members of the work force in South Australia; in fact, at present more than 50 per cent of that work force is subject to Commonwealth awards. There is no reason why a court in South Australia should not be able, in relation to those under a State award, to make orders similar to those that are made by Commonwealth courts under legislation that has existed under Liberal Federal Governments.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: For 23 years it was never changed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, 23 years of it. All that is proposed is that our courts can do the same thing as Federal courts could do under Federal Liberal Governments, but the Leader says that that is compulsory unionism. He knows perfectly well that he is misrepresenting the position grossly to the public, as it was misrepresented in last evening's newspaper.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was deliberately misrepresented in last evening's newspaper; the Leader knows that very well and is trying to cash in on a campaign that will not work, because people believe him no more than they believe last evening's newspaper.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say whether the Government's decision to institute compulsory unionism in South Australia is motivated by a desire to increase union funds and thus to increase financial support for the Australian Labour Party? The trade union movement is, of course, the industrial arm of the Labor movement, and the A.L.P. is the political arm. We know that Mr. R. J. Hawke is Federal President of the A.L.P. and the Australian Council of Trade Unions. We also know that at the Federal election last December the level of financial support for the A.L.P. was about at the same level as the level of support it received in the ballot box, and that it is in considerable financial difficulty. In these circumstances, is at least one of the reasons why the Government has been motivated to introduce compulsory unionism to South Australia the fact that it is seeking additional union funds for the financial support of the A.L.P.?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member obviously intends to proceed with the normal tactic of the Opposition of utterly misrepresenting the position of Government. In reply to the Leader, it was pointed out that the Government's policy is not compulsory unionism. We have not proposed to introduce in South Australia the law which existed in Queensland for most of this century and which required all workers to join unions. That has never been the policy of this Government, and it is not proposed to introduce it here; that is compulsory unionism. The position of the Government is that we intend that there should be a policy of preference to unionists available in Government service, and in those services supported by Government, and available for order by the court, if it finds appropriate circumstances, in awards; that is entirely in accordance with the position that has existed under Liberal Governments in the Federal Court, which also makes

awards in relation to South Australian workers. That is the position. For the honourable member, having had that reply and the position completely stated, to go on and say that the Government is proceeding to a policy of compulsory unionism is to constantly propound here in the House and publicly what he knows to be untrue, and he is doing that deliberately.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether it is a fact that, within his proposals for legislation dealing with compulsory unionism, there exists a provision giving expanded rights of entry to any union official for any purpose into any plant or factory within the State for the purpose of discussions with either unionists or non-unionists at any time? Is the Chairman of the conciliation commission to have power to order or to instruct people before him rather than arbitrate, as has been the case in the past? The powers I have outlined (which I am led to believe will be a part of the legislation that the Minister will introduce) will have serious consequences on industry in this State. "Industry", in these terms, includes the whole of franchise, the whole of activities, embracing any organisation or any individual who employs another.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I reiterate, for the eighteenth time (and I suppose I will keep reiterating it before it penetrates the minds of those people who sit opposite), that there is no intention whatsoever of this Government to introduce any method to compel you people to join unions. The Premier has explained the matter. I have been on television to explain it, and I have explained it to the press. If they want to write it up in their own way, that is their own fault. I understand that the majority of journalists do not believe in their editorials. I have been given some information today about this matter. The two newspaper chains in this State both enjoy compulsory unionism; in fact, they are all members of the union.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Agreed to by the newspapers.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That is right. They have used this hysteria yesterday in the press, and I think that it was disgraceful. If the journalist was responsible for the headline, he gets no credit whatsoever from me.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He wouldn't be worried about that.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: He may not be worried about that, but he should be accurate. If he wants to be considered an efficient journalist, he must write the article accurately.

Mr. Mathwin: Was it lies?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Yes. The front page of the second edition of last night's *News* was lies; there was no question about that. The honourable member knows it, and so does the public. I was on talkback last night for 20 minutes, and not one question was asked after I was on the programme. That is how much inciting members opposite have been able to do about this matter, because people are accepting the situation as it is. Let me quote one journalist who, this morning, has got nearer the truth than anyone else. As I have said, not all journalists believe what is in their editorials. In this morning's issue of the *Australian* I notice that the industrial correspondent, Malcolm Colless, commented soberly:

Legislation to make union membership compulsory would only put the official stamp on what is already in many cases a fact of life.

The Government is not doing that, but this man is writing an article saying what is happening in outside life, and he is speaking about his own industry, a very important thing to remember. Yet this group builds up all this hysteria about the Government.

Dr. Eastick: What's the answer?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The answer is that no compulsory unionism is being introduced in this State at all. We are merely taking away the deterrent that prevents the court from hearing such cases now.

Dr. Eastick: Are you going to expand—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Does the honourable member want the answer, or is he going to continue interjecting?

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. I will hear complaints later in the session about the fact that not enough questions are answered. I should like to make two observations right at the start of this session. Far too many members ask a question, seek leave to explain, and then reiterate the question, and that is an utter waste of time. Far too many interjections are being made to Ministers demanding that they answer this or that. This must cease. I have come to the conclusion, after visiting many Parliaments, that perhaps one of the reasons for so many interjections in our Parliament, and for Ministers taking so long to reply, is that our Question Time is far too long by general standards.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Thank you for that advice, Mr. Speaker; I hope it is heeded, so that questions can be answered quickly, giving Opposition members much more time in which to ask their questions. The only thing the Government is doing with this legislation is to remove a prohibition that has been removed in other States and the Commonwealth for many years. I said yesterday (and if the member for Light was not listening, or has not checked *Hansard*, I cannot help that) that the prohibition was removed in 1938 in Western Australia, and that for 23 years the Commonwealth Liberal Government did not bother to put a prohibition back in the Commonwealth award. If one likes to examine the records of the past couple of years, one finds that in the clerks case, a very important case, the Federal tribunal inserted preference clauses into the award for all purposes. What is this hogwash from Opposition members? All this Government will do is give the court the same right as exists in the five other States and the Commonwealth. If that is not proper, I am a bad judge of what is proper. I was asked two questions by the honourable member. He knows the answer to the second question (if he does not know he should, as he has been here long enough): he will find out what is in the legislation, as is the case with all other legislation, when it is tabled in the House.

SCHOOL DENTAL SERVICES

Mr. ABBOTT: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Health whether the Federal Government has indicated that it is going back on its election promise that it would honour all undertakings with the State in relation to school dental treatment? I believe that the Federal Government has indicated that it intends to reduce its share of assistance by 10 per cent, and I should like to know what effect this will have on the training of future therapists and on the target date of having all schoolchildren under the age of 15 years receiving free dental treatment by 1981. This scheme provided free dental treatment for thousands of South Australian schoolchildren, and, having regard to the high cost of dental treatment, I should like to know the effect of the Federal Government's action in breaking this election promise.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I can understand the honourable member's concern, because of the Fraser Govern-

ment's recent behaviour over Medibank. As the importance of this question cannot be over-emphasised, I shall bring it immediately to the attention of my colleague.

CRISIS CARE SERVICE

Mr. WHITTEN: Has the Minister of Community Welfare any up-to-date information about the work of the crisis care service, which is provided by the Community Welfare Department? At the beginning of this year, just after the service started, I asked the Minister to supply some information about it. The Minister indicated then that the calls on the service were extremely heavy. I know the good work that has been done. Has this heavy demand continued?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member was kind enough to let me know in advance that he would like this information. As well as giving what I regard as interesting details, I can also tell members that they are up to date. Between February 16, when the work began, and Monday, June 7, crisis care workers attended some 500 crisis situations. They also handled about 4 600 telephone calls, about 25 per cent of which required some further action by the service or the department. It is interesting to note that 65 per cent of the cases are referred by the police. Members may recall that when I made an earlier announcement about this service I congratulated the police on their co-operation in this matter, and I reiterate what I said then: the co-operation has been excellent. The benefit to the people of South Australia and also to the Police Force has been considerable. The main case load has comprised domestic disputes between husbands and wives and between *de facto* spouses; tensions between parents and children; deserted or unattended children; runaway children; deserted and deserting husbands and wives; and attempted suicides. Another interesting fact is that about 90 per cent of departmental clients had no previous contact with the Community Welfare Department, indicating that the department's introducing a crisis telephone number for contact has proved successful and the right approach to these matters.

WORKER PARTICIPATION

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Premier say what specific part of the Yugoslav system of worker control he believes should be adopted in South Australia? What other over-sea worker participation proposals does he intend to adopt under his new proposals?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I made clear that there was no proposal for South Australia to adopt the self-management policies of Yugoslavia in the form they exist in that country. I made that perfectly clear in press releases at the time that were printed in the *Advertiser*. Obviously, the honourable member's question is again a deliberate misrepresentation by the Opposition of what has been said by the Government.

Mr. Goldsworthy: So it was a waste of time going there then.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. The significant factor—

Mr. Dean Brown: I asked the question because what was said was so general.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —in the Yugoslav experience of worker participation in management arises from

the fact that their trying to organise worker participation on a whole industry basis meant that workers on the shop floor did not get any sort of adequate involvement in management processes. Consequently, in 1974, finding that this practice was unsatisfactory in providing means of workers having some say in their own future, a new constitution was adopted in Yugoslavia which altered the basis for organisation in factories and which provided a new basis called the basic unit of socialist labour. That was based on American experience of dividing processes in factories on an accounting basis. That is, the management process, which is often propounded by the Harvard Business School, of using the various processes and separate accounting and management process in relation to them in an industry, was used as a basis or organisation in Yugoslav factories. Additional organisations provided fraction meetings of workers in such a unit if the unit was too large. The aim in each case was to ensure an effective relationship between the shop floor and worker representatives in management that would be in marked distinction to the situation in West Germany and Austria, where the *Mitbestimmung* policy (in Austria it has been a long-standing policy that has operated since the 1920's) isolates worker representatives on the supervisory board from people on the shop floor.

The lesson for us in South Australia is that the models we have been writing so far do not take sufficient account of that experience between 1956 and 1974, in Yugoslavia, and that the kind of whole industry organisation on which we have been writing models did not give a sufficient relationship between the worker and his representatives. Therefore, that experience may well modify the way in which we write models in future. That does not mean to say that we will adopt Yugoslav models: we do not intend to do so. However, experience in that area can be of help to us simply because in Yugoslavia the attempt at involving workers in an effective say in their own future industrially has gone further than it has gone in any other country, and is in marked contrast to what has happened in the Comecon countries. That is all we have said. It is interesting to look at the experience, and to draw certain lessons from experience in a completely different system. Nevertheless, the experience within that system may well be relevant in some measure to what we are doing in a very different system from theirs.

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The proposed model for the trust has now been circulated to all of its employees, and we expect to reach finality on this matter soon. The matter had been held up for some time because of representations by representatives of the unions involved in the trust, but it was decided by Government that the best way to proceed was to circulate the proposed model to all employees so that they might be fully apprised of the proposals (and that has been done). The Industrial Democracy Unit is working with a number of other semi-government authorities on the preparation of models.

DEMERIT POINTS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Transport seen reports of the criticisms made in the Magistrates Court yesterday in relation to the points demerit disqualifications? Was the claim made justified and, if it was, what can be done to solve the problem? The magistrate indicated that it was monstrous that drivers should have points demerit disqualifications hanging over their heads for long periods. The newspaper report states:

Mr. D. F. Wilson, S.M., said that it was a matter of "elementary justice" for notice of disqualification to be served promptly on offenders, and that long delays were bringing the law and its administration into disrepute.

What can the Minister tell us about this situation?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I was distressed to read in this morning's newspaper the report of what Mr. Wilson had said, because I think it could be regarded by the public as a reflection on the efficiency of the Motor Vehicles Department. I think it is fair to say that Mr. Wilson said clearly that he believed the Registrar and his staff were not doing their jobs properly. I refute that completely, and I only wish if Mr. Wilson had doubts about the efficiency of the Motor Vehicles Department he had taken action through the Attorney-General to convey those doubts so that information could be obtained properly. He referred particularly to the case of a person who had a suspension hanging over his head for 2½ years. This person committed the offence that brought his total to 12 points in October, 1972; he was convicted in April, 1973; the notice of conviction was received 11 days later; and the notice of suspension was issued six weeks later. It was necessary to wait for six weeks. Mr. Wilson ought to know better than anyone else that there is a period for appeals, and obviously points cannot be finally determined whilst there is a period of appeal. When that six weeks period had expired the suspension notice was issued, but it was not served because no-one could find out where the man was. It was only when the man went into the Motor Vehicles Department a few days ago to try to get a new licence that he was served his notice. To blame the Registrar because the police are unable to find someone is, to say the least, rather unfair.

The same thing could be said in relation to all the other appeals that went forward. I think it is important also to answer the criticism Mr. Wilson levelled when he said that there ought to be someone in the court to represent the Crown. This Parliament inserted a provision in the legislation that makes the suspension mandatory; there is not a discretion at all. In those circumstances, to ask the Crown to be continually represented I think is not fair, nor is such representation needed. I shall write now to the Attorney-General to put the matter in the proper course, asking him to invite Mr. Wilson to make, in the proper fashion, any submissions he thinks important, and those submissions will be looked at. I do not want to get into a public debate with Mr. Wilson or any other magistrate on whether the dispensation of the law from their end is right or wrong. Likewise, I think it is their responsibility to see that, if something is not quite right, they take the proper steps to rectify the error, and that course is certainly not public criticism of respected officers. As to the cases that were before the court, the Registrar has been good enough to provide me with a chart showing the dates of the offence, the conviction, when notice of conviction was received, when the suspension notice was issued, when the notice was served, and when the appeal was heard, together with the names of the persons concerned. With your permission, Sir, I ask that this table be inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

SUSPENSION NOTICES

Name	1 Date of Offence	2. Date of Conviction	3 Notice of Conviction Received	4 Suspension Notice Issued	5 Notice Served	6 Appeal Heard	Remarks
Aslin, Kevin John . . .	1/11/75	22/1/76	27/1/76	12/3/76	22/4/76	8/6/76	
Brand, Gunther August .	16/10/75	11/2/76	17/2/76	29/3/76	15/4/76	8/6/76	
Cameron, Michael	23/11/75	11/3/76	16/3/76	3/5/76	5/5/76	8/6/76	
Denton, William D. . . .	3/12/75	1/3/76	15/3/76	20/4/76	4/5/76	8/6/76	
Edwards, Mark S.	26/11/75	5/3/76		20/4/76	24/4/76	8/6/76	
Essery, Roderick C. . .	27/11/75	9/2/76	26/3/76	8/4/76	23/4/76	8/6/76	
Harvie, Richard J. . . .	18/12/75	3/3/76	5/3/76	20/4/76	23/4/76	8/6/76	
Mecklem, Francis B. . . .	7/4/75	30/9/75	6/10/75	28/11/75 12/3/76	23/3/76	8/6/76	Correct address not known in 1975
Stamatakis, Hercules	6/11/75	19/2/76	1/4/76	20/4/76	23/4/76	8/6/76	
Taddeo, Paul	31/10/75	11/2/76	10/3/76	29/3/76	29/4/76	8/6/76	
Teichman, Eric H.	10/1/76	2/3/76	3/3/76	20/4/76	27/4/76	8/6/76	
Young, Terry, G. . . .	4/10/72	6/4/73	17/4/73	15/6/73	3/5/76	8/6/76	Young's whereabouts unknown. Came to this division to obtain a renewal and was served with the notice.

GOODWOOD ORPHANAGE

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Education say what the Government intends in relation to the recently purchased Goodwood Orphanage? As there had been much speculation for some time about the future of the Goodwood Orphanage, the announcement by the Deputy Premier that the Government was purchasing the building and adjacent land for \$750 000 was most interesting. Doubt had been expressed about who would purchase the property, and I am sure most people are pleased with the Government's action. Can the Minister explain what is intended for the future of the building and the land?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The department is thrilled to have been able to obtain these valuable facilities, particularly as it is not a charge against my line, either capital or current; it is under the line for other Government buildings, which comes under my colleague, the Deputy Premier. The immediate intention of the department is that the physical education and music branches should be moved into the building, and that later the library branch and the educational technology centre will establish a good deal of their facilities at that spot. We hope that the nerve centre of the outdoor education project team can be established there. That is in the short term. There are, of course, facilities there that would enable students and teachers to board on the property, and, once certain modifications have taken place, we hope that these kitchen, dormitory and toilet facilities will be suitable for residential purposes and enable children, particularly from country schools, to be able to come to the city and use the facilities as part of their normal courses. The property will also be available on a limited basis to local schools. The city of Unley has expressed interest in the use of some of the facilities, particularly the physical education and music facilities, as a community service, and we are only too pleased to continue a dialogue with that city in the hope that this type of community use will be available.

TRAVEL CONCESSIONS

Mr. WELLS: Will the Minister of Transport give sympathetic consideration to granting concession fares to members of the St. John Ambulance Brigade travelling on public transport on duty whilst in uniform? The brigade's officers attend practically every function held in the State over the weekend and, sometimes, during the week. The officers, who work in a voluntary capacity, are not reimbursed at all, and their duty at times takes them far afield to, perhaps, the Gawler Racecourse or to a distant beach, and they must pay their own fares whilst travelling to perform a most valuable function for the general public.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have not had a proposition such as this put to me before, but I shall be pleased to study it, make a submission to Cabinet, and see whether anything can be done.

POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. NANKIVELL: Is the Minister of Education now able to state what action the Government may have taken, or proposes to take, to initiate the undertaking he gave in his Ministerial statement on February 3, in connection with the Further Education Bill, to have an inquiry undertaken into all areas of post-secondary education in South Australia?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I can understand a certain suspicion by the honourable member that I have been somewhat dilatory in this matter, as so much time has elapsed since I gave the undertaking. In explanation, I remind honourable members that this is a fairly sensitive area. A few days ago, one of the newspapers used the term "demarcation dispute" in relation to the matter that arose when I first introduced the Further Education Bill in the House. That is perhaps not an unfair description of the matter. The demarcation relates not only to what is appropriately handled within the area of further education

and the area of advanced education but also to what is appropriately handled in the universities.

Because of this, it was necessary that whoever served on this committee of inquiry was not obviously beholden to any of the sectors that would be the subject of the inquiry, and certainly not to the institutions within those sectors in this State, and finding people who were in that category yet at the same time would be able to provide the sort of inquiry which the House and the community would expect has not been easy. I would not for a moment want to suggest that any of the people we have in our institutions in South Australia would give other than a fair hearing to the various submissions that came up, but, to use the hackneyed phrase, justice must not only be done but must be seen to be done.

The result is that, after much time, I now have a panel of names to submit to my colleagues. I have the verbal acceptance from a certain person of an invitation to chair the inquiry, but I have also been requested by him not to divulge his identity until he gives me the green light so to do. I expect that I will have the green light in a couple of weeks, and I will then be able to make an appropriate recommendation to my colleagues. It is unlikely that the inquiry will do too much intensive work before very late in this calendar year.

Mr. Nankivell: So it will be later than you suggested?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes, for two reasons. The first is that, in order to get the sort of person I wanted to chair the inquiry, it was necessary that I gave the undertaking that not much detailed work was to be done this year. In addition, because of the real doubts there are (and I say this without wanting to make a political point) about the outworkings of the new federalist policy, in some ways the inquiry might be an inquiry in a vacuum, because we do not know what are the future plans of the Commonwealth Government for the funding of the post-secondary sector, or whether the commissions will continue over the years to operate in the way in which they have operated in the past, or whether there will be radical changes. We already know, for example, that there will be a rolling triennium instead of what we have been used to having. It is probably wise to give the situation a few months in which to settle down so that a true appreciation of the realities of the Commonwealth situation will be available to our investigators.

LAND PRICE CONTROL

Mr. MAX BROWN: Will the Minister for Planning say whether he or his department has given any thought, or is likely to give any thought, to extending land price control to areas of the State not included in the Act, particularly in the city of Whyalla? I believe that, for some time, the Act has played an important role, particularly in the metropolitan area, in keeping land prices at reasonable levels. I also believe that certain people in other areas of the State (I refer particularly to the city of Whyalla) are putting the system of land sales in severe jeopardy. I question whether some control is not warranted at this time, and I believe an extension of the land price control legislation may be the answer to the problem.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will examine the proposition suggested by the honourable member. I think the Government has regarded urban land price control as a stop-gap measure until the Land Commission is able to ensure that the market is effectively supplied with available allotments at any one time. I have announced that we intend to extend the Urban Land Price Control Act

for a further two years, because at this stage we cannot be completely satisfied that the situation will remain under control in Adelaide. Regarding the situation in Whyalla, I will have it examined to see whether any action is necessary, and then consider the question of a possible amendment to the Act. I am not familiar with the problem and therefore cannot give the honourable member a definitive answer to his question one way or the other.

SCHOOL CANTEENS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say whether the Government will reconsider the insistence, which the Premier confirmed in the House yesterday, that persons in charge of school canteens must be paid full award rates? School canteens have for many years in most and perhaps all schools, both Government and independent operated, provided food that is usually of a better standard and more sensible for schoolchildren than food obtainable elsewhere. Not only have they been a convenience and service in that way but they also have provided or been a means of raising moneys for use in schools for school purposes. Mothers and others have been happy to work in these canteens as volunteers. I know that at one time my wife was in three canteens in one year. The business of canteens has grown so much that it has been found necessary in many of them to have someone in charge, not only coming in from day to day, once a week, or once a month, but regularly, and women have been found willing to act in the capacity of canteen manageress for a nominal salary or for little indeed, and certainly not for the full wage, which apparently the Government, through the Labour and Industry Department, is insisting must be paid to them. If this insistence continues (and this is the purpose of my question) many canteens will have to close. I understand that several of them have had to close already because they cannot afford to operate if full award wages must be paid. I know the Premier regards newspapers as biased, but the situation was summed up pretty well (and this is the last thing I will say)—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member has explained his question and is now entering into debate.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well: in deference to you, Sir, I will not say any more. I hope I have said sufficient to make the meaning of my question clear.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government's opinion is that, where there are full-time employees in any normal industrial situation, it is proper that they should be paid the full award rate.

Mr. Millhouse: Even if children suffer!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not a question of children suffering at all. The breaking down of award rates and conditions and the failure to pay full award rates and conditions, particularly where there is competition for work from people who need bread to exist, is, I believe, contrary to the proper principles on which our society is organised. In relation to school canteens, the Education Department has undertaken an inquiry to ascertain how we may be able properly to assist school canteens with advice on how they may continue their organisation properly at the same time meeting that principle and providing a service for which they were designed. I point out that many school canteens have been established with the assistance of the present Government, and in many cases as a result of some initiatives by the Government. Naturally, we are concerned to see that school canteen services are maintained, and the assistance of the department will be given to canteens to ensure that that happens.

BUS SERVICES

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Transport report on the provision of new buses, the extension and improvement of some Municipal Tramways Trust services depending on this? The Minister will be aware of the transport needs of the Tea Tree Gully District. I know that my remarks may apply to other areas, but I specifically refer to the Tea Tree Gully area, which is continuing to develop. The opening of new subdivisions and the increase in population has resulted in increased patronage on some bus services and in additional pressure being placed on existing services, so that the extension and improvement of M.T.T. services is now required.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When the State Transport Authority took over the operation of the private sector, much upgrading was necessary in vehicles and in services. However, they did not necessarily have equal application over all of the services. Some of them were close to what we call M.T.T. standards, but others left much to be desired. To the extent that it has been possible, we have upgraded services with the limited rolling stock available but the whole of our programme for bus improvements depends on the supply of new vehicles. These were ordered a considerable time ago, and they are now being delivered to Australia in what has been referred to as a knocked-down condition, the chassis having to be assembled here. I think about half the chassis have already been delivered and are now being assembled. The next thing will be to place bodies on them, and members will know that we were successful in inducing Leylands to come to South Australia and take over Freighters Limited's old building, so that the bodies that were to be built in New South Wales will now be built in Adelaide, with Adelaide labour. We expect these vehicles to start coming off the production line in the latter part of this year and continue through next year. As those vehicles become available we will be able to effect many of the improvements that we have announced, and included in them will be the improvements that the honourable member seeks. I hope that early in 1977 some of these improvements will be brought into effect.

INSURANCE

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Premier say why it is required that, before State Bank and Savings Bank loans are approved, house and contents and/or farm buildings must be insured with the State Government Insurance Commission, and whether this constitutes a breach of the Trade Practices Act? Recently, two of my constituents have complained in this regard, one about a loan from the Savings Bank and the other about a loan through the State Bank. I have a letter from the Legal Department of the Savings Bank of South Australia stating, in part:

We are pleased to inform you that the trustees of the bank have approved your application for a loan on credit foncier terms.

The letter continues, and later, in capital letters and underlined, it states:

Important: Prior to the first advance on the loan the buildings must be insured with the State Government Insurance Commission in the names of the bank and yourselves for at least \$.... under a policy covering house-owners and householders risk, and the certificate of insurance lodged with the bank.

My two constituents have complained about this. One of them has a relative in the insurance industry who wished to quote for the house cover; in the other case, relating to the farm loan, the claimant had been an agent for an

insurance company for many years and could have obtained a discount on the insurance for the property covered by the loan.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I did not recognise the honourable member for a start; he seems to have shifted places.

Mr. Venning: Rubbish! Get on with the question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not believe the honourable member would expect an answer off the cuff. He has given a full explanation, and I will have the matter examined and, if it is not possible to give him a reply before the House rises, I will see he is witten to in reply to his question, although I do not think that the points he has made would put the matter outside the Trade Practices Act.

TARCOOLA TO ALICE SPRINGS LINE

Mr. KENEALLY: Can the Minister for the Environment say whether the Commonwealth Government has yet responded to the approaches of South Australia to have the environmental impact statement for the Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway line proceeded with? My question arises from a statement that the Minister made when he addressed the World Environment Day gathering at the weekend at which I understand at least two members of various groups within the Opposition were present. The Minister pointed out that the new Commonwealth Government seemed not to be interested in formerly agreed environmental impact procedures, and he specifically mentioned the Tarcoola to Alice Springs railway line.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I know the continuing interest of the member for Stuart in matters relating to the Commonwealth Railways, and I am pleased to give him an answer. I am sorry that the answer is not more satisfactory.

Mr. Gunn: You're against the Tarcoola railway line, that's what it is.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: As recently as April 15, I wrote to the Commonwealth Minister for Transport.

Mr. Gunn: Are you against the Tarcoola railway line going ahead?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: That is a ridiculous question.

Mr. Gunn: That is what your statement was.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: In May of last year all the parties concerned with that railway, which of course included this Government and also the Commonwealth Railways, agreed that there should be an environmental impact statement covering the line. Since then very little has been done. In November the *Advertiser* published an advertisement calling for consultants to draw up the environmental impact stated on the basis of guidelines laid down by my department and the previous Minister. We have heard nothing more since then. Of course, there has been an election in the meantime, and it seems very much that environment, like many other worthy causes, is suffering grievously in the Federal Parliament. Because I had raised the matter verbally with Senator Greenwood, who was the Minister, and because there had been telephone conversations without any results, on April 15 I wrote again in response to public concern about the lack of an environmental impact statement, and asked what was happening. I have received an acknowledgment of the receipt of that letter, but no reply.

I am concerned that this matter may have been the subject of some of the savage economy cuts which are mistakenly being applied in Canberra, because the line is proceeding quite rapidly. I flew over parts of the line when I went to Coober Pedy via Tarcoola two or three weeks ago and saw that the clearing is past the Coober Pedy area. The line has proceeded 40 or 50 kilometres toward Tarcoola. It will approach sites of considerable interest and importance to the Aboriginal people at Indulkana, and great concern has been expressed that no proper environmental impact statement had been prepared to show what effect the line would have on that area. Apart from writing to the Commonwealth Minister and making telephone calls steadily from this end, I do not think there is much more we can do at this stage, even though the environmental impact statement is required in terms of the relevant Commonwealth legislation. We will try to get this statement out of the Commonwealth Government as quickly as possible, and certainly, I hope, long before the line gets anywhere near the most sensitive areas to the north of the line.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.

3. We thank Your Excellency for the dedicated manner in which you have served the State during your term of office as Governor and wish Your Excellency well in your retirement.

4. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from June 8. Page 24.)

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable this Order of the Day to be proceeded with forthwith and the Bill to pass through its remaining stages without delay.

Motion carried.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): At a time when we would expect State measures to be designed to fit in as far as possible with the overall economic measures of the Fraser Government to combat inflation, reduce unemployment, and stabilise the economy, the Treasurer's speech on this Bill demonstrates an unfortunate and irresponsible disregard for the welfare of the people of Australia and South Australia. In the first words of his speech he says that the outlook for the Australian States is grim. The outlook for all of Australia is grim if we do not contain inflation and restore the economy to the healthy situation that the people of Australia showed so overwhelmingly that they wanted at the Federal election last December. It is largely the fault of the centralist policies of the Whitlam Government which obviously are, because

of its actions and words, still subscribed to by the Dunstan Government and which made it necessary for the Federal Government to take the stern measures to control public spending it has taken.

Far from abdicating its responsibilities (as has been suggested by the Treasurer) the Federal Government is returning to the States responsibilities that are properly theirs. It ill-behoves the Treasurer to peddle a petty Party-political line in the face of such a serious economic situation that confronts Australia today. I repeat that the people of Australia gave the Fraser Government a mandate to tackle the problems of inflation and the economy, and also gave a mandate for its federalism policy. The Fraser Government is now taking the necessary steps to achieve those ends, unpopular though the steps may be with some sections of the community. Unfortunately, the unpopularity seems to rest with people whose political philosophy is directly and diametrically opposed to the Liberal philosophies of federalism as pronounced by the Federal Government at present.

It is not yet possible to say that the steps taken will be successful in containing inflation and achieving the desired result, but the people of Australia generally want, more than anything else, the proposals to be given a fair go. After all, the situation had become desperate at the time of the Federal election. The Treasurer and the Government of this State have a choice: it is a clear choice and there can be no half-way house. They can act in a statesman-like way and put the welfare of Australia and South Australia first, above Party-political interests, by co-operating with the Fraser Government's proposals and giving them the fair go that they deserve. This is what the people of this country want.

If the South Australian Government wishes, it can put Party politics first, and can do everything in its power to destroy confidence in the Fraser Government's proposals. The Government can refuse to co-operate, or give only lip service to co-operation. In doing this, it can jeopardise the economic recovery which everyone in Australia now desires so desperately.

Unfortunately, it seems quite obvious from his attitude that the Treasurer and his Government generally has taken the latter and lesser course, he has adopted the petty attitude that his Party-politicking must come first. He has not been willing to give the Federal economic policies a fair go. His economic statements, both before and after the December election, have been quite irresponsible and have caused alarm in the community. Indeed, they have given rise to stern comment and criticism from the community. Let me remind the House of two of these statements that the Treasurer made. On December 9 last, he predicted that unemployment would reach 1 000 000 and that inflation would approach 30 per cent under a Liberal-National Country Parties Government, and further, said that Liberal economic policies would bring about absolute disaster.

It is quite clear that the Treasurer's remarks on this occasion were pure scare tactics, not based on facts and designed only to confuse the public and attempt to create a lack of confidence. At the time he was criticised for making such sweeping statements without a shred of evidence to support them. Six months later there are definite signs that the economy is on the road to recovery, and that the Federal Government's economic measures are having the desired effect. The *Financial Review* on June 4 stated:

The March quarter national accounts go a considerable way to supporting the Government's belief that the Australian economy is on the road to recovery.

Key economic indicators, such as motor vehicle sales and stocks held by private enterprise, have shown a definite improvement. There are encouraging signs of renewed business and consumer confidence, and it ill-behoves the Treasurer to continue knocking Federal policies, particularly when they are beginning to show some signs of taking effect, just because the basis for them is contrary to his Party-political beliefs. He should, in fact, be taking active measures to support the fight against inflation instead of washing his hands of it and attempting to place the problem entirely in the lap of the Federal Government. He should be anxious to help the people of South Australia to overcome inflation and, in doing so, he would be doing his duty to the people of this State. The States all have a clearly recognised responsibility in this regard. It is further stated in the *Financial Review*:

While there are questions as to priorities in public spending, the general proposition holds good that States, as well as the Federal Government, should cut back their rate of growth in public spending as a major tactic in tackling inflation.

That is a principle the Treasurer could well pay some heed to and give more than lip service to. The Treasurer criticises the Federal Government for neglecting the real economic or social cost of its policies. However, he conveniently forgets to mention the even more damaging economic and social costs to individuals if rampant inflation continues. I am surprised that the Treasurer is not aware of that fact, because most South Australians are. Professor Geoff Harcourt, the Lecturer in Economics at Adelaide University, in a paper entitled "Social Consequences of Inflation", states clearly that periods of high inflation redistribute income away from the poor to the rich. Surely one would have thought that a socialist Treasurer would be anxious to contain inflation for this, if for no other reason. However, that does not seem to be the case. We are all concerned that the low income and needy groups in our communities do not suffer as they are suffering now under high inflation, but the Liberal approach is a practical one. In criticising the Federal Government's economic policies, which are obviously now beginning to take effect, the Treasurer is in fact urging the Federal Government to forget about and to disadvantage even further, the poor and the needy. This, neither the Federal Government nor the Opposition in this State is willing to do.

Mr. Chapman: It suits this outfit to peddle that approach.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes. In criticising the Federal Government's cut-back programme (and in criticising it so strongly) the Treasurer is really saying, "Forget about a \$5 000 000 000 deficit for this year; forget about a minimum \$5 000 000 000 deficit next year; don't worry, it can't possibly affect the inflation rate." He has not made that statement directly, but that is obviously what he implies, and it is a most irresponsible implication. If the Treasurer intends to continue to knock the Commonwealth Government's economic policies, let us hear him suggest how he would cut back that deficit, since a cutting back is vital for the recovery of the economy of this country. Let us hear his suggestions and, if he cannot put up, let him shut up.

He quotes Mr. Hamer, Premier of Victoria, but I think he did so under the misguided impression that it would embarrass us in some way. I am pleased that he quoted Mr. Hamer, although he took his remarks somewhat out of context and distorted them a bit. Mr. Hamer has propounded an important principle, and we

agree with him. He has said that resources should not be transferred too quickly from the public sector to the private sector. That is a well recognised and accepted principle in coping with an inflationary situation, especially one that has been aggravated by excess public sector spending. In fact, it was the very problem of the excessive transfer, and too rapid a transfer, of resources from one sector to the other that caused the Whitlam Government so much trouble and got it so deeply in debt. However, in that case the flow was in the reverse direction, from the private sector to the public sector, but it was the speed with which that transition was brought about that was basically responsible for the difficulties in which the Whitlam Government found itself in its last days.

The Premier of Victoria is adopting a responsible and reasonable attitude, and his statement on the transfer of funds is what one would expect of a careful and responsible State Treasurer: it is not a criticism, as the Treasurer of this State has sought to interpret it, of the Federal Government's activities. Mr. Hamer's attitude obviously contrasts significantly with that of the Treasurer of this State, who seems determined that there be no transfer in any way of funds from the public sector to the private sector. His proposition for unemployment relief highlights this fact and, admirable and necessary though it is to show concern and take positive action for unemployed people in this State (a concern that I believe is shared by every single member of the community), one wonders whether or not a proportion of those funds that we have been told will be set aside should not be used for stimulating employment in the private sector. I believe this should be considered, because such an action would have the effect of propping up the long-term economy far better than would the propping up of the public sector by special employment programmes.

Although he claims good housekeeping, one of the principal reasons for the healthy surplus of \$50 000 000 which we are enjoying in 1975-76 has been the overall improvement in the economy. The Treasurer concedes this on pages 4 and 5 of his statement when he says that wages and salaries and prices for supplies and services have not been as high as estimated in the Budget last year. This is a refreshing change, and it is in sharp contrast to his weepings, wailings and gnashing of teeth on page 1 of his statement. The Treasurer's irresponsible economic prescription of forgetting about the deficit, which is basically what he has suggested, inherent in his earlier remarks, would, if adopted by the Commonwealth Government, have a serious and deleterious effect on the State Budget. The Treasurer must know that, if inflation is to be curbed, and if it is curbed generally, our State budgetary situation must improve. It was good enough to rely on inflation, as he did when the last major Budget was brought in, but that was a Budget of expediency: it was not a Budget designed in any way to do anything about or even contribute to the control of inflation either in South Australia or in Australia as a whole. It is time that the State Treasurer and the State Government lived up to their responsibilities to help control inflation.

As an Opposition we welcome the Federal tax-sharing proposals. The people of South Australia, as did Australians generally at the last election, indicated that they wanted these measures. The Treasurer's statements on the new policy have been totally irresponsible and scaremongering. I can remember, among other statements that he made, his statement that the new policy would spell doom and disaster for the smaller States. Now,

after the last Premiers' Conference in May, he has had to concede that South Australia will do well out of the proposals. For the first time on record, he emerged from a Premiers' Conference with a smile on his face. It is worthy of note, too, that it was one of the shortest Premiers' Conferences on record and that there was uniform harmony and agreement. Once again the Treasurer was guilty of knocking the policy without considering in full its implications.

In the document we are now considering, he states that in his opinion the country now has no clearer an idea of the Federal Government's policies, and that State Governments are now no better able to plan their future commitments than they were when the Fraser Government first took office after the election. That is complete and absolute rubbish, but it is the line he has chosen to peddle. If he had been at all uncertain about the future effect of the Federal Government's policies on this State he should never have left Australia, after the Premiers' Conference, so soon after his return from overseas. His position as Treasurer of this State is surely such that he must work always for the best interests of the people of the State. To fly home from Malaysia for a short Premiers' Conference and then leave immediately afterwards for overseas and remain away for some weeks, without being fully aware and satisfied of the Federal Government's intentions, would have been dereliction of duty: indeed, it may have been.

It was obvious at that time that his Ministers did not understand, or did not want to understand, the details of the policies, but the people of South Australia had every right to expect that they would, and I cannot believe that they did not. They did not choose to understand them, and they did not choose to give public recognition to the fact that they understood them. The time for complaint that those policies were not fully understood was at the time of the last Premiers' Conference and in the weeks that followed, not now in this document, and not now publicly. One can only assume that the South Australian Government has adopted a policy of actively promoting misleading statements designed to spread confusion and that it is not prepared to co-operate in any way with the Fraser Government's proposals. These proposals, on the other hand, have received approval, which, although cautious, has been general. The *Financial Review* states:

It is a political, adventurous and in many ways a radical policy, but it is a much preferable system than that which we have evolved in the last 30-odd years since the Commonwealth has had a monopoly on the income tax collections.

As the *Financial Review* goes on to point out, Mr. Fraser is not going to make any friends on either side of the Party fence, because the policy identifies the politicians who spend the money as being the ones who extract it. This, of course, imposes a considerable political discipline on Governments and a very good thing it is that that discipline is imposed. It is a discipline that applies to public sector spending, and it is quite clear, I am sorry to say, that it is a political discipline that our Treasurer has not faced up to, and will not and does not intend to face up to. He has an obsessional determination to press on with Monarto at all costs, regardless of the present situation, which clearly indicates no immediate need for the project, and the introduction of paid maternity and paternity leave at this stage of our economic problems, setting a clear example of setting the pace for the private sector as well, is evidence of his total unwillingness to consider any restraints in the overall interests of our community. He will not put any restraints on his own Government's spending.

The Treasurer has been willing enough in the past to sit back and take the credit for all his pace-setting proposals and for funds being diverted into areas such as education and health, but he has not been willing to be identified and to be seen as the person raising the taxes to finance the expenditure. No wonder he was such an admirer and supporter of the Whitlam centralist plans. As funds came from the Whitlam Government, specifically labelled for specific purposes, he was able to sit back and take the credit. When local priorities had to be decided, he was able to disown the Federal Government. He even managed to disown Mr. Whitlam, and very effectively, too, give him credit. He survived by the skin of his teeth. Your position, Sir, might have been much the same but our position could have been very different if that action had not been taken at the time of the recent State election. He was able to blame the Federal Government, at a conveniently remote distance, and say, "The funds are not available and we could not proceed because the Federal Government would not give us the funds."

He is continuing with those tactics now, although at present, on his own admission, more money is coming in in the form of general revenue than he expected from the Federal Government. It is little wonder that he is bitterly opposed to the Fraser Federal policies, not just because of its Liberal philosophy but because the Government in this State, under those policies, will have to face fairly and squarely the responsibility for deciding priorities, for deciding which projects shall go ahead, for apportioning the funds available, and deciding which projects are most needed by the people of the State. This is called good government of the State, and it is something we have not seen from the Government opposite for some years. It has not had to worry. It has been able to shelter behind the Federal Government for all those decisions either to proceed with a project or not to proceed. The Treasurer would do well to study and accept as a philosophical proposition the following statement from the *Financial Review*:

It is a most acceptable idea that the elected bodies closest to the electors should decide expenditure priorities.

That is very true. Down the years, this simple but effective proposition has been ignored by Federal politicians who were anxious to assert their personal power and by State Governments which wanted to take a soft political ride, wanting to give away a little bit of their responsibilities to the Federal Government in return for the comfort of not being pinned down as the tax collecting body. The Treasurer's main objection to the Federal Government's economic proposition is that the people of South Australia will now see exactly how much money they are paying to keep the State Government's activities going. They will become more identified, personally and financially, with the activities of the State Government and its spending, as indeed they should. They must be in that position if they are to judge the performance of the Government.

That performance must be judged on facts, not on public relations hand-outs. The Dunstan Government, in short, will have to start governing this State again. The remainder of the Treasurer's document covers well-trodden ground, and indeed, in the latter part of the explanation, a far more responsible view is expressed. I pay a sincere tribute to our Treasury officers for the work they do for this State. In the latter part is a responsible attitude, and this attitude covers the specific needs by the use of the surplus funds which are now available.

They are not the result of good housekeeping by the Treasurer, but they are the result of actions that can be attributed to him. I refer to the sale of the railways, the funds from the Medibank agreement, and the improvement in the economy generally, although he has little to do with the last factor. Obviously, the Treasurer is happy with the general purpose funds promised to this State; indeed, he has said this both publicly and in his statement, when he says that the arrangements should be more favourable to the States in 1976-77 than the old formula would have been.

The new tax-sharing arrangements mean, therefore, that it will not be likely that he will have to call on those revenue reserves of about \$75 000 000. Obviously, as far as projects previously supported by specific purpose loans and grants are concerned, he is not able to tell yet what the future will be. I hope he will be enlightened at the Premiers' Conference that is about to take place. In any event, it is proper that the reserves which we have should be used to benefit the people of South Australia, since the money basically is theirs. An application to such projects as have been outlined in the document before us (urban public transport—and I think everyone would say it is about time—and special electricity and road works) cannot really be argued with. However, as far as general support of the Loans programme and unemployment relief works is concerned, I can say only that we will wait and see exactly what is proposed.

Mr. Mathwin: What do you think he is going to do with all that money?

Dr. TONKIN: I think only he knows, and I am not even sure that he is quite certain about it; I doubt very much whether the members of his Cabinet are. I believe the moneys allocated for unemployment relief work would be better spent by stimulating employment in the private sector as well as in the public sector; indeed, I think this is equally as important as stimulating employment in the public sector in the overall long-term control of unemployment. Even with these transfers of our surplus funds at the end of the year, as a result of the general improvement in the economy and the increased revenue from land tax and other State charges, the State's budgetary situation will still be healthy. Who knows, we may even find that the reference in the document to charges for services "of course having to be kept under review as in the past" could be referring to possible reductions in State charges, and certainly to the removal of many of the anomalies and inequities that currently apply in State taxation.

Let us hear no more confusing and provocative statements from the Treasurer and his Ministers regarding Federal initiatives and actions taken to put into effect the policies designed to restore our nation's economy. So far, they have been politicking to their own ends and have not acted responsibly to advance the welfare of the South Australian people generally. If we hear any more of these critical and confusing statements, let me say that the Treasurer has been proved wrong on a number of occasions, and so have his Ministers. He has had to back down on his predictions of the number of unemployed and the inflation rate; he has had to back down on his predictions of the effect on the States of the tax-sharing policy, and now it looks as though he will be wrong again about the future of the South Australian car engine plant, which he said Mr. Fraser would stop. I suggest that all further predictions of doom and disaster from the Dunstan Government on the Fraser proposals will be treated with great reserve and caution as being politicking without any real thought or consideration for the need or the desire of the

people, clearly expressed, for the country's economy to be restored. The people of Australia voted the Fraser Government into office to perform a specific job: it is doing that job, and the indications are that it is being successful. The Australian people want to see a fair go given to its measures, and the people of South Australia want to see co-operation from their Government. They want to see the Dunstan Government also give those measures a fair go. I support the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): It is obvious from even a cursory glance at the Treasurer's second reading explanation that the first few pages were written by one of those in the Government's employ whose sole task it is to put forth propaganda on the Government's behalf. However, there is quite a noticeable change of tone when we get down to the real nitty-gritty of the speech, because there it is obvious that some more responsible Treasury officers have taken a hand in the document and have written that section of the speech. The first three or four pages are simply the sort of political claptrap to which we are unfortunately becoming accustomed in South Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't you think there's any accuracy in any of it?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Very little. I will analyse the first few pages of the explanation in some detail, because the Government invites controversy and debate in the House when it puts forward such a statement. In reply to the interjection, I say that there is little substance in what we read in the first three pages of the Treasurer's explanation. First, I will deal with the initial political-type comment the Treasurer made, as follows:

The Federal Government is systematically setting out to abdicate its responsibilities in numerous areas, while at the same time attempting to cajole or coerce the States into taking over the functions Canberra is abandoning.

That is an adverse comment, but the fact is that Labor Governments, both State and Federal, are highly centralist in their policies. Australia suffered for about three years under a highly centralist Federal Labor Government, and the attempts by the present Federal Liberal Government to reverse the trend are deliberate and have been spelled out in the Party's federalist policy. At the initial Premiers' Conference, the policy received favourable comment from our Treasurer. He returned rather pleased by what he heard of the new Federal policy, but I understand that he got in trouble with other members of his Party for the enthusiasm he showed in supporting too vigorously what he had heard in Canberra. Certainly the Deputy Premier (acting while the Premier was overseas studying worker participation and other matters in the Communist countries) was far less enthusiastic in his support of the federalist policy. The Acting Premier took a somewhat more political stance, in line with his colleague the new Premier of New South Wales (Mr. Wran), who is obviously going to tear down this federalism policy, whether or not it is good for Australia. The Opposition believes that it is good for Australia.

We hold the sort of philosophy which believes that if one can decentralise responsible decision-making one can decentralise power, and political power is largely economic power. We tend to safeguard the freedom of the citizens of Australia: that is what the federalism policy is all about. Although State Labor Governments are pleased to hand over complete responsibility for almost every governmental area to their colleagues in Canberra, they are not pleased when they find that economic strings

are attached to decisions made in Canberra. I recall the reaction of the Minister of Transport to some of the decisions made by the Commonwealth Minister for Transport in relation to tied grants, when we were told how our money for transport and roads in South Australia was to be spent. It ill behoves the Treasurer to say that the Federal Government is setting out to abdicate responsibility: it is handing over an area of responsibility to the States so that they will have some meaningful part to play not only in the tax spending area but also in the area of income taxing. That is not to suggest that people will be taxed more heavily.

One might expect that income tax at the Commonwealth level would fall significantly and that there would be a discretionary area that could be taken up by State Governments to make up the leeway. The level of State Government spending would then be directly linked with State Government taxing powers. It ill behoves the Treasurer to start knocking this federalism policy. If he continues to do so, let us hear his true motives. The State Government wants the responsibility for spending money but not for raising it. The second comment that puts a completely wrong emphasis on what the Commonwealth Government is trying to do at present is the following statement by the Treasurer:

The Federal Government is obsessed with cutting back services . . .

That is a completely wrong interpretation and a completely wrong emphasis to place on what is happening in Australia now. I do not know that the Commonwealth Government is obsessed with cutting back services: it acknowledges the absolute necessity to come to grips with the disastrous rate of inflation that prevailed in Australia under a succession of Labor Treasurers. Perhaps it amounts to an obsession, but the emphasis placed by the Prime Minister and other responsible spokesmen is that they are attempting as a first measure to come to terms with economic reality by curbing the disastrous rate of inflation that could bring ruination to Australia in a relatively short time. If in one of those measures one of the strategies the Commonwealth Government intends to adopt might tend to stimulate the private sector by playing down the governmental sector and coming to terms with the colossal and mind-boggling deficit that has been run up by the Labor Government, obviously the Commonwealth Government must cut back in some of its areas of spending. It must cut services, if that is the way the Treasurer likes to put it, although I do not know that it is the service departments that are being cut back. Along with the Federal Government's attempts to come to terms with inflation there must be a cut in Government expenditure. We know perfectly well that it was a stated policy of at least one of the succession of Labor Treasurers (I think it was Mr. Crean, from memory)—

Mr. Wotton: There were so many of them.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He said, "Now is the time for us to transfer resources from the private sector to the Government sector." The only one of the long succession of witless men, as they have been described, who seemed to be coming to terms with economic reality was Mr. Hayden, who at least acknowledged that about 75 per cent of employment in Australia was in the private sector and that, if we endangered the private sector, we would do so at our economic peril; he at least acknowledged that. At least Mr. Hayden tried, although feebly, to cut some of the profligate spending of some of his Federal colleagues. It is nonsense for the Treasurer to say the Federal Government is obsessed with cutting back services. The present

Federal Government is trying desperately to come to terms with a disastrous rate of inflation in Australia, but our Treasurer is seeking to find a division in the Liberal Parties in Australia by quoting Mr. Hamer. This morning on A.B.C. news the impression was that Mr. Hamer was highly critical (or words to that effect) of the Federal Government. Later I heard Mr. Hamer interviewed on the *A.M.* programme, and I did not get the impression of any drastic criticism of the policy of the present Federal Government.

Even the words of Mr. Hamer quoted by the Treasurer (and they are taken out of context) do not give one the impression of strong condemnation of the Federal Government. All that Mr. Hamer is saying is that the Federal Government will have to be careful in cutting Government expenditure so that contracts let to the private sector by Government departments are not affected. In effect, that is what he said on the *A.M.* programme. Anyone seeking to interpret those words as strong criticism of our Federal colleagues is trying to make a political point. That is what the Treasurer is trying to do, especially when he states that other Premiers are now agreeing with what the South Australian Government has stressed. The Treasurer then states that the South Australian Government had warned the Federal Government that its actions would create more unemployment and cause confusion and uncertainty in the community: he did not say what the confusion would be or expand on the areas of uncertainty. He makes a sweeping statement and seeks to assert that other Premiers are agreeing with South Australia.

Perhaps Mr. Wran of New South Wales would agree, but he would have one or two political lessons to learn. He has already gone back on one of his election promises. He also says that he will not have a bar of federalism policies at any price. I thought his was a classic example of a Labor back-flip; he told churchmen that in no circumstances would he license casinos, but within a month he is suggesting that he will introduce legislation to licence them. Mr. Wran is a babe in the woods, and he would be the only Premier to be so unguarded as to support what our Treasurer is trying to assert. Later in his speech the Treasurer states:

Unhappily, it is not possible to say that. Confusion surrounds almost every aspect of Federal Government policy, be it Medibank, wage indexation, education spending, Aboriginal affairs, or urban development.

I would not for a moment believe that that statement came from the Treasury. The Government is not taking any notice of public statements made regularly by Federal Ministers. I thought the Federal Government's attitude to wage indexation had been made clear and that its submission to the court was well understood. Also, I believe that this Government has a good idea of what will be spent on education. A national press statement on May 20 by the Hon. Mr. MacKellar (Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, and Acting Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development) deals fairly definitely with some of the matters about which the Treasurer is complaining. The Deputy Premier has said that our water filtration scheme might be in jeopardy, but this is what Mr. MacKellar said in his press statement:

In the meantime the Government will fulfil all existing legal commitments.

In relation to water filtration, Mr. MacKellar said:

Adelaide water treatment scheme: the previous Government agreed to provide financial assistance to South Australia for a scheme to improve the quality of the water supply to metropolitan Adelaide. Some \$14 200 000 has already been provided over the last two years. Further assistance will be provided in 1976-77 up to the limit of the

Commonwealth commitment to the project. The latest information is that \$9 400 000 will be required. The departmental forward estimate proposes an additional \$5 000 000 to enable work to be commenced for the next stage of the scheme.

That is a definitive statement made on May 20, but perhaps the Minister missed it. Obviously, the Government is intent on knocking the Federal Government, and it would not matter what that Government did. We remember only too well the track record of this Government when Liberal Governments were in Canberra before Whitlam's witless men took over. At most public functions I attended, every Minister of the State Government unashamedly attacked the Federal Government, and I am sure that the late Minister of Education would get first prize for his attacks on the parsimony of the Federal Government.

At the opening of the Modbury Hospital the Treasurer was on the stage, and I was somewhat sickened with his political exercise: the Playford Government would not spend a penny on health and hospitals, and so on. At the opening of a wine display at the Adelaide Railway Station the Minister of Transport gave a blast on the same thing, which had nothing to do with the opening at all. Another instance was when a kindergarten was being opened down south. The whole tenor of these first three or four pages is in keeping with the track record of this Government established over a long period (it is a pretty crook record) when Liberal coalition Governments were in charge of the affairs in Canberra. The Treasurer also states:

... education given a niggardly increase in real funds, and hospital funds given no increase of a real nature at all.

I find that strangely at variance with the following statement, obviously by another writer, later in the speech:

One other factor is that the net benefits of the Medibank arrangements for Government and subsidised hospitals are likely to be more favourable this year than was expected. How can the Treasurer complain about niggardly increases in real funds for hospitals on one page and three pages later say the situation will be considerably improved on the earlier expectation. The Treasurer also states:

The result of these and many other cut-backs, both known and anticipated, is that the State's financial resources will have to be used to support these programmes.

I think it is fairly obvious that if the Federal Government, in coming to terms with economic reality, does have to make substantial cuts in governmental expenditure (and any thinking Australian realises we were living in a fool's paradise with a Federal deficit that really boggles the mind), obviously there has to be a diminution of spending and of funds which are flowing in some areas for State projects. The Treasurer finally wraps up this package with a little bit of self-praise, as follows:

The good budgetary position we find ourselves in is the envy of the other States.

When I talked to people in Western Australia in January, (a State that is far more vital and alive than this State), I did not find anybody in or out of Government who thought that life in South Australia was to be envied or that governmental actions in this State were in fact enviable; that is complete nonsense. The Treasurer states:

As to the prospective Revenue Budget situation in 1976-77, I believe that it will be possible to achieve a balance without the necessity to increase taxes.

With the sort of revenue surplus (the much-vaunted revenue surplus) the Treasurer is talking about, the time is now appropriate for the Government to reduce some taxes. The Government is completely insensitive to the plight of people who have been affected by some of its capital taxes. We have been saying in this House for

months that land taxes are causing great hardship in rural areas; now they are starting to apply in certain areas in metropolitan Adelaide. One would think the Government would pay attention when it starts hurting people in the metropolitan area. Now is surely the time, with this buoyant revenue surplus, for the Government to consider giving relief in some of these areas of taxation that are causing such hardship, particularly in districts with which we are familiar.

Is the Government intent on seeing that the rising generation does not go on the land? Does it want to see the continual drift of population to the metropolitan area? We know this is happening; is this what it wants? We heard evidence before the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission that the population in rural areas was decreasing. It will continue to decrease if the members of the rising generation believe they cannot make a go of it on the farms their parents have farmed. That is the situation we are reaching with the over-inflated value of property in the rural area. If, in fact, the Government wants this drift to continue and to be accelerated, it will persist in levying some of these unjust sectional taxes.

Apparently the fact that these taxes are starting to cause problems in some sections of the metropolitan area does not concern the Government at the moment, because I suspect that possibly the complaints are coming from areas the Labor Government does not represent. There is only one thing that energises the thinking of Government members and that is what will be the political impact on them; if there will be no political impact on them, they could not care less. An individual can complain to the Government until he is blue in the face and write letters until he has writer's cramp, but if there is no political impact, too bad. I believe the political minorities deserve rather better treatment than that.

Regarding the specifics in the departmental statements, reference is made to the increase in salaries in the Police Department. I believe that was justly deserved. A point of view has been put to me that we could do with more police in this State. I remember the former Attorney-General pooh-poohing the suggestion. The view is that we could do with more police and perhaps fewer social workers. I believe there are several people in the community who would agree with that point of view. The idea is that vast sums of money are being spent by the present Government in the areas of community welfare in setting up offices around the countryside and other places. If this money were channelled into some of the voluntary organisations and not so much money went in paying what have to be high salaries, perhaps we would see more value for the money we are spending at Government level. That is a view not necessarily shared by everyone on this side of the House, but it has certainly been expressed to me by members of the community. It is suggested that the voluntary organisations are likely to spend the Government money rather more effectively, without the necessity for high wages.

Another interesting matter concerns electricity supply in some areas of the Eyre District. The transfer of funds to the Government insurance fund reminds us of some of the expensive fires that have been occurring. I could refer to other matters but, because of the time available to me, I am precluded from doing so. Mention of works proceeding on the Strzelecki track is another interesting reference to earlier legislation with which we dealt. The reference to welfare for Aborigines is a topic about which I could speak for five minutes in relation to the Government's attempts to house adequately our Aboriginal people.

I could talk about the operations of the South Australian Housing Trust in general, too. However, I endorse that part of the document prepared by Treasury officials, but do not accept the claptrap that has come from other people.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): An advantage of my present position in this House is that I can look at both sides of the Chamber and at what is said on both sides in a far more detached way than I could if I were a member of either the Liberal Party, so-called, or the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Rodda: So-called.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If you wish. I have enjoyed being able to do that in this debate. What I have to say I suppose will not earn me any friendship on either side of the House or even from you, Mr. Speaker, because I have been disappointed by the three speeches that have been made in this debate so far. I refer first to the Treasurer's speech, copies of which were circulated to members yesterday. I have heard it said often in this place that it is marvellous how, when things are different, they are not the same. Until last November, any criticism of the Federal Government in the preceding two or three years was of the most muted kind. Even the Treasurer and his Ministers (his Party colleagues in this place) could not altogether avoid criticising some of the actions taken by the Whitlam Government, but it was always done in a subdued way. Now, of course, nothing done by the Fraser Government is ever right; everything is criticised.

What the Leader and, I think, the Deputy Leader have been saying is correct on this point but, unlike the Deputy Leader, I do not blame the Treasurer for trying to make a political point. The Deputy Leader is about the last person in this House who should complain about that sort of thing, because he does it all the time. The Treasurer's speech yesterday was an excellent example of trying to make a political point. He criticised the Federal Government uphill and down dale, yet this is entirely inconsistent with what he said fewer than two months ago when he returned from a conference in Canberra.

Although the Treasurer does not love the *Advertiser* at the moment (judging from some of the hard things he said about the reputable and efficient journalists of that paper during Question Time), he was reported on Saturday, April 10, as saying the following about the Fraser plan:

It was a genuinely new deal. I think it is a good idea for the States as it stands . . . Mr. Dunstan left the morning's talks smiling and said, "The States have been given almost everything they sought".

Later, he is reported as saying:

. . . and we did better than that . . . as long as I don't have marked loan deductions then it will enable me to proceed with a steady improvement of services and carrying out of the State's plans . . .

There is not a suggestion in what he said when he came back from Canberra in April that things were unsatisfactory for the States. In his speech yesterday he states that nothing is right. Having said that about the Treasurer, I must say that not one thing the Leader or the Deputy Leader could say about the Dunstan Government was complimentary; equally, everything they said about the Fraser Government was complimentary. One side is as absurd as the other side in this play.

I warn my friends (if I have any in the Liberal Party) that it will become harder and harder for them to defend the actions of the Federal Government. One has only

to look at this morning's paper to see what is happening. When I read the paper this morning it occurred to me irresistibly that we have an inresolute Government in Canberra which has not thought through its programmes and which is now chopping and changing those programmes and bowing to pressures from one part or another of the community. The problem this morning was, of course, Medibank. I do not believe that the Federal Government has a mandate to destroy Medibank, yet that is precisely what it is doing. It may have had a mandate (although it certainly was not spelt out) to correct the mistakes and weaknesses of Medibank, but that is not what it is doing. The Federal Government is going much further than that and confusion is worse confounded by what has been announced in the past day or so.

The present Federal Government is offending its former friends in that regard and the process will continue. There are many other decisions taken by the Federal Government with which I do not agree. It is rather interesting to note that when I tried to interject on the Deputy Leader a few minutes ago he rushed on with his speech so that he could not hear what I was saying, because he knew that what I was saying would be difficult for him to answer. One has only to think of what Mr. Fraser said in his policy speech about wage indexation to see my point. Referring to his Government, he said:

It will support wage indexation.

Within a month or six weeks it was doing anything but supporting wage indexation. He also said, when speaking in the first person:

We will abolish the Prices Justification Tribunal: it has presided over the worst inflation in our history.

That decision was soon changed when the Fraser Government came to office. In my view, one of the most scandalous actions taken by the present Government was taken arbitrarily and without warning to reduce allowances to people under the National Employment and Training scheme, people who had ordered their affairs to take advantage of the scheme that was introduced by the previous Government. Those people found that their living allowance was chopped by \$30 a week. That is a scandalous situation, and not nearly enough has been made of that point. In my view, both sides are at fault in this regard.

To sheet home my point I remind members on this side of the House (because I believe more of them will take part in this debate than will members of the Government) of what Mr. Brett Bayly said of Mr. Fraser in this morning's paper, as follows:

Attacks over his breaking of election promises—such as wage indexation, Prices Justification Tribunal and Medibank—have been more telling.

He then recites those parts of the Fraser policy speech to which I have referred and states:

But in a television interview last month Mr. Fraser explained that what he said during the election campaign was to be taken in the context of what was going to happen "immediately thereafter". It was all a case of being flexible.

It is not the sort of reliability that I like to see in a Government. Having said those things, I now say that I very strongly support the present Federal Government's policy regarding federalism. I have always in this House upheld the federal system of Government. I think I was one of the first members, almost 20 years ago, to complain about uniform taxation and the way in which it was sapping the responsibility of the States. I have never resiled

from that view and wholeheartedly agree with the present Federal Government's proposals on this matter. A Government should be responsible for raising the money it spends; otherwise it will lose, along with that responsibility, the responsibility for spending it as well. We saw that happening rapidly under the Whitlam Government. The States were being tied hand and foot by special purpose grants until they had little responsibility left for the spending of any revenue at all. That is deliberate Labor policy, a policy I completely oppose. It seems to me that the complaints of the State Government here are hollow on this matter. So long as the States are given sufficient financial resources to finance their programmes (and that can be done and I believe it is the intention of the Federal Government to do it; I will give them the benefit of that doubt), I believe they should be allowed to do so, and decide for themselves their priorities in spending.

Although there are many taxes that I should like to see reduced in this State, in some ways the proposals of the Government as outlined by the Treasurer in this debate are sensible. It is wise to spend the money which we have got stashed away while we still have it because, for all the trumpeting we heard last year of the long-term benefits to South Australia of the deals the Government had done with the Federal Government, I think the benefits will undoubtedly be short lived. I say that quite apart from what I have said about the proposals with regard to Federal-State relations. We might as well take advantage of the moneys while we have got them. I should have liked to see such taxes as succession duties and land tax greatly reduced and rearranged. With regard to inflation, I am a little worried about the spending of the \$50 000 000 that we have got put away. Although that is not a large amount in the economy of this country, it must have a more inflationary effect than if it were not spent. However, I think it is wise for the Government to do what it intends to do. I notice that neither the Leader nor the Deputy Leader expressed any opinion whatever on this point, which seems to me to be central to the debate.

There is only one other matter to which I wish to refer. The Treasurer has said in his speech that it is intended to rearrange the finances of the railways, such as they are left to this State at the present time. I make one warning to him. I think it would be wise, for a time yet, not to do any rearranging of our finances with regard to the railways. It seems to me that the Federal Government is fairly intent on getting out of that agreement. I want to say a few words about the agreement, from my new position in Parliament. First of all I do not agree that any party to a bargain such as this should try to find ways of getting out of it. Whether I like the bargain or not, I think that is a bad thing and I do not therefore agree with the apparent intention of the Federal Government to get out of this agreement and a number of other bargains which were made by its predecessor and which should be binding with the States.

I think it was obvious to members in this place during the two debates we had on the railways transfer last year that I was personally opposed strongly to the transfer of the railways. I was persuaded by my then Party colleagues to agree to it because of the fact that, before debate took place in this Parliament, my then Federal colleague (Senator Hall) had already expressed himself in Canberra as being in favour of the transfer, and he was in company with every member of the Liberal Party and the Country Party in Canberra. One of the extraordinary things is that Mr. Nixon, the relevant Minister in Canberra,

is now seeing all sorts of traps in the agreement that he did not bother to look for when the Bill was being debated there in the first place. I was persuaded by my colleagues to support the Bill the second time around, and for it to be supported by the members of the Liberal Movement in the Upper House on both occasions (we had only one member, I think, on the first occasion) because we were already committed to that course. It was against my own inclination, as I think was obvious.

The irony of the situation is that if it had not been for that support given by Liberal Movement members the railways transfer legislation would not have gone through. Then we would not now be in the situation in which we find ourselves. I still believe that from our point of view the deal that was made, apart from the financial side of it, was an absurd one. The attempt to split into two parts a unified system is entirely artificial. The Federal Government has now found it is not altogether too good for it either, and I think in that way a setting aside of the agreement would be sensible. On the other hand, the agreement was solemnly entered into between Governments, and I do not believe that without the assent of both parties it should be set aside. I do not intend to say any more about this Bill as it stands. I was only inveigled into the debate because of what I saw on both sides—a completely biased and distorted view of the actions one of the other.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The Independent member has made me cognisant of the fact that we could perhaps all be charged with being too political in a discussion of this important Bill. In his explanation, the Treasurer states:

The impact of Federal policies on South Australia is disturbing.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: On all States, you could have said.

Mr. RODDA: I think the import of the Treasurer's message was well and truly sheeted home to South Australia; he was not saying anything about all the States at all. I think when there was a change of Government in Canberra in 1972 everyone said in fairness, "Well, they have won, let us see what they can do." For about six weeks we saw Mr. Whitlam and his Deputy, Lance Barnard, running the country as a two-man Cabinet. One of my country friends from Naracoorte said at the time, "These people are making Australia sing." I believe that is what they were doing. Towards the end of January the Prime Minister formed a full Cabinet, and major changes took place after 23 years of government by a Liberal Party-Country Party coalition. The Whitlam Government was fortunate in that the agricultural economy at the time was buoyant. We had one of the peaks in the past decade, with farm produce at a high price. Many people were able to get their financial affairs in order as a result of high cattle and wool prices. However, the situation was soon overtaken by inflation as a result of Government policies, costs increased at tremendous rates, and it became obvious that our economy would take a nosedive.

We can recall the euphoria from the Government side of this House. It was a changed position after the criticism of the McMahon-Anthony coalition. Following the political philosophy of which the member for Mitcham has accused both the Opposition and the Government, we heard chuckles from the Government side about the changes that would take place when Whitlam came to office. I can recall the Premiers' Conference that followed the change of Government. Although criticism was muted, the

Government was unhappy. That Mr. Whitlam was to be a centralist Prime Minister, not greatly interested in the States, was obvious early in the piece. We heard of tied grants, and we were shocked to see across the board tariff cuts and the resultant chaos in the motor industry. That was followed by stern measures in requirements for overseas capital coming into the country, a percentage of overseas capital having to be lodged with the Reserve Bank at no interest. As a result, capital was frightened out of the country, and with it went the expertise that had made our industry go. So, the economy ran down. Mr. Connor, the Minister for Mines and Energy, took strong action against the mining industries, and the situation was unhappy.

One had almost to read the morning newspaper to see who was in charge of the Federal Treasury, so many changes having been made in that office. The Government was returned at the subsequent election with limited numbers. We did not see again the euphoria with which the Whitlam Government started out. Ultimately we came to the tragic loan raisings, to which there has not yet been an answer, and on November 11 the Governor-General earned himself a place in history by dismissing the Prime Minister. His action was vindicated, I think, at the subsequent election, when Malcolm Fraser's Government was returned to the Treasury benches in Canberra with an overwhelming majority. The situation had worried the people of this country, and no doubt it had worried the Government. When the member for Mitcham speaks about muted criticism of the Government, that can be well understood in the light of the political system by which we work. Malcolm Fraser and his Government have not found it easy to take over the running of the country. If a Labor Government is ever returned to office in Canberra, I think its members will be wiser and sadder men, and perhaps a little more sober in the administration—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Come on! It was Fraser who was as full as a goog.

Mr. RODDA: He is full of business, if that is what the Minister means. The Government from 1972 to November, 1975, practised legislation and government that got us into a great deal of trouble, and all the crying in the world will not mend the situation. The new Government has spelt out a new line of federalism, and it is only natural—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Tell us what it is.

Mr. RODDA: If I talked until midnight I would not convince the Minister on this issue. The answer is in the document we are debating, but no words of mine will convince the Minister or his colleagues. It has been underlined by Mr. Wran. Mr. Neilson is being more muted, or perhaps he sees the situation through different eyes, but he has not criticised the issues from Tasmania, in line with the Treasurer of this State and the newly elected Premier of New South Wales. In the sittings of this Parliament in February, we tried to get from the Minister of Transport the reason for the change in relation to power weights, but the information was not forthcoming. We are aware now of the great fear and lack of understanding of the new federalism. It is obvious that motorists will be faced with a slug in making contributions to the Highways Fund.

The Prime Minister has said that this is a time for a tightening of belts, and for looking at options and priorities in expenditure to get this State back on the rails. There is a responsibility from the Federal Treasury, and this should be noted by the Treasury of this State and the Government. The sum of \$55 000 000 is being appropriated from reserves for urban transport. It is an open-ended expenditure and, while we do not deny the importance of

these issues, some areas of expenditure could be scaled down in a time of need if we want some breathing space to get this State back on the rails. In that regard, when one looks at the rural community, which is facing high charges and costs, coupled with the poor season (for which I do not blame the Government), one sees that there is much poverty in the community, and this is causing a stringent time for people who are asked and expected to make their contribution by paying high charges such as the motor registration fees that have been imposed by this Government.

It has been said that South Australia is the envy of the other States; at least, that statement is made within the State, but I have been in two other States this year and South Australia has been described to me as the poofter State, because of some of the modern legislation the Government has introduced. To be described as the poofter State in derisive terms is objectionable to the Opposition. I recall last year that some of the Minister's statements (although he did not acknowledge them), supported this claim. One outspoken critic from Queensland told me that he saw my Premier parading with beads and a lace handbag. We have a reputation that is perhaps not in keeping with the idea that we are the envy of the rest of Australia. I think that other States have their views of us, too. Perhaps we could take a lesson from the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Millhouse: You didn't get that from me, and what you've just said was in poor taste.

Mr. RODDA: Perhaps it was, but it was said and, whether it is in poor taste, that is the opinion some people hold of me because I come from South Australia.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I address myself once again to a document which purports to be a factual statement of this State's financial position but which is a myth. Several of these documents have been brought forward in the House and Ministerial statements have been made by the Treasurer to organise the attitude of the media to the whim he wants to follow. When it suits him, he can conjure up (and he has conjured up) all manner of figures that subsequently bear no relationship to the last statement he has made. The Minister now occupying the front bench will recall that, as Acting Whip during a period last year, he asked the proverbial Dorothy Dixier of the Treasurer and received a reply which suggested that, by the way in which the Liberal Party Opposition was acting, the State would finish up with a \$68 000 000 deficit, because we were standing in the way of the railways transfer proposition. Right up to the time of the election, and immediately after it, we still had the kind of comment being made that, unless the railways were transferred, South Australia's financial position was in jeopardy and that, as a State, we would go back and that we would never be able to provide for South Australians the type of services they required.

Anyone who has access to *Hansard* can go back and note these irrational statements that came from the Treasurer's mouth. We can take this Bill, which harks back to statements made in the House last February when the Treasurer said that, by the end of the financial year, he expected perhaps a \$25 000 000 surplus. Now, we are talking about that \$25 000 000, which is in unappropriated revenue, having come from the Commonwealth for selling out our back paddock—in this case, the railways—and we are looking at a sum of \$70 000 000. I proffer the comment that, if the Treasurer, in the cook book he is putting out next August, changes

the recipes as often in that book as he has changed his financial statements over the past year, nothing will come out of the oven according to the book. The Government has certainly pulled out its old template, and I am sure that the member for Torrens will know what a template is: it is the pattern used for repetitious activities. Those members who were here before 1972 may recall (as has been mentioned earlier this afternoon) the persistence of the attack on both the Gorton and the McMahon Governments, it being said that they were strangling the South Australian Government and, in failing to find funds for the State, causing all manner of ills.

Immediately the Whitlam Government came to office those activities diminished and, suddenly, it was a magnificent Government that would do all manner of things for the benefit of Australians, certainly for South Australians. The disaster which that Government brought on all Australians, not only South Australians, is a matter of record, and it will take us years to recover. At a time when a responsible group of people is willing to grasp the nettle and to take unpalatable action, if necessary, it ill behoves the Treasurer or any of his Ministers (and a Dorothy Dix question was asked by a backbencher today) to ridicule the Fraser Government, because South Australia, like every other State, and South Australians, like residents in every other State, are being asked to pull in their belts and act financially responsibly.

Last December, as you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will recall, over 50 per cent of Australians indicated that they were willing to accept the unpalatable pill that would have to be swallowed to reduce the wanton spending that had become so much a part of the Australian scene. Once again, the Government wants to belittle members of the Commonwealth Government for statements that they have made, and they are belittling them by taking their statements out of context and by refusing to tell the truth to the people of South Australia in respect of the valid information made available to this Government and to its individual Ministers. The Treasurer's second reading explanation states:

The Federal Government is systematically setting out to abdicate its responsibilities in numerous areas, while at the same time attempting to cajole or coerce the States into taking over the functions Canberra is abandoning.

What is the true position? Canberra under Whitlam had usurped the responsibility and rights of the States by increasing the amount of funds it was making available as tied grants. We had an acknowledged increase of funds from the Commonwealth into the States, but more than 62 per cent of the additional funds made available to States in 1975-76 were tied grants, which caused the Government to follow projects and programmes that were the whim of the Federal Government and had no necessary relationship to the requirements of the State Government. That is a situation that no Government, if it were really responsible to its people, would accept.

The present Federal Government has shown that it recognises the requirements of people throughout Australia to be able to enter into projects that are directed to the attention of their State Government, and the State Government then becomes the authority to accept the odium if it fails to respond to the people's wishes and fails to finance projects that are an essential part of the local scene. One can take that point further: the Labor Party, both State and Federal, has consistently stated that it recognises the importance of local government and that local government should have access to funds of its own to be used as it

sees fit. However, the Labor Party in this State has not made a move to set up the State's Grants Commission, which will allow large sums that are to be made available by the Federal Government after July 1 to be distributed to local government for its own purposes and for projects arrived at by its own decisions.

People are not being coerced or cajoled into accepting a situation against their wishes: the people are now being given the chance to undertake projects that they direct to the attention of either their local government body or the State Government. The Treasurer referred to the impact of Federal policies on South Australia being disturbing. Obviously, the State Government does not want to accept the responsibility of saying, "No": it does not want to lose the ability to hide behind a Federal Government, which under Whitlam was willing to accept the brickbats and, being far enough away, was not unduly hurt by those brickbats. That the people of South Australia showed an ability to discern these matters was most obvious in July last year. So capable of discernment were they that at the eleventh hour the Treasurer found it prudent to move away from that Government which was drawing the crabs (colloquially speaking) to the South Australian scene through the inactivity (or perhaps "intrusion" would be a better word) of the Whitlam regime.

The Treasurer referred to the fact that in February he said that the State faced many economic unknowns. Following statements that have been made by the Prime Minister and his Ministers, at present the State is much less in the dark than it has been in the past. The percentage income the State will obtain has been spelt out. When the Treasurer returned from the recent Premier's Conference he was more than happy (he was smug) about the sum that would become available to South Australia, a sum that far exceeded his expectations. Yet we find in his speech that he is hiding behind the statement that probably the State will not benefit from as great a share of the Loan funds as it has received in the past. I ask the Treasurer to say where, since the Fraser Government has come into existence, this State has not received a better proportion of the financial cut-up than it had received previously or where there has been a reduction in committed areas.

It is proper that any Government taking office should be able to set its priorities, and the Prime Minister and his Ministers have said that South Australia will obtain the funds that it has been told it will receive. The member for Kavel referred to the extensive news release from the Hon. M. J. R. MacKellar. From this document, which I believe has been circulated to most members, it is apparent that South Australia will receive funds that have previously been committed to it, and that, with the increased amounts of untied grants that will be forthcoming, the State can select its priorities, and in selecting those areas it can increase or decrease allocations to a particular project according to the need of the State and the need of the people in this State. No longer will we see the farcical situation of massive sums being spent for purposes for which there is no community demand, and no longer will we have work undertaken and facilities provided which are not used and which have no chance of being used and therefore give no real cost benefit as to the deployment of the resources. Much play has been made about cut-backs and about the uncertainty of the amounts being made available for sewerage and water filtration schemes. I shall not refer to water filtration because, as indicated in the Hon. Mr. MacKellar's

statement, the money committed will continue to be forthcoming.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Only for this year.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to statements made by the Minister of Works for several years about what he would do for sewerage and common effluent systems in major towns in this State. I ask him why in his first announcement he said that towns in water catchment areas would be the first to receive treatment, and why those towns (Williamstown would be an instance, and there are many others) were enticed to enter into development projects and to obtain the necessary engineering and technical detail for the implementation of schemes on the understanding that they would be the first to be implemented, because it was important that effluent that went into our reservoir system should no longer be allowed to enter the reservoir catchments, yet five years later, because the Government considered it was politically expedient to take much of the money promised for those projects and use it in other parts of the State (good luck to the areas that received it), many towns directly associated with our reservoirs are not sewered and will not be immediately sewered according to the projects announced by the Government. Obviously, the funds of this State are very buoyant. Many comments have been made by the Treasurer about how there has been an improvement and an over-supply of funds from various areas of taxing, and that more money has been obtained than was thought possible, notwithstanding the fact that the economy is not particularly buoyant. On page 5 of the document circulated to members, he says:

At the moment, perhaps I could sum up by saying it seems that all of the favourable influences I mentioned in February are turning out to be even more favourable than was forecast—

forecast in February—

and that many State revenues have been very buoyant despite a general slackness in the economy.

Members on this side told the Treasurer when a number of those service charges were increased, and when a number of the taxings were undertaken, that the amount that was to be taken from the South Australian community was in excess of the amount which in this House he said would be extracted from them. That was certainly borne out by the figures made available to us and by the Treasurer's own admission. But this must be read against the earlier statement he made, in the same document, that for the year 1975-76 there was no increase in taxing or in service charges. Other aspects of that will be taken up later. We must remember that a sum of money came from petrol tax, which has been put aside. We can talk of the partial remission made in respect of pay-roll tax, but in both instances this occurred much later than necessary.

I refer to the service charges which have been effected against people in respect of water, and the massive percentage increase in the amount of water subject to excess charges. I refer also to another area where the Government is bleeding the people of this State with the demands it makes for the provision of services: it fails or refuses to undertake extensions of water mains where they are necessary, because there has been a massive increase in the population of the area. There is no commitment for the original subdividers to provide the water services because it was not a requirement of the Act when the subdivision was undertaken. It tells people, even though they are in an area of fire danger or where water is essential for a number of other important commitments, including schools and other community facilities, that it will not provide the water main

unless it is paid for and pre-committed over a period of at least 5½ years in the metropolitan or urban area, or 10½ years if it be in a country area.

Where is the justice in this? Although we suddenly find we have, apparently, a \$75 000 000 excess of revenue which has been extracted from the people, the money is not being used in some proportion to alleviate these deficiencies. Why is it that a person who has been informed that a sewer will go past his front door, and who then seeks to have the block adjacent to his home divided into three more, is told he may have the block subdivided provided he pays more than \$3 600 to provide a sewer through the back of the property, notwithstanding the fact a sewer line goes past the front of the property? This is a double standard. This is certainly not a situation that is making matters equal for all people in the community. It is a position where the Government says one thing and does another, and then refuses to reconsider the sensitivity of cases drawn to its attention.

One can go on in considerable detail, certainly in relation to land tax (whether it be in rural or urban circumstances). However, my colleagues will refer to this. One other matter that I think needs to be stated so this whole matter can be drawn into perspective is that a major part of the apparent over-supply of revenue to this State at this time has been as a result of selling off the back paddock (selling off the railways). The money is now to be injected into the purchase of new projects or new facilities. It should be used (there is no point in its being put aside to accumulate dust), but we have to be certain that the manner in which it is being spent will be of value to the State and that it will be recoverable by the facilities that it will provide or the resale value of the product, if indeed it is to be expended in that way.

No member of this House wants to see unemployment. No member is foolish enough not to recognise that a great degree of the unemployment that has been forced on us in more recent times is a direct result of the mismanagement of the economy and of the whole of our industry by the Whitlam Government. It grieves me to find that large sums of the money being put into unemployment relief activities by the State Government is being put into areas where one must question the efficiency of the expenditure and the efficacy of the way in which the money is being directed. In relation to the re-establishment of an oval by the distribution of sand over its surface, a direction came from Adelaide that 1 070 tonnes of sand would be deposited in the centre of the oval and that it would be distributed across the surface of the oval by the employment of persons using wheelbarrows and shovels. In another instance, people are called on in this day and age to dig ditches for the purpose of taking stormwater away, ditches over 5ft. in depth and 2ft. in width, and told they will dig those ditches by hand and that no mechanical means will be used. This would provide employment, if people who were unemployed and who were prepared to dig ditches 5ft. deep and 2ft. wide could be found. The unfortunate aspect of this is that a number of people who are unemployed do not want to dig, and will not dig, ditches 5ft. deep and 2ft. wide. I recognise the importance of providing employment for persons who are unfortunate enough to be out of work, but I believe that it can be generated in a different way, by getting away from this rather ridiculous attitude of labour intensive work programmes and getting to a balance between the expenditure of funds and the deployment of other types of equipment, which in turn then demands the employment of other people to

operate them, to service them, to manufacture them, and so it goes on.

The immediate employment of many people on one site is an inefficient means of the expenditure of anyone's money, and is certainly an expensive way of using State funds. We need a more rational and reasonable approach to these matters so that there can be a proper balance between the amount of labour demanded and the use of ancillary services. This approach would help in eventually bringing about a better employment position. When a massive drain was being built in the Munno Para council area (an area embracing the Districts of Elizabeth, Salisbury and Goyder), with channels up to 4.5 metres deep and as much as six metres wide with a two-in-one batter, it was demanded that the council responsible for the work being undertaken should do so with a 30 per cent deployment of funds for labour.

You, Sir, with your experience in local government (indeed, even people without experience in that field) would recognise that such a trench could be dug using equipment that employs only one man at a time and requires the deployment of people using trucks and minimum additional labour. Once the trench has been dug new employment opportunities will be created and the economy of the area will improve to a considerable magnitude because the area is properly drained and conducive to better land use. These are matters that the Government should seriously look at when considering the use of the supposed over-supply of State funds. The Opposition wants a deployment of funds which will produce value for each dollar spent and which will create a better environment in which to live.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): The Treasurer's explanation when introducing this Bill seemed to be fraught with prognostications of gloom. In particular, he said that the choice facing the States was unpleasant. It is obvious to all of us that these prognostications are largely the result of the massive problems created by the Australian Labor Party's bankruptcy situation of a deficit of \$5 000 000 000 confronting Australia as a whole. With that sort of situation, the choice facing anyone could hardly be anything other than unpleasant. The Treasurer says that the Bill before us is introduced at a time when the outlook for the Australian States is grim. I should like to believe that the Treasurer had not written the first few pages of his speech, because much of what he said was belied by later comments, comments that seem to be rather favourable to South Australia even before he goes to the Premiers' Conference. It is a surprising about-face.

This Bill seems to be a strong reflection of the favourable effect on the Australian economy of the present Federal Government's policies plus, we must admit, some sound advice from South Australian State Treasury officials. We should remember, too, that the 1975-76 State Budget was prepared in a highly inflationary climate, not a climate that was brought about by the present Federal Government, but a climate brought about by the previous Federal A.L.P. Government. The Treasurer admits in his explanation that he had been advised by the Federal Treasury to make an allowance of 21 per cent for inflation. The Treasurer then proceeded to take a considerable amount of credit for the present favourable financial situation in this State, whereas that situation is largely a reflection on the way that finances have been contained by the policies of the present Federal Government. The Treasurer expresses some surprise when he states:

It is rather surprising that, where earlier in the year we had estimated for a surplus of about \$25 000 000, we are now able to look to a surplus as high as \$50 000 000.

He should not really be surprised, because Federal policies are working. The previous A.L.P. prediction was an inflation rate of 21 per cent. The Treasurer has chosen deliberately to neglect giving any credit to the Federal Government. Straight after the mini Budget was handed down, the Minister of Works and the Minister of Transport appeared in print and on television almost before the Prime Minister's words had fallen. Both Ministers predicted that grave things would happen in South Australia—that taxation would be increased, that road taxation, in particular, would have to go up instantly, and that Medibank charges would be increased greatly. Those comments were rather surprising, because people even such as Bob Hawke were cautious and chose to wait about 24 or 36 hours before making serious comment. Bob Hawke said that the document was worth considering closely, and that is what he gave it. The same cannot be said for the responsible Ministers of our State.

I thought they were rather inept in the manner in which they cried panic. Whether it was ineptitude or just being on the first bus out of the station in hoping that what they said was right, I do not know. I cannot help but think that they had not consulted Treasury officials before they made those statements. It is unlikely that the documents before us were prepared overnight and that figures like this would have been unavailable to the Minister of Works before he made his wild statements. In any event, the document which the member for Light referred to from Mr. MacKellar (a Minister in the Federal Government) a document released on May 20, meant that even at that time the State Government knew that Federal commitments to South Australia would be met.

I heard someone say that that related only to the current year. What responsible Government will commit itself for longer than the current year in a situation where it is faced with a \$5 000 000 000 overdraft? One can hardly blame the Government for being cautious, but one can commend it for living up to the legal responsibilities it admits. The Treasurer said that the Victorian Premier had belittled Federal policies. It has been said before that Mr. Hamer's statement was taken out of context. Yesterday, the Treasurer spent half of his time running down Victoria and the other half quoting out of context the Victorian Premier in a sort of love-hate relationship which left us wondering which side the Treasurer is really on. We know that the Victorian Premier supports Federal policies overall, policies which are having a tremendous impact on the Australian economy and which are getting us out of the mess created by the previous Government with its flurry of spending in the past three years.

One must wonder whether the Treasurer will take all the credit for this massive surplus in the South Australian State coffers. One wonders how he can face the public in the full knowledge that he has grossly overtaxed the people, because he must either give the Federal Government some of the credit or take all the blame for having overtaxed the people. He refers only to a small proportion of money coming in in additional revenue. He states that improved State revenues in some areas (without mentioning the areas) will bring in perhaps \$5 000 000 extra. We will find out later in the year what are these areas, but no doubt they will include water; pay-roll tax in relation to which some concession was made last year but which overall

brought in an even greater amount of money; power, which may have been overcharged; land tax, which most certainly was overcharged throughout the whole of the community; possibly licences; and road taxation. I shall be interested to see which departments have been over-estimating the portended deficit for the current year.

I must refer to the money the Treasurer is still retaining in the State funds in case of some accident to the railways transfer contract, which still seems to be in some doubt. If anything does happen, I am sure the Treasurer will immediately say it is the fault of the Liberal Party. After all, the double dissolution last year was the result of the non-passing of the Railways (Transfer Agreement) Bill, but I remind the Treasurer and everyone else that the Liberal Party supported in principle the taking over of all Australian railways by the Federal Government. The Railways (Transfer Agreement) Bill for South Australia was defeated in respect of only a few minor clauses that could have been changed at the time. There would then have been no need for a double dissolution. If this agreement breaks down, it will be because the Government was sufficiently inflexible not to agree to minor amendments. Among those I had in mind was the threat to road transport in South Australia through the possible actions of the Interstate Commission. That threat has been neutralised because the present Federal Government will not put that Bill through; it was one of the Bills that led to the dissolution of the previous Parliament. It would have given the Interstate Commission sweeping power to nationalise all transport systems throughout Australia.

Even now, despite assurances from the Minister of Transport, certain problems within the railways have not yet been settled, in spite of certain assurances the Minister gave at the time the railway transfer was debated. I refer to the protection of staff on the railways through super-annuation provisions. I was told, in answer to a question, that the matter had been attended to; it has not. I expressed some fears that there would be no protection of services in South Australia, and that there may be potential cut-backs in staff. One of the questions I asked in debate on August 6, 1975, concerned how long it would be before Commonwealth freight rates, recently increased by 15 per cent, would be imposed to the detriment of both metropolitan and country South Australians who sent their produce and travelled by rail extensively. There is no guarantee that the levels of employment or the present standards of rail services will be maintained. Clause 9 of Part II of the agreement confirms this. I questioned whether the State Government would be willing to contest the legality of the agreement that it was asking us then to approve.

We have already had intimations that railway services will be restricted. Certain train services have been cut off. Members of the Commonwealth Railways staff have been stood down, and I have been told that in Mount Gambier staff deficiencies have not been met. Letters I have written to the Minister regarding this remain unanswered, possibly because the Minister does not have the answers. These were the fears I harboured (and I still harbour them) when I opposed the transfer of the country railways system to the Federal authorities. I maintained then that any Federal Government, Liberal or Labor, would be less sympathetic than would our own State Government had the State Government remained in control. Apart from those few protective clauses that we sought to have inserted and the destructive ones that we sought to have removed from the agreement, we had no opposition to it in principle. I hope the Treasurer will not, in the event of

some railways transfer agreement accident, bring that issue back upon the Liberal Party, because the answers were already in his hands at the time of the double dissolution.

I refer to certain aspects of the Treasurer's speech, such as the comment that the impact of Federal policies on South Australia is disturbing. I imagine it would be disturbing, because the Federal policies are succeeding. They have led largely to the State surplus, and they would be disturbing simply because they are succeeding, and the Treasurer has no answer to them. The Treasurer accused the Federal Government of surrounding almost every policy aspect with confusion. This is false. Previously we had been taking all funds from the same tax pot, which was well and truly empty. Now we are not taking any more pot luck; instead we are being rationed. Some months ago I said that I thought there was not a single South Australian who would mind marking time for a year providing he knew things would improve at the end of that time. I am sure they are already seen to be improving.

One of the items the Treasurer chose to single out related to funds for the school dental care programme. I recall reading in a statement by the Federal Minister for Health that these funds would be increased and a much larger number of school dental services would be established throughout Australia. The Treasurer said that a niggardly increase had been made in real funds for education and hospital funds given no increase at all, yet later in his explanation he said that the balances from Medibank and subsidised hospital contributions were liable to be much more favourable to the Budget this year than was expected. This is obviously the result of two different pens having written those sections of the speech; they are in complete disagreement.

I refer to the niggardly increases in real funding for education, to use the Treasurer's words, and I remind the House that \$800 000 000 was provided in the previous three years. One thing rarely brought out by teachers in campaigning for increased funds is that they should be promising something, as well as demanding something. As one who regards himself as more of a professional teacher than a Parliamentarian, I believe that, for teachers to start promising to give better quality in education, to get kids out of school in better condition, is better than to be demanding constantly more money and more equipment, because there is no substitute for good teaching.

Mr. Coumbe: A lot of equipment is lying about not being used.

Mr. ALLISON: Much equipment is lying around unused because of lack of expertise, but that is the subject for another debate.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: All this would go down like a rocket with the Institute of Teachers.

Mr. ALLISON: That may be so; I thank the Minister for saying that. As one who has teaching very much at heart, I always stress that it is far more important for a teacher to have his heart in what he does for the kids than to worry about extraneous pieces of equipment. I had Commonwealth grants for those extraneous pieces of equipment and I saw teachers using them extremely effectively; I also saw teachers using them for professional babysitting, and there lies the trap. I support the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): Yesterday, I picked up the explanation, expecting to be able to read a responsible document, because finance, after all, is an important aspect not only of Parliament but also of government. Frankly, I believe that financial matters are a fundamental aspect

of Parliamentary procedure. I came to the conclusion rapidly as I read through the document that it is probably one of the most hypocritical statements I have had the opportunity of reading since being a member (I say that without any apology), and I have read many of them. The Treasurer began by whingeing quite blatantly and, later, he told us that he had money running out of his ears, when he talked about this surplus. I cite that as the first example of complete contradiction in his explanation. The first two pages of the document are not really worth the paper they are printed on. As I read further into the document, I got to more of the meat that we, as a Parliament, should be considering.

The Treasurer began by slamming solidly the Federal Government's fiscal policy and then went on to say that, because of his surplus, he would not have to increase State taxes in 1976-77. Good oh, but we will wait to see what happens in the Budget. On the one hand, he is whingeing and slamming the Federal Government whereas, on the other hand, he is saying that he will not have to increase State taxes. What about the huge surplus the Treasurer is prating about? I have not heard any suggestion that some State taxes will be reduced; I think that might be wishful thinking. Can we, as a Parliament, expect that, when the Budget is brought down later this year, we will see some tax cuts?

Mr. Becker: No.

Mr. COURCE: I am fairly certain that we will not. Governments have a nasty habit: once they have imposed a tax they will not remove it. Considering the way in which the Government has loaded the taxpayers in this State to such an extent with State taxes, I think it will keep on riding him into the ground. Let us look at the estimated surplus of \$75 000 000 in the Revenue Account which we are likely to have and of which the Treasurer is proud—\$25 000 000 carried over from June 30, 1975, and \$50 000 000 generated in 1975-76. Apart from Medibank and rail payments, which make up a fair slice of it, it is clear to me, as it is to all other Opposition members, that South Australians are being fleeced and that they are heavily taxed through State taxes, which are falling very solidly on all South Australians. That must be the case, because whence has this great surplus come, if it has not come from the pockets of the heavily taxed people of South Australia?

Land tax has been referred to, and I will refer to it, too. In the last Budget what land tax imposts were likely to bring in in the present financial year was cited, and I hazard the opinion that they will greatly exceed the estimate the Treasurer put before Parliament. Many Government members (unfortunately for them) believe that land tax hardship cases apply only in rural areas. I am the first to admit that many people in the rural areas are being crushed by the incidence of rural land tax. Government members have little interest in some of the rural areas, because they do not help them very much electorally (and I am talking about rural areas, not country industrial centres). I suggest to some of them that they should have a close look at what happens in the metropolitan area and in country centres. They may find that the people will revolt sooner or later over the incidence of land tax charges that this Government has imposed.

The householder is very much affected in the suburbs and in other centres. Undoubtedly, before long there will be a revulsion of support for the Labor Party by suburban homeowners who are today facing frighteningly increasing land tax assessments. We must realise that the Labor Party's philosophy does not really advocate home owner-

ship. The method of valuation for land tax, by using the potential approach, is ludicrous in many cases, and I could cite several of them. I find that some householders are being taxed out of their homes. Some of the cases I know of involve elderly people who only want to live peaceably in their homes for the rest of their lives but who are being forced to sell because of the potential element in the land tax assessment law and the impost of this aspect of capital taxation. When complaints are made they fall on deaf ears. This Government is callous to the genuine beliefs being put forward by many suburban homeowners in the circumstances to which I have alluded.

Mr. Venning: Many of them are senior citizens.

Mr. COURCE: Yes, and they have saved all their lives to buy their homes. They have exercised thrift, and are now being penalised because of the incidence of this type of taxation that is based on the artificial valuation caused by the potential factor. It is on this valuation that we reach the assessed rating obtained not only for land tax but also for water charges and local government rating; this is the tragedy of it.

I referred earlier to some of the differing statements made by the Treasurer in his second reading explanation. The document is, I think, full of the Treasurer's personal paranoid hatred of the Federal Government. There is no doubt about that: one has only to read the first couple of pages to see that glaringly. Then we come to the Treasurer's contrasting comments on his surplus, which is a fairly solid one. The Treasurer was almost smug when he was talking about his revenue result likely to be achieved by June 30.

Dr. Tonkin: Anyone would think he had had something to do with it.

Mr. COURCE: We know whence most of it came: much of it was from the pockets of the people of this State, especially through capital taxation levied by the Government. In a debate last session I referred to and cited in some detail the manner in which individual items of taxation under the heading of State taxation had increased in this State since the present Government had been in office: it exceeded 400 per cent in five years. That included not only rates but also charges and fees and the incidental charges coming under the general heading of State taxation.

Many of these charges are brought in surreptitiously. They sneak through in all kinds of regulations that sometimes come to the House, and in other ways they are increased. Many of them are light in their incidence and unnoticed, whereas others are solid. I believe that we will soon receive another slug in the form of increased charges for drivers' licences. Far from getting some relief, we will be hit more heavily. I said that the Treasurer's statement was full of contrasts and I referred to his air of almost smugness when he talked about his revenue results. Let me, as I always like to substantiate any statements I make, cite two examples which differ starkly from the Treasurer's ranting—and I say that kindly. He ranted at the beginning of his speech, which is printed and before honourable members at present.

The Treasurer referred in his explanation to the new tax-sharing arrangements. I called the attention of members to the fact that the Treasurer said he would not have a bar of some of the measures of Federalism introduced by the Fraser Government. I want members to recall that statement of the Treasurer clearly: he would not have a bar of it; he slammed it as hard as he could. So, there is this interesting statement by the Treasurer:

As far as can be foreseen at this stage, the arrangements—

referring to the tax-sharing arrangements—should be more favourable to the States in 1976-77 than the old formula would have been.

There is a prime example of a two-faced statement by the Treasurer, who would have us believe every word he utters in this regard and that he is saying it from the bottom of his heart, with the greatest sincerity.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you think he put it on his record?

Mr. CUMBE: I would rather not pursue a personal aspect in this regard. The Treasurer went on later, having made a contradictory statement when he criticised forcibly and harshly the Fraser Government's activities and Mr. Lynch's package, to say this:

It follows then that there is not likely to be the requirement to call on our revenue reserves of, say, \$75 000 000 (that is, \$25 000 000 built up to June 30, 1975, and \$50 000 000 in 1975-76). Therefore, it would be practicable to call on these reserves to a significant extent to support the capital programme and other areas of special need in the future.

If one reads it carefully it means that he says there is no need to bring on any other taxes; we are in such a wonderful financial position here in South Australia; we are going along nicely; we can all have a holiday, and no more taxes will be imposed. Those two statements that I have just referred to are completely and diametrically opposed; they are diametrically opposed to each other and to the rantings to which I referred in the earlier part of the Treasurer's explanation. The second part is more responsibly written. The Treasurer has let his political bias come through very clearly in this matter, and has certainly allowed his political bias to cloud what should be a very responsible financial statement to this Parliament. In fact, his political slip is showing.

Another section of the explanation is important but I have not yet heard very much attention being given to it. I refer to the Loan Account, which must be examined in some detail so that the significance of what the Treasurer and his Government are doing can be appreciated by this Parliament. I turn to the statement that the Treasurer made about funding of the Loan Account. I went to the trouble of looking up the position of the Loan Account in recent years, and I remind members that the practice has been by successive Governments that the Loan funds are held in reserve to cover revenue deficits if they occur. In fact, the Treasurer refers to this in his statement.

This has been a well-defined practice, and is good housekeeping, but now we have a different approach altogether. I find that in Loan Account at June 30, 1974, there was a surplus of about \$4 500 000, and at June 30, 1975, the surplus was \$1 900 000. According to this document at June 30, 1976, the estimated deficit will be about \$7 000 000. So we have changed from a surplus last year of \$1 900 000 to an expected deficit of \$7 000 000.

Looking at the 1974-75 figures, the Estimates approved by Parliament, the net payments were \$126 000 000. The actual payments were \$149 000 000, which means a \$23 000 000 variation, a mere \$23 000 000. In the Loan Estimates that were introduced into Parliament on August 14, 1975 (that is the last time we looked at them, apart from the supplementary ones), the programme outlined a result that would give a net payment of \$170 000 000 and a proposed surplus of \$1 900 000, the same as the previous year. But now we see an over-expenditure on the Loan Account of almost \$9 000 000 for the year. In one year, we get an over-expenditure of \$9 000 000, and the concern that I present to Parliament is that Parliament and its

members, from whichever side they come, should be expressing their strong concern at the way in which the Loan Account is being shuffled around.

We are expected each year to sit in Parliament and solemnly and in some detail go through the Loan Account which is put before us and scrutinise it carefully, but here in the last year there is a difference of about \$9 000 000 from the document that was presented to us last August. That is not good enough. The Government is spending on Loan Account (for instance, last year) about \$9 000 000 on capital works over and above that which was approved. What is the good of putting the Loan Account estimates before Parliament if this is to happen? No doubt, many of those works were worth while but it brings into question solidly the accuracy with which the Treasurer is today putting financial documents before this Parliament.

After all, we are not dealing with peanuts: we are dealing with several hundred millions of dollars each year on the Loan Account and, no matter how carefully the Public Works Committee scrutinises these items of Loan Account and capital works that go before it, inevitably costs rise. It is obvious that the Government has spent much more on capital works than it was given approval for under the Loan Account last year. Clearly, some money was carried forward from previous years. This is a matter that all members must consider in detail.

I will not repeat the salient points that have been made by previous speakers. They have given a good assertion and dissection of a poor case put forward by the Treasurer. I reaffirm the statement that I made at the commencement of my speech, namely, that this is a hypocritical explanation, and I ask that more responsible documents be placed before Parliament in future.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I am pleased that the Treasurer has been able to present a reasonable document in monetary terms and to talk about the Government's surpluses, but I was disturbed that he approached the matter in a way that could only be described as one in which he played Party politics. It is a way that I should like to think the Treasurer of this State could keep out of money Bills such as this. The document, comprising 17 pages, is totally confusing, as other members have said. Regardless of the page that one takes in the document, one can find a statement and then turn over three or four pages and find a contradictory remark. This is confusing not only to politicians but also to the general public. The second comment made by the Treasurer in his explanation is as follows:

The Federal Government is systematically setting out to abdicate its responsibilities in numerous areas, while at the same time attempting to cajole or coerce the States into taking over the functions Canberra is abandoning.

Any responsible Treasurer would be quite pleased to be given some say about how the finances of his State should be administered. Surely he would be quite pleased to accept that responsibility. The fear that the Treasurer has expressed is the fear of a true centralist, because only such a person, a person committed to bringing about a single Parliamentary system in this State, would be concerned about a situation such as this. The fact that the Federal Government has made it possible for states to administer their own local responsibility in the State, as apart from national and international responsibilities, should be an advantage not only to the State but also to its residents. The Treasurer also states:

The choice facing the States is unpleasant: either try to make up from State revenues the deficiencies caused by Federal Government cut-backs, or see the development of the States set back and the real standard in the community fall.

That comment raises the query, "How will the services of the State be cut back?" The Treasurer has acknowledged freely that he will get a good deal from the Federal Government, so if next year he will be in a position similar to that in which he was last year, where will the cut-backs be? Surely they must be self-inflicted, and the Treasurer is frightened about the fact that his ambitions to provide new measures for the State will be retarded because of a lack of outside funds and, consequently, it will be necessary for him to raise revenue within the State.

That is his predicament. He is faced with the situation that, if he wants something new, he must raise the money for it, but that is the only proper way to deal with the matter. If the basic requirements of the State are made available through the normal financial channels, that should be adequate. Anything that the States want over and above the normal requirements should be matters for which the States are responsible for raising the revenue. The Treasurer also states:

The Federal Government is obsessed with cutting back services, regardless of the real economic or social cost. This, again, is questionable. Can it be said that the Federal Government is obsessed with cutting back services, when we all know, and the Treasurer has admitted, that the Treasurer is pleased with the financial arrangements made and he will get a fair deal? Consequently, we can expect only that the fair deal will not be sufficient for him to realise his ambitions. The Treasurer was extremely critical of the Fraser Government, and he accused the Prime Minister of irresponsibility. However, irresponsible or not, the Prime Minister has accepted that there is an extremely difficult job ahead of him and that there is a \$5 000 000 000 deficit.

Anyone can fund projects if he has an unlimited Budget, but such a Budget is not available. We must have responsible budgeting. There is a limit, and someone must pay. Consequently, Mr. Fraser has admitted that a curb must be put on unlimited spending, and he has accepted that deficit budgeting is not good for the nation. He has tried to minimise that deficit budgeting and also has tried to do his best to bring the budgeting back to a position of logical restraint. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Later:

Mr. BLACKER: As the debate has proceeded, it has become obvious that the States are pleased with the funding arrangement that has been agreed on between them and the Prime Minister. The South Australian Treasurer particularly has expressed pleasure at the deal he has received from the Federal Government. I should like to refer to the following statement attributed to him as recently as April 10, which is only two months ago:

Mr. Dunstan said that, if full tax indexation were introduced at that stage, South Australia would get no more under the new Fraser deal than before. On the other hand, if only partial indexation were introduced the States could get up to \$350 000 000 extra and South Australia's share would be up to \$40 000 000. This would be a bonanza for South Australia, which approached yesterday's talks in a very much better position financially than the Eastern States.

The report continues:

Mr. Dunstan said his position at the conference was largely one of defending what South Australia had established. "And we did rather better than that," he said. "As long as I don't have marked loan deductions, then it will enable me to proceed with a steady improvement of services and carrying out of the State's plans."

Dr. Eastick: He didn't deny that. He didn't say that the press had misreported him there.

Mr. BLACKER: No, from my understanding that was an accurate interpretation of the Treasurer's statement at that time. He was pleased. However, we now have a change of attitude. In the presentation of this document, we have four pages blatantly knocking the Federal Government and its approach to the financial arrangements. However, it has become clear that there is to be an accumulated surplus of \$75 000 000. Although the reasons for the surplus are many and varied, basically the State's Budget presented last August was planned on advice received from the Federal sphere to expect a 21 per cent inflation rate. Consequently, the State budgeted for such an inflation rate. However, as a 21 per cent inflation rate has not eventuated, the State Government has not had to meet additional costs that it expected to have to meet. I refer now to page 5 of the Treasurer's second reading explanation, where he said:

At the moment, perhaps I could sum up by saying it seems that all of the favourable influences I mentioned in February are turning out to be even more favourable than was forecast and that many State revenues have been very buoyant despite a general slackness in the economy. One other factor is that the net benefits of the Medibank arrangements for Government and subsidised hospitals are likely to be more favourable this year than was expected.

That is contrary to all the knocking we have heard, and it has become evident that the general State budgeting for Medibank as a result of the projected 21 per cent inflation rate and the transfer of the country railways has brought about the surplus.

The transfer of the railways needs to be referred to, much having been said about it. It was that transfer that brought about the last State election, and it has, consequently, had some effects on the State. It has been said that the Commonwealth Government is trying to break the railways transfer agreement. Ten days ago, I spoke to the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon), who expressed to me a desire to break the agreement, not because of the finances involved (he was pleased about that aspect) or because the Commonwealth Government was dissatisfied about taking over the management of our country railways, but because of the veto clause, which enabled the State Minister in charge of transport to veto any decision taken or plans made by Commonwealth Government. That is the part that annoyed him. One can look at that veto provision and ask who is to blame. Being an Opposition member, I could expect to receive as much blame as anyone else in this respect, in that the Opposition did not go through the agreement with a fine tooth comb, which was obviously necessary. So, the criticism levelled by the Member for Mitcham can to some extent be justified. All Opposition members not only in this place but also—

Mr. Langley: And he had our preferences, too, the same as you will.

Mr. Jennings: You won't get Government preferences.

Mr. BLACKER: I fail to see what that has to do with this Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BLACKER: All Opposition members in this House and in another place, as well as the then Federal Opposition, must accept some blame for the present situation, because the veto clause did get through, much to the dismay of the present Federal Government and to the ultimate dismay of many South Australians. This arrangement is certainly beyond their sense of fair play. It is like my selling my house and then telling the purchaser that he can use the bathroom only when I say he can. That is the situation

that has occurred in this instance, and it is quite undesirable. The deal that was agreed to was probably acceptable to the Governments of the day. There were Labor Governments in office in the State and Federal spheres and, although the agreement was very much to the State's advantage, the two Labor Leaders undoubtedly considered that between themselves they could iron out their differences and disagreements in this respect.

Mr. Venning: A family deal.

Mr. BLACKER: That is so. It has been suggested that it was such a deal. However, with a change of Government that family arrangement breaks down, and I believe that the efficiency of the transport system could be at risk as a result. The Treasurer has said that he intends to use the foreshadowed \$75 000 000 surplus on capital programmes. However, the time is fast approaching when the people of this State will be looking for relief from the economic pressures obtaining today. Indeed, they are looking for relief from State taxation. When a State Government comes forward with a Budget surplus and fails to alleviate even some State taxes, it begins to lose the confidence of the people. After all, how can the Government justify such a surplus to widows who are involved with succession duties, and to transport hauliers who must pay road taxes, especially when only a little money is being spent on country roads, which are deteriorating more quickly than are metropolitan roads? Although I acknowledge that funds for transport corridors are scarce, it is difficult for the average citizen to grasp the idea of a State Budget surplus and at the same time not be given relief from State taxation. Even a token relief would give some satisfaction to the people.

A comment was made earlier in the debate about the immediate spontaneous reaction of the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Transport to the supplementary financial statement or mini-Budget, as it has been referred to, presented by the Commonwealth Government. The immediate response that it attracted aroused some curiosity in my mind, because it seemed to be an artificial response. I could not help feeling that it was the first kick by the leaders of the Government and the first indication that an election in this State might be held earlier than expected. It seemed to me to be an election gimmick; something on which to force the issue and with which to blame the Federal Government. The issue raised by the Minister of Transport related to air-conditioned Volvo buses. I do not in any way wish to decry the importance of maintaining a top-class transport system in the metropolitan area, but I believe we should weigh up the benefits of such a system in relation to the rest of the State. After all, is it necessary to have an ultra-modern passenger transport service in the confined area of the State when the outside regional areas are suffering as a direct result?

I cannot help believing that the reference to Volvo buses might have been raised at that time as an issue, but I doubt whether it had a direct connection to the financial statement made recently by the Federal Treasurer. I believe the air-conditioned bus issue was answered on *This Day Tonight* by the number of people who rang during the programme to say that they did not believe air-conditioning was a prerequisite. Some said they believed it was desirable if the State could afford it, but most people wanted their money spent in more essential areas, especially when the majority of people would not spend more than 20 minutes a day on a bus.

I support the federalism policy outlined by the Federal Government, a policy that is filtering through to the States.

It is essential that the States accept the responsibility of raising extra revenue if they have needs over and above normal requirements. Three or four months ago I discussed with a former Treasurer of this State financial arrangements, and he said that the way in which the then Federal Government was spending money raised doubts in his mind whether the States in earlier years should have handed over their taxing powers. He could see much merit, especially for luxury items in the States, in State taxing powers being handed back.

The present Budget surplus should be spent in stimulating private enterprise in preference to stimulating the public employment sector. In my district (and I include the whole of Eyre Peninsula) there are about 2 500 farmers. If the economy of that area of the State could be returned to what it was in the late 50's automatic employment opportunities would be created immediately for at least 700 people. If an industry was to come to South Australia today with a promise that it could employ 700 people, such a statement would make headlines. However, because the employment opportunity to which I have referred involves the private sector and the economic situation that has declined over the years because employers have lost the ability to employ people, it does not make the headlines. Consequently, an avenue of employment could be lost to the State because certain incentives or initiatives in country areas were not given to enable people in the area to employ additional labour and gain extra production.

Country populations are decreasing, and the average age of rural producers is, I believe it has been said, 56 years. That situation cannot continue. Are we continually to see a decline in country populations, with a consequent decline in production resulting in an adverse effect on the rest of the State? Are we to allow such a situation to continue? South Australia has a Budget surplus, but the Government is reluctant to offer incentives in this area. Country areas are being starved in relation to funds for the Highways Department and councils; it is a consequent shift of emphasis in fund allocations in that regard.

It is evident that the Government is not restraining its expenditure and that it will not provide incentives to gain a more buoyant economy in other areas to provide more jobs. This Bill does not in any way try to stimulate employment or production, nor does it indicate a restraint on Government spending. In the present economic climate, it is essential that the Government should tighten its belt to assist the nation. The people of this country want relief from economic pressures. This Government is in a position to reduce taxes, but chooses not to do so. Instead, it prefers to blame the Federal Government rather than take a responsible attitude to reduce collectively the burden on residents in this State. The Treasurer's statement was dressed up for the media. The Treasurer did not wish to produce a document which, in its very first paragraph, put the State in a sound financial position, because, had he done so, he would have undermined his attack on the Federal Government and would not have had, from a political viewpoint, a feather to fly with.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): It is natural, when an accusation is made, that the person against whom it is directed should try to understand the person who has made a judgment in an attempt to see what the other person has set out to achieve. I believe that the explanation to this Bill makes certain accusations against the

present Federal Government. On the first page of the explanation to this Bill the Treasurer stated:

The Federal Government is systematically setting out to abdicate its responsibilities in numerous areas, while at the same time attempting to cajole or coerce the States into taking over the functions Canberra is abandoning. Later, he stated:

The Federal Government is obsessed with cutting back services, regardless of the real economic or social cost. They are serious allegations. I suggest that the reverse should be emphasised, that the Federal Government is obsessed in doing what is right for Australia, in doing what it can for Australia so that real economic stability will be returned to this country. Every consideration is being given to the social cost, not to the detriment of the people of Australia but for their benefit. The first paragraph of the Treasurer's statement on page 3 states:

The good Budget position we find ourselves in is the envy of the other States.

Self-praise is no recommendation. I know that it is the attitude of this Government that it must criticise any opposition from people with a different political philosophy. The Government upholds its rights and ideals as the ultimate as far as its philosophy is concerned. I should like to make only four points, because many things have been said by previous speakers from this side with which I agree, and I do not wish to go over those points. I refer the House to the last two paragraphs on the second page of the Treasurer's explanation, which states:

The result of these and many other cutbacks—the Treasurer had referred to cutbacks in public transport funds, in water filtration, in education, and in hospital funds—

known and anticipated is that the State's financial resources will have to be used to support these programmes. This means that our healthy revenue surplus and reserves will be used to continue providing services previously funded partly by the Federal Government.

I suggest that the Government is not accepting the opportunities being presented to it by the present Commonwealth Government. I am certain that funds are available, if the procedure of the Commonwealth Government is adopted, to assist this State in a real way. Not only can the State Government but also local government can be assisted. When I was in Canberra about a month ago I had the honour of attending a session of the Commonwealth Parliament. While I was there the member for Sturt (Mr. Ian Wilson) asked the following question of the Prime Minister:

I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Is the Grants Commission currently engaged in preparing a report on the proportion of the local government share of income tax which should be allocated to each of the States? If local government bodies are to receive an early indication of their individual shares of these allocations, is it essential that State grants commissions be established by State Parliaments as soon as possible? Should local government in South Australia be concerned that to date no announcement has been made by the State Government that a State grants commission will be set up at a session of the State Parliament convened for the purpose?

The following reply was given by the Prime Minister:

The Grants Commission is at present engaged in an examination that would define the nature of local government because the definitions of local government are different in different States. That affects particularly the honourable gentleman's State because it has large unincorporated areas. The Grants Commission is also engaged in determining the proportions of whatever sum the Commonwealth in the initial stage determines should be made available to local government that should go to local government in each State. It will not be a quantitative answer, it will be a proportional or relative answer that will come from the Grants Commission in relation to that matter. The Grants Commission is currently engaged in determining the proportions of whatever sum the

Commonwealth determines should be available for local government in the next financial year that should go to each State. It has been agreed by all Premiers at a Premiers' Conference that the part which should go for equalisation or topping up grants within a State should be allocated on the basis of recommendations of local grants commissions. It will be important for local grants commissions to be established at an early date so that they can make their own investigations of the particular needs of municipalities within their own States. It was my understanding that in South Australia such processes were proceeding. If they have not yet been announced and made public, I can only urge that in that State, in the interests of local government, the measures be put under way as quickly as possible.

I should mention also that a working party of officials from all the States and the Commonwealth has been set up to determine the criteria that ought to be taken into account in determining the allocation of funds within a State. So far, widely differing views have been expressed by the States concerning that part of the grant going to local government which ought to be on a fixed formula basis—going to all local governments either on a per capita basis or perhaps on a per capita basis weighted for area—and that part which ought to go to local government on an equalisation basis on the determination of State grants commissions. The working party is designed to isolate for governments the considerations that ought to be taken into account in determining intra-state allocations. These matters will be available to be discussed at the next Premiers' Conference early in June. I certainly hope that long before that date all the States will have their mechanisms under way and in force so that they can take part in the procedures early and quickly, to the advantage of local government. The only other point I would like to make is that the Government has announced its firm intention that local government will participate in the new procedures from the beginning of the next financial year. Therefore, the States ought to be in a position as soon as possible to advise their own local governing authorities.

I have brought this information before honourable members to show that, although the Government of South Australia is complaining because the Commonwealth Government is not providing the funds that the South Australian Government requires, the machinery has been provided, the suggestion has been made and the procedure explained for funds to be made available, yet our State Government has not, to my knowledge, done anything about it. South Australia will be the poorer and South Australia will be without additional funds for local government. Nevertheless, the Treasurer has come forward with the explanation to this Bill saying that South Australia will have to use its own funds, but South Australia has not, in fact, taken advantage of the procedure under which it can obtain funds for local government. I should now like to refer to a letter received by Senator Harold Young and written by the Commonwealth Minister for Transport on February 24, 1976. The letter further explains the position.

Mr. Keneally: Who is Senator Young?

Mr. RUSSACK: Senator Young comes from South Australia, as the honourable member well knows. He is an able and capable senator, too. In the letter addressed to Senator Young, who had previously asked a question concerning a matter involving South Australia (he is interested in the State he represents) he received the following reply from the Minister for Transport:

The Commonwealth Government recognises that finance for certain categories of Australia's roads has been severely limited in the past. As it does not want to see any relaxation in the upgrading of these roads, it has therefore decided to allocate an additional \$64 000 000 to the States for roads in this financial year. South Australia's share of the additional allocation is \$5 800 000. In order to qualify for this amount the South Australian Government will be required to spend an extra \$5 100 000 on roads from its own resources. Because of the Commonwealth Government's particular concern at previously limited road funds for local government, it has asked the States to channel all of the additional money, both Commonwealth and State, for the use of local government.

Dr. Eastick: That is in 1975-76?

Mr. RUSSACK: Yes. I have referred to these extracts to highlight the fact that action has been taken, procedures have been introduced, and definite moves have been made for funds to be channelled through avenues, if only the State will accept the challenge and put into motion the mechanism required to bring those funds to South Australia. I now turn to the matter of public transport. On page 6 of his statement, the Treasurer states:

Urban public transport is the area hardest hit by the decision of the Commonwealth Government to cut previously planned expenditure heavily.

I notice that it did not say which Commonwealth Government, but today I received—

Mr. Keneally: I think it meant the Commonwealth Government of Australia.

Mr. RUSSACK: Yes, but not the Commonwealth Government that was rightly elected on December 13 by the people of Australia because they were dissatisfied with the Administration from 1972 to 1975. The information I have received today states:

South Australia entered into contract for 310 buses of its own volition and sought assistance in 1975-76 of the programme bids, but the Federal Labor Government decided not to support any new project.

So it was not the present Government in Canberra, as this document would have us believe, that dealt with urban public transport. It was the Australian Government prior to December 13 last, the Whitlam Government.

Mr. Whitten: Do you think the present Government should support the buses?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RUSSACK: I am certain that the present Government in Canberra will assist wherever it can, in accordance with its policy of bringing back stability in the economy of Australia. When that Government is able to do so and when it considers that the money is available, it will assist South Australia, as I shall explain later. The quotation continues:

But the Federal Labor Government decided not to support any new project, only to provide \$7 810 000 for continuation of previously approved works.

There has been discussion with State Ministers as recently as February 17 concerning this matter. The report continues:

Economic package announced by the Treasurer on May 20 included \$1 300 000 for South Australia, based on funds for continuation of approved projects. No money to be considered for new projects until 1977-78.

I should like the member for Stuart and the member for Price to take note of the following statement:

The Minister will work with the States to achieve maximum flexibility within that grant. It may be that some money can be redirected to the bus acquisition. The Minister did inform South Australia that entering contract for bus acquisition without Commonwealth approval would not prejudice consideration of Commonwealth assistance at a future date. Problem recognised, but all stems from previous Government's decision to restrict commitment for rolling stock to one year at a time.

That was the policy of the previous Federal Government, and that policy has been retained. Therefore, for the information of honourable members opposite, at the time that policy would have been the desirable one. I bring these facts forward to show that, according to that reliable information, it was not the present Government in Canberra that brought about this situation but the previous Government that laid down the policy of no funds for new projects. On page 4 of the document the Treasurer states:

Given that no new or increased taxes had become operative during the course of 1975-76, that the petrol franchise tax had been repealed and that, on the cost side, a rather large wage indexation movement (6.4 per cent) became effective—

and the Treasurer goes on to give the impression that there were no increased taxes. True, there were no increases relating to amendments to Acts or definite increases in the scale of taxation, but receipts of taxation went up astronomically. Until the Treasurer's Financial Statement comes down, possibly early in September, there will be no record in this regard, but in Parliamentary Paper 18, dated August 28, 1975, we find that, in summary, receipts of taxation were \$15 277 000 above estimate. Other receipts for public undertakings totalled \$6 100 000, recovery of debt services \$110 000, and departmental fees and recoveries \$6 600 000. Many millions of dollars in additional taxation was received above the estimates. With inflation this is what happened. As wages have increased, so the receipts from pay-roll tax have increased. As new property valuations have been applied, brought about by inflation, revenue from land tax and allied rates and taxes has increased.

The time has arrived when there must be an adjustment to the scale of these taxes, not to increase them but to reduce the scale. This applies particularly to land tax, and I stress that I am not speaking only of country areas, but of land tax across the board, metropolitan as well as country areas. I appeal to the Treasurer to consider the scale of taxation in this area.

We come now to the increase in stamp duty, the increase in conveyancing duties because of the inflationary trend in values. Although the Treasurer suggests that there has been no increase in taxes, I would suggest that there has been a tremendous increase in receipts of revenue because of the existing situation. This is where much of the money is being obtained, where the taxpayer is being bled in many areas, and not the person who can afford to pay. Many who are finding it difficult are now realising that the taxation burden is beyond their capability.

The last matter I wish to mention relates to unemployment relief works. I believe there should be help where there is need in unemployment. I believe, too, as the member for Light said this afternoon, that many people are unemployed because they are unemployable. Those people in genuine circumstances should be assisted. We believe in self-dignity of the individual, and I believe that every individual with dignity prefers to have a job and to earn a wage sufficient to allow him to live in a decent standard of living. However, I point out that, in his second reading explanation, the Treasurer said:

The South Australian Government has consistently stressed the interdependence of private and public sectors. I take it from that that the Treasurer believes that his Government can and will assist private enterprise. Regarding assistance to the unemployed, in the district I represent and in the area where I live I point out that there is a copper-processing plant. Although this plant was operative and successful for about 11 months between 1974 and early 1975, it had to cease operating because of depressed copper prices. The plant's break-even price was \$950 a tonne. The price of copper has increased to \$1 220 a tonne and, when it reaches \$1 350 a tonne, the plant will be a viable proposition. In the interim, three men, namely, a mining engineer with 25 years experience, a metallurgist with 35 years experience, and a geologist with over 10 years experience, are the principals in this enterprise. They are experienced men who know what they are about, and who are genuine in their exploits and in their industry.

However, when the price of copper reaches a level at which they can once again start processing, they will need about \$20 000 to reactivate the enterprise. They do not want the money given to them; they want it lent to them.

Mr. Whitten: Why not lend it to them?

Mr. RUSSACK: Even while not operating, these three men are paying between \$800 and \$900 a month to maintain the plant, to keep up payment on the plant's leases, and to pay the caretaker to look after the plant. When the copper price reaches a certain level, they could begin operating almost immediately and the plant would employ at least 12, and possibly 14, men in the area. I hope that, out of the \$10 000 000 or out of other money made available, this sort of situation will be accommodated so that employment can be made available in such circumstances for people who can provide employment. I once again bring to the notice of the member for Stuart the Treasurer's statement, as follows:

The South Australian Government has consistently stressed the interdependence of private and public sectors. I bring that forward as a comparison and as an additional suggestion to what is contained in the Bill so that when such a situation arises, for the sake of employing people and of decentralisation of the development of country towns, this assistance may be given. If the State Government is to accuse the Federal Government, the State Government should also take criticism. I criticise the fact that there are ways and means now of obtaining additional funds from the Federal Government by the creation of a State Grants Commission. If that were done, I am sure there would be much funding that would not otherwise come to this State. I suggest that it was not the present Federal Government that hindered the funding for buses and other forms of public transport: that policy was determined before that Government took office. Although there have not been any new taxes in this State, there has been an astronomical increase in taxation receipts. Therefore, the scale of taxation must be reduced in many areas, primarily in land tax.

Finally, I point out that, if the State Government is genuine about helping unemployment, I commend it on what it is doing to assist unemployment and I make a plea to the Government to take note of the particular instance to which I have referred and hope that it will do its best in like circumstances so that private enterprise can be helped to employ people. After all, 75 per cent of Australia's work force is employed by private enterprise; so, the Government must accept that fact and assist private enterprise wherever possible.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): The eight Opposition speakers so far in this debate have extensively set out to protect their colleagues in Canberra. I accept that there is much justification for this, because the very platform that was set when the Bill was introduced invited the Opposition to protect its colleagues from the Treasurer's unfair barrage. I note that, in the first six paragraphs of his explanation, the Treasurer makes a vicious attack on the present Federal Government. He says in opening:

This Bill comes before the House at a time when the outlook for the Australian States is grim.

The Treasurer then went on to criticise the Federal Government by saying:

The Federal Government is systematically setting out to abdicate its responsibilities in numerous areas . . .

In the next paragraph, the Treasurer again attacks the Commonwealth Government by referring to its thrust on the States and its measures to transfer resources from the public sector to the private sector. Later, he issued the following warning:

We have warned that the Federal Government's moves would create more unemployment and cause confusion and uncertainty in the community.

On a somewhat unhappy note, in the next paragraph the Treasurer reports the confusion that surrounds almost every part of the Federal Government and its policies. Later, the Treasurer said:

This means that our healthy revenue surplus and reserves will be used to continue providing services previously funded partly by the Federal Government.

The Treasurer's entire second reading explanation is a most critical attack on the present Federal Government. I am not too proud to criticise that Government, whatever its political colour, if such criticism is justified. In all fairness, I accept that, as regards the Menzies Government there was a tendency to a form of centralism, but immediately the Whitlam Government took office in Canberra it belted in and went all out to centralise the control, distribution of funds, and to take over this State's, and every other State's health scheme by means of Medibank, to control the respective States' fiscal policies, and to interfere in our educational programme, in fact taking over the responsibilities of tertiary education in total from the States. Even our Highways Department, which had previously had control over the Commonwealth funds directed to this State, was told that the local government funding would come not by direct grants to local government, not by the former systems of the Highways Department, but by some harebrained idea of a regional system of local government.

Clearly, during that short and disastrous stay of the Whitlam Government in Canberra there was this attempt to shift the rights and privileges of the States to a centralised Canberra system. The only grants that we were to enjoy during that period, as we all well know, were the section 96 grants. The Fraser Government and the Ministers of that present Government have taken a very bold step and they may well make some mistakes. They set out to return the rightful powers to the States; they set out to ensure that the States will enjoy a reasonable and proper funding under the grants system and, as a result of that responsibility taken and publicly ventilated, we find that our State Treasurer cannot handle it and cannot accept it, so that at every opportunity both within and without the Parliament, and by any article they can take advantage of in the media, the Treasurer and his Ministers are having a crack at our Federal colleagues.

It is interesting to note that, under whatever barrage of criticism the Government is directing in that way, it is unable to commend any single part of the policies being adopted at that level. Whatever Government is in power, it is only fair to say that it cannot be all wrong all of the time. In fairness and to add my protective comments to those colleagues who are absent from this Chamber, I will refer to one or two of the policies that are not only responsible to the nation as a whole but in fact have embodied in them very clear and determined incentives for the individual; and I think the most classic example of this is the policy promised by the Liberals prior to the last election and quickly adopted and implemented after their election to office: that is, the new home savings grant scheme, which in brief is an incentive to encourage home ownership among the young people and anyone else seeking to build, acquire or obtain his first home. Under the new scheme, one may qualify for a grant regardless of his age and whether or not he is married, single, widowed or divorced. In other words, it is all-embracing. The

opportunity is there which has incorporated in it a 33 per cent incentive on the money saved.

Mr. Olson: What chance has anybody got of saving that amount of money in that period of time?

Mr. CHAPMAN: You may not have confidence but I have great confidence that the present Federal Government will remain in office for a sufficient time to allow this scheme to be implemented; and, even if by the remotest chance it was outvoted from office and was replaced by another Party or Parties, one would hope that whatever the new Party's policies were, it would retain the valuable one incorporated in the housing policy of today. So, irrespective of Party politics, it is an incentive that I welcome and I know the people generally welcome because, notwithstanding previous incentives for home ownership and subsidy and grant systems that have applied in this country, it is the very best offer ever promised and upheld that we have experienced. There should be a duplication and a wider usage of this sort of incentive where help is extended to those people who help themselves. I do not have to repeat my attitude on that on this occasion; members opposite are quite aware of my feelings about helping those who demonstrate self-help.

Quite apart from that home savings grant scheme, which encourages saving by the individual, single or married, and quite apart from the \$2 000 maximum grant, non-repayable and non-taxable, that one person or a couple may qualify for over the three-year period, there are other incentives that we are seeing as a result of this move at Federal level. I refer now to the overall aim of reducing Government expenditure and concurrently the Government's policy that encourages growth, expansion and circulation of funding in the private sector. At the same time as their policies are promoting private sector involvement, they are also providing a real and attractive capital investment allowance to those who are prepared to have confidence in the Government and in the future and get the wheels of industry turning once again.

For example, for those persons who are venturesome and are keen to get industry under way, there is a 40 per cent capital investment allowance available to them on new purchases. For further restoration of business confidence, there is a scale of double depreciation that is available and therefore, on the schedules of depreciation that are available throughout the whole of industry, whatever rating applied prior to the election of this Government, those depreciations have been doubled at this stage.

Some mention has been made this evening of the Treasurer's intention to hold our State taxation for the forthcoming year. If I may say so, that is a welcome promise but it is interesting to define what are taxes and what are service charges. Really, the man in the street is not concerned with what these costs are called or into which category they may be placed: he is interested in the cost of raising his family and meeting his commitments in the community. There is little comfort to be derived from a promise such as that made by the Treasurer yesterday that there will be no increase in the State taxation structure for the forthcoming year, and at the same time we hear his Ministers and colleagues reminding us through the media of the wide range of increases in other service charges. I know only too well the sorts of effects that can and have come from the veiled equalisation scheme presented to us early last year and how it applied in the water rating formula and accordingly the water rates in which we are involved in this State—not to overlook to mention, of course, the land tax rates that apply in both the rural and the metropolitan sectors.

Mr. Keneally: What percentage of the rural section pays land tax?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am interested in the honourable member's raising this question. I do not know what percentage of the rural section pays land tax but it creates a very interesting subject.

Mr. Keneally: I am told that 90 per cent of those people do not pay land tax.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Frankly, I do not agree that over 90 per cent do not pay rural land tax in South Australia. I am not in a position to argue about the actual percentage of non-payers, except that I say this, and with all respect. I suggest that the honourable member may be confusing the issue and what he really should be saying is that it could be 90 per cent of the State that is not subject to rural land tax, and not 90 per cent of the growers or producers. I am not willing or equipped to argue the detail but I remind the honourable member about an area on which I have up-to-date information. Water rates and the cruel formula applying to that service charge have been mentioned, as has land tax, which is a charge without a service of any form.

There is another service of a form. I do not know who gets the service, but I refer to a charge called stamp duty. Having spoken of housing, I will relate figures to the ordinary household. I am sure that members opposite would not suggest that a house valued at \$35 000 would be an above-average house. That is a realistic figure to place on a normal family unit. The stamp duty on the transfer of a house of that value varies considerably among the States. In Tasmania the duty is \$587.50; in New South Wales, \$613; in Victoria, \$700; in Western Australia, \$587.50; and in South Australia, \$810. We are not only first but we are the highest.

Mr. Mathwin: They have strangled the building trade.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The interjection about strangling the building trade may be true. I am concerned about the strangulation going on among those people who are striving to build and own their own house. That is only one of the many areas in which, for convenience and to gain revenue, this State is well out in front. Members will recall my speech last evening in the grievance debate, when I referred to the operation of the war service land settlement scheme on Kangaroo Island. It is interesting to note that in the soldier settlement file that I have, I have information that, for convenience or maybe for other unidentified reasons, there are interesting anomalies in valuations carried out by the State and by the Commonwealth for varying purposes.

Members may recall my mentioning yesterday the unrealistic valuations placed on Kangaroo Island properties to determine the liquidity of those individual units. To bring them up to date, I mention that in the *Stock Journal* of May 13, 1976, I have a reference to the unrealistic valuations placed on one property on Kangaroo Island by a South Australian Lands Department officer. I do not know from whom the officer got guidance, but this soldier settler unit was valued at \$27 000. I repeat that that valuation was made for the purpose of determining the question of insolvency and the future of the occupier of that unit.

In 1973, for the purpose of assessing land tax, council rates, water rates, and for all other purposes, the unimproved value set on that property by the Valuation Department was \$13 960. Therefore, it is easy to understand why I became so disturbed at the time and why I am referring to the position again now. The difference between the two figures,

namely, \$13 040, represented the value of the fixed improvements, the pasture, the fencing, the dams and all other improvements on that area of 320 hectares of cleared land.

Last year the same Lands Department, for the purpose of determining stamp duty and any other applicable taxes, when assessing the valuation of the property for transfer of joint tenancy between father and son in respect of the holding, valued it at \$54 000. It is also interesting, when comparing similar land around the area that has been sold, to find that a property about 5 kilometres westward had a sale price for the lease and improvements of \$65 000. Another property about the same distance east attracted a sale price of \$57 500 at about the same time.

Those comments show the extremities of valuations of the same unit. To show how our Governments, particularly in this case our State Government, under-value when it is convenient to do so, I mention the deceased estate of Gordon William Symons in relation to a property in the hundred of Duncan, near the area to which I have referred previously. It was war service leasehold land valued not at \$27 000, \$54 000, or \$65 000, but at \$70 941. The total area was almost identical. There was a little more development than there was on the land to which I referred earlier, but the valuations made were:

Lease	\$70 941 Value
Item	\$
Farm plant	4 790
Farming motor vehicles	625
Livestock	18 930.50
Farm produce and other requisites	667.90
Furniture, etc.	510
Motor vehicle	1 000

In that case a valuation accumulated for probate and succession duties to gain revenue for the Governments to which the tax applied was \$97 464.40. I have a copy of these valuations, dated September 24, 1975. A few months before, the officers went to that area and grossly understated and unrealistically valued properties of a similar type and of similar productive value. I am referring to war service properties valued in recent times as against the itemised case above, which was prepared by a licensed valuer, and accepted by all authorities.

Mr. Venning: That's interesting!

Mr. CHAPMAN: It is more than interesting. It is disturbing, when one finds that for the purpose of gaining revenue our valuations vary, invariably upwards. This happens for other reasons, such as the disturbing example to which I referred yesterday. It is done for the purpose of dislodging families from their units, following the claimed insolvency situations, when there is the clear suggestion that the variations are downwards.

Mr. Wotton: Down when they want a bit of collateral.

Mr. CHAPMAN: When it is convenient. I do not know what are the motives behind that story. It may well be that, if some cleared land was available, it would be more convenient to plant pine trees on it than to upset the environmentalists by interfering with what is now undeveloped or virgin land: that natural scrub and beauty of the area that becomes the shine in the eyes of the Minister of Environment and Conservation. To be fair, this applies not only to him but also to many others who are eccentric about holding vast areas of land in this State, denying councils of the rates on them in the meantime, and thereby resulting in the great bush fire risks, and so on, that are associated with them.

This is a matter to which I should like to refer tomorrow in Question Time. I say that for no other purpose than to be courteous to the Minister, to whom this

should be somewhat of a warning of what is to happen tomorrow, that is, if I get a call. I am greatly beholden to our Acting Whip in this respect.

Mr. Keneally: Are you crawling?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am not crawling. I am telling him, the same as I would tell the honourable member or anyone else. I know what I want, and I am making it clear now, and will make it clearer at any other appropriate time.

Mr. Mathwin: Ask your question now, because you've still got five minutes to go.

Mr. CHAPMAN: In case I miss out in Question Time tomorrow, as I did yesterday and today, I will go further with my warning to the Minister and, in the minute or so that I have left to speak, bring to his attention a matter that worries not only me, the representative in this place for that vast and important District of Alexandra, but also those people who are struggling along and trying to make a living in it. I ask the Minister for the Environment to say whether there is a conflict between his department's conservation policy and the Government's general pine afforestation policy, and whether his department's conservation policy conflicts with the proposal to establish pine forests on Kangaroo Island's unoccupied virgin Crown land. If it does, will the Minister explain the details of that conflict? I may just as well go on with this matter, as it involves finances for the people and ultimately, one would hope, for the State. Without having to ask for leave to explain, I can say that, following recent investigations by the Woods and Forests Department officers and other interested parties, it is reported that:

(a) There is a desperate need to establish further industry in presently unoccupied virgin land areas of the State, including Kangaroo Island.

(b) There is a need to encourage diversified practices by those involved in the marginally profitable rural pursuits.

(c) The economy of exploring agricultural meat and wool growing by developing natural scrub areas is slim.

(d) The climatic conditions, rainfall and soil types are reported suitable for afforestation in the area mentioned. Finally, in the expressed opinion of many Islanders:

(e) Such development of this useless scrub land would rid the area of a harbor for unwanted vermin, to allow improved control of the bush fire risk, and offset an embarrassment claimed by the local government authority that the area is neither ratable nor revenue earning.

For the purpose of dealing with that matter at this stage, I am seeking not only to get another question on another important subject dealt with tomorrow, but also to give the Minister a little more time to furnish me with replies before the end of the session. I point out that, despite the efforts made by this Government to gain revenue, there are responsible people in the community who are trying to help themselves and establish an enterprise, diversification or whatever else one might like to call it, in order to make a "quid" in the field.

I started my speech by saying that I supported the Federal Government in its efforts to pursue policies that encouraged incentives for people to help themselves and, in the last few moments, I have demonstrated how the people in my own District of Alexandra are trying to do just that. I look forward to the Minister's co-operation in relation to the requests made to him, in order to clear the air. I hope he will give whatever encouragement he can give members of that community in their support for the proposed afforestation on Kangaroo Island. I thank you, Sir, and Government members for hearing me out. You will hear a little more from me in the grievance debate later this evening.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): This Bill reminds me somewhat of the little ditty "Little Jack Horner sat in the corner" that I used to know when I was small. Obviously, the Treasurer, with this Bill, is saying to everyone in the State, "What a good boy am I." He is saying that he is a good boy and that the Commonwealth Government is the bad boy. What a change! Of course, previously the Treasurer did not want to know his friend, the Honourable the Gough at all. He said then, "Do not blame me for Canberra's mistakes. We will do a Judas and wash our hands of him completely." However, in this field he is the Jack Horner. He sits there with his finger in the pie and the plum on the end, saying, "What a good boy am I."

Mr. Wotton: You're getting your stories mixed up.

Mr. MATHWIN: No, I am not. In the first paragraph of his second reading explanation, the Treasurer said:

The Federal Government is systematically setting out to abdicate its responsibilities in numerous areas . . .

Perhaps the Treasurer does not realise that the Opposition believes there should be no tied grants and that the States and local government should be able to spend their finances as they think fit. If they are given money, they should be able to spend it to the greatest possible advantage of their constituents. That is quite unlike the former Whitlam Government, which believed that the only solution to the problem was tied grants. If that Government allocated money to a State Government or a council, it directed how the money was to be spent. If money was received for the upgrading of a road, filling in potholes, or the like, the authority concerned had to ascertain from Canberra which work had to be done with the grant. For the benefit of the Treasurer, who obviously does not know that it is the Opposition's policy to have no tied grants, the Commonwealth Government has acted in accordance with the principles of the Party of which I am a member and which believes that the local knowledge is worth far more than that of the bureaucracy way off in Canberra. The Treasurer also states:

The South Australian Government has consistently stressed the inter-dependence of private and public sectors.

I suppose that is a fair statement from a socialist. He believes that private enterprise and nationalisation live happily together. What a strange marriage!

Mr. Allison: He probably means that private enterprise supports the other.

Mr. MATHWIN: He probably means that private enterprise carries the brunt of nationalisation and will be robbed through high taxation to give benefits to the State. If members do not believe what I am saying, I refer them to the green book that now costs 70 cents. I got this copy free from the library. I usually buy a copy each year, but I suppose the price will increase this year, too. I understand a new copy is due out soon. The objective of the South Australian branch of the Australian Labor Party is the democratic socialisation of industry, production, distribution and exchange—

Mr. Venning: That's been there for years.

Mr. MATHWIN: "Democratic" has been added to make it sound a little different. Perhaps it means that it takes just a little longer to achieve the same end. After all, the definition of communism and socialism is the same, but communism gets there a little more quickly. The Treasurer's statement is indeed wide. He did not say that many industries are leaving South Australia. In the past couple of weeks Wadham's, a company that has been in South Australia for many years, has indicated it will leave my district and go to Victoria. That decision affects 200 people

in my district. From time to time the Treasurer struts around with his feathers flying, stating what he is doing for industry in this State, but he has declined to comment about industries that are leaving the State and why they are leaving.

Mr. Venning: When Dunstan fights, South Australia wins!

Mr. MATHWIN: So he says. That is a myth, and one must have a certain sense of humour to believe it. It reminds one of Box and Cox, a Gilbert and Sullivan opera. The Treasurer also states in his explanation:

We have warned that the Federal Government's moves would create more unemployment and cause confusion and uncertainty in the community.

If he is so worried about that situation, one wonders why he did not pay some attention to the matter some time ago when the Federal Government was in the hands of the spoilers—the Whitlam Government. At that time the Minister of Labour and Industry (Mr. Cameron, a local boy) stated publicly that if unemployment reached 200 000 he would resign. That figure was well exceeded, but Mr. Cameron did not see fit to resign. However, his name began with "C" so he was on the list to be struck off, and he was, along with other "C's", demoted.

Mr. Allison: He declared at 350, did he?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes. Another matter referred to by the Treasurer in his Little Jack Horner story related to the confusion that he said surrounded almost every aspect of Federal Government policy, be it Medibank, wage indexation, education spending, Aboriginal affairs or urban development. If anyone is confused, it is the Treasurer of this State. We know well that it is difficult for him because, after all, he has been away and has not been in touch with what has been happening in Australia. He left matters in the hands of the Minister of Works, who made some rather bold statements. In fact, he was throwing statements out left, right and centre until he realised he was saying things that were incorrect, and he had to close his mouth. When the Treasurer returned, he was a fresh person to wage the attack on the present Federal Government. If anyone is confused about the Federal situation it is the Treasurer of this State. In his explanation, the Treasurer also states:

The Budget position we find ourselves in is the envy of the other States.

One wonders whether the position is much wider than that and whether he believes that we are the envy of other States in matters of the permissive society and compulsory unionism, which is now in the forefront as far as this Government is concerned. It is the issue that has been pushed up to number one on the Government's list. Perhaps he is relating to other matters about which the people of this State are upset. The people have something to fear in relation to matters referred to in the Governor's Speech. If one travels around the other States, as many of us do, one hears how people there talk about us. If the Treasurer did the same he would ascertain that the position is not as rosy as he might believe. He might also find out that the other States do not hold us in as high regard as he might think they do. Indeed, it could even be the other way around. I know that the new Premier of New South Wales intends making a clean sweep in all sorts of areas, but he has already reneged on a couple of matters, in quick time, that he said he would consider.

Mr. Gunn: He painted himself into a corner.

Mr. MATHWIN: True. He is almost like a shadow boxer without his shadow; he does not know where to turn next. The Treasurer, in his explanation, gives us

five points to consider in relation to how well off we are and how we arrived at the situation of having a fair sized kitty in this State. The fourth point, so the Treasurer states, is the improved State revenue in some areas. He indicated that receipts as a whole could perhaps be \$5 000 000 above estimate. We know how that situation came about. Everybody knows it—certainly the workers of this State know it. Being a socialist State we are carrying out policies of a socialist Government, and the only way that such policies can be carried out is to impose excessive taxation, taxing people to death.

Socialism means high taxation; it is as simple as that. No-one can get anything for nothing. No Government has money unless it is derived from some sort of taxation. The more money that is given away in the myth that things can be given for nothing, the more taxation people must pay. In dealing with some of these matters we do not have to look far. I refer first to the tax that the Government would describe as a rich man's tax, and I refer to land tax. All honourable members know the sad story of land tax in South Australia. The imposition of land tax is driving people to the wall, both in the country and in the metropolitan area.

Many people have come into my office expressing their concern about land tax. I refer especially to people who built a house 20, 25 or 30 years ago. Often, they put their life savings into their house, which was then built at a reasonable price. Now, years later, merely because their house is in a light industrial area, these landowners must meet annual land tax payments equal to the original cost of their house, at a time when houses of this age are being sold merely for land values because they happen to be in a light industrial area.

Houses which cost \$1 000, \$1 200 or \$1 400 to build are now assessed at more than \$33 000, \$34 000, or \$36 000. Such assessments result in land taxes which are impossible to meet. They provide a millstone around the neck of house owners, causing much concern and worry to people who should not have such worries at their stage of life. Certainly, these people did the right thing in their early days by obtaining their own accommodation. They struggled over their working years and now, when they have come close to retirement and near to the time when they want to feel that they have security, they are faced with high land tax payments.

Why does one have to pay land tax? One pays it merely for the privilege of owning a house or a property. There is no other reason. Yet these people, who are not rich people, have achieved their independence through their life's struggle. Their life savings are tied up in their house, and now they are faced with this burden placed on them by the Government. No matter how Government members wriggle and squirm, it is they and the Government who are responsible for the imposition of this burden on the people of this State, and especially on the people in my district. This applies also in many other districts, and I am sure that the member for Heysen will have much to say on this matter. I know only too well how concerned he is, and I know how the imposition of land tax is wreaking damage, heartbreak and distress on his constituents.

I refer also to water and sewerage charges. Last year the member for Hanson and I were faced with the problems of our constituents in regard to these charges. We faced this problem because we were in Liberal districts, and we had the privilege of being in the barrel first. We attended a big meeting and we were supported by the people of Glenelg in our fight against the savage increases in water

and sewerage charges. I refer also to increased stamp duty and similar charges which this Government has proceeded with in order to implement its policies of socialism further. To try to socialise this State it must apply greater and more excessive taxes. The Treasurer further stated:

Fifthly, these four favourable effects were expected to be offset by net increases in payments of about \$4 000 000. Here we have more proof about the way in which the Government is taxing the people of South Australia out of existence and, if the Government is able to do so, it will take advantage of the situation. People are moving away from South Australia to escape the tax burden the Government is imposing on them. The Treasurer went on to state:

Now, in early June it is clear that the estimate of surplus made in February was a significant understatement, and that on recent trends we may expect a surplus as high as \$50 000 000.

The Treasurer went on to say that this was rather surprising. It may be surprising to the Treasurer, if he is asleep in his shell, but it is not surprising to me or any of my colleagues, as a result of the savage increases in taxation inflicted on thousands of people in South Australia. Certainly, it is not surprising that the Government has so much in the kitty.

Why is the Government hiding this fact? Where is it shelving the money? What is the reason for the Government's hoarding of funds? When will it do something about those funds? Will the Government plough these funds into Monarto? Where does the Treasurer go to think about what he will do with these funds? The Treasurer has not stated what he will do with this money, and I shall be interested to see whether he will expend it on Monarto and whether the Minister for Planning will have Monarto once again included in his portfolio. The Treasurer also stated:

It seems that all the favourable influences I mentioned in February are turning out to be even more favourable than was forecast and that many State revenues have been very buoyant despite a general slackness in the economy. I have explained to the House and to the Treasurer how this situation came about: it has resulted from the high level of taxation imposed in this State. This is a typical Jack Horner Bill. The Treasurer has said that the Federal Government is comprised of the bad people, that they are causing all the trouble in South Australia and Australia, and he is the good clever boy because he is the Treasurer of South Australia. I support the Bill.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity to say one or two things about this Bill. It is unfortunate that the House has been in recess for several months and that we have been given only three days to discuss many important issues that have taken place in South Australia during the non-sitting period of the House.

Mr. Millhouse: The Government would have sat last night if you blokes had not wanted to go elsewhere.

Mr. GUNN: If the member for Mitcham had done his homework he would have realised that it was not the Government's intention to sit on Tuesday night. If the honourable member checks back in *Hansard* he will find it is rare that the House has sat on an opening Tuesday night.

Mr. Millhouse: Nevertheless, the Government would have sat last night.

Mr. GUNN: We are happy to sit this week, next week and the week after next if there are matters that should be put before this Parliament. There are one or two matters I should like to bring to the attention of the House.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr. GUNN: I refer to the time during the recess when the Minister of Agriculture displayed a complete lack of responsibility. Obviously, the other members of Cabinet and members of the Labor Party in this Parliament have no regard whatever for agriculture. This Bill now before the House also pays scant regard to the benefits that agriculture gives to every citizen of this State. If this were a responsible Government, the Treasurer should immediately sack the Minister of Agriculture, because the Minister has lost the confidence of all sections of agriculture in this State. He has proved that he is following the same negative, destructive line that the Whitlam Socialist Government followed in Canberra. He is mouthing nonsense, and it is time he accepted some of the advice from the responsible officers within his department and relied less on the nonsense his private staff has been feeding to him. If anyone follows the statements he has made, he will be aware that he knows nothing about the problems of agriculture. He is merely attempting to divide country producers and city people.

He has complained bitterly about the superphosphate bounty, but he knows little about the background of why that subsidy was given to producers. He has deliberately failed to tell the people that everyone employed in the motor industry is subsidised to the extent of about \$6 000. The member for Spence, who is so busily writing and who was so critical of Mr. Fraser last night, has received a subsidy, as have all the members he represented, for some years. There would not be a motor industry in Australia today if it were not for a subsidy by way of tariff protection. It ill behoves the honourable member to make personal attacks on the Prime Minister when he has received the taxpayers' money by way of tariff protection. I challenge him to deny what I have said. The member for Whyalla is never in the House, and he is not here tonight, like most members opposite, but there would not be a shipbuilding yard at Whyalla without a subsidy of about \$9 000 a person employed in the industry. It will take about \$16 000 a person for those employed in the industry to keep it going. The Government has sat idly by and allowed a foolish Minister of Agriculture to attempt to discourage agriculturists in this State, and it is a disgraceful state of affairs.

This is the first time in my memory that the rural organisations in South Australia have been so united in their criticism of a Minister. They have called for his resignation and, if he is not prepared to do the right thing, the Treasurer should exercise his proper responsibility and sack the Minister. He has insulted agriculturists and failed to appreciate the contribution they have made to the welfare of every person in this State. He has failed to appreciate that the Industries Assistance Commission investigated this proposal and recommended the reintroduction of the superphosphate bounty. The Minister has not mentioned how costs have increased. For the benefit of the member for Spence, I will say what has happened in relation to the cost of superphosphate. In January, 1971, superphosphate cost \$13.88 a tonne; in January, 1972, the cost had risen to \$14.17 a tonne; in January, 1973, the cost was the same; in January, 1974, the cost was \$15.05 a tonne; in January, 1975, it was \$55.08 a tonne; and in January, 1976, it was \$61.90 a tonne. Those prices were at the factory, and freight must be added. People who are long distances from the fertiliser plants must pay more. The Minister of Agriculture did not mention these figures when he had his private staff putting out the nonsense he allowed to go into the press.

The Minister is merely trying to protect himself. He is kowtowing to the left wing unions, which are completely controlling this State, and endeavouring to guarantee his endorsement by making the noises he thinks they would like him to echo. It is disgraceful that a Government should allow an irresponsible Minister to go round the State causing concern and doing much damage to people who have laid the foundations of South Australia, those who have been involved in agriculture and industries that have provided so much employment, directly and indirectly. I wonder whether the Minister knows how many people are employed at the excellent agricultural machinery factories in this State which rely on a strong and viable agricultural industry. I have not heard the member for Spence say anything about that. Those people stand on their own feet. They are not like people in the motor industry, not like the honourable member who has received a subsidy while employed in the industry.

On the subject of subsidies, I shall give some more figures. It is typical of the Labor Party attack on primary industry that its members always claim that people involved in agriculture are whingeing cockies. The member for Spence is always talking about agriculturists. Members opposite fail to appreciate that most of the funds provided to assist agriculture are by way of loans at current rates of interest, not by way of tariff protection. The superphosphate bounty is a small tariff compensation. I hope this Government will realise that it has a person who is not fit to discharge the responsibilities of the office of Minister of Agriculture. The superphosphate bounty was one area where he charged off at a tangent. Another time when the Minister charged off like a bull in a china shop was when he was making statements expressing concern that beef producers had not availed themselves of funds made available to them. The Minister would not have had to think very much to find why they did not do so. If people are in financial difficulties and having trouble running their industry, they will not borrow funds offered to them at an interest rate of more than 11 per cent. His own common sense should tell him why beef producers have not taken advantage of that scheme. If the funds had been offered at a reasonable rate of interest, the producers would have availed themselves of the opportunity.

The next issue in which the Minister was involved was his advice to the wool producers to support Mr. Apap, of the Storemen and Packers Union. That was a classic example of his incompetence and his failure to appreciate the problems of the industry. If the woolgrowers had gone before the relevant commission and had acted on the Minister's advice, the cost of wool handling across Australia would have been increased by 90 per cent. Charges in other areas also would have been increased. The Minister and his colleagues do not realise that many of the charges producers have to pay are calculated on a bale basis. If the amount of wool in a bale is reduced, the cost is increased. Freight is charged by the bale, as are wool tax, handling charges, and the cost of the bales themselves, while the pressing of the wool into bales is charged on a bale basis. Yet the Minister advised the woolgrowers to support Mr. Apap. One could make quite a speech about Mr. Apap and ask how he got into the position of Secretary of the Storemen and Packers Union. Why did Mr. Marinoff leave, and why did the Federal Secretary come over? Why was Mr. Thompson sacked as President of the union? One could go on at length about that gentleman, but there are more important things to say. I am pleased to see the Minister of Education is smiling.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is referring, I think, to the Minister for Planning.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It is just as well Port Lincoln has got its new high school. If you were the member it wouldn't have.

Mr. GUNN: I would not be surprised at any threat the Minister made.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Ineffective representation!

Mr. GUNN: The Minister is complaining about representation. We are aware that members of the Labor Party are not entitled to represent their constituents. They are bound by what is said by the people at South Terrace. I am proud to belong to a Party that allows its members freedom of action. That is something the Minister cannot boast about. Regarding education expenditure, I think that I have done fairly well in my district over the past few years. It was obvious that the first two pages of the Treasurer's second reading explanation were the work of the Treasurer's political staff. They set out on the same line that they followed in 1972, when the Government attacked the Gorton Liberal Government, whereas previously it was the McMahon Liberal Government. Page 3 of the document gets to the actual speech prepared by the Treasury, and it was up to the usual high standard.

Regarding the federalism policy on which the Fraser Government has set out, it is, in my opinion, one of the most important of the coalition Government's policies, and the sooner it is implemented the better it will be for State Governments and for local government. It is rather interesting to listen to the criticism of the Treasurer, and particularly of other socialist leaders in Australia. Obviously they recognise that, when this scheme is put into effect, it will make State Governments responsible for their own actions, and that is something they do not want to accept in any circumstances. We can all recall how the Whitlam Government set out on a campaign of complete financial irresponsibility. It believed that, if it could continue to spend millions of dollars, no matter how it was spent some good must come from it, whereas the opposite was the result. The new policy that our colleagues will implement will allow State Governments to be their own masters for the first time.

Mr. Millhouse: Not for the first time; for many years, yes.

Mr. GUNN: For the first time since I have been associated with politics.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not very long.

Mr. GUNN: I think I may be around a little longer than the member for Mitcham will be around. That will not be much longer.

Mr. Millhouse: We'll see about that. Ask the member for Flinders about that.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Mitcham wants to make the most of his remaining few months in Parliament, after which he can return to his lucrative law practice or go into the Army. I do not know which group would be pleased to have him.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That wasn't very kind.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member has not been very kind on many occasions, either, but I will not worry about that.

Mr. Millhouse: You just made a mistake, that was all.

Mr. GUNN: I do not need assistance from the member for Mitcham. It is a long time since I realised that his advice was not very sound, and he has proved by his actions recently that his colleagues have realised that his advice was unworthy of any consideration.

In conclusion, I am pleased to see in the later parts of the explanation that the Government has seen its way clear to spend \$3 000 000 in the western part of my district in providing assistance to the people there by connecting them to the power system at Port Augusta. I only regret that the Government has not spent extra funds to extend the power west to the Penong and Nundroo areas but, no doubt, it will do that soon. I hope that, when the Government has completed this phase of the project, it will turn to the other areas of Eyre Peninsula that would like to avail themselves of these services.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The Treasurer's second reading explanation reminds me of little boy lost. It would be fair to assume that he has lost his benefactor in the Federal Parliament and has taken the opportunity in the past few months to abuse the new Federal Government continually on any decision it has made. I do not think that anyone would have been too anxious to take over the Federal Treasury following the chaotic years of Labor Administration in Canberra, but someone had to do it for the sake of the nation and make some brave decisions affecting Australia's future as it stands not only in the Asian areas but also in the rest of the free world. The Treasurer later took advice from the Opposition, which said that he should always plan and prepare for a balanced Budget and, at the same time, use his Treasury officials and heads of various Government departments to seek ways and means of generally updating the departments, adopting efficient methods, and seeing what savings could be made without any undue retrenchments. So, the Government has benefited, we estimate, by about \$50 000 000 from that exercise. It could also be argued that it has benefited from other payments from the Federal Government.

When one looks at our Revenue Account and the Bill, one finds that the Treasurer is trying to confuse the issue by bringing in the Loan Account as well, and the general pattern emerges. It emerged about a year ago and during the 1975 State elections: you can confuse the people if you try hard enough by using the Loan Account or Revenue Account and try to justify some of the "robbing Peter to pay Paul" system. What the people really understand and what I believe they appreciate is that South Australian taxpayers have been over-taxed by this Government. If one looks at some of the major revenue lines in the Revenue Account and at stamp duties, one finds that the Government again has benefited from inflation. In the 1975-76 Budget the Government expected to receive \$55 000 000, whereas at the end of April, 1976, it had received \$53 900 000. If one follows the pattern of receipts from stamp duties for May and June, 1975, it is reasonable to assume that this year the State Treasury will receive \$61 400 000 in stamp duties, thereby exceeding the Budget estimate by \$6 400 000.

Land tax at the end of April, 1976, had exceeded the Budget by about \$39 000. Again, if one applies the method of comparing receipts for the previous 12 months, one will find that land tax will exceed the Budget by about \$400 000; that may not sound a large sum, but it means that there are and have been areas of over-taxation. Regarding succession duties, we find that, at the end of April, 1976, the Treasury had received \$16 200 000 against a Budget estimate of \$16 500 000. Again, if one uses the previous year as a guide, one sees that there could be about a \$2 800 000 excess from stamp duty receipts. Adding these figures, we get an excess of about \$9 600 000, so it is fair to argue that we have been over-taxed and that the State Treasury has benefited immensely from inflation. It has been a continuing process, even though inflation is beginning

to diminish, and the Treasury, particularly in the stamp duty area, has not made allowance for the down-turn in inflation.

Because the taxpayers have been over-taxed and the Treasury has benefited as a result, the Government has taken the opportunity, as stated in this morning's *Advertiser* leading article, by good husbandry or sheer politics to decide that it will now spend \$61 000 000 of its surplus. In spending that money gained as revenue from the hard-earned money of this State's taxpayers, the Loan Account will be propped up. This is a poor way to finance some of the commitments this Government made on the Loan Account, some of its political promises it made without thoroughly considering the long-term effects, because the Treasurer has reminded us that, whilst he is aware of the short-term effects, it is the long-term effects on the Revenue Account and Loan Account that must be borne in mind. There was also a warning from this side of the House that, even though we were appearing to have a buoyant surplus in our Revenue Account, we must take into consideration the long-term effects of the Government's extravagant programme over the past six years. We are finding this in the Federal Government sphere that only after a few years the effect there, the damage that was caused, will take this country many years to resolve to restore economic stability in Australia.

So that is the problem we have, that the Treasurer finds—and no doubt he was under tremendous pressure from his Ministers with a projected surplus of some \$50 000 000 in the Revenue Account and \$25 000 000 sitting in reserve—that we may as well blow it before the end of the financial year because, if we do not, it will go into Reserve Account and then it can be offset only against future deficits in the Revenue Account. To take this money from revenue and pay out money in areas normally funded by Loan Account, in my opinion, is entirely wrong. It is like going out and paying cash for certain long-term projects.

Mr. Dean Brown: It is very inflationary.

Mr. BECKER: It can be. We are taking away all our capital and skinning ourselves right down and the Government may well find in the next 12 months or three years that, when it goes to the cupboard to find something, it will not be there. Take, for example, the bus deal, the \$20 000 000-odd that is needed for urban public transport. Normally, this is funded by Loan Account. Let us go back to the 1974-75 Loan Estimates. At page 16, under the heading "Municipal Tramways Trust—\$2 400 000", we read:

For the four years 1973-74 to 1976-77, the capital programme of the trust envisages the net expenditure of about \$22 500 000 at present price levels for the transfer of licensed services, the purchase of new buses, the acquisition of land for depots, the construction of buildings and purchase of plant. If the whole of this programme were accepted by the Australian Government for support under the urban transport arrangements then two-thirds of the cost, say \$15 000 000, would be covered by grants and one-third of the cost, say \$7 500 000, would be a charge to State funds. However, we have not been successful as yet in getting approval for the costs of transfer of licensed services to be financed under the special urban transport arrangements and the net cost to the State over the four-year period could be as high as \$9 000 000. A contribution of \$2 400 000 towards the programme is proposed in 1974-75.

He goes back to say that this programme was not accepted by the Australian Government. There are a lot of "ifs" and "perhaps". We then look at the Loan Estimates for 1975-76 under the Municipal Tramways Trust and see:

During 1974-75 an amount of \$4 400 000 was advanced from Loan Account to the trust towards its capital programme of purchase of new buses, acquisition of land for depots and construction of depot buildings. Finance is also being provided by the Australian Government by way of grants under urban public transport arrangements to meet two-thirds of the cost of approved projects. The amount of such assistance to be provided in 1975-76 is not yet known, but we are hopeful that up to \$10 000 000 will be available towards total payments of the order of \$15 000 000. Two major contracts for supply of buses are now under way, one for 67 AEC Swift buses and one for 310 Volvo buses.

The Loan Estimates for 1975-76 were introduced into this House in about August-September, 1975. So we are talking of the major contracts for the supply of buses that were under way, and we are talking of the two Loan Estimates from which the State Government was hopeful that it might get some grants, but it has not received any assurance on that. We then find in the *News* of April 12, 1976, under the heading, "Giant South Australia Bus Deal", the following:

Leyland taking over. In a multi-million dollar deal announced today, Leyland Australia is to take over Freighter Industries bus-building complex at Royal Park. And a subsidiary of Leyland Australia has won a State Transport Authority tender to build 376 air-conditioned commuter buses to upgrade the Adelaide bus fleet.

The contract had been let, I was given to understand from this article, some time about April 12, 1976. Knowing this Government or its policy of huffing and puffing as best it can, one can assume that the contract was signed probably within a day or two of that announcement; yet this evening the member for Gouger informed us that he had contacted the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon) and had been informed that South Australia had entered into a contract for 310 buses of its own volition. The message was:

South Australia sought assistance 1975-76 programme bids; but Federal Labor Government decided not to support any new project, only to provide \$7 810 000 for continuation of previously approved works. Minister wrote to State Ministers on February 17, indicating he would be prepared to agree to reallocation of the funds to high priority areas; currently as proposed involving direction of \$3 000 000 towards bus contracts (Commonwealth contributed \$2 000 000).

Then, on May 20, the economic package was announced by the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Lynch:

It included \$1 300 000 for South Australia, based on funds for continuation of approved projects; no money to be considered for new projects until the 1977-78 Budget. Minister will work with States to achieve maximum flexibility within that grant.

The point I am making is that the State Government went ahead: it ordered new buses, it signed two contracts, in fact. The first one collapsed and then the second contract was given to a company on the understanding, as far as I understand it, that it would come to South Australia and would build the buses in South Australia and, provided it did that, the Housing Trust would purchase a factory for it and would help to set it up. It was given preferential treatment. A contract was entered into, and yet the Government was not assured of or had any guarantees that it would be getting funds from the Federal Government.

Now we are asked to consider taking \$20 000 000 of hard cold cash earned by South Australian taxpayers, fleeced from them by over-taxation, to prop up a contract that probably should have been reconsidered. Let us look at our public transport system. It is not the best; it is not the worst, but it is a long way from being satisfactory. At some time in the future there would have to be a replacement programme. The Minister went

straight out and ordered 310 or 376 buses without being assured that he had guarantees from the Federal Government that it would support the programme. To take this money from the Revenue Account to prop up a commitment that should normally be a Loan Account programme is, in my opinion, completely unfair to the South Australian taxpayer. It is regrettable that, in this Parliament, under the system that we operate, we cannot reject this Bill. I believe that the Minister has used his influence and power in Caucus to railroad the scheme through.

In another area, there have been several announcements during the Parliamentary recess by various Ministers while the Treasurer has been away. After all, the Treasurer said that he was reasonably satisfied with the Liberal Party's federalism policy. He and other Ministers understand that policy but they are doing their damndest to sabotage it. The whole document that we are considering is a smokescreen and an attempt to damage and destroy the credibility of the new Federal Government.

That attempt is typical of the ploy adopted by members of the Party opposite, and they have had some success over the years. They destroyed the credibility of Mr. McMahon when he was Prime Minister and they certainly did it to Billy Snedden when he was Leader of the Opposition. Now they are trying to do it to Malcolm Fraser, our Prime Minister. In the months since the most recent State election, the same Ministers and other members of the Labor Party Government have done the same thing to the Leader of the Opposition in this State. When he offers constructive criticism and warns the Government on issues, Government members accuse him of being against South Australia or of knocking the State. If a person throws enough mud, regrettably some of it sticks, and at the New South Wales election recently mud certainly did stick and that was the reason for the change of Government there.

We want the people of South Australia to understand that the new Federal Government is working in their interests by giving the States powers, by handing back to the States power to control their own programmes. Whether in the Revenue Account or the Loan Account, the State Government has the right to go to the people for whatever funds it wants for a project. It can put on a taxation surcharge if it wants to, and it must be answerable to the people about how it spends that money. If we wanted to upgrade and completely modernise our transport system, the State Government could introduce a surcharge for that. It would not do so, because it would consider that unpopular.

People do not mind if they know where their money is going, but, when we are asked to give up \$61 000 000 of hard-earned taxpayers' money, with 21 days left this month in which to spend it, we become suspicious. I am not pleased about handing out \$20 000 000 for public transport in this State knowing that the money cannot be spent this financial year and probably will not be spent in the next 12 months. I cannot understand why this Bill does not give only sufficient cover for the remaining weeks of this month and why we cannot then start again next financial year, or why we cannot provide sufficient funds when the next Budget is introduced. I have said many times that it is difficult to present an annual Budget without having continual review at least quarterly.

The State Government and the Treasury should adopt a system of having a Budget for 12 months, with the right to adjust it quarterly. If that was done, Treasury statements back to September and December last year and January this year would have shown that there would be

a surplus in the Revenue Account and that Loan Account money was being spent at a far more rapid rate. The Government should take little credit for having done a good job, and for taking taxpayers' money and giving it away in areas where we will not be able to keep our finger on those commitments.

The document states that there will be a change in relation to the financial arrangements of the State Transport Authority. The Municipal Tramways Trust always has been autonomous and the Minister has discovered a new area of control, by which he can inject money into the State Transport Authority, with 12 or 18 months passing before we know what has happened to the money.

However, if the money is in our Revenue Account, we will get at least a monthly report. When money is taken from Revenue Account and given to autonomous bodies and we have to wait for reports to be tabled in Parliament, there is grave risk that that money can be used for other than the matters for which it is provided. It would be a very brave Minister who misled the Parliament. However, we are not sure that we like the present system.

As I have said, with the Federal Government's federalism policy on special projects we can keep an eye on the spending of money. When the money is in the Revenue Account we can keep an eye on expenditure but when it goes outside the area of Parliamentary control it is a matter for grave suspicion and it is extremely difficult for us to supervise the operations. The public money now being provided for the State Transport Authority and the bus contract involves an area where there should be serious investigation. The Treasurer also states in his explanation:

As to the prospective Revenue Budget situation for 1976-77, I believe that it will be possible to achieve a balance without the necessity to increase taxes.

As I have explained, there will probably be no need for that because the Treasurer still is capitalising on an inflationary period. He then warns:

Charges for services, of course, will need to be kept under review as in the past.

We have had the threat from the Minister of Transport that registration fees and other fees affecting the motorist will be increased. It is regrettable that Parliament can only protest and cannot object to the whole document. The Government should still observe restraint in handling the revenue finances on behalf of the people. Unless it does that, the State Treasury soon will be asking the people for more money by way of indirect taxes.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier) moved:

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

Motion carried.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I thank the Deputy Premier for the opportunity to speak further on this Bill. Much has been said this evening about Federal and State relations and about the big improvement in the Revenue Account this year. We have been hearing about this improvement for several months and the Treasurer has continually reminded us of this Government's surplus of \$40 000 000 or \$50 000 000. However, nothing has been said about the fact that State taxes have increased dramatically over the past five years under the Dunstan Government.

Nothing has been said about private enterprise being strangled in South Australia, whether in relation to family properties, farming properties, small businesses, or industrial development. Nothing is being said about the total lack of incentive in South Australia today. We have heard much about the surplus in this year's Revenue Account, although we certainly have heard nothing about the massive

rip-off in pay-roll tax, stamp duty, and particularly land tax. Tonight we have heard many comments about the various statements the Treasurer has made regarding the Bill. One reads on page 9 of his second reading explanation that a number of State revenues are showing some upward trends. On page 6, he says that charges for services will need to be kept under review.

I intend speaking tonight not about Federal-State relations but about a concern that my constituents and much of the State have at present regarding land tax. Many of my colleagues have already referred to this matter. I intend to go into it more deeply, and to refer particularly to rural land tax. Although I realise that land tax generally is a serious problem throughout the State at present, I intend tonight to deal more particularly with rural land tax. I wish that the Treasurer was in the Chamber tonight to answer a few questions.

Mr. Millhouse: But he is in Canberra for the Premiers' Conference tomorrow.

Mr. WOTTON: I am sorry. I did not realise that.

Mr. Millhouse: I was answering your colleagues' stupid questions.

Mr. WOTTON: Well, I am sorry that the Deputy Premier is not present in the Chamber now; he was here a few minutes ago. Is the Treasurer, Deputy Premier or any Government member aware of what is happening to primary producers at present? If so, what exactly do they expect of primary producers? I was pleased to hear His Excellency, when opening this session of Parliament, express concern regarding the difficulties being experienced by primary producers at present. I point out to the Minister of Education that, before the end of my speech, I will refer to some figures that might waken him a little more. I am sure he will await those figures with much anxiety.

The present prices for primary products is low and out of all proportion to inflated costs. As His Excellency said in his Speech, the season has meant that rain in many areas, particularly in parts of my district, is something of a memory. Fodder is in short supply, and is expensive, although a very necessary commodity to enable many Hills herds to survive. We all know that wages and related costs are soaring. Of course, this is something that involves more than the rural industries at present.

What is the Government's answer to the problems being experienced on the land at present? One of the answers it has given is its idea of valuations in relation to land tax, which is the last straw for primary producers in my district and those in many other districts. Indeed, it is the straw that broke the camel's back. I do not know whether the Treasurer realises (and I will be asking a question of the Deputy Premier on this matter tomorrow) that many people involved in primary production in my district are leaving the district, and indeed the State, because of excessive State taxation. Land tax is at present a charge that many primary producers in this State simply cannot meet at present. It has involved unrealistic revaluations of genuine food producing properties, and this could not have come at a worse time. I refer to a report in the March 25 issue of the *Review Times*, as follows:

Mr. Dunstan said that the State Government has greatly eased the incidence of land tax on the rural community . . . Mr. Dunstan said that his Government was anxious to ensure that farmers were not penalised by land tax . . . He said that farmer organisations who are agitating so loudly and constantly about land tax do not on that issue represent the interests of the majority of farmers. They are acting only in the interests of the few very wealthy farmers who are subject to land tax because of the high value of their property.

On March 25, things were not much different on the land from what they are at present. This illustrates to me just how much out of date the Treasurer is regarding the problems at present being experienced by primary producers. Few, if any, genuine primary producers who must rely on that occupation for a living could be regarded at present as being extremely wealthy.

A recent survey carried out in the Mount Barker area amongst a section of farmers has shown that it is estimated that land tax accounts will be taking up to 20 per cent of farmers' gross income in one year. I intend to refer to a number of instances to emphasise the problem which we are at present experiencing so that the Government's revenue might be increased to the extent that it has now been increased. I refer now to a report in the *Mount Barker Courier* headed "Land Tax . . . 10-20 per cent Gross Income", as follows:

A survey of a cross-section of farmers shows that the estimated land tax accounts could take up to 20 per cent of their gross income in one year . . . One of the most savage examples of land tax increases is the case of Mr. J. L. Frame of Burbank, Mount Barker. The property, which has been in the family since 1847 . . . is being threatened by a staggering land tax impost.

If the Deputy Premier is anywhere in the House where he can hear what I am saying, I ask him to take special note of these figures.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: But you—

Mr. WOTTON: The honourable member should listen to this if he is at all concerned about the food he eats and where it is coming from in South Australia.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Who wrote this article?

Mr. WOTTON: It is written by the Editor of the *Mount Barker Courier*, a paper for which I have the highest regard. The figures I am about to quote have nothing to do with the editor of that paper. This is purely an example. I go back.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Go forward! That's what you want to do.

Mr. WOTTON: If the honourable member listened, he would know what I am talking about. The report continues:

In 1974, the land tax payable was \$1 142; in 1975, it rose to \$3 320; and this year, it is estimated to be \$18 000. Mr. Frame told the *Courier* that this figure would represent about half the partnership's gross income from the land.

That is only a start. That property happens to be across the road from a property that was divided into small farms, and is only good for the running of merino wethers; it is stony and steep.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Why doesn't the owner have it declared for special uses?

Mr. WOTTON: He has, and a test case is coming up soon. We will hear more about that matter, too. Regarding unimproved values, I refer especially to a 99·7 hectare section of land which, in 1973, was valued at \$3 670, and this year has been valued at \$67 800. A 162·27 hectare section in 1973 was valued at \$15 300, and this year is valued at a staggering \$107 700.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Has that been declared special use land, too?

Mr. WOTTON: Yes, a special case is being prepared now. In 1974, 406 hectares was valued at \$32 760. This year it is estimated that the value is \$211 600. That will give some idea of the problems of revaluation. In that case there has been a massive increase of 50 per cent of the gross income. State land tax in South Australia used to be a minor levy, a few dollars a year at the most. It was a small charge easily met out of farm income. Now it is based on a speculative gamble on the future,

rather than on the producing potential of a property. The present system makes it nothing more than a potential wealth tax. People involved on the land know that it is impossible to live or pay on potential.

As I said earlier, these people have been looking desperately for incentives to stay on the land, they are genuine primary producers. I have received a letter from an accountant who writes on behalf of one of my constituents and states:

At the request of my client I am writing to you to let you know that this company's State land tax has almost trebled this year from last year. At a time when prices are low, wages and related costs are soaring and the primary producer is being squeezed generally, this increase in State land tax represents a tremendous imposition. The position is becoming so grave that it is understood that some farmers may be forced to leave the land. That property is one of the best established properties in the Hills and was built up by the family over many years. This year, the owners of the property are faced with the situation that shearing costs and land tax will wipe out completely the wool cheque to be received. I regard that as an extremely serious situation. In a report he prepared for the Agriculture Department, Mr. Ian Lewis calls for protection of rural land in the Hills and states that legislation aimed at preserving good agricultural land needs to offer incentives and remove disincentives to bring about and maintain the viability of farmers and their families.

What is this Government doing to preserve agricultural land? We hear a lot about this matter. The Government keeps on talking about maintaining the magnificent Adelaide Hills. I am the first to agree with that policy. However, what is the Government doing about this chap who has worked on his property all his life and whose wool cheque will be wiped out completely by land tax and shearing costs? It is doing nothing. Is the Government concerned about the present situation? Land tax is having exactly the opposite effect that it should be having. It should be giving the genuine primary producer the incentive to stay on the land. Most primary producers in my district have lived their entire lives on their property, property developed in most cases by their fathers and grandfathers. That is certainly the case with Mr. Frame, to whom I have referred. Another letter from a constituent in Littlehampton is as follows:

The Town Planner will not allow me to subdivide my property, so how can my property be worth the same money as the smaller blocks in the district? I feel that this tax which is being forced on to the landowners who are the lowest paid people in this country is a very unfair tax because, in my own case, the tax is going to be a higher figure than that of my taxable income for 1974-75. How can I be expected to pay this tax when I will have even less income this year? I feel that this is just one way of forcing the farmers off of their land. I am a man of 56 years, and I am restricted as to how much hard work I can do, so I have concentrated on beef cattle, but at the moment it is costing money to sell them so I have been forced to leave them in the paddock. We are now having a drought and I have never known my paddocks to be so short of feed. So far this year I have had to destroy eight head of cattle and there is a possibility I could have to destroy even more. This is something that has never happened before on my property, but what can we do when it is not profitable to sell them?

My great-grandfather took over this property in 1850 and things have never been as tough as they are at present. Has anyone in the Government stopped to think what the people in the cities are going to eat when all of the producers are forced to leave their properties? I would like to know what the Government have in mind for the future and why they are doing their utmost to get rid of the man on the land. Could Mr. Dunstan please answer this for me? I would really like to know.

I have referred to examples of people who have grown up on the land and who have come to understand and love the land. They understand that they cannot just take from the land; they must replenish it. I therefore ask members of the Government whether they are aware of the extent to which primary producers are presently living by not doing what they should be doing on their properties. By this, I ask whether they are aware of the number of primary producers who cannot afford to use superphosphate and fertilise their properties or to look after them as they should, but who are relying year after year on what the property can produce without being able to put anything back into the land. Anyone who knows anything at all about the land will realise that this just cannot go on forever. The genuine person on the land who is a good husbandman so far as the land is concerned will be proud of a well-kept farm, of good and well-tendered pastures and stock. He does not want to sell to the developers. He does not want to sell merely so that the Treasurer can say he has a surplus of \$50 000 000.

Such people do not want to sell, and I do not believe that they should have to sell merely because they have stood up for what they are now putting up with in order to be on the land in this area. Such people are proud of their own small piece of Australia, and such people have the right to be proud. They have worked hard and they must now look for incentives to help them keep what they have got. Farmers who are presently being forced to pay such heavy land tax charges are being forced to sell their properties. I am not just saying this. Any honourable member who likes to spend time in my electorate office will meet the number of genuine people who come to see me and say that they will (or have) put their property on the market.

It is frightening to wonder how many people would be willing now to go into agriculture and pay current land prices in the existing circumstances.

Farmers are being forced to exist with massive over-draft nooses around their necks. Is that the price they have to pay merely because they have sufficient initiative to go out on their own and support such properties? If genuine people in the Hills are forced to sell merely because of the Government's greed, it will be a tragedy for the area. It is no good for officers of the Agriculture Department and the Government to say that the land, must be protected, if the Government will do anything about giving the genuine primary producer an incentive to stay on the land, look after it and preserve it.

Much has been said and is being said about the effect of hobby farmers. I have said much about them, but they can often be regarded in a similar way to students. We hear bad points raised about students because a small minority of students are willing to create a riot or do something that is written up in the press, and many people think less of students for that reason. A similar situation applies in respect of hobby farmers. Many hobby farmers are doing a lot for the Hills area, but others are not doing so much. It is probably a minority that is now causing so much trouble for genuine people on the land. In the past, people in my district have prided themselves on being a cool, calm and collected society. In fact, we had almost reached the stage of being complacent on many matters, but I believe that the time has come for us to be much more forceful in objecting to the treatment that is being handed out to the man on the land by this Government.

We have read much about action undertaken by trade unions if they do not get their own way. On this matter,

I should like to refer to the editorial of the local Mount Barker paper, as follows:

To Hills primary producers we say: Trade unions protest when they consider they are not getting fair treatment from the Government. If they do not win what they consider is a "fair deal" they promptly become militant, shake the clenched fist of union threats under the noses of the administrators and finish up, most of the time, with another "scalp under their belts" as well as an increase in the inflation spiral. It's about time primary producers became militant and protested against treatment being meted out to them! Yes! It's about time primary producers threw down the gauntlet and proved they are men, and not mice.

Tonight, I say that I hope the situation does not arise where primary producers in my area have to become militant. Certainly I would not encourage them, but I point out to all members that, if this situation continues, the time is not far away when we can expect to see primary producers blocking the South-Eastern Freeway with tractors, as was suggested at a resident's meeting at Mount Barker last week.

I assure members that these people were not kidding: they meant what they said. They believe that, if trade unionists can carry out their protests, they can carry out their protests if that is the only way the Government will listen to their present plight. I hope that tonight I have been able to express my concern for my constituents, for the Hills area and for the State. I can refer to many examples provided to me by constituents concerning the treatment that is being handed out to them.

Many letters have been written to me concerning this matter, and I intend to present them to the Treasurer, hoping that he will answer them in the way he sees fit. Certainly, I would not like to be in his position in having to answer those letters, because I do not know how he could go about it. If the Government does not do something concrete about improving the incentives for the man on the land, especially in the Hills area, it must face the consequences, and I make that statement seriously. I have not stressed, as many of my colleagues have, Commonwealth-State relations; instead, I have tried to get over to the House my concern for this State and for my district regarding current land tax charges. 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 the consideration of the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): This is the time traditionally allotted for the Opposition and other members of Parliament to ventilate grievances and various matters of concern. Yesterday, in this House whilst speaking on another matter, I made the statement that certain trade union officials in South Australia were holding the community to ransom. Indeed, I have no doubt that they have the power to do so. In October, 1975, the Gallup poll organisation released the findings of a survey aimed at determining the public's opinion of groups in the community holding either too much or too little power. There were several interesting results, but the outstanding one was in relation to trade union officials.

It was found that 77 per cent of all people interviewed believed that union officials had too much power, while only 3 per cent believed that union officials had insufficient power. Even when the sample was broken up by political allegiance, 63 per cent of Australian Labor Party voters believed that trade union officials had too much power and too much influence. Although the depth of feeling was

perhaps surprising, happenings in recent months, especially in South Australia, have demonstrated that the impression held by such a large proportion of the population is warranted. Officials of certain unions hold positions of extreme power and influence, and it is difficult to understand why certain of these radical leaders should be acting as they are, in a way which effectively destroys the industrial base and, therefore, the employment of the very workers they are representing and defending. The matter of the influence of trade union officials on the community's way of life was dealt with in outline yesterday, but it is important to examine the development of public awareness of this influence over the past few years.

This began with sporadic publicity given to individual cases of standover and pressure tactics being applied to individuals. It has grown steadily until now it has become quite apparent that even the Government of this State is totally and completely in the hands of the Trades and Labor Council. The most recent proposals to introduce measures which will enable compulsory unionism to become an established fact in South Australia, and which will remove disputes normally heard in the regular courts of law to industrial courts and tribunals, are ample evidence of the growth of this power. In the time available to me now I intend to examine the events that have brought to public attention the enormous power which union officials are now able to exert on the community in general. There were small beginnings, but the matters involved were not small. Most people in the community will remember the events on Kangaroo Island and the shearing dispute.

Mr. Chapman: I'll never forget it.

Dr. TONKIN: My honourable friend from Alexandra will never forget those days, as he says. I do not intend to go on about the details of the intimidation, or the attempted intimidation, that took place and the effect that had on Mr. Woolley, but this was the first time really that the enormous power of the trade union official came to the notice of the public in such a significant way. The Government's role in this became more noticeable when the Government paid the court costs involved in a legal action in the Supreme Court. For the first time the people of this State were able to see that the Labor Government was wholeheartedly behind the attempts of trade union officials to bring about, in this case, compulsory unionism. The general person in the community did not believe that this was the length to which the Government would go in showing its support.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You complain when we do not attempt to settle disputes and you complain when we take steps to settle them.

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Henley Beach suffers from the same disability as do the Minister of Agriculture and a number of other people in the community who state that the only way of settling disputes is to give in to the demands made. The Government then came out and showed its dedication to the principle of compulsory unionism by a directive to Government departments which, in its explanation, was immortalised in the words of the present Minister of Transport, when he said that employees would be given the necessary incentive by way of ultimatum. When he said that in the same breath as saying that there was no hint of compulsion, hollow laughter rang throughout the State. Once again, I refer to a new instruction brought to my attention (and I thank him in his absence) by the Minister of Labour and Industry, dated April 20, 1976. It is headed, "Preference to unionists: Industrial instruction No. 464, Department of the Public Service Board", and states:

A non-unionist shall not be engaged for any work to the exclusion of a well conducted unionist if that unionist is adequately experienced in and competent to perform the work.

Later, it states:

However, before a non-unionist is employed the employing officer shall obtain in writing from him an undertaking that he will join an appropriate union within a reasonable time after commencing employment.

Whatever that may be called (and the instruction is headed "Preference to unionists"), it amounts to compulsory unionism. It is a matter purely and simply of saying to a man, "Either you join the union or you do not get a job, and if you do not get a job you and your family can starve, for all we care." That is the attitude that is clearly set out in that directive. There is no way at all that members can take away from that interpretation, and they can talk as much as they like.

Again, the headlines were made in the well-known Seven Stars dispute. Once again, the employees of the Seven Stars Hotel were visited by the union official involved and told that they must join the union. Furthermore, the proprietor was told that if they did not join the union he should sack them. These people had come from a country in Europe where they had seen the effects of compulsory unionism and socialism, and they would have no bar of joining a union. They had no interest in joining a union, and they decided they would not do so. The outcome of that dispute was interesting, because the union did not win that argument. It may in fact have appeared to win on the surface, but only after it had compromised its own so-called principles.

During that time shop assistants were the subject of a widespread campaign to ensure that they became members of unions, and retail stores in Adelaide succumbed to the pressure brought to bear by the threat of black bans and industrial action. They had no option but to succumb to that pressure, because union activity organised by the same trade union official could well have brought their operations to a standstill. It did not matter that people did not want to join a union, that people could see no advantage in joining a union, that they had moral and conscientious objections to joining a union. They were forced to join the union because the employers gave in to union pressure that said "You must dismiss anyone who does not join the union." I intend to blame public apathy, up until this point, for the reaction that occurred. Gradually, union activity became more and more directed by the militant left wing, and it became more and more apparent. The Storemen and Packers Union is a union we frequently hear about, and Mr. Apap of that union wields enormous power in this State; indeed, it is not too much to say that he wields almost as much power as the Treasurer, and some people would say that he wields a great deal more power than the Treasurer and that the Treasurer is quite helpless to do anything at all about the high-handed actions of Mr. Apap on occasions.

Everyone will remember the petrol strikes which plagued this State, forcing us to the buses and leaving our cars at home, and seriously interfering with the every-day running of this State to the extent that the Government was forced to introduce emergency legislation. Once again, it was apparent that the Government of this State would do nothing constructive whatever to contain that union official influence. The emergency legislation imposed wide controls on all sections of the community except members of trade unions, and specifically exempted industrial disputes from the effects of that emergency legislation. This was the very cause of the emergency, and yet the Government

was not strong enough to stand up to Trades and Labor Council pressure and bring in emergency legislation that really meant something and applied to everyone. Was this the action of a responsible Government? It was certainly not, and the thinking people of South Australia began to wonder what sort of Government we had. It was obviously the action of a Government entirely and completely under the thumb of the Trades and Labor Council.

The self-interest of the trade union movement continually dictates the actions of the Labor Government, and the Treasurer, for all his abilities, whatever they may be, is unable to stop this influence. I well remember the day when a roneoed copy of a Bill was introduced into this Chamber to help pay off the debt on Trades Hall. I well remember the Treasurer's embarrassment when he introduced that legislation.

Mr. Abbott: He made his donation.

Dr. TONKIN: And so did I, and I would have made it, if I had been asked, without a Bill being introduced. This shows that the responsible members of the Labor movement are still nevertheless very embarrassed by the self-interest and selfishness of a small band of union officials. If we look at the workmen's compensation legislation (the most generous of such legislation in Australia), we see once again that its provisions adversely affect jobs, directly increase costs, and, because of this, increase unemployment and decrease productivity—all things which this State cannot do without. They are matters which are vital to the recovery of the State and to the economy. That legislation in its present form is something we can well do without, yet attempts to amend the legislation to bring it into reasonable line and to maintain costs at a reasonable level were completely thwarted by a dispute in Caucus, which could not agree on the legislation to be introduced. We saw the ridiculous situation last February of notice being given, and there the Bill stayed. Eventually, it was not introduced in the House.

Mr. Chapman: That's been a common practice under this kind of union pressure.

Dr. TONKIN: Indeed, because the Government was told not to act by the same influential members of the Trades and Labor Council. It did not suit them to have the legislation amended, despite its putting its own members out of employment. If it wants to tidy it up, it should put those officials out of office. It shows to what extent the Government of this State is under the influence of trade union officials. Compulsory union membership and closed shop agreements have come to the fore with monotonous and increasing regularity over the past year or so. Obviously, as someone suggested today, it is a means whereby union funds can be increased. Obviously, as has been admitted freely by union officials, it saves the unions much money in organisers' salaries. If the unions can persuade an employer that he should run a closed shop and deduct and collect union fees, they promise not to impose black bans or threaten industrial unrest. It saves the unions much money, because the employer immediately becomes an agent for the union.

What happens here is that, with the proposed legislation, the Government is trying to say that the rights of a union supersede the rights of a citizen, and we will not have that. There are enlightened members of the Australian Labor Party who I think honestly and sincerely believe in and subscribe to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. There are even more such members who subscribe to the International Labor Organisation's conventions, various and many though they may be, one of which complements the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,

article 20. They both cite that there shall be a free right of association but that no-one shall be forced to join an association.

Mr. Jennings: We all agree with that.

Dr. TONKIN: In listening to the members for Ross Smith and for Henley Beach in that matter, one can see exactly how deep is the Government's hypocrisy. I believe that the Government subscribes to those things and that it does not want compulsory unionism or preference to unionists, however it is described. Regardless of that, the Government is unable to take any action to stop the pressure that goes on: the assault on individual liberty and freedom of choice continues regardless of the wishes of employers and employees.

Many hotels have been under pressure for some time, and names have been mentioned by the member for Davenport. The clothing industry has also been under attack for some time, and I intend to go into the details of such an attack as an example later. We have seen the ridiculous situation that applies to school canteens, club bars and the automobile trade. These are all now and have been subject to the standover tactics of union officials. All I can say is: what has happened to that wonderful quality of life that we are supposed to have had in the State as a result of the Dunstan Government? I suspect that the welfare of union officials comes before the welfare of children, workers and the community. That is absolutely clear as a result of the activities of union officials that are presently condoned by this Government.

Let us have a look at some of the things that have happened. While dealing with the quality of life, we might well look at the situation in our restaurants, of which the Treasurer is proud. Prices are rapidly escalating to a stage where the average person can no longer afford to eat out. Many of these restaurants are in serious trouble, and, if they are family affairs, they have a chance of surviving.

Mr. Gunn: What about Mr. Ceruto?

Dr. TONKIN: That is another matter. If they have to depend on casual labour for jobs that traditionally have been carried out by students, under the penalty rates that have now been awarded in this State, people walking in the door of a restaurant to work on a Saturday evening immediately attract penalty rates, regardless of whether they have worked in the restaurant during the week. It does not matter what time they have spent there; if they have not been there at all they attract penalty rates. Much the same applies in other industries. The Minister of Labour and Industry on his return from his oversea jaunt said the other day that he felt it would be nice for us to have a late shopping night.

He intends to look at the legislation, and that will be interesting to see, after the Government's record at Elizabeth and in others of its seats. It is impossible with the award rates and the penalty rates as they are for that step to be taken without an increase in prices of at least 5 per cent across the board in retail stores. Is this the time that we want increases in prices? I suggest that this is the last time we want to see increased prices. The Minister had better hurry up and get back in touch with the situation.

Cheaper bread cannot be supplied because of union pressure on the Government; yet I do not see any activity by the Government on beer discounting. Union officials and union self-interest are the name of the game, and the Government is powerless to act. I have already referred to the standover tactics being used. Many firms are now writing standard clauses into their agreements. I

have in my possession one such clause in an agreement between a builder and a subcontractor. The first item in the agreement states:

Any persons engaged by this subcontract shall be responsible for all of its workmen or subcontractors to be financial members of a union applicable to his trade; any cost occurred to the builder through delays due to strikes or stoppages for the above reason will be borne by the subcontractor; clear cards are to be presented to the site foreman before commencing on site.

Is it any wonder that closed shop agreements are brought into being and agreed to, when builders and subcontractors have no option but to agree to those terms? Building prices are running at about an average of 10 per cent higher in this State than in any other.

Mr. Jennings: Don't be ridiculous!

Dr. TONKIN: If the member for Ross Smith cares to do the necessary research, he will find that that is exactly the case. Builders and contractors in this State are in serious difficulties, finding it difficult to make ends meet. They cannot afford any threat of union activity, and are prepared to give in to that pressure.

Let us look at the case regarding the Clothing and Allied Trade Union. A clothing factory that has been established for some time was visited by a Mr. Collins, who was Secretary of the union. He agreed to the hours that the factory was to work, and the matter was left as a gentleman's agreement until 1975, when Mr. Collins desired to come to the factory and increase union membership. He wished to enrol everyone in the union. He had arrangements made for him to come to the factory, and the staff were asked to make themselves available. Mr. Collins on the first occasion did not turn up; he offered no apology for his absence and telephoned no excuse. Later it was heard that he had been to another factory where he had had a fairly torrid time, and he did not feel up to going on to the second one.

When he finally came, the staff were totally unimpressed with his performance and many of the employees who were token members of the union resigned from it as a result of his visit; they did so on their own initiative, with no prompting. I am told they were disgusted. Shortly after that episode, a summons was served on the proprietor for not having the correct and proper rest room facilities, dining facilities, water available, and floor coverings. The case was heard before a magistrate and was dismissed. There was no substance in the charges at all.

Mr. Venning: Who laid the charges?

Dr. TONKIN: The union, of course, through Mr. Collins. In 1976, another summons was hand-delivered with a comment "This is just the tip of the iceberg." I have seen a copy of the summons. It was in relation to the provision of a notice board in the lunch room area and the contents of the first-aid cabinet. There was no truth in either of these allegations, either, but in discussions between Mr. Collins and the proprietor it was made quite clear that all such charges and future charges would be dropped if he agreed to a closed shop agreement. The proprietor was in considerable difficulty because he had a loyalty to his employees; he was in business to keep the business going as much for the employees as for himself. Many of his employees did not wish to join a union, yet he was forced to say to his staff, "I am sorry; you will have to join the union because I cannot risk being closed down by union activity if I do not sack you; I would have to sack you if you do not join the union." That is the activity of a union official who is supposed to be looking after the welfare of those people. He is in fact running a serious risk of

destroying them. If that employer had decided, as I have heard has happened in other cases, that he could not be bothered going on and if he was not so loyal to his staff, if there had not been that bond of friendship and loyalty between the employer and his staff, he could easily have said, "Forget it; I will close down", and our unemployment figures would have increased still further. I wonder how often that has happened. An agreement was entered into and it states, first, the following:

The union will forgo all actions, claims and demands against the company in respect to the company's non-compliance with the proviso contained in the last paragraph of subclause (a) of clause 13 of the Clothing Trades Award. Provided, however, it is agreed by the parties that each and every employee of the company currently employed shall be paid, and shall receive, a payment of half of one day's wages calculated at the current rate of pay applicable to such employee at the date upon which this agreement is made.

All employees of the aforesaid company who work under the terms and conditions of the Clothing Trades Award shall be obliged to become and remain a financial member of the aforesaid union during the entire period of their employment with the company.

Basically, it states that there will be no further trouble if the employer agrees to a closed shop agreement. If that is not stand-over, if that is not pressure applied to employers and employees, I do not know what is, and I cannot understand how anyone in any organisation could want to belong to such an organisation that coerced its membership. As I have said, the rights of the unions are being made to supersede the rights of the individual and of the citizen. The point is that the Government of this State is doing nothing whatever about this situation. Indeed, by its actions it is supporting the activities of trade union officials in their stand-over and blackmail tactics, and it is going still further when and if (I say "if") it proceeds with its compulsory unionism legislation.

Mr. Jennings: It is not compulsory.

Mr. Langley: You know it is not.

Dr. TONKIN: Words mean nothing in the face of actions such as I have described. These activities have been repeated over and over again in factory after factory and in shop after shop, and most closed shop agreements have come about because of a threat, either direct or implied, of black bans and union activities.

I began by saying that trade union officials are holding this State to ransom; they are trying to hold the entire country to ransom, but in this State they are getting more co-operation than anywhere else in Australia. The Treasurer and his Government are nothing more or less than puppets. Oh, yes, the Treasurer speaks well but, when he speaks, he speaks the lines that have been written for him on South Terrace in Trades Hall. The Treasurer acts well but, when he acts, he acts out the part that has been written for him by the Trades Hall and by the union officials there. Although members opposite may deny this, there is no question that the preselection techniques of the Labor Party—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. The honourable Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Dr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know that members opposite do not like the facts. Unpalatable to them as they may be, they are nevertheless true but, because of the preselection, the card system and the large quantity of votes that apply to the preselection of members to represent the Australian Labor Party in elections, the left

wing now has this Caucus and members of this Government totally under its control. The Treasurer could not do anything if he wanted to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: It will be interesting to see exactly what happens at the Labor Party conference at the weekend. I repeat that the trade union movement through its officials is exercising inordinate power over the whole way of life of our community and is holding individual members of the community to ransom.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I should like to carry on the theme of the grievance raised by the Leader. I mentioned some of the matters yesterday in the debate on an urgency motion, but my time was limited to five minutes and I did not have the opportunity to develop the matters fully then. I refer to the increasing community concern at what is happening in Labor Party and union circles. A classic example of union stupidity is the Ansett hotel project across the road. I understand that the unions there are engaged in their 51st strike. A report in the *Advertiser* of April 10 states:

The never-ending industrial disputes on Adelaide's Ansett Gateway hotel project are a classic example of the inter-union strife wracking (or is it wrecking?) Australia's multi-storey building industry. They are disputes in which building employers are simply the "meat in the sandwich". It is reported unofficially that the \$10 000 000, 21-storey project, which began about two years ago, is more than eight months behind schedule. And the cost of the disputes, which began from the time the foundations were poured, must be considerable. Such disputes obviously are a multi-million dollar cost burden on an already depressed commercial building industry.

When the Federal Government is trying desperately to come to grips with Australia's economic ills, particularly those in the building industry, we are faced with the total irresponsibility of union leaders in their internecine fights to establish their superiority. An interesting report on the building industry shows how far to the extreme left the leaders in this industry are. That report, in the *Australian* of March 18, states:

For weeks the Building Workers Industrial Union and the Builders Laborers Federation have been locked in a struggle which has erupted into violent attacks on union offices in Melbourne and Sydney, and at the home of a union official in Canberra. In Melbourne yesterday a meeting of the five unions called on the A.C.T.U. to immediately call a meeting to examine the dispute. There are now fears that the violence will spread to building sites throughout Australia, endangering the fragile recovery that the industry is beginning to make after the 1970's economic slump. But in fact the struggle between the two factions dates to 1974 and draws some of its motivation from the ideological differences between the unions' rival leaders. Pat Clancy, the 55 year old Federal secretary of the 50 000 strong B.W.I.U., is a Moscow line communist in the Socialist Party of Australia. His opposite number, "Big" Norm Gallagher, Federal secretary of the B.L.F. (with 35 000 members) is a member of the Peking-oriented Communist Party of Australia Marxist-Leninist. Both men deny their personal feelings enter into the present struggle for building site power but Mr. Gallagher said bluntly yesterday: "I don't like the man"—and made it clear he considered that an understatement. The rivalry between Mr. Clancy and Mr. Gallagher is long-standing.

These two union leaders at the head of these two warring factions in the building industry (and this is what is involved with the 51 disputes on the building across the road) are communists, one a Moscow-style communist and the other a Peking-style communist. That is what the long-suffering people of South Australia must tolerate.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You merely show your ignorance, because the plumbers have been involved in many of those disputes.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The men that I have mentioned have been involved, whether in a minor way or a major way, and these men are influential in major unions in Australia and certainly are involved in the trouble at the Ansett Gateway hotel. Doubtless, the thrust of Labor Party policy in this Parliament at present is influenced considerably by the people at Trades Hall. We know that there has been a definite victory for the left there.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: More union bashing.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is not. It is a description of the people in control of unions who have taken them over. A report in the *Advertiser* of February 24 states:

Victory for left in T.L.C. poll; The South Australian Trades and Labor Council is now controlled by a left wing dominated executive. The previously dominant right wing group on the executive was routed in a poll conducted at Friday night's meeting of the Trades and Labor Council. Three of the four new members of the executive are left-wing militants. They are Messrs. J. L. Scott (Amalgamated Metal Workers Union), R. Barklay (Seamen's Union) and G. Apap (Storemen and Packers Union).

Probably most people in South Australia have heard the names Scott and Apap. These are two militant unionists who are giving the union movement in South Australia a bad name. They are left-wing militant unionists, the sort of people now in control, with their left-wing colleagues, of the Trades and Labor Council in South Australia. I hear frequent references, not only in the country areas but also in the city, to these "imported" union leaders, as they are termed. People talk about men like Scott and Apap, who are at the centre of the union stir.

There is much cause for concern at the activity of these militant left-wing union leaders in Australia, the two communists that I have mentioned, and the stirrers and left-wing militant union leaders in South Australia. We in Australia are treading the same path as has been trodden by the union movement in Great Britain. I refer now to a notable Socialist and to some of his recent writings. He is a man named Paul Johnson. A report of a statement by him, published in the *Advertiser* on February 16, states:

Travelling around Australia recently, I was reluctant to make comparisons between union behaviour in Australia and in Britain, because I did not want to be accused of generalising on the basis of inadequate knowledge. But I am bound to say, the more I saw of Australian unions, and their place in society, the more the parallels with Britain seemed plainer.

I have heard it said that Australia is treading the same path as in Britain for some time, where the unions are controlling the country. In an earlier publication, Johnson states:

The union was not a socialist instrument. It was not a political instrument at all. It was an economic function of the capitalist system, a defensive leaguering together of desperate and exploited men to enable them to meet the owners of capital on something like equal terms. Its great weapon, the strike, was essentially negative, destructive and despairing, like the riot. But this is not what has happened. The unions have refused to recognise the limits of their historical role. They have not only rejected the idea of a progressive abdication, and the shift of their social and economic function to the political process, but they have flatly declined to allow the smallest diminution of their power to press the sectional interests they represent.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Unfortunately for South Australia, we are now left with a Government that is tired, run-down and nervous.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: That is a fair description of the Fraser Government.

Mr. ARNOLD: Obviously, the Attorney-General was not listening to what I said. I said that this State is now left with a tired, run-down and nervous Government.

This is obvious from the statements that have been coming from the Ministers of this Government in the last six months. They have been totally irrational statements made for the sole purpose of undermining the community and instilling fear in it. If one examines some of the statements that various Ministers have made in the past six months, one sees that this is obviously their purpose. I refer, first, to the Minister of Transport, a Minister who is continually jumping at shadows, like all other Ministers are doing. I refer to statements along the lines that there will have to be a 100 per cent increase in motor vehicle registration fees, although he is not certain why that will be necessary. That statement was designed to instil fear into the community.

I refer also to the Minister of Works and to some of the statements he has made recently, particularly a statement referred to in a report headed, "Federal Government accused of R. M. water quality delay" in the April 29 issue of the *Murray Pioneer*. The present Federal Government has been in office for six months and, although the Minister of Works has now been in office for six years he still talks about delays regarding Murray River water quality. I point out that the Gutteridge report was brought down in 1970, six years ago. It recommended to the South Australian Government, and to the Minister of Works particularly, that certain measures should be taken to put that part of the Murray River in South Australia into a better state.

Mr. Keneally: How will you put the Murray River into a better State? Are you going to change its course?

Mr. ARNOLD: Some of the recommendations contained in that report have not been implemented in any way. One of the major recommendations therein was that the South Australian Government should proceed immediately to remove the irrigation evaporation basins from the Murray River Valley in South Australia. Although that recommendation was made six years ago, the Minister has until now managed merely to say to the Federal Government, which has been in office for only six months, "You are delaying the process of improving the quality of water in South Australia." What hypocrisy that is! Why does not the Government get down to business and implement recommendations that have been made to it to improve the quality of our water? If the Government does not put its own house in order, how can it expect other State Governments to act to improve the quality of Murray River water, from which South Australia will derive the greatest benefit? Surely, Government members can understand that, if we are to improve the quality of water in South Australia, it is high time we did something about putting our own house in order first.

Another instance of the lack of action taken by the State Government is that in 1970 the Public Works Standing Committee reported to Parliament on a proposal to site a new pumping station to supply water to the Coolong and Chaffey irrigation areas. At that time evidence was given to the committee that it would be a disaster, the consequences of which would be severe indeed, to site the new station on Ral Ral Creek. However, the Government proceeded to site the pumping station on Ral Ral Creek, and it has proved precisely that.

The Government has three alternatives if it wishes to solve this problem. It can resite the pumping station on the Murray River proper; it can take a line from the existing new pumping station across the river so that it draws water from the Murray; or it can cut a canal from Ral Ral Creek into the Renmark reservoir and draw a flow of water through Ral Ral Creek, thereby maintaining the quality of

water therein at a similar level to that of the water in the Murray River. One of these three alternatives must be adopted by the Government. However, in the past six years the Government has seen fit completely to skirt around this problem. I made the last approach to the Minister on this subject on March 5, when I again wrote to him. I received the following reply, dated April 12:

It is realised that the salinity level in Ral Ral Creek reaches a critical stage at times and that the diversion of water for irrigation from anabranches of the Murray River is most undesirable, but the solution to the problem is not easily apparent unless high-cost capital works are undertaken.

I readily agree with that. Although it was pointed out in 1970 that this would be the case, the Government did not accept that advice, and is now left with this problem. I will give honourable members some of the salinity readings in Ral Ral Creek. This will support what I am saying regarding the quality of South Australia's water, which is a direct result of Government action. These figures are taken from the Engineering and Water Supply Department's records. On February 13, 1975, there was a reading at the pumping station in Ral Ral Creek of 51 900 E.C. units, taken at a depth of 2.7 metres. On February 15, 1975, again taken at 2.7 m depth at the pumping station, the reading was 46 200 E.C. units. On February 20, 1975, the figure reached 56 300 E.C. units. It is therefore high time that the Government faced up to its responsibilities instead of running away from them.

The point was made earlier that the new tax-sharing arrangement proposed by the Federal Government will give each level of Government its own area of responsibility. This is something of which the present South Australian Government is scared. It will not accept that responsibility. It will not only spend its finances but it will also be responsible to the community for raising them. Instead of having the Commonwealth Government hand it the money, the South Australian Government will now be responsible. The same will also apply to local government, which will play a greater part, and rightly so, under the new federal scheme. If we look at Western Australia, where local government plays an important role—

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Yesterday I listened to the member for Alexandra talking about the situation of the 21 soldier settlers on Kangaroo Island.

Mr. Chapman: That was only the first round.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am pleased to hear that, and I hope the honourable member will be glad to know that I intend to say something in support of those people.

Mr. Chapman: Good!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yesterday the honourable member used the word "disgraceful" in the course of his speech, and used the word in regard to the actions of two public servants, Messrs. McConnell and Roe, about the way in which they had approached settlers on Kangaroo Island. I do not intend to say anything more about their actions, because the honourable member dealt with that matter. However, I do point out to him and to all members that those two gentlemen are public servants and are therefore responsible to their political masters, the Federal and State Governments. I intend to use that word of both those Governments, because of their attitude to Kangaroo Island settlers.

If it had not been for the specific request of a settlers' committee on Kangaroo Island, I would have tried in this place to move an urgency motion on the matter. However, members of the committee told me that they have pinned their hopes on a Select Committee,

which they believe is to be set up in the Legislative Council. No doubt they have been encouraged in this hope by their local members of Parliament (the member for Alexandra in this place and the member for Barker in the House of Representatives). I have grave doubts about the effectiveness of such a committee and the speed with which, in any case, it could make recommendations that would help these settlers.

I also have grave doubts about the effectiveness of referring this matter to the Land Settlement Committee. However, I respect the wishes of the settlers, so I do not therefore intend to move an urgency motion on the matter. Nevertheless, I want to say something about the matter. Memory, of course, is short, so I should like to remind members about the principles on which war service land settlement was to be based. Those principles are to be found in the War Service Land Settlement Agreement Act, 1945. I will not have time to read it all, but clause 3 of the agreement states in part:

Land settlement under the scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the following principles:

(a) Settlement shall be undertaken only where economic prospects for the production concerned are reasonably sound, and the number of eligible persons to be settled shall be determined primarily by opportunities for settlement and not by the number of applicants.

Placitum (c) is the other significant and relevant placitum, and states:

Holdings shall be sufficient in size to enable settlers to operate efficiently and to earn a reasonable labour income.

Let me now turn briefly to what was said by Sir Thomas Playford, or as he then was, the Hon. T. Playford, when introducing the Bill regarding the obligations of the community to persons in the position of the present soldier settlers. He said:

The men have rendered a service to their country to such an extent that it is difficult for any Parliament to provide them with adequate compensation. Under the Bill it is proposed to give some of the men the benefits of land settlement.

Later he said:

There is no need for me to emphasise the sacred obligation we have to see that the men are settled satisfactorily on the land. All members are in accord on that matter.

Subsequent debate showed that Sir Thomas was accurate in saying that. It is a pity that Messrs. McConnell and Roe were not reminded of the sentiments expressed in this place when the schemes were first considered.

Mr. Chapman: And the same in the Federal Parliament.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I have looked at the speech made by the Hon. Mr. Dedman when introducing the Bill to ratify the agreement. However, he does not use such glowing terms (anyway, I would not have expected him to do so); nevertheless, his sentiments are the same, and I agree with them. Now, 30 years later, we find that men in their 50's and 60's who have almost literally worked their guts out on the island (and I have been over there and at least know some of them) are being told that they have a few months to go; that they must get out and leave with virtually nothing after having battled for the best part of their working life.

When one compares that with the way we treat ourselves with regard to superannuation benefits, one wonders whether much justice is left in the world. What is being done to these men is heartless; there is no other word for it. It will have appalling social consequences. When men of that age are told to come to the mainland and are told "We will try to find a Housing Trust house for you—

Mr. Chapman: It is not necessarily a trust house.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and try to find you another job”, it means nothing. They know at this age that it is almost impossible for them, with the training they have had, to get another job. All they will have to look forward to is the dole and a pension. One has only to think of the disruption to their family life to see again another example of the social disruption that will be caused. These matters quite outweigh the direct financial considerations involved. We have an obligation to these men and their families. So far as I can ascertain, neither the State nor the Federal Minister has yet given any undertaking, except for a few weeks or at most a few months delay.

In my view, the settlers should be content with nothing less than a straight-out, unequivocal assurance that no settler, neither any of these 21 nor any other in the same position, will have to leave his property except voluntarily; that is, with his own consent. Not one of these men should be forced off his place. That is the threat that is still hanging over them. I challenge the Minister of Works, who has made, I understand, sympathetic noises, to accept that principle. I also challenge the Federal Government to accept the principle. I hope that the member for Alexandra, who is listening to me this evening, will give us the next chapter in his story on this matter and that he will espouse the same principle because, so far, from what he has said, he has made no personal commitment of a definite nature.

I believe it is imperative, if these men are to be helped to remain on their properties, that there should be direct and plain talking, and no equivocation at all. Whether it means embarrassing the State Government or the Federal Government, we have an obligation to these people, all of us (and no-one more so than the member for Alexandra). I repeat that, in my considered view, after having met these people and having talked to them and to others about their position, none of them should be obliged to leave his property unless he does so freely and willingly. Personally, I will be content with nothing less than that.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I draw the attention of the House to the Government's attitude taken under the direction of the Trades and Labor Council and union bosses to turn its Labour and Industry Department inspectors loose in the school canteens of this State. Until now, this issue alone has caused the wholesale closing of canteens and has caused great problems in schools. At least four canteens have been closed, and certainly others will follow. It is a typical action of the Government under the direction it is getting. We have seen this sort of action tried before. I remind the House about what happened at the showgrounds a few years ago when officials told people they should be members of a union and that they should be receiving full pay rates instead of working voluntarily trying to raise money for a certain organisation. We know what it is all about. What a coincidence it is that this pressure has come about, especially in respect of one of the schools, since the change in the Commonwealth Government. Is there some motive behind this? In some schools the Government has already let loose its Health Department inspectors to assist in this project. In one school in my district a special sneeze-guard has been demanded for use in the canteen. Sneeze-guards must be supplied so that children cannot lean over the food too far.

If the Government is willing to go this far, then should not people working in canteens wear medical masks? Will these inspectors who have been turned loose inspect school grounds? Will they spray disinfectant on the grass before children sit down and eat their sandwiches? Will they spray the ants and wash the children's legs? It is

ridiculous. How far is such a matter taken? We know what the inspectors do and we have had a host of inspectors supplied by the Government. Indeed, they have wider powers than police officers. How far is this matter to go?

Will inspectors come to family barbecues to insist that people handling meat and the barbecue wear rubber gloves in case something happens? How far are we going to be directed to do this, that and the other? I foresee the creation of a big problem. I understand that school canteens are covered by the delicatessen and fruit and vegetable shops award and that the following conditions have been directed to apply:

Regular part-time employees must receive per hour one-fortieth of the weekly award rate and also the following benefits:

- Four weeks paid annual leave per annum plus a 17½ per cent loading;
- two weeks paid sick leave per annum;
- payment for any public holiday on which they are not required to work.

Annual and sick leave is, of course, on a pro rata basis, that is, if she is working 25 hours per week she receives four weeks of 25 hours per week. Casual employees receive per hour, one-fortieth of the weekly rate shown in the award plus 20 per cent and are not entitled to any of the benefits mentioned above. Irrespective of whether the employee is on a weekly or hourly contract, provided that she has sufficient continuous service, she will eventually qualify for long service leave.

In these circumstances school canteens find it virtually impossible to continue. In schools in my district I find that no canteens have closed as yet, but the Glengowrie High School with 1 183 students has a canteen operating at no profit at all. It has paid help and a canteen manageress. The canteen there is only just keeping its head above water! The larger the school the more opportunity it has to keep its canteen open and, conversely, the smaller the school and the number of students the greater the difficulty in maintaining the canteen operation.

Brighton High School is a large school and has many voluntary workers in its canteen. Warradale Primary School has recently increased its canteen prices and Paringa Park has also recently increased its prices. Fortunately for that school, its canteen faces little competition because there is little opposition from adjacent shops. Already prices in the canteen of the Glenelg school have increased by 6c for each sandwich and prices at the Morphettville Park school canteen have also increased. What sort of situation is developing?

The original purpose of school canteens was to supply a service for schoolchildren. The canteens were created to meet a need and provide protection and safety for schoolchildren. Parents give a right to a headmaster and put their children in his care from 9 a.m. to 3.30 p.m. What is the situation if schoolchildren leave the school grounds?

Mr. Nankivell: The original purpose was to provide funds for the welfare club.

Mr. MATHWIN: That was not the primary purpose. The original purpose was to look after schoolchildren, and any excess or profit was to be ploughed back into the school for the benefit of the children. That is what it was all about. What is the situation now? Who will police the situation if children leave the school grounds? They must then face the problems involved in crossing roads to get to shops and other similar problems. Certainly, there would be insufficient police on duty to protect children in these circumstances. Moreover, I refer to the bad types who hang around in these circumstances if they think an opportunity is there. Members opposite can

lie on the Government benches in a tired way, but the fact is that we have had things happen in this State. We had two children disappear from Adelaide Oval and we have never heard of them again.

Mr. Harrison: What has that to do with school canteens?

Mr. MATHWIN: I am glad that the honourable member has woken up, because he has been asleep for most of the afternoon and this evening. At least he has opened his eyes.

Mr. HARRISON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I take exception to the remark of the member for Glenelg, because I have not been asleep either this afternoon or this evening.

The SPEAKER: I must ask the honourable member for Glenelg to withdraw that remark.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member has not been asleep this afternoon or tonight, but he is ready for it at any second. The fact is that most parents want to do something for the schools, and there are people like that in our community. They provide a service to the school and to the children of the school. Indeed, the liberty of the individual is at stake. Will inspectors start investigating the presidents and secretaries of school councils and other people who work for schools giving many hours in working bees on Sundays? What happens during working bees? Will the Government send its inspectors down to ask whether the people working on a project are being paid double time or specific wages? Will the builders labourers get in on it? Will these volunteers be asked whether they support Russian communism or Chinese communism? How much longer will the Government go on with this farce, because it is causing much concern to schools? It is about time that the Government and the Minister stood by the people who wish to improve school facilities.

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

Dr. EASTICK (Light): Earlier this afternoon I indicated to the House that I was puzzled and worried by various aspects of the unemployment schemes that are currently being fostered by the South Australian Government. I indicated that members on this side, and I am sure honourable members opposite, would not want to see any person unemployed. It helps considerably if the individual can be employed. I believe that the State Government at present is perpetuating the idea of unemployment in respect of a number of persons. I say that against the background that the money currently being made available for community work is made available on the basis that the persons who will be employed will be paid at the normal rate plus a 20 per cent loading. People are being employed at the rate they can expect as unskilled labourers, if they fall into that category; they become builders' labourers if they work on a project associated with building work; if they are carpenters they receive a commensurate payment; but loaded on top of all these payments is a 20 per cent loading based on the fact that this is casual employment.

One would have to agree that it is casual employment in one sense, but it is employment, and it is putting these people into a position that, while they are so employed, they are receiving a greater sum of money than if they were normally employed. We have a situation that, if the Government intends to continue such payments to various organisations for the overall benefit of the community, some people will go from job to job, quite happy to have a stand-down period between jobs, in the full knowledge that, once employed on community works, they will have a 20 per cent loading added to their salaries. I

commented earlier this afternoon that several people are being employed just for the purpose of saying that they are physically on the job, whereas the magnitude of the work to be undertaken demands that other facilities be used to get the greatest value in the work undertaken. I make this point in relation to a project in the area in which I live where, in the overall renovation of an oval and the preparation of additional facilities for that oval, including the building of a football clubroom, the persons in charge of the project can offer a bricklayer \$178 a week.

Mr. Keneally: They wouldn't get one at that rate.

Dr. EASTICK: They are like black seagulls: they do not exist. The work is being given on the undertaking that it will employ unemployed bricklayers. Obviously, if an unemployed bricklayer is to be obtained at \$178 a week he will be unemployable, otherwise he would not be willing to take the job. The opportunity for this project to be taken to fruition is based on getting a second-class job done by employing a person who is not a recognised bricklayer and who would accept the task at \$178, and then having a major maintenance problem or the ultimate waste of the money spent. Other than that, some means would have to be found to increase the amount payable so that a legitimate bricklayer could be employed. It is not possible to have it both ways. The greatest benefit to the community would be to allow the use of a qualified bricklayer at the regular weekly rate so that the job could proceed efficiently, with the end result being to the benefit of the project under construction.

So one goes on in respect of other building trades in a project such as this. There is no value to the State and to the community in forcing upon the community a situation in which people are employed who are unemployable in relation to the skill required. I hope the Government will urgently consider this matter, since we are talking about \$10 000 000 of the State's funds being set aside for the employment of these people. I hope we will have a degree of rationality that will allow an integration of the top-class artisan along with the persons requiring employment. However, that employment should not put him into a position where he would be better off working as an unemployed temporarily employed person than he was in the position of full employment.

I turn now to one other factor in which the Government has completely failed the people of South Australia, more particularly those on the Adelaide Plains. While the centre of the operation is not within my district, the influence of the underground waters problem of the Adelaide Plains in the area of Virginia, Two Wells, Gawler River, and Angle Vale worries me considerably. To this date, despite all the announcements made progressively by the Hon. Mr. Kneebone, the Minister of Lands in another place, by the Hon. Tom Casey, when he was Minister of Lands and also Minister of Agriculture, by the Minister of Works in this Chamber, and by others, statements that the Bolivar effluent would be made available for reticulation and use in the Adelaide Plains area have come to nothing. We have seen a constant situation of withdrawal and backing off from earlier statements.

This is an urgent matter from the sociological and economic point of view. Water must be made available to reduce the demand on the underground water. It is also extremely important from an environmental point of view because of the damage being done by water from the system to marine life, to the mangroves, the sea grasses, the breeding grounds of the fisheries, and the adjacent coastline at Port Gawler and almost up to St. Kilda. There is evidence that this damage is occurring

and that the rate of damage is escalating at an alarming rate. It behoves the Government to ensure that no further damage is done and that the requirements of the area are met by an effective use of the huge quantities of water permitted to go out to sea. The statements by Professor Holmes in recent times suggesting that the water is of no value and should not be used are entirely wrong.

Mr. VANDEPEER (Millicent): My Party's objection to compulsory and/or preferential unionism has been well aired in this House today. I shall not repeat what has been said, except to mention areas in my district that have been affected by this attitude of the Government and of unions in general. At a time of severe unemployment it is difficult to understand why the Government and the unions, which are said to be thinking of the welfare of the workers, are adopting attitudes that increase the unemployment problem. When the Government compels the employers to employ only union members, it restricts their ability to select the workers most suitable for the job in hand; thus, the unemployed find it more difficult to obtain work. It is a similar situation to that which applies when a union official says that a casual worker working for an hour of two in an office or looking after a telephone must be paid full award rates. This practice, in many cases, makes it uneconomic for the employer to engage such a worker. The employee thus becomes unemployed and is unable to add a few dollars to the meagre wage the other half receives.

I stress that I do not condemn unions, except for those few unions that adopt radical policies. I admit that unions are necessary. They have done a wonderful job in the past and they will continue to do a wonderful job in the future if only they will be rational. It is up to union members to do something about the few union leaders who cause most of the trouble.

Mr. Keneally: Who are they?

Mr. VANDEPEER: I will not go into names, but the Flying Scotsman is one. I do not attack unions in general; it is only a few unions that I criticise. We claim to be a civilised society, and I tell many of the union boys with whom I come in contact that, if we cannot solve our problems around the conference table, it does not speak very well for our society. I well remember what it cost us in the country when we had that strike in the Port Adelaide and Melbourne woolstores that resulted not only in a colossal cost to the woolgrowers but to all citizens of the country. It was ridiculous for a strike to hold up an industry in this manner to the considerable cost of our economy. I remind the Government of what Mr. Fraser said on television a couple of weeks ago, namely, "When political Parties make promises at elections, remember that all the money they are promising comes from the people," and that includes Government members.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That should be interpreted in terms of the immediate circumstances.

Mr. VANDEPEER: The immediate circumstances are that we have many unemployed and, unless we get many of the best youth of our country back in employment, I do not know what effect it will have on our community in the future. Two fine people in the South-East decided to restore an old inn at Robe. They wanted local girls to serve as waitresses during the day and evening and to join in the atmosphere, which had been developed in the inn, by putting on old costumes. The girls wait on tables and assist in creating the atmosphere the proprietors are trying to build up. If the girls are forced to

join a union, it will destroy the atmosphere that is being built up. The Government is trying to encourage hotels and restaurants into creating the atmosphere of what we were like in the old days, but the unions are destroying it. Certain members of sporting clubs do not mind giving an hour or two of their time behind the bar, thus adding to the club's finances. However, the next thing might be that the unions will be moving into sporting clubs and forcing them to employ full-time labour at award rates, and this would almost break the clubs. The atmosphere in the clubs is an important part of our society.

Many of us live for such an atmosphere, and some of the radical union bosses might want to destroy it. If these temporary barmen are forced to be paid full award rates, it will mean less money will be coming into the club to offer the necessary facilities. The clubs would probably be looking for a hand-out in order to continue operating, and that hand-out would come from all of our citizens in the way of taxpayer money. The important subject of land tax has been well covered by the member for Heysen this evening. Migrants who came to Australia worked in vineyards and went to the coast to fish. Some of them built their own houses, and now that someone has decided to pay \$20 000 for a block of land alongside them, their land tax has increased so considerably that they will be unable—

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

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): I pin my remarks on what has been stated in the Bill and refer to the points that have been made under five headings where the Treasurer has set out what a wonderful job he has done in administering the State's affairs. As the member for Glenelg said earlier, this amounted to "What a good boy am I." The Treasurer said that the State's finances were in such a good position that the surplus could be as high as \$50 000 000. The Treasurer should not be too elated about that figure and take too much of the credit for it, because we are all aware that this State until recently has been a trendsetter State. The Dunstan Government here had a sweetheart agreement with the Whitlam Government in Canberra. There seems to be some petulance on the part of the Treasurer that he is no longer privy to what is going on in the fair city of Canberra.

This \$50 000 000 surplus is something of which the Treasurer is proud, and well may he be because he has misled this House in order to achieve this result. Other members on this side of the House have referred to land tax, stamp duties, water rates, and other measures that have improved the revenue situation in this State, but I refer specifically to succession duties and the amendments introduced to the Succession Duties Act in the last session of this Parliament. Section 15 referred to rebates on rural property and to the fact that a rebate of half the value was offered on rural property, and the effect of that was that, if a landowner had \$100 000 worth of rural property, a rebate on succession duties was granted to the extent of \$50 000 or one-half of whatever the total value of the rural property was. That was similar to the situation that obtained prior to the changes, in that there was a rebate for single ownership. A new provision was introduced when this amendment came in to extend this rebate to joint ownerships and tenancies in common, and it was the understanding of members on this side of the House at least and of some members opposite that the practical situation was that the end result of the rebate on rural property was the same whether it applied to a single ownership, a joint ownership, or a tenancy in common. However, the situation

appears to be, through some ambiguity in the wording, that the succession duties office has interpreted this provision differently. It sets great store by the word "proportion", and the end result is that the official interpretation is different from the common understanding of this House. Therefore, under joint ownerships and tenancies in common, it is half of a half and, on the death of the two members of the partnership, only \$25 000 in \$100 000 applies. I think we were misled over that. When the Bill went through, most of us on this side of the House thought it was a great improvement and that the Government had been generous, but the Government, as I see it, misled us. It is no wonder that the Treasurer can boast of this much improved financial situation for the State. I suggest to him that even that may be only temporary.

I now turn to the Cavan bridge, which I admit is not in my electoral district (it is over the railway line just north of Samcor) but it affects me as it affects every citizen of this State to the north and to the west. Indeed, it affects every traveller who would go to Darwin or Perth. Last session, the Minister of Transport said that the earliest date for a start on the project was 1977. I am as proud as any citizen in the State of our South-Eastern Freeway, which improves the transport situation to other States to the east, but I contend it is just as important to have a free and open flow of traffic to the north and to the west. I charge the Government with gross neglect in not giving at least equal priority to this serious bottleneck to the north of this city. Not only are bottlenecks created daily but most of the freight to Darwin, at least, has been by means of road transport, particularly since the flooding in the Centre.

Consequently, bottlenecks with those transports occur. These bottlenecks affect not only transports but transportable houses. Since the upsurge in that kind of housing, it has been necessary to allow those transportable buildings to cross the Cavan bridge, contributing to the bottlenecks. Work on the new bridge is a matter of urgency and, if it is not possible to do that, surely it is possible to install a level crossing on the down track from the country and allow at least half the traffic to bypass that bridge and improve the traffic flow for the betterment of access into and out of the city.

[Midnight]

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I will continue now from where I left off this afternoon. Government members, particularly the Deputy Premier, are obviously not aware of the full implications of the federalism policy of the Commonwealth Government. It is clear from the Deputy Premier's statement, made a few weeks ago in the absence of the Treasurer, that he is quite confused and does not realise the great benefits that will flow to the people of Australia and to local government from the Commonwealth Government's policies.

The Federal Government's federalism policy aims at creating a Government in Australia responsible to the people and community. It seeks to provide and encourage wider participation and expression by individuals and the community in the three spheres of government. That is something the Labor Party has never attempted to do or never will attempt to do. The policy clearly defines responsibilities for finance and functions and provides mechanisms for co-operation and co-ordination between Federal, State and local government. It ensures that the centralist ambition of denying individual freedom by containing power in Canberra shall not become reality. That is something that we all should try to achieve. We should try not to allow

any Government to centralise all power in Canberra, but the policy of the Labor Party is to centralise power there, and the Whitlam Government tried to do so. Fortunately, the Australian people rejected that aim on December 13. I am pleased that they woke up in time.

Mr. Keneally: The people of New South Wales obviously regretted the decision and reversed it at the next opportunity.

Mr. GUNN: The fundamental thing in the policy is that the present Commonwealth Government believes that the Government that spends the money should be responsible for raising it. That will make Governments honest. The federalism policy will put a curb on wasteful spending, something that the Whitlam Government did not try to achieve. That Government kept on spending money. I think that Mr. Wran, in New South Wales, has painted himself into a corner that he will have difficulty getting out of. He misrepresented the case to the people of New South Wales and deliberately created confusion in their minds. That is the only reason why he won power. When the federalism policy is put into effect—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is to force the States to impose income tax.

Mr. GUNN: I will not be sidetracked by the Minister. The federalism policy specifies that a coalition Government will give the States permanent access to revenue raised through personal income tax. I do not know whether the Labor Party does not want that, but we want it. In future, Commonwealth, State and local taxes will be separately identified on one tax assessment so every taxpayer will see the amount levied for each form of government. This new system will ensure that the States will have substantially the financial capacity to meet their responsibilities. The Grants Commission will be fully retained with regard to existing State functions. The commission will have a special responsibility to ensure full and continuous equalisation for the less populous States under the new federalism policy. The coalition Parties are convinced that national objectives can be fully asserted and social reforms achieved and maintained with a much more selective use of special purpose grants and without heavy-handed interference and duplication. Programmes financed by special grants, which are now well established and accepted, will be transferred to the States with appropriate adjustments in State revenues.

Special grants will be used, where necessary, to initiate programmes in agreed areas of national need, to encourage innovation and to meet special situations, but not to make inroads into the constitutional responsibilities of the States. A fixed percentage of personal income tax will be earmarked for distribution through the States to local government to provide a "weighted" per capita grant to all local government bodies and an equalisation or "topping up" grant to be distributed through State Grants Commissions. A Council for Inter-government Relations will be established and will include Federal, State and local government representatives and a number of citizens. It will provide permanent dialogue between all spheres of government and will have wide advisory and investigatory powers.

On April 9, after the Premiers' Conference, the Prime Minister clearly set out for the people of Australia the Government's aims in its new policy, and I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* an attachment that the Prime Minister distributed, so that Government members will be aware of that policy.

Mr. Jennings: No, no.

The SPEAKER: Would the honourable member define what this is?

Mr. GUNN: It is a statement by the Prime Minister.

The SPEAKER: No, I am afraid that that cannot be allowed.

Mr. GUNN: I will read it during the Supply debate. Obviously, the Government does not want to understand the policy. I am disappointed, because the Government's action will prevent interested people from being fully aware.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How many pages are there?

Mr. GUNN: It would be only a page of *Hansard*.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How many pages have you got?

Mr. GUNN: I refer now to the remarks made by the member for Mitcham about Kangaroo Island. He referred to the attitude of the Commonwealth Government. When I was in Canberra recently I raised the matter concerning Kangaroo Island with the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Sinclair). The instruction that the Minister gave to his officers was not to go to Kangaroo Island and tell the 21 farmers that they would be evicted from their farms. The instruction that the Minister gave was to go there and make an assessment, and the officer gravely breached the terms of reference given. He completely exceeded his authority, and I have made that clear in comments to the press.

I stand by those comments, and I entirely support the course of action that has been taken by the member for Alexandra. I feel sorry for those people and fully support them in their desire to obtain justice and their rights. I believe that they have been treated in a heavy-handed way by bureaucrats. Those officers gravely breached their duty.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Have you heard about Ministerial responsibility? Sinclair has to be responsible for that, as you know very well.

Mr. GUNN: I am aware of the situation and do not retract a word of what I said about the officer, because he breached his instructions.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Do you know what Ministerial responsibility is?

Mr. GUNN: If the officer acts in a similar way again, he should be disciplined. It is not good enough for this State Government to try to hide behind the Commonwealth Government, because the South Australian Government also has responsibility.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, I understand that the Attorney-General wished to speak. He has been carrying on for the past few minutes as though he wanted to speak.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have called on the honourable member for Alexandra.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Yesterday, in the grievance debate, I ended round one on the island soldier settlement issue on the note of pleading for a joint Ministerial public statement condoning, or otherwise, the manner in which officers Roe and McConnell conducted their review mission on Kangaroo Island during the week commencing May 10, 1976. I should like to continue now, except that the matter that I wish to raise in this debate I shall delay following comments made by my sparsely feathered and doubtful friend "Milly" on my left, and convey to the House my understanding of how that honourable member happened to become involved in this issue.

From the outset, I hasten to accept the honourable member's assistance, if he has any positive assistance to offer, and I should be grateful for any true and genuine

support that he has to offer now or in the future in relation to anyone in my district, particularly regarding this question of our soldier settlers. He made continued references to the desires of a committee on Kangaroo Island.

I point out that the committee to which the honourable member so often referred was the Kangaroo Island (Gosse) land settlement committee, which was set up for a specific purpose and which was elected by a large public gathering on Kangaroo Island in 1969. It consisted not only of soldier settlers but also of private primary producers settled, in some cases, for many years on Kangaroo Island. I was appointed the committee's Chairman at the outset, and remained such for more than six years. I am, therefore, somewhat aware of its activities and its original aims and objectives. These were set out in a letter to the Editor of the *Islander* on March 24, 1976, when the long-standing and well-respected Secretary of our committee, Mr. Howard Peck, said:

The members were charged with the responsibility of seeking desired services for island landholders and with securing claimed entitlements based on the War Service Land Settlement Act of 1945 for soldier settlers and their families. The committee has worked deliberately and harmoniously with their federal and State members of Parliament to maintain a fair go for the genuine triers, and consistently supported the family farm unit against unfair authority pressures.

That was the basic aim and objective of the committee at the time of its initiation, and I assure the House that this is still the case and will continue to be so in future while it is required of the group. In no circumstances have I or the committee, as a group, supported any irresponsible requests, handouts, gifts or protection to those who are not fairly described as genuine triers. Yet "Milly" comes and tells us in this place tonight how we should be supporting those people, irrespective of their actions, while occupying those properties.

Mr. Keneally: That is the member for Mitcham?

Mr. CHAPMAN: That is so. The honourable member knows about whom I am speaking, and for him to make blatant statements tonight about a subject of which he is completely unaware is to abuse his position and his political gambit to gain political support from an area from which he will never get it. There is one matter to which he referred and to which I should like to draw members' attention. The member for Mitcham referred to the request made by the local island committee for an independent Select Committee to carry out an investigation into the war service land settlement scheme as it applied on the island and to recommend to the Parliament appropriate measures to enable those settlers to enjoy their entitlements and future years of occupation on those blocks in the proper and dignified way that they deserved and, in the cases where settlers desired to leave their properties, to ensure that this Parliament recognised the needs of those settlers and their families in a secondary rehabilitation situation. On April 2, 1976, I was asked to approach the Legislative Council in this State and seek the appointment of a Legislative Council Select Committee to carry out those inquiries. By the wisdom of those approached in the Legislative Council in recent days, it was decided that they would take a certain course of action on the opening day of the session. However, that action was pre-empted by the Minister of Lands, who came into another place yesterday and made the following Ministerial statement:

In view of the decision of the Minister for Primary Industry to have valuers from the Taxation Department review property values on certain war service holdings on Kangaroo Island, the Governor-in-Council has referred

the question of the financial viability of certain settlers to the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement for investigation and report. The specific matters which the committee has been asked to report on are:

- (1) Financial viability of specific settlers.
- (2) Whether those settlers at present considered viable will continue to be so under present rural economic conditions.
- (3) Whether the present value of securities taken by the Minister of Lands to cover the total debt of individual settlers to the Minister are adequate.
- (4) Which of these settlers is considered to have reasonable prospects of remaining or becoming financially viable.

I am the first to recognise that that referral is a fair start towards upholding the request made by my local island committee. As I have written to each member of the Land Settlement Committee, which has been appointed to carry out this work, I bring to the attention of the House that it is my opinion that the terms of reference referred to in that Ministerial statement are far too restrictive, and that, if the committee's investigation is to be effective, its terms of reference must embrace the opportunity to take evidence and determine whether any particular reason (or reasons) have existed which may have had a significant effect upon the viability of specific settlers, and report accordingly.

With respect, if the committee search is confined to determining viability "under present rural economic conditions", neither the soldier settlers on K.I. nor a significant number of primary producers across Australia could be described as "currently viable". Bearing in mind that a decision of lease occupation (and in this instance "lease call up") is pending, I regard this matter as extremely important, and accordingly seek the attention and support of all members of the committee on the above as a matter of urgency. I direct that message not only to the members of my committee, as has been outlined in writing, but also to this Parliament, for its support.

As a result of the exercise to which I have referred, the Minister of Lands was today asked a question in another place. We are now awaiting a decision on whether he will widen, or whether Cabinet will allow him to widen, those terms of reference so that they may be as effective as is desired in this whole exercise. It is with keen interest that I await the outcome tomorrow of that matter. I am sure, without any reservations, that the decision, if favourable, will allow the inquiry for which our people have asked and which they are prepared to accept, whatever the outcome. They want the opportunity to give evidence for the first time that they have been in occupation of land on Kangaroo Island since the original settlement of the scheme. This is a request which I intend to support and uphold and which they certainly deserve to have granted.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I wish to grieve briefly about two matters; the first relates to the engine plant at Lonsdale, and the second to certain trade union matters, where I will follow on from what the Leader and the Deputy Leader said earlier this evening. Today, another fraudulent election promise of the Dunstan Government has been well and truly revealed. It relates to the promise of a consortium to produce a four cylinder engine plant at Lonsdale. That promise is now on the same scrap heap as the Redcliff petro-chemical plant, dial-a-bus, and most probably the proposal for the new city of Monarto. A day before the most recent State election (July 11 last year), the Treasurer announced that two major Japanese vehicle manufacturers (Toyota and Nissan) had committed themselves in principle to build four cylinder

engines in South Australia. The announcement was made with much trumpeting and chest beating—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It was arranged by the previous Commonwealth Government, but the Fraser Government has fouled it up, and you know it very well.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: With much trumpeting and chest beating, just like the Minister is trying to do now, the Treasurer promised 1 000 new jobs and also wads of other jobs in associated component industries.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: But your mates in Canberra would not—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If the Minister would have the decency to listen—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: —I will show him that the Treasurer tried to convince South Australia that it was a foregone conclusion, irrespective of what happened to the Government in Canberra, that this proposal would go ahead. The day before the election (within 24 hrs of that election) the Treasurer praised the deal as if it were already an absolute certainty. He announced that it was already a triumph for the fight that the South Australian Government had put up on this score together with the car industry and unions. The victory had already been won, according to the Treasurer: it was a triumph. Yesterday, we saw that it was no longer a triumph and, in fact, that the letters of intent were nothing more than an indication by both Japanese manufacturers that they were willing to negotiate. I have it on good advice that if anyone had known the motor vehicle industry, it would have been known that there was no way in the world that Toyota and Nissan would produce engines in the same plant. The Treasurer and his advisers, if he has any, were naive to believe that they could get those two Japanese manufacturers to produce engines in the same plant. I understand the announcement simply related to an indication from the two producers that they were willing to negotiate. If people like the Treasurer are foolish enough to misunderstand the Japanese and their negotiations, they should not negotiate with them. I advise the Treasurer to stay in South Australia and try to overcome some of the cost escalation problems we are facing here instead of flitting around the world trying to sell products which can no longer compete on the international market because of cost escalations that have taken place in South Australia and throughout Australia as a result of Whitlam Government policies.

As I said, it was announced yesterday that the consortium would not proceed with the project and that Chrysler would build the engine plant as a sole venture. The reason given on television last night by the managing director of Chrysler was that negotiations had broken down and had failed to reach agreement between—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you think Fraser—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Just listen—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Fraser and the Vics—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Managing Director of Chrysler indicated last night on *This Day Tonight* that the reason negotiations had not gone ahead was that the three manufacturers could not reach agreement. It has nothing to do with the Government in Canberra.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It was a sell-out!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It was because the three manufacturers of motor vehicles could not reach agreement. I know that the Government is hot under the collar on this matter. It was a dishonest promise by this Government. The Minister of Mines and Energy knows that only too well.

Like the Redcliff project, it was nothing but a blatant lie to try to buy votes just before an election. The Minister should be ashamed of his and his Treasurer's attitude.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What are you going to sell out next?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections. The member for Davenport has the floor.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I believe it has been well and truly proved here this evening that the Treasurer's announcement was nothing but a shabby deal in a cheap attempt to buy votes just before an election. It is the shabbiest form of attempt one can ever have.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're a cheap and shabby misinterpreter—

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Language used by way of interjection to the member for Davenport that he is a cheap and shabby misinterpreter of fact is, in my opinion, totally unparliamentary, and I ask that the Minister of Mines and Energy withdraw those remarks and apologise.

The SPEAKER: I should like to point out to the Leader that there was a little bit on each side. The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the Government's actions, not to the Minister, so there was a distinct difference between the two sorts of accusation levelled across the floor. Furthermore, I was on my feet and the Minister was trying to interject from his seat. I support the remarks made by the Leader and the Deputy Leader concerning the trade union movement. Yesterday or the day before we debated an urgency motion on this matter when I believed some important material came out. I wish to refer to two matters in that regard; first, to the action taken by the union at the Caledonian Inn and, secondly, the blackmail attempt at that inn. I could have quoted many other cases yesterday, but time did not permit me to do so. I have a fairly thick file of cases that have been referred to me on at least a weekly basis, if not almost on a daily basis, about trade unions black banning, threatening strikes, or using some other form of threat tactic against members of the public simply to force their will and way on the community.

Mr. Whitten: Where do you get that information from?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: From poor people victimised by trade unions.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You'll hear some information tomorrow that you won't be looking for.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Minister is saying that he will get information tomorrow. No doubt he will try to protect the actions of his department. I should like to read a letter that was sent by his department to Mr. M. J. Kingston-Lee, of 346 Glen Osmond Road, Myrtle Bank. The letter is dated February 17, 1976, and states:

I refer to the statement which you made to this department on January 12, 1976, when you alleged that you had been forced by your employer, M. S. McLeod Pty. Ltd., to terminate your service because you refused to join a union. The question as to whether this department should launch a prosecution against the company for an alleged breach of section 157 of the State Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act has been given careful consideration. A decision has now been made not to proceed with a prosecution against the company because of the doubt—and that is an important word—

whether an employer who was bound by a Federal award can be prosecuted for a breach of the State Act. If you should require further advice on this matter, I suggest that you contact your own solicitor.

It is signed by the Secretary for Labour and Industry. I reiterate what I said yesterday, that that gentleman has

sought legal advice. It should be noted that he first went to the department on January 12. Five weeks later, on February 17—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Tell us again why he went to the department?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: —he was asked to see his solicitor. On that occasion the advice was at least two weeks too old. I have sought legal advice on this matter. It is obvious that he should have seen his solicitor at least two weeks earlier. The reason he did not see his solicitor was that the letter took five weeks to come from the department. It is unfortunate, because the rights of the individual—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Are you saying that he was dismissed by his employer?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am saying that he went to the department and that five weeks later the department sent—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What was his complaint to the department?

Mr. Chapman: Why don't you listen to him?

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You keep quiet.

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

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The member for Mitcham set about casting aspersions in relation to the member for Alexandra and the Commonwealth member for Barker by suggesting that they might not have had unequivocal support for their actions regarding Kangaroo Island soldier settlers and problems surrounding the questioning of the land tenure of those settlers. I refer to a letter written to *The Islander* on March 24, 1976, by Howard Peck, secretary, K. I. (Gosse) Lands Committee, who stated:

Out of respect for the varied political views held by its members since formation, the committee has adopted an open attitude to allow the utmost freedom of speech at its meetings and remained, as far as possible, politically unbiased towards the Federal and State authorities with which it has been required to negotiate, also refraining from any form of Party promotion.

He further stated:

Our Chairman, Ted Chapman, has strictly enforced and upheld this principle and never relaxed from the aims and objectives set down in our terms of reference, despite his affiliation with the Liberal Party of S.A. and his responsibility as our State representative.

The member for Alexandra is no longer the chairman of that organisation. It ill behoves the member for Mitcham, in view of the chiding he gave the Government and the Opposition this afternoon in relation to their political stance, to act as he has done. The member for Alexandra and the Commonwealth member for Barker (Mr. Porter) have made strong representations on behalf of these settlers, and they will continue in their efforts.

I presume the member for Mitcham, shorn of responsibility, has gone home to bed and has left those of us with responsibilities in Government and alternative Government here to carry on. It ill behoves the honourable member to cast aspersions on honourable members obliged to provide a 24-hour service in the interests of people who may lose everything they have set out to put together over the years.

I now wish to refer to abalone licences, referred to by the Minister. Speaking as a member of an alternative Government, we would establish an advisory committee, comprised of a chairman from the Agriculture and Fisheries Department and members from each area where the abalone industry is located. Moreover, we would attach the licence authorisation to the vessel, and we would supply relief divers. Amongst other things, the Minister made the following statement:

The production of abalone has fallen significantly from 360 tonnes in 1970-71 to under 200 tonnes in 1974-75.

The Minister also said that this situation had led to concern by some of the State's main processors that they may be forced to withdraw their canning facilities from the industry if production continued to fall. This situation has created a paradox in the industry.

The Government, as a result of its medical advice, requires abalone divers to undertake the C.Z.18 medical test, which is related to excessive diving. The Minister referred to a fall in production, and to increase production diving would have to be undertaken in deeper waters. Divers now operate in depths of 0 m to 12 m, and I understand they can dive for about an hour at that depth. However, the abalone grounds encompassed by that depth are becoming over fished. Various opinions have been expressed concerning the resource available and, with the imminent provision of 10 more authorisations for abalone divers (especially as the licence holder only is allowed to undertake the dive), divers will have to take to deeper water to obtain their abalone catches. Divers will then be subjected to the hazards revealed by the severe C.Z.18 medical test.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Do you agree with the test?

Mr. RODDA: Yes, it is important, because the Minister's actions will subject individual divers to greater stress, especially as the Minister has given no indication of his acceptance of the need for relief divers. The Minister is concerned about reduced production, but the way out of this dilemma would be to give the authorised diver a relief diver. A parallel can be drawn between the argument canvassed earlier this evening concerning an excess of car manufacturing plants and the principles embodied in this industry. The abalone industry is important. Those engaged in it have thousands of dollars invested in their vessels, and to maintain production they must follow the resource. I understand that the two abalone varieties are readily procurable in water deeper than 12 metres.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You believe that, even if you double the amount of effort, there would still be plenty there?

Mr. RODDA: One cannot double the effort because divers can dive for one hour only. The divers must spend the remainder of the time in their boat resting. A relief diver would ease the situation. Is the Minister willing to accept the responsibility for the increase in diving accidents that must result from the related health hazard that will ensue from divers having to enter deeper waters because of the new licences to be issued? These people will push it to the limit because they have a financial commitment, and there is no room for this unless they have a relief diver.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I wish to use the time available to me to bring to the House the importance of retaining the township of Hahndorf, in my district, as an important tourist centre. It might be well for the Attorney-General to smile—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You said you were going to use your time, not waste it.

Mr. WOTTON: I do not believe the people of South Australia will appreciate that remark. Last Wednesday evening I attended a meeting called by the residents of that town and I have been asked to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism in another place. I intend that that question will be asked tomorrow. It is as follows:

In view of the Premier's efforts—

and I might say this is probably a self-proclaimed effort—to promote tourism in this State, and the importance of Hahndorf as expressed in the recently published report of the S.A. Division of Tourism, is the Premier aware that exorbitant land tax valuations are going to force long-time residents from their century-old homes to make way for those who supposedly can afford the resultant high taxes, namely commercial interests, thus destroying the main attraction that the town has to offer?

I will be further asking the Minister whether he is aware of the situation, and what steps have been taken or will be taken to preserve this, the oldest surviving German settlement in Australia. If any member opposite does not agree with the importance of this issue he should read *The Impact of Tourism on Hahndorf*, a study of the social, environmental and economic effects of intensive tourist activity on the local community, put out by the South Australian Division of Tourism in January, 1976. The report states:

Although a number of semi-rural townships within a 100-kilometre radius of Adelaide have adopted a strong tourism stance, primarily through the development of restaurants and craft outlets, Hahndorf represents one of the most concentrated areas of such activity in South Australia.

It goes on to say that the impact of tourism on the visual environment of Hahndorf is representative of the situation in many other areas with a strong tourism/recreational focus. It states:

Environmental threats inherent in the continuing orientation of Hahndorf towards tourist activity include the tendency to create an artificial townscape which compromises the basic historical integrity of Hahndorf and which overshadows the function of the town as a living area and the more obvious unsightly infrastructure that is associated with the commercialisation of leisure pursuits.

Because of excessive valuations placed on properties, particularly those in the main streets, many old homes in the town are in danger of being pulled down because the people living in them, mostly elderly, are unable to pay the taxes associated with such valuations. It is possible that commercial enterprises will build in their places superstructures and other buildings quite out of touch with the local situation. In an article appearing in the *Mount Barker Courier* under the heading "Rape of Hahndorf", Mr. John Storey, who was representing the town at the meeting last Wednesday, makes the point that the town is in danger of dying, mainly through greed and taxes. The article states:

Crippling land tax assessments and "commercial greed" are the reasons given for the pessimism surrounding the town's future. The recent assessments for land tax in this town have risen something like 600 to 700 per cent in three years, but the worst aspect of this is that every property in the main street is being assessed on a commercial basis.

The historic significance of Hahndorf is closely tied to the century-old homes in the town. It is extremely important that these homes be protected and that the people living in them are protected. I ask the Government to do what is possible to protect Hahndorf from the threats that lie ahead.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): It is regrettable that the opportunity for a grievance debate must occur at such a late hour. The Government must accept responsibility, because it is some months since Parliament has sat and, after this sitting of three days, we are to have a break until July 27. Parliament is the voice of the people, and that voice must be heard. I am pleased to see the Minister of Labour and Industry back from his overseas trip during which he looked at certain facets in relation to his department. Members on this side are not continually out to bash the unions and the role they play

in this State. I have said many times that I agree that there are too many unions in South Australia and in Australia generally, but I cannot suggest a solution to reduce the number and yet give the workers the cover to which they are entitled.

The workers should have a right to choose a union that is responsible to their industry, they should have the right of voluntary membership, and it is up to the unions to brighten their image, to approach people employed in industry (and I am sure this would not be denied them), and to gain the confidence of the workers. Some union officials have failed. We knew 10 years ago that some union officials were failing in their jobs, but it was recommended that they should take some course of training. If they were prepared to spend more time working for the benefit of their members, at the same time appealing to those who are not members to join, rather than forcing workers to join unions, I am sure the community at large would have greater respect for the trade union movement. Undoubtedly, unions have contributed much to the quality of life in Australia.

In difficult times not all employers are reasonable and understanding, so surely it is the fundamental role of the unions to ensure that their future is secure by adopting a more realistic course in this regard. It behoves the Minister to ensure that all members receive a copy of his press release on the important school canteen issue. We all know that it is desirable for school canteens to be able to employ voluntary staff, but in certain areas today that is impossible because far too many mothers are forced to work for their economic survival. The Minister should clarify the situation regarding the exemption clause with relation to charitable organisations.

We have seen some rather infamous statements emanate from the Attorney-General on Sunday trading in hotels, probably in order to ascertain public reaction, but no-one has approached me in this regard. I know that the publicans do not want it. The Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport recently announced the policy of after-race payouts on the Totalizator Agency Board. The T.A.B. has now arranged to buy a computer, but I have not forgotten the \$2 500 000 loss the T.A.B. suffered when it tried to install a computer. The new arrangement is between International Business Machines and Burroughs Limited, but I would have thought that the T.A.B. would be careful in going into this field and would have selected a company that was already operating computers in most Australian States. The Burroughs company is not involved in this field. By floating a story, this matter has backlashed on the Minister.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Schedule.

Premier, Miscellaneous, \$500 000; Police, \$1 330 000—passed.

Treasurer, Miscellaneous, \$23 240 000.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Deputy Premier give me the details of the capital programmes that will be supplemented by this further provision?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): There is a slight problem in defining where this money will be spent. The Leader knows that any appropriation does not have to be spent, but it is a contingency. We will not specify exactly how the money will be spent until we know the outcome of the Loan Council meeting to be

held later today in Canberra. We hope that not only major constructions but also housing will be the two main thrusts in this area.

Dr. TONKIN: Is it correct to say that this sum basically is contingent on the outcome of the Loan Council meeting and is not a further provision as now headed in the column in which it appears?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is a contingency sum, and the Leader must surely appreciate that there must be some flexibility in a sum of this size.

Dr. EASTICK: It becomes obvious that it is another case, then, of the Treasurer once again crying "wolf".

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Rubbish!

Dr. EASTICK: No, it is not. Constantly, the Treasurer has stated what the Federal Government will not be giving him, and then finds that the Federal Government will be giving it to him. What the Treasurer has said about so many of the projects is found to be wanting because of the unqualified undertaking given by the Federal Government and statements made by Federal Ministers. Apart from that I refer to the \$3 000 000 shown here for capital works in the western areas of Eyre Peninsula, including Streaky Bay and Ceduna. No member would deny those people the right to a supply connected to the Electricity Trust. Because the Government has seen fit to extract increasing sums of money from the Electricity Trust by way of surcharges, the trust has been denied the opportunity of providing its own capital requirements and thus needs this assistance.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is way off the track, and he knows it. This Government has not denied the Electricity Trust the right to do these things. The Government has a surplus and it is prudent for it to allot moneys to the trust to do the work mentioned in the Treasurer's explanation. It is a one up—it will not happen again. We are in a position to do this sort of work. As to the uncertainty whether the Treasurer will not do this or that, we do not know what will come out of the Loan Council tomorrow. It has been asked whether this is a contingency: it is. If we tried to spell out in detail exactly what we were going to do with this \$23 000 000, we would be held up to ridicule by the member who asked the question if it did not turn out exactly as we said it would. There is nothing that provides we shall necessarily spend that \$23 000 000, and he knows it. I have said all I need to say on this.

If it so happens that at the Loan Council meeting tomorrow the State does not get what it considers it is entitled to or there is some change, the position will alter; but, if we spelled it out in detail, we would be ridiculed for saying we would do something that we could not do. The \$23 000 000 is there and, if we can, we intend to do exactly what we want to do with it, but we must wait and see. There is nothing unusual about this. It is the way this matter has been handled ever since this Parliament has been in being. The member for Light is trying to build something into it that is not there. I may add that the \$3 000 000 is not a contingency; it is specified and will be spent.

Dr. EASTICK: Paraphrasing the answer I have received, what the Deputy Premier has said is that the Government has sought to use the Federal Government as a whipping boy, by the statements made by the Treasurer yesterday claiming what we would not get and also big-timing himself by saying how good the Government is and seeking to get cheap publicity by saying it had put aside \$23 000 000 that it will then take back; and that is the truth of the matter. Is it a fact that, if the Government was not

extracting so much money from the Electricity Trust, it would not need the \$3 000 000 and would be able to finance its extensions from its own resources?

Mr. GUNN: Referring to the capital works on Eyre Peninsula, can the Deputy Premier say when it is likely that the Electricity Trust will carry out this programme? I am pleased that it is providing funds to the Electricity Trust so that my constituents in this area will receive the same sort of power supply as most other people in South Australia get. When this project has been completed, will the trust be in a position to extend the power supplies further west to Ceduna and other places not served by local government? The Deputy Premier may not be aware that some of my constituents have been making approaches over the last few months to have their houses connected to a 240-volt power system.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The \$3 000 000 will be spent during the next financial year on those extensions. That is the purpose of it. It is not a contingency—it is a firm commitment. I am not aware of the exact details of the other points raised by the member for Eyre but we will have the matter examined and let him know exactly what the programme is as soon as we can.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I should like some details of payments in connection with fires. Fires have been publicised in the press from time to time: some have been fairly big school fires. There was also a big fire at the premises of the State Supply Department. What have we lost through fires in this financial year? I think this extra \$220 000 is to cover fires that have already occurred. What steps is the Government taking in fire protection? It was suggested that a night watchman be employed to roam around the metropolitan area and keep an eye on schools. To prevent one fire would more than pay his salary.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I refer the honourable member to page 12 and the top of page 13 of the Treasurer's explanation. I accept what the honourable member says about vandalism in schools, and whether or not it would pay the Government to have security services available; but, when vandals decide to operate, they seem to be able to avoid the normal precautions, even stringent precautions, taken to prevent them from doing the damage. I do not know why these people strike at schools but it may be related to the age range. The Government is concerned about the loss annually and, I suppose, almost weekly. I will have the points that the honourable member has raised examined and give him a detailed report.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Government, instead of carrying its own insurance, insure through the State Government Insurance Commission? What is the meaning of the reference to premiums?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government carries its own insurance on school buildings and school furnishings in temporary buildings. Recently the Minister of Education and I discussed the matter with the South Australian Institute of Teachers. The relevant provision is separate from the Education Department vote; it is in a Treasury vote. It does not affect the amount of money available to education, contrary to what some members of the South Australian Institute of Teachers believed. As the amount has not been sufficient this year, we have had to supplement it.

Mr. Nankivell: I questioned the matter of the provision regarding premiums.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government carries its own insurance. The provision may have a meaning

in relation to the Treasury, but we do not insure with anyone.

Line passed.

Minister of Lands, Minister of Repatriation and Minister of Irrigation, Miscellaneous, \$11 000 000.

Dr. TONKIN: It has been made clear during earlier speeches that the suggestion has been made in private quarters that the private sector should be stimulated equally with the public sector. Can the Deputy Premier give some indication of how those funds could be used and of whether the amount being set aside can be applied to projects necessary to stimulate the private sector, such as pay-roll tax concessions or other concessions that would allow private industry to employ people who would not otherwise be employed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: To the best of my knowledge, it is not intended to do as the Leader has suggested and stimulate employment in the private sector through concessions on pay-roll tax. Rather, the effort will be aimed towards local government and specific projects, as well as towards Government departments spending the money to employ people on labour-intensive projects that will benefit the community, so lessening the burden on the people and on the Commonwealth Government. When we employ people, they come off unemployment relief benefits and the Commonwealth Government is relieved of those payments. The State Government sees a big need to do what it intends in this area, because people in this State are faced with a problem when, through no fault of their own, they cannot get work. In addition to local government, specific projects not necessarily concerned with private enterprise are involved. It has been announced about five or six weeks ago that we are supporting a different approach to the employment of younger people in the community, and I think that more than \$1 000 000 will be provided for that scheme.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will councils apply to the Government, with projects that they have in mind, for the Government's decision whether it will make money available to employ people in their area? Regarding Government intervention, I should think that the Engineering and Water Supply Department, for instance, would employ people on day labour under this scheme. That was done in regard to the fencing of Milbrook reservoir, and the fencing was fairly expensive. Perhaps that is the sort of thing that the Deputy Premier is referring to.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is correct, and it also includes such projects as the supply of water from Kanmantoo to Callington, which was a worthwhile project so far as Government departments were concerned. That was a means of getting water to people to whom it would not otherwise have been available, because money was not available. I applied to the Lands Department to have this done because it was most desirable, and we were granted the money. The honourable member is virtually saying that we should not do that sort of thing, but we are employing people to do something useful for the community.

Dr. EASTICK: Does the Lands Department intend that there will be an investigation or appreciation of the work being undertaken to determine whether the present 50 per cent labour cost will continue to apply, or is it possible that, in view of the experience of the Federal Government, such as in the Regional Employment Development scheme, the 50 per cent arrangement may be departed from? It is a disastrous situation when people are receiving the 20 per cent loading because it is recognised not as full employment but as casual labour. It is more

beneficial for people not receiving this 20 per cent loading to become unemployed so that they can be employed under schemes of this nature.

Also, questions are raised in the minds of those in local government, when persons are asked to distribute sand across ovals by means of wheelbarrows and shovels, when the work could be done much more quickly, efficiently and cheaply if, say, a grader was used. Many other projects could be undertaken if it was desired merely to give people work. The present method is certainly not satisfactory for many of the people so employed. This is embarrassing for many councils, as the effort that they must make, by using their own staff, to keep people on the job is upsetting the proper administration of councils. I realise that an effort is being made to help people who are currently receiving unemployment benefits. However, I suggest that the present administration of this scheme is doing more harm than good at present.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I take it that the honourable member is saying that the councils with which he is associated would prefer not to have any part of the scheme.

Dr. Eastick: I didn't say that at all.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member has indicated that clearly to me: they are dissatisfied and do not want it. I therefore take it that we do not have any worry about any applications regarding this sort of scheme that come from the honourable member's area.

Dr. Eastick: That's not a smart thing to say.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member knows perfectly well that the whole purpose of this scheme is to employ people. If it is in some respects considered by the honourable member and others to be wasteful, I suppose that is part of the scheme. We are not all as clever or as innovative as the honourable member and his colleagues. However, this Government has at least tried to help these people. Indeed, it is the only State Government to have done so, and the Federal Government has given it away. The honourable member is not giving the Government any credit: he is merely saying that it is a wasteful exercise. I am sorry, but I cannot agree with him.

Dr. EASTICK: It is a great pity that the Deputy Premier did not listen more carefully to what I said. I pointed out earlier today that problems are being experienced and that the people who are being assisted could be better served if there was an appraisal of the situation, to the benefit of all concerned. Regarding the suggestion that the area I represent does not need any more of these funds, I did not say that, as the Deputy Premier well knows.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You said they were disturbed.

Dr. EASTICK: Naturally they are disturbed to see waste, as are the people in the middle of that waste, who are being employed. When an employing authority is told that it must spend a certain sum by June 30 or a project will not be paid for, and it is impossible for that authority to spend the money in the required time, a wasteful situation arises. I shall be pleased to give the Minister a copy of a direction which contains this sort of requirement.

Line passed.

Public Buildings, \$1 715 000.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Although work on the Lobethal Primary School was approved by the Government some time ago, it has been deferred because of a shortage of funds. Inquiries indicate that there was a proposal to

stage a rather extensive building programme, and to try to convert it to a series of minor works programmes. Is any of this work included in this allocation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will find out for the honourable member.

Line passed.

State Supply, \$400 000.

Mr. BLACKER: The estimated expenditure is about 35 per cent higher than the sum appropriated in 1975. Is this a general increase, or has additional staff been taken on for any reason?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I cannot say, I will find out and let the honourable member know.

Line passed.

Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Forests and Minister of Fisheries, Miscellaneous, \$380 000; Minister of Transport and Minister of Local Government, Miscellaneous, \$22 400 000—passed.

Minister of Community Welfare, Miscellaneous, \$375 000.

Mr. MATHWIN: Does this sum relate to acquiring houses for Aborigines in the metropolitan area? Also, does it include the maintenance of city dwellings rather than those in the country? I have in my district some of these houses, the maintenance of which is a big problem. Indeed, in one property no maintenance has been carried out in the garden, and from time to time the department has to clean up the garden and house. I wonder just how many houses are bought for Aborigines, and what sum is involved in this allocation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There is no amount for that purpose. If the honourable member reads the Treasurer's explanation, at page 16 he will see that this sum is included to make up the deficit that has occurred. It does not relate to future works. However, this question will be examined and, if there is anything in it that needs to be answered, I will get a reply.

Line passed.

Schedule passed.

Clauses 1 to 7 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

OFF-SHORE WATERS (APPLICATION OF LAWS) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This measure is proposed against the background of the recent judgment of the High Court in *The State of New South Wales and others v. The Commonwealth*, 50 A.L.J.R. 218, which upheld the validity of the Commonwealth Seas and Submerged Lands Act, 1973. Briefly, this Act asserted a claim by the Commonwealth to "sovereignty" over the territorial seas of Australia; that is, the waters within three nautical miles of the coast. Up to the time of the enactment of this measure it was thought by many, including the legal advisers to the States, to be settled law that each State had jurisdiction over the territorial sea adjacent to its coast.

However, it is clear that there is at present a legal vacuum in the open seas adjacent to this State with respect to large areas of both the criminal law and the civil law. In the case of certain serious crimes it may be possible to proceed under old Imperial Acts that give jurisdiction to

colonial courts to try serious crimes against United Kingdom laws committed on British ships. However, this is a complicated and anachronistic procedure, and at any rate it covers only a part of the criminal law. There is not even this limited provision with respect to the civil law.

It is highly desirable, then, that the gap disclosed by the Seas and Submerged Lands Act judgment be filled. The High Court recently affirmed the power of the States to apply their laws generally in offshore waters (though this course may not be available in the case of certain topics), so it is neither necessary nor desirable to leave the matter solely to the Commonwealth Parliament. Besides, the problem needs to be dealt with speedily. The Government has therefore accepted the recommendation of its legal advisers that a measure of the nature proposed be enacted into law as soon as possible. Their advice is based on these two grounds:

- (a) first, it will, in one area, as nearly as possible restore the situation in relation to the "territorial" waters of the State so as to accord with the situation that was thought to have existed since Federation. This without more is a compelling ground since it will re-establish the element of certainty in the law that is so essential for those whose activities are affected by it;
- (b) secondly, it provides a legislative solution that is entirely encompassed by the philosophy of "co-operative federalism" as enunciated by the present Government of the Commonwealth.

In passing, I mention that at least two other States, Western Australia and Tasmania, have enacted or have in contemplation legislation broadly along the lines of this measure. The measure is short, but not without complexity, since it has been drawn against a background of some uncertainty in the developing law of offshore sovereignty and at a time when the constitutional constraints on the exercise of extra-territorial powers by the States are not yet entirely settled.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 sets out the definitions used in the measure and two of these definitions are of particular importance:

- (a) the definition of "law of the State" which expressly includes both "civil and criminal" law. In the measures enacted or in contemplation by the other States only the criminal law was dealt with. Although civil actions arising in offshore waters would be rather less common than the proceedings for offences, the Government's advisers consider that as far as possible civil actions should be covered to accord with the aim to restore the situation as it was presumed to exist;
- (b) the definition of "offshore waters" which is set out in the schedule to the Bill. For the purposes of the definition the waters are separated into three bands of three nautical miles, nine nautical miles and 88 nautical miles respectively. The first of these bands comprises the former territorial waters of the State, the second when added to the first will encompass the proposed extension by international convention of the territorial sea to a total of 12 nautical miles offshore, and the third when added to the first and second will extend the scope of the measure to 100 nautical miles offshore. The reason for this "step by step" assertion of

application is simply to ensure that should the State's powers in this area prove deficient in some particular the assertion will prove "severable" in the constitutional sense.

Clause 3 is an overriding clause and applies every appropriate law of the State to offshore waters. If the validity of this clause as a proper exercise of the extra-territorial legislative power of the State is upheld there will be no need to have recourse to clause 4. In constitutional terms the "nexus" which grounds the exercise of this power is the propinquity of the offshore waters to this State.

Clause 4 which is to be called in aid only in the case of the total or partial invalidity of clause 3, is grounded on a different "nexus". In this case the "nexus" is the asserted power to control and protect persons connected with the State (as to which see the appropriate definition in clause 2). Clause 5 is an averment provision in the usual form and clause 6 provides for an appropriate extension of jurisdiction of the courts.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from June 8. Page 24.)

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable this Order of the Day to be proceeded with forthwith and the Bill to pass through its remaining stages without delay.

Motion carried.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): There is little point in keeping the House at this stage of the evening. This Bill is the standard measure to provide an appropriation of \$160 000 000 to enable the Public Service of the State to be carried on during the early part of the next financial year. The reasons for the introduction of the Bill have been clearly and adequately stated in the Treasurer's explanation. I support the measure.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN 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): For the second time during today's sitting we have the opportunity to ventilate grievances. I intend to deal briefly with the subject with which I was dealing before about agreements that were being made for closed shops between officials of trade unions and employers. I shall now quote a standard form of agreement that exists between employers and the Vehicle Builders Employees' Federation of Australia. The memorandum of agreement is clearly set out and is a *pro forma* that is used wherever possible. I can say only that this form of agreement has not been concluded in recent cases where pressure has been applied to automobile dealers. Car dealers generally, although having been subjected to black bans, have not agreed to subscribe to this document. The important part of the agreement relates to clauses (c) and (d) of the preamble, which state:

(c) The nature of the work performed or contemplated by the company necessitates the employment of classes of labour appropriately covered by the constitution of the federation.

(d) With the foregoing matters in mind and being desirous that the business of the company shall be carried out without stoppage or dislocation of work, the parties hereto conferred together and agreed upon the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth:

There, thinly veiled, is the threat that exists as a common factor in all such agreements put forward. Clause 5(a) of the agreement states:

The company will, as a condition of employment, require every new employee who joins the company on or after the day of . . . and who at the time of such employment is not a member of the federation, but is eligible for membership thereof to sign an application for membership thereof and an undertaking that he will, subject to the provisions of this agreement and during its currency remain a financial member of the federation during the whole term of his employment with the company.

So it continues. The company will be required to ensure that everyone is a member of the federation and will require every new employee to sign an authority enabling the company to deduct and forward to the State branch office of the federation all entrance fees and contributions. Clause 5 (e) states:

The company shall be entitled to dismiss any employee who fails or omits to observe the provisions of subclauses (a), (b), (c) and (d).

It states that the company "shall be entitled to dismiss", whereas anyone knows that management is required under threat of industrial action to dismiss anyone who does not become a member of the union.

Mr. Abbott: That's a good agreement.

Dr. TONKIN: I think I heard the honourable member say that it was a good agreement: it is nothing more or less than compulsory unionism carried out to achieve a closed shop agreement under threat of industrial action and black ban. It has been said by members opposite (and I have no doubt that it will be said again) that the Opposition is engaging in union bashing. Let me make it clear that nothing that has been said this evening on this side involves union bashing. It is the men who are dictating union policy who stand indicted by the activities that have been going on. Personally, I admire and respect trade unions for what they have achieved for workers in Australia and many other countries.

I say that the men dictating union policy now are not like the men who led the unions so successfully in the past, and in exactly the same way the men who comprise the Labor Party today, generally, are not like the men who comprised it in the past. Both the trade union movement and the Labor Party are being used. Their members are being used by left-wing radicals to achieve a rule of union anarchy in this country and in this State, and we are heading towards the nationalisation of industry and total socialisation of the State more rapidly than the people of South Australia realise.

Both the Trades and Labor Council and the Caucus are moving, and the Government is powerless to stop them. It is up to the rank-and-file members of the unions, and members of the community at large, to act. We cannot afford to let these few people wield the power that they have and to get away with it for much longer. Certainly, we cannot afford to have in office a Government whose hands are tied and who does exactly what it is told, because that is exactly what we have got currently in South Australia. Again, I refer to the cartoon, which appeared in the *News* and which showed clearly that things will come to an absolute halt. There will be no mending of taps, no mowing of lawns, no cementing of paths, no washing up; nothing will happen at all unless one belongs to the appropriate union.

As someone said earlier today, we are fast approaching a situation where voluntary drivers for Meals on Wheels might find themselves precluded from performing their voluntary service unless they join the appropriate union. Such a situation would be ridiculous, and it is a situation

that should not possibly be allowed to be contemplated, yet today it is possible.

Mr. Chapman: Would they have to join the caterer's union or the transport driver's union?

Dr. TONKIN: There would certainly be a demarcation dispute over who would get what. This is exactly what is happening to South Australia, and it will continue to happen until more South Australians wake up to how they are being manipulated. However, I have great faith in the good straight common sense of the average South Australian. The McKell Government tried to introduce compulsory unionism many years ago, but it backed off from that undertaking rapidly, and so it should have done. We will have the opportunity for prosperity and true quality of life in South Australia under a Liberal Government, and the sooner the people of South Australia realise that, as I believe they are now doing, the better.

I will not keep the House long, but I wish now to refer to the sittings of the House. Honourable members will recall that there was a public outcry when the Government intended, at the end of October, to rise and not call Parliament together for nearly eight months. It was not intended that Parliament should sit in February at all but, in response to the outcry from the public and from the Opposition, the Government then agreed to sit a little longer. We also had a couple of extra weeks off, but then we came back for three weeks in February.

The three weeks was a very busy period, busy mostly as a result of the business brought before the House by the Opposition. Now we have a new sitting and a new session of Parliament, which began on Tuesday and which is to last for three days only. The member for Mitcham made some passing reference by interjection to the fact that we could have sat last night, on the night of the opening day of Parliament. I have checked out past precedent, and there have been only two occasions in the past seven years when we have sat on the night of the opening day of Parliament. It is a tradition not to sit on that night. The Opposition believes that Parliament should stick by tradition and precedent, and that is exactly what we did last night. Although the Government of this State is afraid to face Parliament and wishes to keep out of this Chamber for as long as it possibly can, there is no reason why the Opposition should give in to the Government's demands in this regard. Certainly we did not expect to sit last night. It is ridiculous that we should be dealing with a Supply Bill and an Appropriation Bill at this hour of the morning.

There is absolutely no need for this. The Opposition is willing to come back and sit next week for as long as is necessary to get these measures through in a fit and proper manner. Moreover, I wish to refer to another serious dereliction of duty that can be attributed to the Government. At the Premiers' Conference last April it was stated and agreed to by all Premiers that a State Grants Commission should be established. I understand that the South Australian Premier agreed that that should be the case. The purpose was to establish a commission to administer the funds that will now be available to local government through the \$140 000 000 that is to be made available. South Australia will get more than 8 per cent of that sum.

The Commonwealth Grants Commission in its special report has set down the categories of councils. It has set down the equalisation factors, how they will be based and on what proportions they will be based. The amounts of money that will come to each State is set out clearly and, therefore it is possible to calculate exactly how much money will go to each local government body. However,

to do this, it is necessary that we have a State Grants Commission, which will clearly allocate those funds for use by local government. Unless such a commission is in operation by July 1, 1976, those funds will be delayed, and local government will not have access to those seriously needed funds.

I am sure that the Government will trot out the rather lame excuse that it will allocate the funds according to the last determination of the Commonwealth Grants Commission. The Government seems to be so wedded to the centralist policy still. However, if it does that and if the State gets the funds to be allocated for local government works, it could be interpreted that those funds were available for use on projects such as water supplies to local government, and the funds could find themselves easily devoted to such public works rather than going directly to local government.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: How much do you think Fraser will give?

Dr. TONKIN: Obviously, the Minister has not been listening. The sum has been decided. The sum of \$140 000 000 was announced in April, and South Australia will get about 8.3 per cent of that sum. Obviously, the Minister has not taken the trouble to find out what it is all about. For the same reason I condemn the Government for not taking the trouble to bring in a State Grants Commission. I repeat that the Opposition is still willing to sit extra days, if necessary, to get this commission into being. I presume, since the Government has had notice of this measure since last April, that the legislation must already be drawn and must surely be ready.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You will find out the true position later today.

Dr. TONKIN: Therefore, we are happy to sit, if necessary, for an extra two or three days. I told the Deputy Premier this publicly in Mount Gambier some weeks ago. Local government is a most important branch of government. It is the form of government closest to the people, the form of—

Members interjecting:

Dr. TONKIN: The laughter of members opposite shows quite clearly what they think of local government. It does not deserve such shabby treatment from this Government, and there is still time for this legislation to be brought in later today. We as an Opposition will be pleased to consider it and to put it through, because we believe it is vital. It is no good the Government trying to abrogate its responsibilities in this regard. I realise that it is still totally and absolutely wedded to the centralist philosophy. The sooner this Government wakes up to the fact that it no longer applies, the sooner it faces reality and works out that those policies did not work, and indeed got this country into the biggest mess since federation, the sooner this State will get out of its present difficulties and the sooner local government will be able to benefit from these extra funds.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I should like to refer to members on this side who have supported me in the matter involving the war service settlers on Kangaroo Island, and while on that note of appreciation I should like to mention one member on the Government side. On the morning of May 11, the morning after the first day of interview of the settlers by officers McConnell and Roe, I became aware of the tenor in which those officers were approaching the subject and the settlers. With concern I rang the office of the Minister of Lands, from Kangaroo Island. I was informed that the Minister was on holidays on the coast of Queensland and would not

be available for some time. When I inquired who was the Acting Minister I was informed that there was no Acting Minister of Lands on May 11; Cabinet had not sat and constitutionally no-one had been appointed to that office. I asked then to speak to the Acting Premier, Mr. Corcoran. Without reservation, I say on this occasion that the Acting Premier acted promptly; he immediately contacted his Government's officer on Kangaroo Island, and assured me of his efforts to see that that officer would alter his approach to the settlers for the balance of the interview. For that prompt action and the confirmation of matters reported in the media in the days to follow, and in particular for the telegram that he sent to the island settlers during that distressing period, on behalf of the Kangaroo Island community, and the Gosse committee in particular, I extend our gratitude.

During this debate there has been considerable interjection from the Government side that the responsibility for the future of the settlers rests in the hands of the Minister for Primary Industry. I do not accept this, and I refer to the cancellation of a war service land settlement lease on Kangaroo Island about five years ago. It involves the case of a Mr. Berryman. His lease was cancelled by order of the State, and that order was signed under the State seal by the then Minister of Lands, Mr. Kneebone. Ironically, his officer, Mr. G. P. Roe, at that time was authorised by the State Minister of Lands to implement the cancellation of the lease and conduct and carry out the sale of the assets. It is quite clearly my understanding that the decision, the determination, and the order for cancellation and removal from the property of not only the soldier settler but also his wife by a due date was an authorisation not partly but entirely in the hands of the State Minister of Lands.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Mr. Sinclair—

Mr. CHAPMAN: Mr. Sinclair was the Minister for Primary Industry at that time, and, on contacting his office as to whose responsibility it was to tip off Mr. Berryman and his wife, I was told it was a decision to be determined entirely by the State. We get this shift of responsibility from the State to the Commonwealth, and *vice versa*, when it is convenient. I thought I should bring to the attention of members the clear precedent and pattern set. It is obviously convenient for our Government to "blame the feds." That is in line with the other course of action it has taken in recent months. Another interesting factor is that during a case between a zone 5 settler in the South-East (Mr. Heinrich) and Mr. Dunsford, the Director of Lands in South Australia a few years ago, Mr. Justice Bright said in his findings that, quite clearly on the evidence available, in his opinion the principal in this whole war service land settlement agreement between the settler and the Government was the State. That is the only case I am aware of in which the Government has been cited as a principal partner. I am still confused, but meanwhile I regard the State of South Australia as the principal party and the one which should be making the decisions.

In anticipation of a favourable reply tomorrow from the Minister to the request that the terms of reference of the Land Settlement Committee be widened, I shall bring one other matter to the attention of the House. It will be difficult to determine the viability of the settlers, and no doubt considerable evidence will need to be collected to make such determinations and report to Parliament. To show how difficult it is for farmers there to exist in the present climate, I have an account sales for some stock sold from Kangaroo Island within the past couple of weeks.

A soldier settler, following a request from a meat marketing firm based in Adelaide, sent 12 of his best Hereford steer yearlings to be slaughtered at the Gepps Cross abattoir and sold on hooks to Borthwicks. I refer to account sales No. 4241, dated May 25, 1976. The 12 steers realised a gross figure of \$615.93 for the carcasses, \$42 for the hides, and \$18 for the offal, a total gross return of \$675.93. The costs involved were as follows: commission \$30.80, beef levy \$6.60, killing charges \$266.76, transport \$163.92, and special Samcor charges for transferring the carcasses from the killing rooms to Light Square totalled a further \$53.30, making total expenses of \$521.38. When we deduct that from the gross return, the total net return for the 12 beasts was \$154.55, which works out to about \$12.90 a head. That is a classic example of what these soldier settlers and other settlers are faced with in trying to carry on rural pursuits on the island in the present climate and with the only transport for livestock available to them. I hope that, in the light of those comments and many others I could make, every reasonable sympathy will be extended not only to Kangaroo Island farmers and other South Australian farmers but also to all those practising rural pursuits throughout the nation.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I ask the Government to give sympathetic consideration to a request by the Federation of Australian Motor Cyclists (South Australian Branch) to release the figures contained in the Sangster report of accidents in the motoring field. As I understand that the report is in the Government's hands, it would know the contents of the report, and I believe it only fair that the public should also have access to the report. The federation's main concern is the increase in the cost of third party insurance by \$35 in one sweep. If there is any justification for this colossal increase, the figures ought to be released so that the federation may ascertain whether the increase is justified. There is also a threat of a possible additional 50 per cent increase in third party motor cycle insurance. The newly-elected New South Wales Labor Government had dangled a carrot and said that it would conduct an investigation into the high third party insurance on motor vehicles; this was no doubt a catch-cry to obtain support for the Australian Labor Party to gain Government.

Recently, I joined a motor cycle rally attended by about 2 000 motor cyclists who drove through the Hills and into the Barossa Valley. The cyclists kept to the open road, many of them with pillion passengers, at the ridiculous speed of 70 kilometres an hour, which is unsafe for the rider and passenger and for other people using the road. The members of the federation are good responsible people.

Mr. Whitten: You are not a member?

Mr. MATHWIN: No, but I am a supporter of it. I will quote, in part, from a pamphlet issued at the rally, as follows:

Our point of view as motor cyclists: A motor cycle can only carry one pillion passenger (and is rarely carrying one when involved in an accident), is supposedly causing more third party claims than vehicles which carry up to five passengers, which are involved in a high percentage of accidents. Hardly: . . . By whose figures and by what stretch of the imagination are we expected to believe this . . . We now have the prospect of paying more than cars for the right to use the roads. It appears that this State Government is attacking a group of road users, who have a high accident rate, rather than attacking the causes of this accident rate: the lack of training, and the lack of driver care and awareness of the motor cycle on the road. We are being asked to subsidise the car drivers who are killing us.

That quote puts the matter in a nutshell. The organisation has a properly constituted committee, headed by Mr. Bob Gaston, who is a well-respected member of the community and who is an excellent young married man with two children. I can but recommend this organisation as worthy and reasonable, comprising responsible people. If the Government sees fit, will it release the figures in this report to prove to these good people that the evidence is there that there was a need for the vast increase in third party insurance for motor cycles and there is a need for a possible increase if one is to come soon?

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I will take up where I left off in the last grievance debate because, as my time expired, the Minister interjected across the floor and asked whether the gentleman I was referring to on that occasion, Mr. Kingston-Lee, was dismissed. To clarify the situation, I think I should read this document, which is headed "Complaint". It is a statement signed by Mr. Kingston-Lee and Mr. Mazey the two people concerned. This document, prepared by the Minister's department, lists the complaints, and it was signed by those gentlemen in the presence of one of his officers. I think it fully clarifies the situation that the Minister was obviously trying to misrepresent. It states:

Complaint. Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act—section 157 (1) or section 15 (e).

Employer M. S. McLeod Pty. Ltd., Head Office Pulteney Street, Adelaide. Employees: (1) Robert Gordon Mazey, 2/607 Tapleys Hill Road, Fulham, S.A. (2) Melville John Kingston-Lee, 346 Glen Osmond Road, Myrtle Bank, S.A. Employed as transport drivers from premises of above employers situated at Beans Road, Thebarton, S.A. Employment was for local and suburban deliveries.

Complaint: R. G. Mazey commenced service in November, 1972, and M. J. Kingston-Lee in March, 1973. They have always been employed as drivers. On about November 26, 1975, Mr. Fisher, from Transport Workers Union, approached them, jointly, and questioned them about becoming members of the T.W.U. They both expressed disinclination to do so, on principle, as they were against joining any union. Mr. Mazey had been a member of the T.W.U. but had resigned through dissatisfaction. Mr. Fisher then said that their actions could cause industrial strife. Apparently, the union members had previously had meetings in the Trades Hall and elsewhere protesting against the employment of non-members by M. S. McLeod Pty. Ltd. The next day (27/11/75) the paymaster of M. S. McLeod Pty. Ltd., Mr. King, interviewed Mr. Mazey and Mr. Kingston-Lee and informed them that Mr. Fisher had seen him and told him that these two employees could no longer work there at that job as non-unionists without causing industrial strife.

He said that the company did not want to dismiss them and offered them alternative jobs, as machinists, which neither had had any experience of and which meant a decrease of approximately \$20 per week in wages. These were the only suitable jobs available, he said. Alternatively, if they did not wish to accept these jobs, they would have to hand in their resignations, as the company did not want and could not financially afford industrial strife. Apparently, the union had also threatened to black-ban the company in certain areas.

Resignation was supposed in the first instance to take effect from the end of the week; that is, November 28, 1975. The next day they saw their jobs advertised in the paper. Later that same day (November 28, 1975, the day they were supposed to terminate) the manager of the bulk store informed them that he had been instructed to tell them that they could remain on until January 9, 1976. During the week ending January 9, 1976, Mr. Kingston-Lee was told unofficially by this manager that at one stage the company had contemplated paying their union fees for them but in the end decided not to set such a precedent. On January 9, 1976, they were paid all money due and service was terminated. At no time did they initiate termination, and, in fact merely agreed with Mr. King that termination seemed inevitable, to avoid industrial strife. No written resignations by either employee were passed in to employer.

That is signed by M. J. Kingston-Lee and R. Mazey and is dated January 12, 1976. The signature of the gentleman who handed it to me checks with another signature of his that I have, and I am confident that that is a statement signed by that gentleman, because he handed it to me as a signed statement that he had made. Looking at it, we see that the handwriting in which the complaint has been taken down is different from the handwriting of either of the two people who appear to have signed the document.

The Minister implied that the gentleman may not have been sacked—in fact, that he was not sacked. I sought legal advice on this, which was that it obviously was a matter for the courts to decide. It is obvious from reading that statement that there is certain evidence suggesting at least a *prima facie* case that both were sacked for not joining the union, although some two months earlier they had been offered alternative work at the place as machinists; but that was six weeks before they were actually dismissed. That occurred in November and they were dismissed in January of the next year.

I believe that the Minister's own department obviously felt there was some chance of a legal case there because it advised Mr. Kingston-Lee in its letter of February 17, 1976, to go off and seek further advice from his own solicitor if he wished to take the matter further, which he did, and rightly so. Therefore, there is no doubt that there was a *prima facie* case that the gentleman was sacked, that he was sacked for not joining the union, and because there was a threat of industrial dispute. The point I was making on Tuesday in the debate was that there had been a threat of industrial dispute. There was no doubt that there had been. It is one of many cases that have been brought up.

I hope that has fully clarified the situation for the Minister of Labour and Industry, who raised the question earlier. He challenged my statement when I made it in the House on Tuesday. I have read all the correspondence in relation to his department; I have not hidden any of the facts, which stand as they are. There is no doubt that that gentleman should have sought legal advice within three weeks of being dismissed or at the point at which his employment was terminated and he was dismissed.

If he had sought advice, it would appear that he could have taken legal action but unfortunately, when he received this letter from the department, it was then too late, on the legal advice I have, to take any further legal action. Unfortunately, it points up again the adverse effects that the union threats are having upon the community. This is yet another case that has caused to those two individuals distress of the same kind as has been caused to other people. I hope that the Minister of Labour and Industry and the Cabinet will appreciate and realise that when they bow to union pressure on all occasions.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The Leader of the Opposition has stressed the importance of local government in South Australia, and unfortunately in recent years, under the Labor Government, local government has been downgraded in that it has lost much of the responsibility and authority that it used to have, especially in the field of planning. Under the Planning and Development Act in this State, the Government has largely removed that area of responsibility from local government. In Western Australia the Government has done precisely the opposite and has handed more and more responsibility to local government. It is essential that this be done here. The Leader made the point that local government was the sphere of government closest to the people. Consequently, in planning and

development we get a much greater influence from the people in a given area if local government has a greater say in planning.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's what will happen once they get the regulations.

Mr. ARNOLD: Until now, the opposite has happened. The powers of local government have been continually whittled away by the State Government in planning and development. The development plans produced in South Australia by the State Planning Authority show how little say councils have had in the destiny of their own areas.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're misrepresenting the position, aren't you? The plans were put on public display. For example, that happened in the Riverland.

Mr. ARNOLD: It was put on display so that local government could have its say, but that is all that has happened. That does not mean that anything will be altered. The plan will still go ahead. Local government in South Australia has virtually no say in planning and development.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not true. You are not telling the truth.

Mr. ARNOLD: The Minister is not correct. The plans would never have been presented in the form in which they have been if local government had had its say. The plans were prepared and then placed before local government, with the statement, "Here is a plan. Make your comments. The fact that we will take no notice of them has no point."

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not true. You're just making it up for political purposes.

Mr. ARNOLD: Local government will say whether I am doing that. In Western Australia local government and town planning are administered by one Minister, because the Government in that State recognises the need for local government to be totally involved with planning. Under broad guidelines set down by the Town Planning Department, local government in Western Australia carries out all plans. It employs the planners and engineers and the total planning is carried out by the council in each shire. In this way character is retained for each area. In South Australia, we will end up with stereotyped development.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not true.

Mr. ARNOLD: It is true.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It is not. You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. ARNOLD: When the plans have been prepared by one central authority, with little say being given to anyone in the area concerned, we must finish up with stereotyped planning for the State.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're not telling the truth.

Mr. ARNOLD: Let local government be the judge of that. If the Minister has not seen the resolution carried by the Riverland Local Government Association protesting at the attitude—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Most of that resolution was a complete misunderstanding.

Dr. Eastick: Who is making this speech?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He's making a horrible one.

Mr. ARNOLD: The Minister does not like what is being put forward. He is saying that the members of the Riverland Local Government Association are not capable of understanding what the Riverland development plan is all about, but that is not so. They are competent people and they recognised that the Government was not going to give local government any say regarding that area.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's a direct untruth, again.

Mr. ARNOLD: It is not. It is perfectly true.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: There is no Riverland—

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I draw attention to Standing Order 159, which states clearly that no member shall interrupt another member while that member is speaking, and the Minister has deliberately set out to waste the time of the member for Chaffey, who is making an excellent speech.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Chaffey.

Mr. ARNOLD: The Planning and Development Act in South Australia and the role of local government in determining its own destiny in planning are vital issues. The Government's philosophy is to centralise all power in one place. If the Minister cannot centralise it in Canberra, he wants to centralise the total development of South Australia in Adelaide, instead of having development carried out in regional areas. I suggest that the Minister obtain a copy of the minutes of the Riverland Local Government Association for the meeting at which it adopted that resolution.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They sent it to me. Have you seen my reply?

Mr. ARNOLD: Obviously, the Minister did not understand what the resolution was about. This Government is denying the people in that area the right to have any say.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's a lie. It is not true.

Mr. ARNOLD: The sooner what the Government is doing is changed, the better. The approach adopted in Western Australia should be adopted here.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Here we call it a plan. In Western Australia, they refer to guidelines.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister can have the opportunity to reply if he so desires.

Mr. ARNOLD: It is interesting to note that under the Western Australian scheme they are able to provide approximately double the number of housing allotments that we are able to provide in South Australia under our esteemed Minister. So, something is radically wrong, and it is about time that the Minister went to Western Australia and learnt something about planning and development, in order to provide sufficient housing blocks in South Australia and also to give local government in this State a fair go.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I want briefly to make one or two comments about a subject that has caused me much concern over the past few years. I refer to the increasing costs that this Government is inflicting on those sections of industry that are not in a position to pass them on to the consumer. Most of the people who are affected by the processes of this Government are rural producers who cannot pass on the charges and costs that the Government levies upon them, as well as the increased costs that have resulted from legislation passed in this Parliament.

In order to explain the situation, I shall give certain figures. The disturbing aspect of this matter is that massive cost increases are affecting the rural work force, thereby making it essential for many people to leave the country to seek employment. The charges imposed on farmers is making it impossible for them to employ people. In 1971, only 113 000 people were employed on farms, compared with 168 000 people in 1954. As a percentage of that total work force, employment fell from 15 per cent to 8 per cent. By 1975, this figure had fallen to 6.2 per cent. Including farmers, the number working on farms fell from 430 000 in 1954 to 298 000 in 1971. The most significant factor that we ought to consider is the real income of the farm worker, which fell from

\$3 000 in 1954 to \$2 800 in 1966-67. The income of the families of city workers, over the same period, increased by an average 2 per cent to 3 per cent a year.

This decline in the farm workers' position took place despite a doubling of production an acre over the last two decades. This was possible because of greatly increased use of machinery and fertilisers and better farming methods. Over the last 20 or so years, farmers' costs have risen steeply by 123 per cent, but prices although varying year by year remained fairly static from 1950 to 1970. Since then, average prices received by farmers have risen by 40 per cent. We all know what has happened to the cost of superphosphate, to quote yet another example. The charges that are causing concern include land tax, which, if it is not abolished, will destroy certain farms. Currently in South Australia 4 000 people are paying rural land tax, and hundreds are being drastically affected. Unless something is done about this tax, a certain number of people will be forced off their farms each year. If the Government does not do anything about this, one can only conclude that it wants systematically to eliminate a certain number of people each year.

The next problem is that caused by the ravages of succession duties. While I was in Victoria recently, that State's Minister of Agriculture said (and what he said was correct) that many of the problems in agriculture today could be traced back directly to the difficulty caused by heavy State succession duties and Federal estate duties. I am pleased to say that that Government is to take proper action to alleviate this difficulty, as will the Liberal Government, on election, in this State.

Another problem facing producers is the high cost of workmen's compensation premiums, which is the direct result of actions taken by this Government. It has failed to recognise the problem, and has done nothing about it. It was interesting to read in today's press that the New South Wales Government intends to reduce workmen's compensation premiums. Part of that report was as follows:

Cuts of about 20 per cent in workers' compensation insurance premiums were announced yesterday by the New South Wales Government.

They estimate that this will save employers about \$80 000 000. I should be pleased if this Government would take similar action and pass legislation that would enable insurance companies in this State to reduce premiums by 20 per cent. I hope that when Parliament resumes in July, when the Budget is debated, the Government will have realised that something must be done in these fields, and that it will take positive action in this regard. If it does not do so, it will systematically each year remove from the rural scene a large number of rural producers.

Land tax, succession duties and the other charges which farmers must pay and which have been increased by inflation (a direct result of the incompetent Government in Canberra, *alias* the State Treasury), coupled with increased costs that farmers have had to try to absorb, will systematically eliminate a certain number of these people from the industry each year. If we are not careful we will have not agriculturists but peasants. I believe that is what the Labor Party may have in mind. It may want a socialist economic system created. Then, we will be the importer, not the exporter, of our agricultural necessities. That is what will happen if this Government does not take positive action.

It is enlightening to have a Federal Government in Canberra that is sympathetic to the needs of these people. However, it is disappointing to have in this State a Government, and particularly a Minister of Agriculture, who can be described only as a left-wing academic, who has no real understanding of agriculture. He professes to be a practical farmer, but he is about as practical as the member for Stuart. He has no knowledge of or concern for the industry.

Mr. Keneally: He knows more about farming than anyone on your side of the House.

Mr. GUNN: He may have studied at Reading University but I would like to have a look at his own enterprise. The Minister proposes as a solution that we set up collective farms. That was his answer. We know how successful collective farming is. He wants systematically to herd the people on to collective farms. It is obvious that he has not thought about the matter a great deal. When he writes letters to members saying that, as a woolgrower, he is concerned about the industry, he is being nothing more than a hypocrite, and his actions over the past few months have proved that he has no regard for the welfare of agriculture. The sooner the Government gets rid of him, the better. I know that it will find it difficult to replace him, because the Government has no-one who understands. His predecessor could not be described as a brilliant Minister, but he was cunning enough not to say much.

Over the past few months, we have seen some deplorable demonstrations against the Governor-General. I was privileged to receive an invitation to attend the opening of the Torrens College of Advanced Education, at which a large group of louts, which I was told comprised members of the Builders Labourers Federation (they are known communists), were protesting. They set out to disrupt the proceedings. They showed a complete disregard for the taxpayers who provided those excellent facilities, and insulted Her Majesty's representative. I have been told since that time that the Premier has caused an inquiry to be instituted into the manner in which the police acted on that occasion. I should like to know on whose request that inquiry was instituted, whether it has been carried out, and whether the Premier will table the reasons for ordering the inquiry and the documents in relation to the matter.

As far as I am concerned the police acted most commendably. People at that occasion set out deliberately to provoke the police and to try to intimidate them. It was obvious that the people instigating the protest and the disruption were unwilling to be at the front of the crowd but instead used megaphones at the back of the crowd to egg people on. I was told by a friend of mine that many of the people concerned were well known to the police, as well-known communists, members of a communist organisation, the Builders Labourers Federation.

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

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The theme I was pursuing during the earlier grievance debate related to unions in Great Britain. I shall continue to quote this commentary on the position in England, as follows:

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

have exhausted or beaten down any opposition and have finally succeeded in making themselves the arbiters of the British economy.

Huge unions, each pursuing wage claims at any cost, have successively smashed other elements in the state—governments, political parties, private industry, nationalised boards—and now find themselves amid the wreckage of a deserted battlefield, the undoubted victors. They did not plan the victory. They do not know what to do with it now they have got it. Dazed and bewildered, they are like medieval peasants, who have burnt down the lord's manor.

That is an apt description of what has transpired in Great Britain, where the economy is in a tatters and the Government cannot govern without the sanction or approval of the trade union movement. The situation has come about largely because of excesses of the left wing militant union leaders. Speaking personally, my argument is with left wing militants and the communists who control influential sections of the trade union movement. I have no argument with right wing or moderate unionists. Such people sit in this place. The motives of the other kind of unionist are certainly not in the interests of the people they represent, the country or the State.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What are the communist-controlled unions in South Australia?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I was referring earlier to a demarcation dispute that occurred in the building industry, and referred to Clancy and Gallagher.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Tell us about South Australian communists.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Government members are probably more able to identify the communist element in unions in South Australia; I have no doubt it exists. Some union leaders speak with moderation and, I believe, have some appeal to the public of this country.

Mr. Keneally: Who are they?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Egerton in Queensland seems to talk a bit of sense. I do not know whether he is classified as a moderate or a right wing unionist. My knowledge of the union movement comes largely from reading the daily press.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The majority of people in Australia would gain their impressions of the unions from the same source. Fellows like Gallagher, Halfpenny and Carmichael, and people in South Australia Apap and Scott—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: They're not communists.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not say they were. I am saying that they are left wing militants who give unions a bad name. People such as Gnatenko and other people are referred to (not by me necessarily) by the general public as imported stirring foreigners.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am pleased that what I am saying is generating some interest at this hour of the morning. I am repeating a common view.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What the newspapers have told you to say.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Nonsense; it is a common view expressed by the public. Time precludes further comment. I want to refer to the South Australian Government's attitude and the gross discourtesy it showed to Sir John Kerr in South Australia. What this Government is doing is insulting the Queen. In today's *Advertiser* is a report of the sort of thing Labor Party rabble rousers are willing to do to insult the Queen's representative in this country. The report states:

Labor supporters and Socialist students, armed with banners and wearing top hats, began gathering outside the society's Queens Road headquarters about 6 p.m. The banners read "Toss toff Kerr" and "Deflowerer of Democracy".

The report then talks about the way in which these people smashed a window in the Governor-General's car, injured his private secretary (Mr. Smith) and so on. The Queen thought so much of Sir John that she raised the status of his knighthood.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: However, as I pointed out, the Labor movement in Queensland seems to be more moderate. An encouraging footnote to the report I have quoted states:

The Leader of the Labor Opposition (Mr. Burns) said the Opposition would not boycott any function attended by Sir John.

That bears out my point that there are trade union officials and there are trade union officials, and that there are Labor leaders and there are Labor leaders; they are not all bad. They do not all act in the worst interests of this country. Some of them are well motivated and act responsibly. Not all of them are poorly motivated: only most of them.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I am invited to participate in this grievance debate (for a short period) only because of the intolerant and intemperate attitude this evening of the Leader of the House, the Deputy Premier. I questioned him in a responsible and reasonable manner regarding matters before the House. Perhaps he was hurt by references to that myth surrounding the Labor Party relating to the delivery of Bolivar water to the people in the Virginia area. Perhaps he just wanted to vent his spleen or was having trouble with his liver; it might be a combination of all three factors. In any case, I hope that the Deputy Leader's irresponsible attitude, which was reflected by his comments, will be regretted when he has had time to reflect on his comments, and I hope that his verbal indiscretions uttered this evening will not be those which will be reflected against Opposition members in the future. On an earlier occasion I was attacked in a similar manner by several members opposite who doubted the veracity of statements I was making.

I refer members to page 813 onwards of *Hansard* of September 10, 1974, and to the further information that is available at page 873 of *Hansard* of September 11, 1974. I further refer honourable members opposite, if they want to check the veracity of my statements on that occasion, to volume 4 of the Parliamentary Papers for 1974-75, especially Parliamentary Paper 166, being the report of a Royal Commission. I had asked questions in a responsible manner on behalf of the people I represent in this House and I expected a reasonable approach and a reasonable reply—not a reflection on my integrity or on my physical form. As I stated earlier, I trust that when the Deputy Premier has reflected on his indiscretion he will think better of it and regret the action he took.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I have been asked by constituents of my district to talk on a couple of issues, although I deplore having to do so at about 3 a.m. (I would be much happier if the Government would accept a sitting of a few more days, as it would have been easier to speak on this matter next week.) The first point I wish to make is to support the Opposition shadow Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries in what he has said concerning abalone divers. Last September we led a deputation, which included Rodney Fox, whom most people consider to be

a responsible member of the community. We spoke with the Minister concerning the plight of abalone fishermen.

Since that time these fishermen have been told that they have to catch a minimum of 3 000 kilograms of abalone a year or their licences may have to be cancelled. At the same time these abalone fishermen were given a medical examination to protect them. The examination involved the taking of eight to 12 X-rays for each of the first two years, and then for each second year thereafter. The purpose of these examinations is to detect whether the fishermen are suffering from bone necrosis. If they do have bone necrosis the fishermen have to quit their profession, but they can obtain no compensation, as their licences are not for sale.

More than that, the shallow waters are fished out and, in order to catch the stipulated amount of abalone, the fishermen are forced to dive in deeper waters where there is a greater risk that they will suffer from the bends or bone necrosis. Abalone fishermen cannot safely dive for longer than one hour. After that period they have to come to the surface and spend an hour along with their relief diver, who cannot dive because he is not licensed. Therefore, both the divers have to sit in the open boat while the licensed diver rests and can then dive again after an hour. This pattern continues hour after hour. This system lengthens the time that the fishermen have to spend working, and it increases the chance that a diver will spend more than one hour under water, thereby increasing the risk of becoming sick. If that situation obtains, the diver has to quit the industry but his licence is not saleable: he just forfeits everything.

The Minister said that he would consider the fishermen's plight but, having considered it, he has seen fit to grant another 10 fishing permits, not to relief divers but to new divers entering the industry. New boats and fresh divers will enter the industry, but the original problems are in no way reduced. The original problems exist as they previously existed. So much for the Minister's consideration.

The next matter to which I refer and which has been dealt with at considerable length already concerns an interjection which I made to the Treasurer yesterday concerning men being fearful of telephoning the Labor Party about compulsory unionism. The Treasurer tended to scoff and scorn about my remark. He said that the media monitor had not detected anything like that. However, I say, "Blow the media monitor." If the Treasurer is that sure that the media monitor is in control of everything that happens in South Australia, I believe that Big Brother has come a little sooner than 1984.

Perhaps that is right, because a few nights ago the Treasurer said something about the Leader of the Opposition not having publicised a certain comment that he made but that, "We have it on tape". Perhaps everything we say is being recorded. In any case, my office has been receiving telephone calls from men, some of whom prefer to remain anonymous simply because they do not want anyone to know that they are inquiring. The call that I receive is repeatedly—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: How many men have approached you?

Mr. ALLISON: I have had six so far. Four men were not willing to give their names and two gave their names. The Australian Timber Workers Union secretary in the South-East, whom I am sure all honourable members opposite know, has already been made aware of the two men who gave their names.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: He's a very fine fellow.

Mr. ALLISON: Yes, he fines everyone apparently if they do not join the union. The man who came in to see

me last week said that his comrades had been picked off one by one until he was the last man in his industry who was willing to stand out.

Mr. Keneally: His comrades.

Mr. ALLISON: This man was an ex-Croatian who fought against communism. He did not want to be compelled to join a union. What is wrong with that attitude? He is a human being. He said he was against the inflationary trend in the trade union, whose fees had increased from \$20 to \$30 overnight, and that rate of increase was in excess of the rate of inflation for the year. I was interested in the Minister's comment that, if the Opposition had its way and stopped compulsory unionism, it would wreck the union system. The Minister then quoted West Germany as a model. It is interesting that a press attache of the West German Embassy was recently in South Australia and said that in West Germany only 30 per cent of all workers were members of a trade union. Despite that, the Minister refers to West Germany as a model.

West Germany is the home of Karl Marx, socialism, worker participation, and democratic socialism, yet only 30 per cent of its workers are union members, and still the Minister refers to West Germany as a model. Perhaps West Germany can give a lesson even South Australia can learn from.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I didn't say that.

Mr. ALLISON: The Minister quoted West Germany as a model this afternoon. Certainly if we had that system applying in South Australia we would be much better off, and I am inclined to agree with him.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you believe you would be better off?

Mr. ALLISON: This is one of the rare occasions that I agree with the Minister. The West Germans say they abhor compulsory unionism because they have the Iron Curtain alongside them. They say that is sufficient deterrent in itself for unionists who want to play up in West Germany. One man in Mount Gambier is being summoned for non-payment of union fees, so perhaps there is a shortage of funds. I told the men who came to complain about compulsory unionism that it was, first, a matter of conscience and, secondly, they should consider the wellbeing of their fellow workers and the potential for disruption in industry and commerce. Having weighed that up, they should remember that the Deputy Premier last year said there was no such thing as compulsory unionism, and this was supported by the court decision in the case of Werner Lachs, although he did not take up the offer of reinstatement. He was also

supported at the Federal level. I left it up to the man, and offered to give a statement that I would support him if it came to the crunch. I do not take an irresponsible action such as I suspect the State Government might take. Even though the members opposite are professing that there is no such thing as compulsory unionism, they are condoning what is happening throughout the State. People are complaining because they object to having to subscribe compulsorily to the Labor Party if they are unionists who do not vote for the A.L.P. Most are quite willing to subscribe to an active union, and one of the complaints I hear is that the union representative comes around only at election time or when he wants something. They do not see him often enough to find out what they need for the rest of the time. They resent the number of unions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ALLISON: They resent the multiplicity of unions because they believe the unions lobby more against themselves in escalating wages than against the Government. They believe there is far too much expensive litigation. I enjoyed being in my union because it was too busy running itself to bother about running the country. It was a damned good union. I was a member of the Institute of Teachers because I wanted to be, not because I was forced to be.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You are a union basher.

Mr. ALLISON: Never. People object to the sort of arrogance which comes from that side of the House and which sometimes comes out in union officials. That sort of arrogance can also come from employers.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Premier has been in this House long enough to know that he cannot repeatedly use the word "you" across the Chamber in the way he was doing.

The SPEAKER: Order! The point should have been taken at the time of the offence.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, I have taken it at the time of the offence. He used it in the last 10 or 15 seconds of the address, and I stood up to take the point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.6 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, June 10, at 2 p.m.