

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 17, 1976

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will be prepared to receive honourable members for the presentation of the Address in Reply at 2.10 p.m. today. I ask the mover and seconder, and such other members as desire to do so, to accompany me to Government House.

At 2.2 p.m. the Speaker and members proceeded to Government House. They returned at 2.17 p.m.

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's Opening Speech and other honourable members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address adopted by this House on August 11, to which His Excellency has been pleased to make the following reply:

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which I opened the second session of the Forty-second Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you.

I thank you for your personal message to me. It has been my privilege to be the representative of the Queen in South Australia. I have endeavoured at all times to serve the State to the best of my ability and have derived much reassurance from the support given to me by the members of the House of Assembly. It is my earnest hope that my successor will receive the same support. I wish you all collectively, as the representatives of the citizens of this State, and individually, my very best wishes for your happiness and fulfilment. I pray for God's blessing upon all your deliberations.

DEATH OF MR. H. H. SHANNON, C.M.G.

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

That this House express its deep regret on the recent death of Mr. H. H. Shannon, C.M.G., former member of this House for Murray from 1933 to 1938, for Onkaparinga from 1938 to 1968, Government Whip from 1938 to 1941, member of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works from 1941 to 1968 and its Chairman from 1954 to 1968, and place on record its appreciation for his long and meritorious service to the State and, as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Many members of this House will recall the service of Mr. Shannon to the people of South Australia. He was an eloquent member of this House, always a doughty adversary, with a sharp tongue and a quick wit, but he gave long service to the people of his district and to the people of South Australia.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. Howard Huntley Shannon was born in 1892, and grew up in a political family; his father was a Senator. Mr. Shannon entered Parliament in 1933, with two very worthy colleagues, Sir Thomas Playford and Mr. G. C. Morphet, in the days when Murray was a three-man district. Sir Thomas Playford, even now, tells stories of the campaign episodes that he took part in with "Shan", and was obviously full of affection for a

colleague who served with him during much of the time that he was in office.

Mr. Shannon took the new seat of Onkaparinga in 1938 and, as the Premier has said, gave distinguished service as Government Whip and then as a member of the Public Works Standing Committee from 1941, and as Chairman of that committee from 1954 until 1967. Also, he made a great contribution to this State through his concern for agricultural affairs and his long association with the board of what is now Southern Farmers Co-operative Limited for which he was honoured by the award of a C.M.G. for services to the State in 1960.

"Shan", as he was affectionately called, left this House before my entry into it and I did not know him well, but I knew him well by repute. He was a diligent and concerned member of Parliament, and his love for his district, the Hills district, was known to everyone. He was once quoted as saying, "I am a confirmed hill-billy", and he worked faithfully and well for the people of the Hills. On behalf of the Opposition I offer members of his family our sincere sympathy, and know that they will take great comfort in knowing that Howard Huntley Shannon's memory will live on in all that he achieved for Onkaparinga and South Australia.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I add my brief comments to the motion, which I regret has had to be moved. I knew "Shan", as most of us knew him, for some years. I believe his great contribution to the Parliament, apart from his expertise as a Whip, long before I came into this place (and before anybody else came into this place, for that matter), was as Chairman of the Public Works Standing Committee, which was one of his loves. He was often chided for using the phrase "my committee". I think it is indicative of the work of the late Mr. Shannon that the Public Works Standing Committee did such excellent work during those years. He helped to raise the standard of that committee (which is a most important one) to the standard that it now enjoys. I hope that members of that committee and of this House can follow the example set by the late Mr. Shannon in the work that he did for that committee, not only for the Parliament, but also for the workings of the legislature. I believe we all owe him a debt, and South Australia is the poorer for the passing of such a fine Parliamentarian.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 2.25 to 2.34 p.m.]

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

The SPEAKER: I notice in the gallery His Excellency Datuk Syed Ahmad, D.S.M.W., S.M.N., J.M.N., J.P., M.P., Chief Minister of Kedah, in the Federation of Malaysia. Knowing that it is the unanimous wish of members that I do so, I invite the honourable gentleman to take a seat on the floor of the House, and I ask the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to escort the honourable gentleman to the Chair and introduce him.

His Excellency was escorted by the Hon. D. A. Dunstan and Dr. Tonkin to a seat on the floor of the House.

PETITION: AGE OF CONSENT

Mr. RODDA presented a petition signed by 84 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would retain the present age of consent.

Petition received.

PETITION: UNLEY TRAFFIC

Mr. LANGLEY presented a petition signed by 512 residents and persons using Wattle Street, Unley, praying that the House take appropriate action to ensure that the Traffic Prohibition (Unley) Regulations made under the Road Traffic Act be not amended so as to provide for the reopening of Wattle and Duthy Streets, Unley.

Petition received.

PETITION: SEXUAL OFFENCES

Mr. Langley, for the Hon. E. CONNELLY, presented a petition signed by 47 citizens of Port Pirie, praying that the House would reject or amend any legislation to abolish the crime of incest or to lower the age of consent in respect of sexual offences.

Petition received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Dr. TONKIN presented a petition signed by 83 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that the present discriminatory position of blood relations be improved and that blood relationships sharing a family property should enjoy at least the same benefits as those available to *de facto* relationships.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (July 28).

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

Officers on contract: Dr. McPhail, Minister of Local Government; J. Mant, Minister for Planning; A. W. Richardson, Minister for Planning; P. Bentley, Premier; W. L. C. Davies, Premier; D. McCulloch, Premier; and H. H. Salisbury, Chief Secretary (this is a type of contract specially made for the present Commissioner).

Officers who were on contract: Dr. D. Scrafton, Minister of Transport (converted to public servant); N. Currie, Premier; L. J. Prowse, Premier; and R. C. Taylor, Monarto Development.

Terminated contracts: N. Currie, and R. C. Taylor.

NARACOOORTE MEATWORKS

In reply to Mr. RODDA (July 29).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The future of the Naracoorte abattoirs is a matter which must be decided by the managements of the companies which own the works and whether or not the abattoirs are reopened will no doubt depend on decisions taken by the management in the light of economic prospects. S.E. Meat (Aust.) Ltd., the operating company, has applied for, and has been

granted, a renewal of its Ministerial permit to bring meat into the metropolitan abattoirs area for the current year ending on December 19, 1976.

PORT LINCOLN ABATTOIRS

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (July 29):

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A scheme to pay producers 40 cents a head for drought affected sheep has been extended to the Port Lincoln abattoirs. The arrangements will be similar to the scheme announced recently by S.A. Meat Corporation and will apply for this month. The 40 cents a head will be paid to producers on the Eyre Peninsula who were too far from the Samcor abattoir at Gepps Cross, subject to the following conditions: that the sheep be bare shorn; that they have a minimum weight of 18 kilograms; that they be delivered to the Port Lincoln abattoirs; that delivery be properly regulated by producer organisations to ensure consistent same day kill; and that no dead or diseased stock be accepted. Sheep delivered at lighter weights than the 18 kg will be disposed of by the Port Lincoln abattoirs at no value to the producers.

DROUGHT RELIEF

In reply to Mr. MILLHOUSE (August 4):

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: When the areas affected by drought were designated on July 22, it was not intended that there would be clear cut-off lines for assistance to drought affected farmers. Applications will be accepted by the Lands Department for subsidies of transport of stock and fodder, as previously announced, from any person in an area physically affected by drought.

MODBURY HEIGHTS SCHOOL

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (August 5).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The school will be ready for occupation by the beginning of the 1977 school year. The physical education, drama, art and craft building, administration, resource area, humanities, commerce, science and year 8 and 9 teaching blocks should all be completed by December 5, 1976. Plans for the housing of Pedare Primary School students in the Modbury Heights High School buildings are under consideration, but no definite plans have been formulated at the present time. No difficulties in housing these students are anticipated. Four buses will be provided to transport students in the zoned areas east of the Modbury Heights High School. These buses will serve the Fairview Park, Surrey Downs and Redwood Park areas and will be provided at departmental expense.

SPORTS FUNDS

In reply to Mr. LANGLEY (July 29).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Funds approved by the Federal Government for capital assistance grants towards sports and recreation facilities in South Australia are as follows: 1973-74, \$631 500; 1974-75, \$798 692 plus an amount of \$3 196 000 committed for the Parks Community Centre. Funds to the extent of \$630 642 were committed by the Federal Labor Government during 1975-76 for expenditure in 1976-77. This amount was subsequently

ratified by the present Federal Government. No further commitment has been made for capital assistance for sport and recreation facilities for 1976-77. In 1974-75, the Federal Labor Government approved grants totalling \$1 376 464 towards the sports assistance programme, which includes fares for athletes and delegates to national and international events, administration expenses, coaching expenses, etc. These grants were made to national sporting associations for distribution to the State associations. A total of about \$275 000 from that amount was received by the various South Australian sporting organisations. The present Commonwealth Government has cut all assistance to national and international events except for the Olympic grant of \$250 000.

SPORTS MEDICINE CLINIC

In reply to Mr. LANGLEY (August 11):

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The South Australian Government, through the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department, has made available a sum of \$5 000 to assist the Australian Sports Medicine Federation (S.A.) in its endeavour to provide a specialised treatment facility for soft tissue injuries, which is to be known as the Sports Medicine Clinic. The Department is also arranging for suitable accommodation for the clinic in the former premises of the National Fitness Council of South Australia at 70 South Terrace, Adelaide. It is expected that renovations and alterations to these premises will be completed by November to provide for the opening of the clinic during that month. The clinic will provide treatment for sportsmen and women of all ages, at all levels of sport. It is proposed that injured participants in sport will be examined between the hours of 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. on Sundays and that treatment will be provided from Mondays through to Thursdays. The major advantages of a specialised clinic of this type include: an ideal environment for rehabilitative treatment and quick recovery; the development of medical expertise in the treatment of sports injuries; and the education of the community in the proper treatment of sports injuries. The clinic will represent a significant step by the Government in its aims for the development of sport in South Australia.

HILLS QUARRYING

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Did the Environmental Protection Council seek from organisations and individuals their views on quarrying in the hills face zone, requesting that those views be given on or before October 31, 1973, and if so:

- (a) did it ever receive any such views;
- (b) how many;
- (c) to what effect were they;
- (d) what action, if any, was taken as a result; and
- (e) what further action, if any, is proposed?

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

- (a) The Environmental Protection Council sought the views of organisations, including Public Service departments, industry and the public by advertising in the press, by direct approach and through announcements made by the media, as part of its inquiry into quarrying in the hills face zone.
- (b) A total of 55 formal submissions was finally received, of which 25 came from individuals, 17 from associations and Government agencies, and

13 from commercial operators within the quarrying industry.

- (c) The submissions received from members of the public, and from non-Public Service organisations, including industry, fell into two broad categories: submissions concerned almost wholly with noise and other problems arising from motor vehicles and trucks, which formed the majority of those received from members of the public; and submissions, in the form of large and detailed reports, on quarrying operations and the economic and social values of the resource under exploitation, which were received almost solely from quarry companies.
- (d) The Environment Department initially attempted to handle these submissions, on behalf of the council, but it later became clear that it would be unable to do so sufficiently quickly in view of the other work of an even more urgent and immediate nature it had to undertake. Consequently a specialist officer was specifically employed by the department to examine, analyse and summarise the submissions. During this examination further discussions were held with the quarrying industry and with individuals who had shown particular concern and expertise about the subject under consideration. As a result of this study, a working paper was completed summarising the submissions and the discussions held.
- (e) An officer of the Environment Department has subsequently been employed full-time in preparing, on the basis of that working paper, a draft final report for presentation to and consideration by the Environmental Protection Council. It is intended that that report shall be completed and presented to the council within the next two months, at the latest.

OVERLAND EXPRESS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What have been the financial results of the refreshment services on the Overland train in each of the last 12 months, respectively?
2. Is it proposed to continue these services and, if so, what alterations, if any, are to be made to them?

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

1.

CLUB CAR	NET LOSSES		
	VICTORIA	S.A.	TOTAL
	\$	\$	\$
July	7 061	4 815	11 876
August	6 616	4 511	11 127
September	6 233	4 250	10 483
October	6 326	4 313	10 639
November	6 539	4 459	10 998
December	7 001	4 774	11 775
January	6 163	4 202	10 365
February	6 769	4 615	11 384
March	8 050	5 489	13 539
April	8 556	5 834	14 390
May	9 448	6 442	15 890
June	8 622	5 878	14 500
	<u>\$87 384</u>	<u>\$59 582</u>	<u>\$146 966</u>

BUFFET CAR	VICTORIA \$	S.A. \$	TOTAL \$
July	4 943	3 370	8 313
August	3 873	2 640	6 513
September	4 208	2 869	7 077
October	4 602	3 137	7 739
November	4 684	3 193	7 877
December	4 985	3 398	8 383
January	3 295	2 246	5 541
February	4 929	3 360	8 289
March	7 190	4 902	12 092
April	6 460	4 404	10 864
May	6 165	4 204	10 369
June	6 137	4 185	10 322
	<hr/> \$61 471	<hr/> \$41 908	<hr/> \$103 379

2. It is intended to continue the service. Arrangements have been made to reduce the club car staff in South Australia by one stewardess during off-peak periods, and the Victorian Railways has also been approached to make a similar reduction in that State.

HILLS FARMLETS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has a report been received by the Minister of Agriculture to the effect that owners of farmlets and small holdings in the Adelaide Hills should be encouraged to stay and, if so:

- when was it received;
- from whom;
- is the report publicly available; and
- how is it available?

2. Had the Minister previously received a report to the effect that hobby farmers were mismanaging the land in the Adelaide Hills and creating weed and bush fire problems?

3. What action, if any, does the Government intend to take as a result of these reports, and when will this action be taken?

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

1. No. A survey has been conducted, however, which was completed in November, 1974. The document is now out of print.

2. No; but subsequently a discussion paper by Ian Lewis, horticultural adviser in the Adelaide Hills, entitled "Rural-Urban Land Use Conflict in the Adelaide Hills" was released.

3. Both documents were intended to help foster discussion on the subject of land use, and no action on the papers is contemplated.

MONARTO

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What work, if any, is at present being done by the Monarto Development Commission on the Monarto project, and at what cost?

2. What other work is the commission doing, for whom is this work being done, and at what remuneration?

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

1. The commission is currently engaged in the following tasks:

Site management including leasing of housing and land, weed and vermin control, road maintenance, fire prevention, and general local government activities. Planting of trees.

Finalisation of the land acquisition programme.

Policy investigations in the fields of marketing, land tenure, industrial and commercial development, planning control, economic and financial planning, private urban funding, development of community and recreational facilities.

Completion of Phase II of environmental impact statement.

Preparation of:

plans and designs for arterial roads, water supply and sewerage systems to serve the initial development areas;

detailed designs for initial residential areas; parks plans associated with the first residential areas;

plans and layouts for the first stage of the city centre and the initial industrial area;

assessment of housing requirements, and development of designs suited to the Monarto environment.

Construction of an irrigation experimental station to investigate the effect of watering on local soils and determine range of trees, shrubs, and ground cover, suitable for growing at Monarto.

The approved estimates for 1976-77 total \$3 391 000, and are made up as follows:

	\$
Administration	1 871 000
Development—	
Investigation	458 000
Design	740 000
Construction	518 000
Maintenance	300 000
	<hr/> 3 887 000
Income	496 000
	<hr/> 3 391 000

2. Work being carried out under the Monarto (Additional Powers) Act:

For the Port Adelaide Centre Joint Committee of the South Australian State Planning Authority:

Preparation of a redevelopment scheme for the District Business Zone in the centre of the Port Adelaide Local Government Area under Section 63A of The Planning and Development Act. Stage 1, involving the preparation of alternative strategies, has been completed and endorsed by the Committee as the basis for ongoing work—cost \$27 500.

Stage II, involving the refining of a preferred plan and ongoing management techniques has been commenced and will be completed in December, 1976. In addition to technical planning work, the Commission has advised the Joint Committee on, and carried out under their direction, a large segment of the associated public participation programme—estimated cost \$60 000.

For the South Australian Government:

A study of portion of the Adelaide Hills to be undertaken in two stages. Stage I will investigate appropriate policies, development control mechanisms and management systems, to ensure that the Government's declared policies for the conservation of the Hills are implemented. This

stage has commenced. In accordance with Governmental instructions, liaison is being established with Hills communities through their local government bodies and citizens associations. In addition, Government agencies responsible for planning, development, and conservation in the Hills area are being consulted.

Stage II will investigate specific geographic areas identified as having particular problems and such functional matters as the maintenance of visual amenity along the South-Eastern Freeway corridor. The identification of areas suitable for rural living subdivisions, and the maintenance of viable agricultural activities in the Hills, estimated cost \$170 000 over a period of about 18 months.

The Monarto Development Commission is negotiating with several Government authorities in relation to various proposals.

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. When does the Government intend transferring the Agriculture and Fisheries Department to Monarto?
2. What staff of this department will remain in Adelaide?
3. What benefits will flow to the staff who are moved to Monarto?
4. What action will be taken against any member of the department who refuses to move to Monarto?

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

1. No decision as to date can be made until a decision to commence major construction work at Monarto has been taken.

2, 3, and 4. Final decisions on these matters will then be taken after the decision in 1.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What has been the cost in each of the last five years, respectively, of the renovations of Parliament House?
2. What work has been done in each of these years?
3. Is any further renovation to be done and, if so:
 - (a) what is it;
 - (b) when will it be done; and
 - (c) at what estimated cost?

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

1.	\$
1971-72	41 438
1972-73	87 640
1973-74	1 015 919
1974-75	2 036 735
1975-76	623 651

2. 1971-72:

Additional lighting to the Legislative Council and Parliamentary Library.

Interim air-conditioning throughout Parliament House using room air conditioners. All top floor ceilings were lagged.

Improvements to Premier's suite, additional room for reception staff, Sergeant at Arms room, room for Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Feasibility study for Phase I renovations.

1972-73:

Accommodation for additional members in the basement and on the second floor.

Design for Phase I renovations.

1973-74:

Design and Supervision for Phase I renovations.

New plant room above billiard and conference rooms.

Second floor members' rooms.

New stranger's lift.

Duplicating room under portico.

New western service courtyard.

1974-75:

Design and supervision Phase 1 renovations.

Upgrading toilets.

Replacement of electrical services.

New air-conditioning to all habitable spaces.

Repainting and decorating.

Reglazing of north windows.

Additional female toilets.

Additional lean-to accommodation in light courts for Parliamentary Counsel, Government Whip and Cook.

Reporters' rooms north of Legislative Council Chamber.

Special carpets to ground floor executive corridors.

Extension to dining room servery.

Improvements to Premier's suite and Deputy Premier's room.

1975-76:

Installation of fire detectors.

New lift (members) and tunnel.

Male stranger toilet.

Library book lift and gallery office.

Acoustic improvements to party rooms.

Improved accommodation for Leader of Opposition, House of Assembly.

Hansard sound equipment cubicle and equipment.

Security lighting to western courtyard.

Public Accounts Committee accommodation.

Improvements to P.A.B.X. equipment room.

Upgrading Hansard scullery.

Reroofing some sections.

Redecoration of Legislative Council Chamber.

Staff amenities, drivers and messengers.

3. Yes.

(a) Additional works that have since been requested have been grouped together to form Phase II of Parliament House renovations. They include:—

1. Improvements to catering services.
2. Improvements to Library services.
3. Additional engineering services.
4. Integrated landscaping.
5. Replacement of obsolete furniture.
6. Renovating valuable antique furniture.
7. Redecorating in special areas.

(b) This project is currently under consideration by the Public Works Standing Committee. A commencement date has not yet been decided.

(c) The estimated cost, based on April, 1976, prices, is \$1 750 000.

MINISTERIAL CARS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many motor cars have there been in the Ministerial car pool of the Government Motor Garage in each of the last six years, respectively?

2. Who is now entitled to the use of these motor cars and upon what conditions is each such person so entitled?

3. What has been the cost of maintaining and running these motor cars in each of the last six years, respectively?

4. What makes and models of motor cars are now in this pool?

5. Has consideration been given to the use of smaller motor cars and, if so, is this to be done and, if not, why not?

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

1. 1970-71, 20; 1971-72, 20; 1972-73, 20; 1973-74 and 1974-75, 22; 1975-76, 24.

2. Cabinet Ministers; President, Legislative Council; Speaker; Leader of Opposition; Deputy Speaker; Deputy Leader of Opposition; and Chairman, Public Works Standing Committee.

3.

YEAR	TOTAL RUNNING COST \$
1970-71	16 671.17
1971-72	16 581.86
1972-73	No details available
1973-74	
combined with	
1974-75	22 868.96
1975-76	29 834.17

4. 1, Statesman Caprice; 18, Ford L.T.D.; 1, Chrysler sedan; 2, Dodge Phoenix; 2, Valiant Regal.

5. The type of cars has been reviewed and changed on several occasions, and it is considered by the Government that the present fleet best meets the present needs.

ADVERTISING SIGN

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is there a contract for the advertising sign on Adelaide Railway Station for Royal Insurance and if so:

- (a) who are the parties to it;
- (b) how long does it have to run; and
- (c) what payment, if any, is being made under it and to whom?

2. Is the Government satisfied that this sign is aesthetically pleasing and, if not, why has it been placed there?

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

1. Yes.

(a) State Transport Authority—Rail Division, Claude Neon Ltd., and Royal Insurance Company Limited.

(b) Expires April 20, 1977.

(c) \$3 000 per annum from Claude Neon Ltd. and \$71.76 a month from Royal Insurance Company Limited for electricity charges. These charges are paid to the Rail Division, S.T.A.

2. The sign is considered aesthetically unacceptable. However, the present contract does not expire until April 20, 1977. It could be reasonably anticipated that the contract will not be renewed.

JUSTICES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Does the Government intend that justices of the peace should not sit on the bench after attaining the age of 70 years and, if so:

(a) why; and

(b) how will such proposal be put into effect, and when?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It is Government policy that justices of the peace should not sit in Court after attaining the age of 70 years.

(a) As it is mandatory for judges to retire at 70, it is considered only proper that the same age limit should apply to all other judicial officers, including justices of the peace.

(b) It is appreciated that courts are being constituted by some over-age justices and that they are providing excellent service to the Government and the community. Further, it is appreciated that there are difficulties in obtaining the services of younger justices because most are in employment. It is therefore a difficult policy to implement and one that will be phased in gradually.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Does the Government intend that justices of the peace should resign their commissions on attaining the age of 70 years and, if so:

(a) why; and

(b) how will such proposal be put into effect, and when?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No.

TEMPORARY OFFICERS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What is the policy of the Public Service Board regarding the engagement between the ages of 65 and 70 years as temporary officers under the provisions of section 112 of the Public Service Act of:

- (a) retired officers of the Public Service; and
- (b) other persons?

2. How many persons are at present employed under the provisions of section 112 of the Act?

3. Will the Premier provide a list of such persons, showing in each case whether or not he is a retired officer of the Public Service, his age, present employment classification and salary, date of commencement of his employment under section 112 of the Act, and the date on which such employment is expected to cease?

4. Will the Premier assure the House that these provisions will be so administered as to reduce to an absolute minimum any adverse effect on the employment prospects of school leavers and other qualified persons below normal retirement age?

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

1. The board's policy regarding engagement between the ages of 65 and 70 years as temporary officers under the provisions of section 112 of the Public Service Act requires that two considerations be borne in mind:

(a) that the employment of such temporary officers will not be prejudicing the employment prospects of other candidates who are of working age; and

(b) that the temporary officers shall possess specialist skills or experience that cannot be found in candidates of normal working age.

The policy is the same for retired officers and other persons.

2. Three persons are currently employed under the provisions of section 112.

1C3.

Name	Age	Title	Salary	Commenced	Expiry
A. H. Finger, (retired officer) ..	66 years	Temporary Senior Medical Officer	\$ 22 457	5/4/76	17/9/76
C. L. Gaal, (retired officer)	67 years	Temporary Senior Medical Officer	19 999	2/9/74	Not determined
J. Scollin, (retired officer)	66 years	Temporary Dentist (part-time)	16 186	7/10/75	Not determined

It will be noted that each is a specialist professional officer employed in areas of expertise where suitable candidates are not easy to obtain. In the cases of Doctors Gaal and Scollin, no date of termination of employment has been determined because they are each employed in areas where some staffing difficulties have been encountered; Dr. Gaal, of the Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board, and Dr. Scollin, of the Royal Adelaide Dental Hospital.

4. In administering section 112 of the Public Service Act, the board's policy is always to ensure that general employment prospects throughout the community are not adversely affected.

SAMCOR CHARGES

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. What amount was due to Samcor for meat inspection charges for the 1975-76 financial year?

2. What amount of these charges was outstanding as at June 30, 1976, and, of this amount, how much was owing by intrastate and interstate meat works, respectively?

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

1. Meat inspection fees invoiced for 1975-76 totalled \$230 652.99.

2. Fees outstanding as at June 30, 1976 were:

	\$
ex intrastate	328.11
ex interstate	7 460.33
	<hr/>
	\$7 788.44

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. To whom and what were the individual and total amounts of unemployment relief grants paid to State Government, semi-government and local government authorities during the past two financial years and for what purposes?

2. How many persons were employed on each project and for how long?

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

1. and 2. The considerable amount of work involved in extracting this information is unwarranted.

MESSAGE PARLOURS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the policy of the Government concerning the control and regulation of message parlours, and why has this policy been adopted?

2. Is it proposed to introduce legislation to control and regulate these parlours and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

3. Has the Government any evidence that diseases are spread through massage parlours and, if so, what diseases?

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

1. The Government has examined reasons advanced for control of massage parlours.

(1) Suppression of prostitution. A licensing system has been examined for this purpose. The Government is satisfied that the addition of a licensing system to the present penal provisions would add nothing effective as a means of suppression. It appears from his public statements that the honourable member agrees with that view. The use of entrapment procedures to obtain evidence has been discussed with police and rejected on their advice. Where evidence has been obtained in the normal way prosecutions have occurred.

(2) Protection of public health. There is no evidence of any general public health problem arising from massage parlours. The Venereal Diseases Clinic reports 5 per cent of female gonorrhoea and less than 3 per cent of female syphilis, and male gonorrhoea and syphilis is reported as contracted from massage parlours. It could not be expected that that low figure would be likely to decrease under a licensing system. The honourable member's suggestion that it could be affected by each customer putting his name and address in a book at each parlour is ludicrous. It needs little imagination to forecast the false names which would appear.

(3) Prevention of nuisance to neighbours. The only complaints which have come to Government on this score have been in respect of residential areas. In those cases the attention of the local government authority has been drawn to its powers under zoning provisions and local government action has been taken to prohibit such activity in residential areas.

(4) The prevention of big crime syndicates taking over such operations. A close watch is kept on activity of people such as this. There is no indication that they have succeeded in moving into this State effectively.

2. and 3. See 1.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT SALARIES

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): How many positions within the Education and Further Education Departments carry an annual salary of \$18 000 or more and:

(a) what is the title of each position (without disclosing the identity of the people who fill the positions);

(b) what are the functions and responsibility of each position; and

(c) what annual salary is paid for each position?

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

There are 371 positions in the Education Department and 77 positions in the Further Education Department carrying an annual salary of \$18 000 or more. In addition, seven

positions of the newly created position of Principal, Class I, under the terms of the restructuring proposal for the Further Education Department have been created but not filled. The salary for these positions is \$25 198 per annum.

(a) For Education Department see table 1. For Further Education Department see table 2.
(b) See (a).
(c) See (a).

TABLE 1—EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Column 1 Title of Positions	Column 2 Functions and Responsibilities	Column 3 Annual Salary	Column 4 No. of Positions
Director-General	Permanent Head of Department	\$ 31 572	1
Deputy Director-General	Responsible to Permanent Head for Administration of Schools and Resources	26 438	2
Director of Schools	Responsible for administration of the Schools Directorate	24 156	1
Director, Education Services	Responsible for administration of the Education Services Directorate	24 156	1
Director, Research and Planning	Responsible for administration of the Research and Planning Directorate	24 156	1
Director, Educational Facilities ..	Responsible for administration of the Educational Facilities Directorate	24 156	1
Assistant Directors	Assist appropriate Directors in administration of their respective Directorates	24 100	6
Regional Directors	Responsible as the Education Department's representative in a defined Region	24 100	6
Principal Research Officer	Responsible to the Director of Research and Planning for control of Research and Planning Branches respectively	24 100	{ 1
Principal Planning Officer			
Senior Research Officer	Plan, direct and administer Research and special projects	23 358	1
Superintendents	Responsible for management of various Education activities (e.g. staffing curriculum, etc.)	23 358	12
Director, Administration and Finance	Responsible for administration of the Administration and Finance Directorate	22 445	1
Principal Education Officers	Advice to schools and assisting the evaluation of educational programmes, in-service education and assessment of teachers	19 785-21 028	55
Education Officer, III	Education duties within various functional areas of the Department	18 230-19 473	10
Research Officer, III	Develop and conduct Research Projects	18 230-19 473	1
Chief Guidance Officer	Responsible for the administration of Guidance Services	18 852	1
Assistant Director, Administration and Finance	Responsible for the provision of Accounting and Administrative Services	18 115-18 685	1
Education Officer, II	Educational Duties within various functional areas of the Department	17 111-18 230	8
Secondary Principals, Class A	Principals in secondary schools in which the demands of leadership are unusually complex and which call for special administrative and educational skills	23 358	20
Secondary Principals, Class 1	Responsible for the administration of a secondary school	20 962	41
Secondary Principals, Class 2	Responsible for the administration of a secondary school	19 365	47
Primary Principals, Class A	Principals in primary schools in which the demands of leadership are unusually complex and which call for special administrative and educational skills	21 028	20
Primary Principals, Class 1	Responsible for the administration of a primary school	18 541	109
Area Schools, Principal, Class A ..	Principal in an area school in which the demands of leadership are unusually complex and which call for special administrative and educational skills	21 028	1
Area Schools, Principal, Class 1 ...	Responsible for the administration of an area school ..	18 541	17
Principal, Correspondence School ..	Responsible for the administration of the Correspondence School	18 514	1
Junior Primary Schools, Principals, Class A	Principals in junior primary schools in which the demands of leadership are unusually complex and which call for special administrative and educational skills	18 230	2
Principal, Raywood Inservice Centre ..	Administration of the centre	21 961	1
Wattle Park Teachers Centre	Administration of the centre	21 961	1

TABLE 2.

Title of Position: Number of Positions:

Salary and Function

Director-General, 1, \$28 721 per annum. Responsible to the Minister of Education for the administration of the department.

Deputy Director-General, 2, \$24 156 per annum. Assist the Director-General in the overall administration of the Department. Specific responsibility for the administration

of either the Operations or Resources Division within the department.

Director, 2, \$24 100 per annum. Assist the Deputy Directors-General in the overall administration of a Division in the Department and with specific responsibilities for some of the following; curriculum development, manpower planning, educational services, community-based educational programmes and projects, budgetary control, staff evaluation and development, research, inservice training and the provision of physical and human resources.

Superintendent, 8, \$23 358 per annum. Responsible for the overall administration of one of the branches within the Department and which comprise; Research and Planning, Educational Services, Training and Development, Curriculum Development, and Buildings; or, the administration of one of the three geographical regions which together contain the thirty-three teaching institutions of the Department.

Principal Education Officer, 14, \$19 785—\$21 028.

Training and Development, two positions; responsible for the administration and conduct of either the In-Service Training Section or External Services Section of the Branch. Specific responsibilities include the assessment of training and development needs and the development and presentation of appropriate courses.

Research and Planning, three positions, each responsible for a section within the Research Branch and in particular for,

1. Undertaking broad educational research and the preparation of submissions to Federal Government and other national and international authorities.
2. Programmes of research into the evaluation of curricula, teaching methods, student/lecturer assessment together with the operation of the research clearing house publications.
3. The preparation of educational briefs for the Department; the oversight of expenditure of T.A.F.E.C. funds and the maintenance of relations between the Department and other State and Federal Government Departments.

Building, two positions. Responsible for the initial development of briefing details for major or minor accommodation projects within the Department and all associated planning. Liaison with officers of the Public Buildings Department and Consultants involved with the Department's Building Works Programmes.

Operations, four positions.

1. Three positions require the incumbents to assist the three regional Superintendents in the administration and operation of the thirty-three teaching institutions of the Department. They are required to act as educational advisers and consultants of senior status and to carry out special projects of educational importance.
2. One position requires the incumbent to act as an educational adviser in technical and scientific fields, to carry out special projects and investigation leading to the recommendation of solutions for emergency and long-term problems.

Curriculum Development, three positions. Responsible for the investigation review, and evaluation of curricula. Assist in determining the short and long-term needs in curriculum planning and recommending policies concerning them. Act as consultants to field teaching staff and as team leader for small groups of specialist educators employed on curriculum development. An additional responsibility is the maintenance of liaison between head office, colleges, further education centres, educational institutions, trade, industry, commerce, government and the community generally.

Principal, Class I, Technical Colleges, 4, \$20 593 per annum. Responsible for the administration, conduct and financial management of one of the larger technical colleges and for the total educational programme provided by

it. Additional responsibilities include forward planning, staff development and liaison with industry, trade, commerce, government and the community.

Principal, Class II, Technical Colleges, 8, \$19 785 per annum. Responsible for the administration, conduct and financial management of a technical college and for the total educational programme provided by it. Additional responsibilities include forward planning, staff development and liaison with industry, trade, commerce and government and the community.

Principals, Class I, Further Education Centres, 4, \$18 666. Responsible for the administration, conduct and financial management of one of the larger further education centres and for the total educational programme provided by it. Additional responsibilities include forward planning, staff development and liaison with trade, industry, commerce, government and the community.

Education Officer, Grade III, 3, \$18 230-\$19 473 per annum. Assist the Director-General and Deputy Directors-General with the professional and educational aspects of their duties, prepare information, analyses and returns on matters affecting educational policy. Act as executive officer to committees.

Head of School, Class I, 11, \$18 666 per annum. Responsible to a college principal for the administration, conduct and financial management of a school within a multi-school college. Responsibilities include the development of educational programmes to meet the needs of trade, industry, commerce, government and the community, staff development and the optimum use of resources to achieve educational aims and objectives.

Head of School, Class I (without Principal), 3, \$19 224 per annum. Responsible to a Superintendent for the administration, conduct and financial management of a school. Responsibilities include the development of educational programmes to meet the needs of trade, industry, commerce, government and the community; staff development and the optimum use of resources to achieve educational aims and objectives.

Education Officer, Grade II, 17, \$17 111-\$18 230 per annum. Under limited direction of a more senior officer responsible for the planning, co-ordination and direction of activities associated with a particular project or a group of projects of an educational nature and which require a high degree of educational expertise.

Future Positions. Following a recent determination by the Teacher Salaries Board, seven principalships, Class I, carrying a salary of \$25 198 per annum were established. Persons appointed to these positions will take charge of the more complex and demanding technical colleges in the metropolitan area and at the larger country centres.

DEPARTMENTAL RESIGNATIONS

Mr. GUNN (on notice): How many people have resigned or retired early from the Agriculture and Fisheries Department since January 1, 1976?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Officers retiring at age 60 or over, 5; officers retiring before age 60, 1; and officers resigned, 25.

MEAT MEAL

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What is the export price of meat meal which is processed at the Samcor works?

2. How was the amount of 40c a head, which is paid by Samcor for bare shorn sheep delivered to its works calculated?

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

1. The present export price of meat meal is \$190 a tonne F.O.B.

2. The amount of 40c a head paid for bare shorn sheep delivered to Gepps Gross was calculated as a break-even for the humane slaughtering of drought affected sheep and conversion of the carcasses into meat meal.

GLENELG TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has work commenced on the installation of traffic lights at Brighton Road and Jetty Road, Glenelg, and, if so, when will the lights be in operation and what is the estimated total cost of their installation?

2. If work has not commenced on these lights, why not?

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

1. Roadworks and preparations for installing the signals have commenced. It is expected that they will be in operation by late October, 1976, at an estimated cost of \$27 000.

2. Not applicable.

ANZAC HIGHWAY TREES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has an investigation been made into the future of the trees in the median strip along Anzac Highway and, if so, what progress has been made with this investigation?

2. Are the existing trees diseased, and, if so, what is the cause?

3. What action has been taken to control the diseases, and has such action been successful?

4. Have trees died or been destroyed by vehicle accidents or vandalism, and, if so, have they been replaced and, if not, why not?

5. Will all the trees be eventually replaced, and if so:

(a) when; and

(b) with what types of trees?

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

1. Yes. It has been completed.

2. Practically every tree is affected to some degree by bacterial canker and borers.

3. No remedial action has been taken because of the species involved: neither pruning nor chemical control is a practical solution.

4. Yes. Replacement planting has been carried out and will continue as required.

5. (a) It is not known when all the trees will be replaced.

(b) Selected Australian and New Zealand species in order to perpetuate the name Anzac.

EAST END MARKET

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): Has any decision been made in connection with redevelopment of the East End Market and, if not, when will a decision be made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No decision has been made in connection with the redevelopment of the East End

Market. It is not known when a decision will be made because of the many uncertainties associated with the project.

ADELAIDE HILLS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): Are any further restrictions to be introduced in connection with the subdivision of rural properties in the Adelaide Hills?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The matter is being considered.

RURAL SUBDIVISION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): Is any measure contemplated to increase the minimum area of 30 hectares allowed for subdivision of rural properties?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The matter is being considered.

LAND COMMISSION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): What is the average cost a block of providing services to blocks which have been developed for sale by the Land Commission?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: To date the average cost of providing services has been \$3 449 a block.

PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What alterations, additions and improvements have been made in the Premier's Department for security purposes during the past 12 months, and what was the total cost?

2. Are any personnel employed by the Premier's Department as security officers and, if so, what are their terms and conditions of employment and annual remuneration?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Several measures have been taken. As they are security measures, they will not be disclosed publicly.

URANIUM

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What was the total cost of the preparation and publication of the report on the feasibility of a uranium enrichment plant for South Australia?

2. How many copies of the report were printed and to whom were they issued?

3. Who prepared the report?

4. Will there be a further report and, if so, when?

5. When will a final decision be made on the project?

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

1. The cost of the second interim report of the South Australian Uranium Enrichment Committee was \$4 795.

2. A total of 200 copies of the report were printed. Distribution to date included: Cabinet members; Dr. Tonkin; Prime Minister and his department; Minister for National Resources and his department; Atomic Energy Commission; private enterprise groups with interests in uranium developments; oversea groups with interests in uranium technology; public, Parliamentary, and University libraries; the Environment Department; Mines Department; Premier's Department; AMDEL; members of the Uranium Enrichment Committee; Agent-General.

3. The report was prepared by the South Australian Uranium Enrichment Committee, with a substantial input provided by Mr. R. E. Wilmshurst, a member of the committee, and Mr. S. B. Dickinson, who is acting as adviser to the committee. Technical advice was sought and obtained from the Australian Atomic Energy Commission.

4. Depending on the outcome of the Ranger inquiry, it is contemplated that there will be a further report to the Government by the committee.

5. A final decision on the industry depends, among other factors, on the outcome of the Ranger inquiry, on Commonwealth Government policy, and on whether the feasibility of such a project can be established.

WEST BEACH

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the Coast Protection Board taken over the sand dunes at West Beach from the West Beach Trust and, if so, why?

2. What is the total amount allocated and spent to date by the board and trust, respectively, for protection and regeneration of the sand dunes?

3. What plans has the board for this coastal and sand dune area, and what is the estimated cost of these plans?

4. What form of control will be implemented to protect the dunes from visitors?

5. Is a toilet block for beach users to be built in the area and if so:

(a) what is the estimated cost; and

(b) when will it be built and, if it is not to be built, why not?

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

1. The Coast Protection Board, at its meeting of January 5, 1976, resolved to approach the West Beach Trust with a proposal under which the Board would undertake direct management of the sand dune area for a period of three years. The objective of the management was specified as being the rehabilitation of the dunes. The West Beach Trust has since indicated its agreement in principle to the proposal, and a detailed agreement is now being drawn up. The Board offered to undertake direct management of the rehabilitation programme because it considered that the difficult nature of the task required direct supervision by board personnel and direct board control of funding. The West Beach Trust has agreed to provide all possible co-operation in implementing the programme.

2. Total expenditure by the Coast Protection Board and the West Beach Trust on protection and regeneration of the dunes, within the last three years, can be itemised as follows:

	\$
(a) Sand replenishment to the dune face— financed totally by the board . . .	43 500
(b) Sand drift fencing, dune planting and walkways:	
Coast Protection Board . . .	9 086
West Beach Trust (R.E.D. scheme)	18 799

3. The board's plans for rehabilitation of the dunes include the following elements:

(a) Limited reshaping of the dunes by pushing sand from the rear face to fill blowouts;

(b) Installation of water reticulation using Glenelg treatment works effluent water;

(c) Concerted programme of boundary fencing, sand-trap fencing, and planting of stabilising grasses;

(d) Provision of pedestrian boardwalks across the dunes;

(e) Regular maintenance of the walkways and fencing;

(f) Declaration of a restricted area under the Coast Protection Act, section 34, to control unauthorised access into the dune area. This measure is contemplated as a temporary control only, to be lifted when the dunes are stabilised. The cost of the above measures is estimated at \$70 000, to be spent over a three-year period. The West Beach Trust has agreed to contribute \$14 000 towards this cost.

4. The dunes will be fenced to deter general access to the restricted area. Boardwalk pedestrian ways will be installed to provide pedestrian access to the beach.

5. The proposed agreement between the West Beach Trust and the Coast Protection Board relating to the rehabilitation of the dunes does not include any plans to construct public toilets in the area. However, the development of the whole West Beach Trust area, has been the subject of an investigation by a committee set up to advise the Minister of Local Government. The committee will report to the Minister soon.

REGIONAL BOUNDARIES

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What are the regional boundaries for local government and transport in South Australia and if a decision on fixing these boundaries has not been made, why not, and when will it be made?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The recommendations of the Committee of Inquiry into Uniform Regional Boundaries are now being considered, and it is expected that decisions will be made soon.

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What are the regional boundaries for community welfare and health in South Australia and, if a decision on fixing these boundaries has not been made, why not, and when will it be made?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: There are no existing regional boundaries for the provision of health services other than the State bisection for Mental Health Services and four metropolitan Adelaide demographic divisions for Domiciliary Care Service. These are self-describing, being Para, Eastern, Southern and Western. Boundaries will not be set until such time as the Health Commission Bill has been passed.

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What are the regional boundaries for tourism in South Australia and, if a decision on fixing these boundaries has not been made, why not, and when will it be made?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: Twelve tourist regions have been designated in South Australia, as follows:

Adelaide, Barossa Valley, Eyre Peninsula, Far North, Fleurieu Peninsula, Flinders Ranges, Kangaroo Island, Lower Murray-Mallee, Mid North, Riverland, South East, Yorke Peninsula.

Boundaries of the regions coincide with local government boundaries. These tourist regions were identified by the Division of Tourism during 1974, as a practicable compromise between the various regionalisation concepts in existence; for example, State Planning Office, Commonwealth Bureau of Statistics, on the one hand, and the manner in which visitors actually view different areas of South Australia, on the other. The regions have been adopted as the basis for tourist development planning, including promotion.

Mr. BECKER (on notice): What are the regional boundaries for sport and recreation in South Australia, and, if a decision on fixing these boundaries has not been made, why not, and when will it be made?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Recreation and Sport Division operates within a regional framework comprising eight zones—four metropolitan and four country. They are as follows:

Metropolitan Zone

1. North Metropolitan—comprising the following local government areas:

Gawler, Munno Para, Elizabeth, Salisbury, Tea Tree Gully, Enfield, Prospect.

2. South Metropolitan—comprising the following local government areas:

Glenelg, Brighton, Marion, Mitcham, Stirling (part), Noarlunga, Meadows (part), Willunga.

3. East Metropolitan—comprising the following local government areas:

Adelaide, Unley, Walkerville, St. Peters, Payneham, Campbelltown, Kensington and Norwood, Burnside, East Torrens.

4. West Metropolitan—comprising the following local government areas:

Port Adelaide, Woodville, Henley and Grange, West Torrens, Hindmarsh, Thebarton.

Country Zones

5. South East—comprising all local government areas south of and including Yankallilla, Meadows (part), Mount Barker, Strathalbyn, Meningie, Coonahpyn Downs and Tatiara. This zone includes Kangaroo Island.

6. East—comprising all local government areas north of zone 5 but east of and including Morgan, Truro, Ridley, Mount Pleasant and Mobilong.

7. Mid North—comprising all local government areas north of the northern metropolitan boundary and west of zone 6, including the Yorke Peninsula. The northern boundaries of Port Broughton, Snowtown, Blyth, Clare and Burra Burra.

8. Upper North and West—comprising the remainder of South Australia north of zone 7, and including the Eyre Peninsula.

MANN TERRACE

Mr. COUMBE (on notice): Has the Highways Department had discussions with the Adelaide and Walkerville councils on the redesign of Mann and Park Terraces, and what decisions have been reached?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes. Agreement in principle has been reached with both Councils but detailed planning has not yet been completed.

DARTMOUTH DAM

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. What funds have been expended to June 30, 1976, by the South Australian Government towards the construction of the Dartmouth Dam?

2. What is the expected final cost of this project, and what is the total contribution by the State Government?

3. When is it expected that water will be impounded in this dam?

4. When is it expected that this project will be completed?

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

1. \$13 720 000.

2. The estimated final cost is \$114 000 000 (based on March, 1976 costs) of which South Australia must contribute \$28 500 000. Under the terms of the Dartmouth Reservoir Agreement Act, 1970, South Australia receives \$8 800 000 by way of financial assistance towards this sum, with repayments commencing 10 years after the receipt of the first payment from the Commonwealth.

3. Provided the present construction schedule can be maintained, it should be possible to close the diversion tunnel and impound some of next winter's runoff.

4. All work will be complete at the end of 1978.

LeFEVRE TERRACE

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. Has the Highways Department held discussions with local councils on a proposal to realign LeFevre Terrace, North Adelaide, through the parklands?

2. Has agreement been reached and a decision made on this proposal and, if so, what is it, and when is it planned to implement this scheme?

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

1. Yes.

2. No.

TOD MAIN

Mr. GUNN (on notice): Will the Minister give consideration to extending the Tod water main west of Ceduna?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No.

WEST COAST SCHOOLS

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. When will the new school at Karcultaby be completed and what will be the total cost?

2. What does the Education Department intend doing with the existing schools at Minnipa and Poochera?

3. Will housing be provided at Karcultaby for a caretaker?

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

1. The new school at Karcultaby will be completed by February, 1977, according to the present programme. No delays are envisaged. The estimated cost of Karcultaby is \$1 820 000.

2. No plans for future use of the schools at Minnipa and Poochera have yet been finalised. The matter will be further investigated with the Regional Director of the Western Region. Poochera Welfare Club and school council have requested some land and buildings be retained for a pre-school.

3. It is not sure which project is referred to. Karcultaby has, of course, been referred to the Public Works Standing Committee some time ago. There are no plans to submit projects relating to Minnipa and Poochera to the Public Works Standing Committee at this stage.

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. When is it expected that work will commence on the new Ceduna school?

2. What is the expected cost of this new school?

3. When will the project be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee?

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

1. A number of projects related to the Ceduna Area School construction have already begun. Documentation is nearing completion on the erection of a sports hall ex Maralinga. Tennis courts which are a joint community venture are under construction at the school. So far as the new school is concerned, final agreement with the school council on the details of the type of construction is awaited. Sketch plans are near completion and it is expected that construction will begin in the 1976-77 financial year. A Demac agricultural science block will be completed towards the end of 1976.

2. Approximate estimated unescalated cost of Ceduna Area School is \$2 300 000.

3. The project will be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee as soon as sketch plans are completed and funds approval has been obtained.

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Does the Government still intend to build a new school at Miltaburra and, if so, when?

2. If a new school is not to be built will the schools at Wirrulla and Haslam be upgraded?

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

1. The Education Department has no plans at present to build a new school at Miltaburra and it is unlikely that the Miltaburra project will proceed in the foreseeable future.

2. In regard to the schools at Wirrulla and Haslam, the need for upgrading at these schools will be discussed with the Regional Director of Education of the Western Region.

PENSIONER FLATS

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. Does the Housing Trust intend building multistorey pensioner flats and, if so:

- (a) where will they be built; and
- (b) how many flats will be in each block?

2. What is the present unit cost of cottage flats?

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

1. The trust has no immediate plans to build multistorey pensioner flats.

2. The building costs vary with locality, but a recent contract at Christie Downs gave final costs of \$17 000 for a couple flat and \$15 800 for a single-person flat. These costs include full development, including land, landscaping, paths, etc.

MOUNT GAMBIER LAND

Mr. ALLISON (on notice):

1. Has the South Australian Land Commission yet acquired land in the Mount Gambier district for subdivision and resale to the public and, if so:

- (a) where is the land;
- (b) how many hectares in area have been acquired;
- (c) what was the purchase price; and
- (d) when is the land to be released for sale?

2. If land has not yet been purchased does the commission have immediate plans for land acquisitions in Mount Gambier and district for resale as building allotments?

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

1. Yes.

(a) i. Part section 1180, behind Fletcher Jones factory.

ii. Part section 311, corner Wireless Road and Sutton Town Road.

(b) i. 14.90 ha.

ii. 16.29 ha.

(c) i. \$60 000.

ii. \$97 700.

(d) i. Land will be released in two stages, 63 lots by March, 1977, and 57 lots by June, 1977.

ii. A development programme has not as yet been set for this land.

2. Vide 1 above.

MOUNT GAMBIER CONSUMER AID

Mr. ALLISON (on notice):

1. Has office accommodation yet been acquired in Mount Gambier for the establishment of a Prices and Consumer Affairs Department branch?

2. Does the Attorney-General have records of how many inquiries for consumer aid emanated from the South-Eastern towns during 1974-75 and 1975-76, respectively?

3. If records are not kept, how are priorities determined for opening new branches?

4. If records are available, how many inquiries were there from Mount Gambier in 1975-76?

5. What is the estimated establishment cost of each regional office?

6. What is the estimated annual running cost including staffing for each office?

7. How many staff will be appointed to Mount Gambier?

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

1. No. However, the Public Buildings Department has commenced negotiations in respect of the lease of a particular area of office space.

2. No. Whilst records are kept on the State as a whole, statistics are not kept in regard to particular country towns.

3. The Consumer Affairs Branch periodically sends teams of investigation officers to the major country towns to deal with consumer inquiries.

The number of inquiries received during two trips to each town in the last 12 months have confirmed the already known pattern of complaints emanating from country towns, namely:

Port Augusta, Whyalla and Port Pirie	268
Mount Gambier	113
Berri	101

Priorities have been decided accordingly.

4. See 2.

5. Port Augusta (including Whyalla and Port Pirie)	\$ 232 200
Mount Gambier	182 000
Berri	147 000
Murray Bridge	108 500

6. Port Augusta (including Whyalla and Port Pirie)	\$ 86 000
Mount Gambier	86 000
Berri	66 000
Murray Bridge	54 000

7. A request was submitted to the Public Service Board on June 22, 1976, for the creation of eight positions, and is still under consideration. It is not expected that the full eight positions, if approved, would be filled immediately. Staff will be appointed over a period as required.

PENSIONER SPECTACLES

Mr. ALLISON (on notice):

1. What proportion of the cost of spectacles supplied by the Royal Adelaide Hospital to pensioners is reimbursed through Medibank to the State?

2. How long does an applicant for free spectacles have to wait before he can expect receipt of them?

3. Will the Minister now attempt renegotiation of the Medibank agreement with the Commonwealth Government to enable hospitals such as the Mount Gambier hospital to become approved hospitals for the purpose of supplying free spectacles to pensioners?

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

1. 50 per cent.

2. Four to six weeks.

3. It is not necessary to renegotiate the Medibank Agreement. The Government is currently investigating ways and means of supplying spectacles to pensioners through its various hospitals.

WATER RESOURCES APPEAL TRIBUNAL

Dr. EASTICK (on notice): Pursuant to the Notice at page 326 of August 5, 1976, issue of the *South Australian Government Gazette*:

(a) why has Garry Francis Hiskey been nominated only as Acting Chairman of the Water Resources Appeal Tribunal, and who is to be the permanent Chairman;

(b) what particular expertise do Messrs. Stephen Oulianoff and Spiridon Cosmidis provide to the tribunal as panel members; and

(c) was consideration given to persons who have knowledge and experience as dryland growers, Riverland growers, and South-East growers as panel members, and, if not, why not?

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

(a) Garry Francis Hiskey is a Stipendiary Magistrate and is Registrar of the Credit Tribunal. It is the Government's intention to rationalise the arrangements for the sitting of judicial personnel in administrative tribunals under the general supervision of the Chairman of the Planning Appeal Board, and Mr. Hiskey has been appointed Acting Chairman of the Water Resources Appeal Tribunal pending these rearrangements and the appointment of a permanent Chairman. A decision has not been made on who is to be the permanent Chairman.

(b) Mr. Oulianoff and Mr. Cosmidis are market gardeners and water users in the North Adelaide Plains area. They have had wide experience as growers and water users and are well aware of the particular problems facing the consumers of water for market gardening purposes.

(c) Consideration was given to persons who have knowledge and experience as dryland growers, Riverland growers and South-East growers as panel members, and the matter is still under consideration. Previous experience has indicated that most contentious matters arising out of water resource control measures have related to the problems on the Northern Adelaide Plains. As and when the need arises, consideration will be given to appointing further members to the panel.

GOVERNMENT OFFICES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): Has the Government conducted a feasibility study into the construction of a 30-storey tower block for greater centralisation of Government departments and, if so, what were the results of the study?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

VOLUNTEER WORKERS INSURANCE

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Did the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department or the State Government Insurance Commission pay for the advertisement inserted in the *Advertiser* on July 17, 1976, in respect of an insurance scheme for volunteer sporting and recreation workers?

2. Did the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department or the State Government Insurance Commission pay for the public meeting arrangements outlined in that advertisement?

3. Did the proposed scheme commence on August 2, as proposed, and, if not, why not?

4. Were private insurers consulted in relation to the proposed scheme and were they given the opportunity of participating in the scheme and, if not, why not?

5. What is the estimate of the number of people needed to make the scheme viable for the S.G.I.C., and what is that number expressed as a percentage of the estimated total market in this area?

6. Will the Government's 50 per cent per capita subsidy enable the S.G.I.C. to offer premiums lower than those of the private insurers already operating in the field?

7. Why is the benefit provided under the schemes for the loss of one limb and the loss of two limbs the same amount?

8. Has the Government investigated the possibility of subsidising the S.G.I.C. in any other section of the personal accident insurance market, and, if so, in what areas?

9. What estimate, if any, did the S.G.I.C. make of possible gains in other forms of insurance, such as fire and burglary insurance, as a result of this proposal?

10. Will the S.G.I.C. disclose what income is derived from the scheme and what claims are paid out, and, if not, why not?

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

1. The Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department paid for the advertisement.

2. The public meeting was held on the premises of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. No hire charge was involved.

3. Yes.

4. An independent firm of insurance brokers originally costed the proposed scheme at \$2.70 per capita plus 5 per cent tax. The State Government Insurance Commission subsequently quoted a charge of \$2.60 per capita plus tax. The latter quote was accepted because of obvious cost savings.

5. It is estimated that 1 400 people will join the scheme, and this number is sufficient for a successful operation. The fact that a number of sporting bodies are insured with other companies and that a number do not insure at all, makes it impossible to answer the remainder of this part of the question.

6. No. The source of subsidy is not related to premiums. The State Government Insurance Commission based its premiums on previous experience for this class of business.

As tariff insurance controls are no longer in operation, the commission's premiums could be either lower or higher than individual insurance companies operating in this particular field.

7. An offer from an overseas insurance organisation was to underwrite the scheme on a maximum benefit basis; the State Government Insurance Commission decided to meet the competition and retain premiums within the State.

8. No.

9. The State Government Insurance Commission did not take into account possible gains in other forms of insurance, as the business was accepted as a service to the community.

10. It is not the practice of any insurance organisation to disclose the results of a particular account. Underwriting experience of this account will be included in the overall personal accident figures of the commission.

SUPERANNUATION FUND

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What was the total value of the assets of the South Australian Superannuation Fund as at June 30, 1970?

2. In view of the delay in completing the valuation as at June 30, 1973, because of the sickness of the Public Actuary, what other actuarial services has the Government attempted to obtain?

3. If no attempt has been made to obtain other actuarial services, why not?

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

1. \$62 095 270.

2. The Government has called for applications for appointment to a new position of Actuary in the Public Actuary's Office. The call was made through the local and interstate press and by circular through the Institute of Actuaries. Applications received are being considered now.

3. Answered by 2.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

Dr. TONKIN (on notice): For each of the financial years since June 30, 1970, and for each Ministerial portfolio:

- on what dates did the Government enter into contracts with advertising agencies and public relations firms;
- what was the nature of the advertising or public relations work contracted;
- what were the names of the advertising agencies and public relations firms involved in each account; and
- what was the amount involved in each case?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The considerable amount of work involved in extracting this information is unwarranted.

POPULATION PROJECTIONS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What are the projected population figures for South Australia as a whole and for the Adelaide metropolitan area, respectively, for mid-years 1975 to 2001 as at June 30, 1976?

2. If there has been no annual review of the projections made as at June 30, 1975, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It can be reported that there has been a review of the population projections, which were prepared in mid-1975 for South Australia as a whole and the Adelaide Statistical Division (including Monarto) for the period 1975 to 2001. That review has been carried out by officers of the Premier's Department in consultation with the Australian Bureau of Statistics. As a result, a revised set of population projections has been prepared and adopted by the Government for planning purposes. A schedule of the population projections, for individual years over the period 1976 to 2001, follows. The bureau has already published its own population estimates for June 30, 1975, namely, 1 234 100 persons for the State as a whole, and 899 300 persons for the Adelaide Statistical Division.

The year to June 30, 1976, will show a relatively small growth in South Australia's population due to a substantial flow-back of Darwin evacuees who came to this State after cyclone Tracy in December, 1974. The 1974-75 year's growth rate for South Australia was boosted by that disaster. The population projections indicate that the population of the State is expected to grow from 1 242 300 at June 30, 1976, to 1 526 600 by the middle of 2001. Comparable figures for the Adelaide Statistical Division (including Monarto) are: 900 400 in 1976 and 1 138 800 in 2001. Under different migration assumptions, the State's population could range between 1 424 000 and 1 628 600 in 2001, while that of the Adelaide Statistical Division (including Monarto) could range between 1 081 000 and 1 196 600 persons.

Year (As at June 30)	Population Projections 1976-2001	
	South Australia (No. of persons)	Adelaide Statistical Division (incl. Monarto) (No. of persons)
1976	1 242 300	900 400
1977	1 253 100	909 200
1978	1 265 900	919 500
1979	1 278 700	929 800
1980	1 291 600	940 300
1981	1 304 700	950 700
1982	1 317 800	961 200
1983	1 330 800	971 600
1984	1 343 900	982 000
1985	1 356 900	992 300
1986	1 369 700	1 002 500
1987	1 382 300	1 012 500
1988	1 394 700	1 022 500
1989	1 406 800	1 032 300
1990	1 418 600	1 042 000
1991	1 430 100	1 051 500
1992	1 441 300	1 060 900
1993	1 452 100	1 070 100
1994	1 462 500	1 079 200
1995	1 472 400	1 088 200
1996	1 482 300	1 096 900
1997	1 491 600	1 105 600
1998	1 500 800	1 114 100
1999	1 509 700	1 122 500
2000	1 518 300	1 130 700
2001	1 526 600	1 138 800

METROPOLITAN RESERVOIRS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

- What is the total storage capacity of Adelaide metropolitan reservoirs?
- What is the current amount held by those reservoirs?
- How does this compare with last year at this time?
- What is the estimated water usage for the 1976-77 financial year in metropolitan Adelaide?

5. What is the estimated water usage for the three summer months, beginning at December 1, 1976?

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

1. 187 620 Megalitres.
2. 77 795 Ml.
3. The storage at the same time last year was 135 632 Ml.
4. 191 534 Ml.
5. 79 600 Ml.

CLOTHING FACTORY

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What has been the progress of the Government study into the establishment of a Government clothing and uniform factory as announced on September 15, 1975?
2. Who are the members of the committee conducting the study and what are their qualifications?
3. When is it expected that the final report of the study will be completed?
4. Will the Government make the final report public and, if not, why not?

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

1. The committee to examine the State Government's clothing requirements has presented an interim report requiring further studies to be done.
2. Mr. J. A. Haslam (Chairman), Promotions Officer, Trade and Development Division, Premier's Department, B.A., Dip.Ed. (Adel.), M.B.A. (N.S.W.). Before joining the Trade and Development Division in 1973, Mr Haslam held an executive position in private industry.
- Mr. P. H. Palmer, Assistant Director, Supply Division, Services and Supply Department. Mr. Palmer has had many years experience in all aspects of Government purchasing in this State.
- Mr. K. J. Collins, Secretary, Clothing and Allied Trades Union of Australia (South Australian Branch). Mr. Collins has a wide knowledge of the clothing industry in South Australia.
3. At least two to three months yet.
4. The Government expects to do so.

TRADE TRAINING

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What has been the progress of the Government study into trade training arrangements in South Australia as announced on December 11, 1975?
2. When is it expected that the final report of the study will be completed?
3. Will the Government make the final report public and, if not, why not?

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

1. The inquiry team has had extensive consultations with trade union and employer representatives on an industry by industry basis, and with appropriate authorities in Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria to take advantage of experience with trade training arrangements operating in those States:
2. The timetable being worked to calls for the inquiries to be completed within the next two weeks, and for the final report to be available to the Minister by the end of September, 1976.
3. The report is being prepared for the Government and will, in the first instance, be reserved for its consideration.

NO-FAULT COMPENSATION

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What progress has been made in the Government study into the possibility of replacing workmen's compensation by a system of no-fault compensation as announced on February 12, 1976?
2. Who are the members of the committee conducting the study, and what are their qualifications?
3. When is it expected that the final report of the study will be completed?
4. Will the Government make the final report public and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: This is a long-term study, which it is not expected will be concluded in a short time. It was one of the matters in respect of which the Secretary for Labour and Industry (Mr. L. B. Bowes) made initial inquiries while he was overseas; he returned on August 7. No committee has been appointed and it is not possible at this stage to forecast when the study will be completed or whether the report will be a public document.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What has been the progress of the Government study into the long-term problems of the young unemployed as announced on January 16, 1976?
2. Who are the members of the working party conducting the study, and what are their qualifications?
3. Will the Government make the final report public and, if not, why not?

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

1. The youth unemployment working party commenced its study in February and presented its recommendations to the Acting Premier on April 29. Cabinet considered them, and the Acting Premier announced their adoption in principle in a statement issued on May 5. Since that time the supervisory committee, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Gordon Bruff, Deputy-Director of Community Welfare, has been working on detailed programmes and proposals for the youth work unit, which is to be established in the Labour and Industry Department.
2. The members of the working party were Mr. J. C. Bannon, Assistant Secretary, Labour and Industry Department (Chairman), Mr. G. K. Forbes, Supervisor/Coordinator, Unemployed Youth Scheme, Community Welfare Department, and Mr. L. Horvat, Principal Education Officer, Further Education Department.
3. The report is being evaluated.

TOURIST BUREAU

Mr. EVANS (on notice): Is there a shortage of marketing personnel in interstate branches of the South Australian Tourist Bureau and, if so:

- (a) what positions need to be filled in each State; and
- (b) is any action being taken to fill these positions, and, if not, why not?

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

- (a) There is a need for additional staff in the interstate branches of the South Australian Tourist Bureau, namely, Sydney and Melbourne. Two positions for the Melbourne office are currently being created and action in respect of the Sydney office is expected at a later stage.
- (b) Action will be taken to fill the Melbourne positions after they have been created.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What is the rate of interest charged on loans granted under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act?
2. What is the maximum amount of any loan which may be granted?
3. What are the necessary qualifications required to obtain a loan?

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

1. Part 5 (2) (a) of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, 1967, provides that "The advance shall bear interest at the rate charged by the State Bank of South Australia in respect of overdraft loans made to primary producers at the time of making the advance." The current rate is 10.5 per cent.
2. There is no fixed limit. Applications are assessed and, if approved, the applicant is assisted on individual need.
3. Part 5 (2) (9b) of the Act directs that "No advance shall be made unless the Minister of Lands is satisfied that:
 - (a) The primary producer is in necessitous circumstances mainly because of the effect of drought, fire, flood, frost, animal or plant disease, insect pest or other natural calamity.
 - (b) The advance is necessary for the primary producer to continue in the business of primary production.
 - (c) The primary producer has no other source of funds available to him for that purpose.
 - (d) Given the advance, the primary producer has a reasonable prospect of being able to continue in the business of primary production."

COSTS SURVEY

Mr. EVANS (on notice): Will the Government carry out a survey to establish the total cost to the State of each of the following: crime, vandalism and littering, road accidents, industrial accidents, and alcohol and drug effects?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

MOUNT LOFTY HOUSE

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. Were Government departments or statutory bodies aware that the property of 5.79 hectares, and known as Mount Lofty House, was for sale for a long period before the unnecessary destruction of trees and bushlands took place?
2. Did the Botanic Garden Board consider and reject a proposal to buy this property?
3. What valuation did the Valuation Department place on this property?
4. What were the reasons for the refusal of the Government to buy this property?

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

1. See 2.
2. The Botanic Garden Board has never been interested in purchasing the entire property. It has only been interested in buying about 2 hectares on the southern side to enable a wider and more picturesque entrance to be developed into the western area of Mount Lofty Botanic Garden and to preserve some unusual and well-grown trees. This area was valued at \$35 000 by the Land Board,

and by the owners at \$65 000. In the circumstances and in the light of the cost estimated, the Government was unable to make funds available for such a purpose.

3. and 4. See 2.

CHRISTIE DOWNS RAILWAY

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What, and how much, equipment has been purchased to date for the electrification of the Christie Downs railway?
2. Where is this equipment stored?
3. What will happen to this equipment if electrification of this railway is not proceeded with and could not it be used or installed in anticipation that the project will go ahead in the future?

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

1. Steel work for the structures to support the overhead contact wires and catenaries. Signalling equipment, part of which has been used to provide for the current service.
2. Islington workshops.
3. Should the electrification project not proceed, the steel work could be used for other projects. In fact, portion of it has already been used for other purposes.

MEDIBANK STRIKE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): Did the Government issue any instructions to any Government departments that employment was not to be offered on the day of the Medibank strike to any employees who were members of any trade union which had decided to strike on that day and, if an instruction was issued, what were the terms of the instruction and to which departments was it issued?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Public Service Board did not issue an instruction to any Government departments stipulating that employment was not to be offered, on the day of the Medibank strike, to any employees who were members of any trade union which had decided to strike on that day. Indeed, a number of departments which contacted the board in this regard were advised that employees reporting for duty were to be employed and to receive payment for the day of the strike.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): Did the Minister of Transport issue an instruction to the Rail Division, State Transport Authority, that employment was not to be offered on the day of the Medibank strike to any employees who were members of any trade union which had decided to strike on that day?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Rail Division was advised that it would be contrary to the preservation of good industrial relations to permit tasks that are normally performed by unionists who are involved in an industrial dispute to be performed by persons who are not so involved.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Did any executive of any trade unions or associations give 14 days notice in writing of the intention of the associations to participate in the Medibank strike on Monday, July 12, and, if so, which associations gave such notice?
2. Did the Government publicly encourage people to participate in the Medibank strike?

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

1. No.

2. As indicated on August 2, 1976, by the Premier, in a reply to a question on notice from Mr. R. R. Millhouse, M.P., the Government supported the general strike on July 12, 1976, in connection with Medibank, for reasons published at that time.

AYERS HOUSE RESTAURANT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Will the Government release the report of the Companies Office concerning the possible involvement of Mr. Saffron with Ayers House Restaurants Proprietary Limited and the operation of the restaurants at Ayers House?

2. How were the liquidity problems in the operation of the restaurants at Ayers House solved, and what was the source of money involved?

3. Did the Government give any financial assistance to the operation of the restaurants at Ayers House during the past two years, and, if so, what was the assistance given?

4. Has the Government paid compensation or any other financial reward during the past two years to Ayers House Restaurants Proprietary Limited, or to any interests involved or planning to become involved in the operation of the restaurants at Ayers House?

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

1. The report was oral and confidential, apart from material already made public in the Licensing Court.

2. The proprietor made other arrangements which did not involve bringing further parties into the business or a transfer of the lease.

3. No.

4. No.

INDUSTRIAL LEGISLATION

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Is the Government preparing amendments to the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act?

2. Have draft copies of these amendments been circulated to some union officials, and, if so, what persons have received draft copies, and why have these people a priority over the Parliament?

3. What is the substance of the proposed amendments?

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

1. Yes.

2. Last month certain proposals in a preliminary form were sent on a confidential basis to the principal peak organisations affected by the operation of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, for their information. (Those organisations were the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, South Australia; The South Australian Employers Federation; and the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia.) They are proposals only at this stage and not draft amendments.

3. A final decision has not been made on matters to be included in the Bill with the exception of the two matters referred to in the Governor's Speech.

POLICE TRANSPORT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What action has the Government taken to provide convenient and cheap parking facilities within the city of Adelaide to police officers who are required to operate from Police Headquarters during late afternoon and night shifts?

2. What transport facilities are available to police officers who finish duty after the public transport services have stopped operating for the night?

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

1. Additional premises are becoming available to the Police Department in suburban areas of Adelaide.

2. Officers who complete duty after public transport services have stopped operating are conveyed to their homes by Departmental transport, where necessary.

WHYALLA SHIPYARD

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith, namely:

That this House deplore the decision of the Commonwealth Government not to provide further support to the shipbuilding industry and call on all South Australian Senators to take whatever action is necessary to ensure that this decision is reversed, and that the Speaker transmit the foregoing resolution to all South Australian Senators.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, Sir.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This is the first time that the House has had a chance to discuss the shipbuilding industry since the announcement by the Federal Government that no further support would be given to the industry beyond that now available. The shipbuilding industry is a major part of the industrial process of this State and especially of Whyalla, where the livelihood of about 35 per cent of the population depends on the continuance of a shipbuilding industry. It is an extremely serious matter indeed, that action should not be taken now that would be necessary for the continuation of that industry beyond 1978 in Whyalla.

It is necessary for the House to take such action as it can to achieve something for the industry. It is not merely a question of our having a discussion about the urgency of the position: everyone is apprised of that matter. It is a question of our taking the necessary action when we can take action to get something done about a situation which, if action is not taken now, will mean effectively that the shipbuilding industry in Australia at the two major shipbuilding yards of Whyalla and Newcastle will close. This House can effectively do something in that regard only by putting the matter before the representatives of this State in the Federal House of Parliament, the members of which are directly responsible to the State as representatives of the whole State in what has been called the States' House—the Senate. The purpose of moving the suspension of Standing Orders is to enable this House to take that action at the earliest possible moment.

If we do not take action that is effective, discussion in this House is just so much an elocutionary exercise. No assistance that can be given to the industry from any other source will meet the needs of the present situation. I believe therefore that it is necessary for us to suspend Standing Orders now to ensure that a motion is put to the House that enables us to take a practical and effective course,

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose the suspension of Standing Orders not—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Knocking the State again.

Dr. TONKIN: —I must make quite clear, because the Opposition is not vitally concerned with the future of Whyalla. The Premier's motion to suspend Standing Orders refers entirely to the Commonwealth Government and to its actions. That motion is far too restrictive a term of reference in which to debate the whole issue of Whyalla. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition lodged with you a letter intimating that I would move an urgency motion in this House on three major aspects of the Whyalla shipbuilding problem, aspects that refer not only to the Commonwealth Government but also to the role of the State Government and the trade union movement.

Inevitably, the future of Whyalla is tied up with all three factors: not just with the Commonwealth Government, which is the only matter referred to in the motion. I assure Government members that, with about 30 minutes remaining in which to debate urgency motions, motions in which we can debate these other factors, the Opposition will agree to suspend Standing Orders. I understand that the time for that purpose expires at about 3.15 p.m. Provided the Opposition has a chance to ventilate the other matters it believes are of vital importance to the future of Whyalla, and debates the part that the State Government is playing in the matter, it will agree to the suspension of Standing Orders, if the Premier wishes to do so at 3.15 p.m.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is "That the motion be agreed to". For the questions say "Aye", against "No". There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division.

The House divided on the motion:

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

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

The SPEAKER: There are 22 Ayes and 20 Noes. Not having been passed by an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, the motion lapses.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: WHYALLA SHIPYARD

The SPEAKER: I have received the following letter dated August 17, 1976, from the honourable Leader of the Opposition:

I desire to inform you that this day it is my intention to move: That this House at its rising adjourn until 1 o'clock tomorrow for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely:

That this House view with grave concern the uncertain future for the Whyalla shipbuilding yard, and as a consequence, urge:

- (1) The Federal Government to re-examine the future of the yard, particularly in relation to the construction of the proposed naval vessel *Tobruk*;
- (2) The State Government immediately to review taxation and legislative measures which have substantially increased production costs; and

- (3) The trade union movement to act to increase productivity, and to stop unnecessary industrial disputes.

I call on those honourable members who support the motion to rise in their places.

Several members having risen:

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

That this House at its rising adjourn until 1 o'clock tomorrow,

for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely:

That this House view with grave concern the uncertain future for the Whyalla shipbuilding yard, and as a consequence, urge:

- (1) The Federal Government to re-examine the future of the yard, particularly in relation to the construction of the proposed naval vessel *Tobruk*;
- (2) The State Government immediately to review taxation and legislative measures which have substantially increased production costs and
- (3) The trade union movement to act to increase productivity, and to stop unnecessary industrial disputes.

This motion has been moved because we believe that the future of Whyalla and of the shipbuilding yard is intimately bound up with these three factors. I regret that we were not able to support the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders. Perhaps if the motion the Premier wished to move had been couched in terms to encompass all of these factors, we would have been happy to admit it. As it was, the motion referred only to the situation of the Federal Government.

Whyalla depends on the sheet steel industry, and basically on iron ore. It was built up in the days of Sir Thomas Playford, and it has grown to become South Australia's second largest city. It is based predominantly on steel production and steel fabrication, and the shipyard has played a significant role in the industrial development of this country. It has built ships for Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited as well as for overseas firms, and at present it is finishing contracts on two ships for the Union line, from New Zealand. The situation of Whyalla and its shipbuilding yard has been known for some time, and has caused considerable concern to everyone in the community.

I visited Whyalla nearly two months ago and had discussions with management as well as with the union officials on the job. There was (and still is) a lack of morale at Whyalla quite foreign to the town. The future of the shipbuilding industry generally is so poor that it does not know where it is going. Following the announcement made last week, a subsidy of up to 35 per cent still pertains. In the past the subsidy that has been necessary has varied between 25 per cent and 35 per cent. Indeed, four years ago it was less than 30 per cent. The subsidy is provided in an attempt to make the shipbuilding industry competitive with overseas shipbuilding interests. The subsidy varies because it depends entirely on quotes received from overseas yards. Costs of production at the Whyalla shipyard have increased steadily. They have increased out of all proportion and, although the subsidy of 35 per cent will still apply, this figure is no longer adequate to meet the short-fall in quotes from overseas yards and the cheapest price at which similar vessels can be built in South Australia. In general terms, overseas shipyards can now offer large vessels at less than half the cost, and often in considerably less than half the time in which we can produce ships in Australian shipyards.

Mr. Max Brown: They get the material from us.

Dr. TONKIN: That is an interesting interjection. In the paper prepared by the University of New South Wales on the Australian shipbuilding industry, it is shown that Australian cost disadvantages included such items as the overall material cost, which is at a 30 per cent cost disadvantage compared to Japan. Australia's direct labour cost is 18 per cent above Japan's and 64 per cent above the United Kingdom's. Disputes and absenteeism in the Australian shipyards account for 5 per cent of ship costs, and demarcation disputes add between 2 per cent and 5 per cent to the cost of each ship. Obviously, the State Government and the trade union movement have significant roles to play in any move to make the Whyalla shipyard a more viable and more competitive operation, and it must become more competitive if it is to survive. Certainly, the Federal Government has a role to play; it has carried out that role by providing a 35 per cent subsidy. It could make a real contribution by awarding to Whyalla the contract for the building of the *Tobruk*, the proposed \$50 000 000 naval vessel. That would be a shot in the arm to Whyalla. When I go to Canberra next week I will discuss these matters among other things, and I will put forward as forcibly as I possibly can South Australia's claims to that contract.

I am pleased to know that the Premier intends to do much the same thing. This is one time when I emphasise that politics is not important; it is South Australia that matters. As well as the Federal Government, the State Government has a role to play—a very effective role if it wishes to play it. That is where it can show its true concern for the people of Whyalla. If it wants to do so, it can play a significant role in reducing direct labour costs by acting to amend the workmen's compensation legislation, by relieving the load of pay-roll tax, and by refusing to support, either tacitly or indirectly, the industrial unrest and demarcation disputes that occur in the yard. As has been brought to the attention of this House many times, I repeat that South Australia has the highest rate of State taxation in Australia excepting one State. It also has the second highest rate of increase in State taxation of any State, and that situation has come about during the past three or four years. If it wants, this Government can lower direct labour costs significantly.

The pay-roll tax exemption scheme announced for the iron triangle, the green triangle and even Monarto is a sham, because in order to qualify for that pay-roll tax exemption a totally new industry must be established in the area. I do not think anyone in Whyalla, in Port Pirie or in the iron triangle has been able to qualify successfully for that pay-roll tax exemption. Although I am open to correction, if such is the case it is a minor industry indeed.

The State Government has a second role to play in relation to Whyalla. It can stimulate industrial development for Whyalla and for South Australia generally. However, its record in the sphere of industrial development is not good. Only 14 major developments have been made in the past three years, and one of these was the multi-million dollar refinery, which was the major item. Indeed, we were lucky to get that, yet the Premier says that we are doing better than Victoria and New South Wales. He does not mention the other States, the record of which is far better than is South Australia's record. If this State wants to keep Whyalla a viable proposition (I hope we all do), we must take positive and serious steps to encourage industrial development in Whyalla and in the State generally. That is the second role that the State Government can play.

Finally (although the Premier was careful not to put this in the motion), the trade union movement and trade union officials have a tremendously important part to play. I repeat that disputes and absenteeism account for five per cent of the cost of building a ship in South Australia. Demarcation disputes add between two per cent and five per cent to the cost of a ship. These are significant figures, especially when we are talking about subsidies of 35 per cent from the Commonwealth Government. Demarcation disputes caused by trade union officials, unreasonable demands for wages and conditions, and continual industrial activity are adding to the cost of shipbuilding and are therefore pricing workers out of employment. We have only to look at what happened to the Adelaide Ship Construction Company. Ultimately, these companies do close down. We are therefore exporting jobs overseas, because we cannot export a finished product at a competitive price. We cannot afford to export jobs overseas, because it is the people of Australia, the people of South Australia and the people of Whyalla who matter more than anything else. In this we may be parochial, but it is our job to defend the people of South Australia.

If we are to preserve Whyalla, the responsibility must be spread among the Federal Government, the State Government and the trade union movement. We must face facts. Can the Federal Government continue to subsidise at the rate of 35 per cent? I hope that we will get the contract for the *Tobruk*. It is now up to the State Government to make changes in the levels of State taxation, and in workmen's compensation and to do everything it can to attract alternative industries. It is up to the trade union movement to increase productivity and make people believe that Whyalla has a future after all. No-one wants the shipyard at Whyalla to close. No-one wants Whyalla to suffer. It is up to all of us as a combined community effort, however, to keep Whyalla as a going proposition. I hope that all members will support my sentiments.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The Leader has moved an urgency motion which, as he knows, must lapse shortly, leaving the House with no conclusion and no vote of the House; it is merely an airing of the Leader's views. What the Leader has done is say that the Federal Government should re-examine the future of the yard, particularly in relation to the construction of the proposed naval vessel *Tobruk*. I would like to get the contract for the *Tobruk*, but any examination of the present position in the yard must show that what we now face is a long-term problem for that yard that will lead to the run down of employment from here on unless the long-term future of the yard can be guaranteed. It is the long-term future which is the vital problem for this yard and for Newcastle. The mere gaining of one contract (much as I would like to get it) will not cope with that situation. The Leader says nothing about any other proposal in relation to the Federal Government. All he then does is make an attack on trade unions in the yard, although, in fact, we have had no severe industrial trouble at the Whyalla shipyard in recent times.

Mr. Gunn: You must be blind.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not blind.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What is more, the Leader then proceeded to make his usual political attack on this Government and to say that it was our taxation position that had produced a situation disadvantageous to South

Australia and to the yard. The figures he has quoted regarding State taxation per capita are not correct. Our position for the past financial year (when figures were inflated by a period of petrol tax) was third in Australia, and we were below the Australian average. With the reduction in taxes that has taken place since, we are back to the fourth position per capita. The Leader then said that the specific area in which we should reduce liability for costs in the yard was workmen's compensation payments. Apparently, the workers in that yard are to be deprived of workmen's compensation cover.

Dr. Tonkin: Come on!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What other means have we got? Do we have to put in a special provision that the shipyards do not have to pay workmen's compensation pay-outs? He said, further, that we should dispense with pay-roll tax. Apparently the Leader has not bothered to follow the very comprehensive submission regarding the shipping industry made to the Federal Government by the South Australian Government. A submission was made not only to the Chairman of the Industry and Commerce Subcommittee on Shipbuilding, but also to the Joint Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs and Defence, which was investigating defence needs and allied matters. We made the submission direct to Senator Cotton and he was very glad to get the paper; he said it was a very good paper and that it assisted him in his submission to the Federal Cabinet.

The South Australian Government specifically offered that, if the Commonwealth Government was prepared to play its part in assisting the industry, for builders of smaller vessels (200 to 2 000 tonnes deadweight), loan guarantees of up to 70 per cent of the cost of new vessels or of improvements to the yard producing such vessels would be given. For builders of medium and large vessels (over 2 000 tonnes) capital development loans were offered to shipyards producing those vessels. Grants equivalent to pay-roll tax in exchange were offered for an undertaking that four times the amount of such grants would be spent on capital re-equipment and modernisation. We said that we would remit the whole of the pay-roll tax, and that offer has already been made. We were prepared to play our part in the yard, and all that we sought was that the Commonwealth Government would give to the shipbuilding industry in this country support similar to that given in comparable countries.

Dr. Tonkin: With conditions.

Mr. Dean Brown: What is the subsidy at present?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows what the subsidy is in this country. I am going to talk about the subsidies in comparable countries.

Dr. Tonkin: It was conditional, wasn't it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was conditional on the Commonwealth Government's playing some part. We wanted it to be a co-operative effort. It was utterly useless for the State Government to make these arrangements if no assistance was given to the yard to get orders, because there will not be an industry to which to grant these things. The situation in comparable countries (and this applied as long ago as 1974) is as follows:

The following have been the principal features of Japanese maritime policy:

Five-year goals for the delivery of new ocean-going ships to Japanese operators.

Interest subsidies to finance each annual programme for building ships for the domestic fleet.

An initial depreciation allowance of 25 per cent on new ships and other tax rules whose effect is to minimise payment of corporate tax by Japanese operators who continue to improve their fleet.

Deferred capital gains tax on sales of ships.

Tax credits against earnings in the foreign trades by Japanese operators.

Cheap credit to shipbuilders to finance suppliers' credit to foreign ship buyers.

Cheap credit to finance shipyard expansion.

Immediate tax write-off of devaluation losses on deferred payments of suppliers' credits to foreign buyers.

The cost to the Japanese Government Budget of such assistance to the maritime industry for the Japanese fiscal year ending in March, 1973, is estimated at \$500 000 000 on current account and \$278 000 000 for increased borrowing of Government funds by the industry. Government support saved the shipbuilding industry about \$250 000 000 in the same fiscal year, about 6.6 per cent of the value of the ships they delivered. Undervaluation of the yen saved foreign buyers at least another 20 per cent for ships bought under dollar denominated contracts. Government support saved Japanese shipping lines about \$250 000 000 in the same fiscal year, equal to about 9 per cent of their revenues. Those operators acquiring ships under the Government credit programme probably had savings equal to 15 per cent of their revenues.

Sweden, which is a comparable country, which has wage rates that are just as high as ours, and which has more generous provisions for social assistance and taxation provisions than we have, has a policy with the following features:

Accelerated depreciation of ships and in recent years depreciation of over 100 per cent of the investment costs.

Inventory write-down potential for shipyards which can help shelter profits in boom years.

Credit guarantees to shipyards on second mortgage loans.

Sheltering of capital gains from ship sales if reinvested in new ships.

Government participation in industry consolidation and specialisation.

Subsidised loans to shipowners.

Interest-free loans and other special rescue aids to shipbuilders in financial difficulties.

That means that in the kind of difficulty that Whyalla is facing, they receive interest-free loans for re-equipping their yards.

Mr. Evans: How are they going for work at the moment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They are doing a darn sight better than we are. The Swedish Government is not allowing the industry to collapse. The statement of policy continues:

Subsidised interest rates on exports.

Use of tax-free reserves to shelter windfall profits. The cost to the Swedish Government budget of its aid to the maritime industry in 1972 is estimated to be about \$85 000 000. This is exclusive of the cost of exempting ships delivered to domestic owners from value added tax, which would add about \$22 000 000. About \$30 000 000 was for navigation aids and related harbor costs, which should be recouped from charges to ships using its harbors. Government support saved the shipbuilding industry about \$22 000 000 for the same fiscal year. This represented a benefit of about 4 per cent of the value of ships delivered.

The Federal Republic of Germany gives a very similar high degree of support to its industry. All of the shipbuilding industries in the world are in trouble, including that in Japan. The only shipbuilding industry that is not in trouble is Korea's which has a very newly equipped industry. There is a low demand for ships generally at the moment, and in consequence all shipbuilding countries are facing problems. Every country comparable to our own is giving very heavy support to the industry. This is the only comparable country which is saying that it will give no further effective support to the industry and that it will let the industry die. Members opposite cannot deny that without Federal Government support the shipbuilding industry will close: it would not matter what was

done by a State Government. We are prepared to play our part to save the shipbuilding industry, and the proposals we put forward to the Federal Government were agreed by Senator Cotton to be reasonable, proper and generous.

Mr. Dean Brown: What is the existing subsidy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows that, so there is no point in his asking that question.

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

WHYALLA SHIPYARD

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith, namely, that this House deplore the decision of the Commonwealth Government not to provide further support to the shipbuilding industry and call on all South Australian Senators to take whatever action is necessary to ensure that this decision is reversed; and that the Speaker transmit the foregoing resolution to all South Australian Senators.

Motion carried.

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

That this House deplore the decision of the Commonwealth Government not to provide further support to the shipbuilding industry and call on all South Australian Senators to take whatever action is necessary to ensure that this decision is reversed; and that the Speaker transmit the foregoing resolution to all South Australian Senators. I thank members opposite for their courtesy. I was willing to accept their invitation.

Mr. Coumbe: Is this an identical motion?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, the motion is identical to the one I sought to move previously. The Federal Government has had submissions from the State Governments concerned with the major shipbuilding yards and offers from the State Government to co-operate in necessary measures for the industry. I have detailed to members the proposals we put forward, and I will table the submission made to the Federal Government. The proposals we put forward were fully researched; they were effective and sensible and, if acted on by the Federal Government, they could have saved the industry in Australia. Despite the fact that we made those submissions and offers and were willing to discuss any variant of them (the offers amounted to a considerable payment out of the South Australian Treasury), we have had no response from the Federal Government to the offers.

We have simply had the announcement that the Federal Government does not propose to alter its support for the industry and that all it proposes now to do is ask for a study by the Industries Assistance Commission, which necessarily takes a considerable time to investigate, and it is pointless having an investigation by the commission at this stage, because all the facts relevant to this industry are already known. There is nothing new for the commission to establish. The position is clear. The nature of the tariff position is clear, the problems which the industry has in costs as against imports are clear, and it was necessary for us to act immediately because of the order book situation for the industry. What the industry is faced with in Australia as a whole has been a slump in shipping demand, combined with the fact that Korea is severely undercutting every other shipbuilding country.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It's virtually a dumping situation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is virtually a dumping situation, effectively. Korea has tooled up well, and it has efficient shipyards. No-one going to the Whyalla shipyard can believe that the workers there do not take a pride in their work or do not work hard; they do, and they are a hard working lot.

Dr. Tonkin: Hear, hear!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They are, unfortunately, working in a shipyard that has not had its equipment updated, and the same position occurs in the New South Wales shipyard. Other countries have foreseen this problem in the industry and have given supports to industry to provide for the upgrading of the shipyards by introducing more modern equipment. There had been plans for some more modern equipment, certainly in the Newcastle yard, which have now been scrapped by the Federal Government. We need an overall plan to retain this industry, and without Federal Government activity—

Mr. Chapman: And union co-operation!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not saying that everyone should not co-operate.

Mr. Chapman: Good! That's a start.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether the honourable member knows anything about the history of shipyards in South Australia but, when the Birkenhead yard was in trouble (and some of that trouble came from union disputes in that yard), it was this Government that got an agreement between the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union and the Birkenhead shipyard, as a result of which there was virtually no further industrial dispute in that yard before it closed. Unfortunately, that did not save the yard.

Mr. Chapman: Then get an agreement on this issue.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am happy to pursue the same course in relation to any shipyard as I did with Birkenhead; however, that in itself would not save the yard. We cannot get orders for the yard, given the kind of cost disability which Australia has and which is significantly from the fact that we do not have a modern shipbuilding industry, and that Korea is undercutting every comparable country.

Mr. Chapman: Surely you agree that these people have sabotaged themselves by over-pricing themselves.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not agree with anything of the kind and, if that is the kind of attitude the honourable member has, he is denying the interjection his Leader made a few moments ago. I suggest that they have a debate on their own and let me get on with the facts in this matter. In order to take the necessary action to retain the industry, we must have Government support in order to make its prices reasonably competitive with those which overseas builders are now providing. The Japanese industry and the improvements in its yards are heavily subsidised in order to compete with Korea, and the Japanese subsidies and supports amount to substantially more than the subsidies and supports presently available to Australian yards. From the honourable member's interjections, it is obvious that members opposite do not believe the concern their Leader has expressed for the retention of the industry. The honourable member is saying that it is impossible to shore it up now. If that is the view of members opposite, clearly the exercise we have had this afternoon has been merely a bit of shadow playing.

Dr. Tonkin: You're putting words in our mouths.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I am taking what the honourable member for Alexandra has said. If he disagrees with the Leader, I suggest that the Leader have it out with him. It would be an absolute disaster for South Australia not to retain the shipbuilding industry at Whyalla, because 35 per cent of the people in Whyalla would have their livelihoods affected by such a move. The State Government has been discussing the situation with the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, seeking to provide such assistance as it can, and I shall be having discussions with Mr. Hawke tomorrow on this score. We have already been surveying means of providing some emergency job assistance to the Whyalla shipyard, but that will not save the industry. It may help in relation to the employment of some people in the area, but it will mean that the industry, as a major portion of Whyalla's work activity, will be lost.

Whyalla has two main industries: the steel mills and shipbuilding. Without the shipbuilding industry, obviously Whyalla would have a severe blow to its position as the second city of this State. That will cause untold harm and misery to the people involved. It is necessary for us to draw the attention of the Commonwealth Government to the fact that the people of this State believe that all sections of the community and Government's at all levels, as well as the work force (and I am quite pleased to include the work force in my proposals), should play their part, and that does not involve providing one contract only for Whyalla. It involves providing a higher subsidy than the 35 per cent now provided and, if such a higher subsidy is not forthcoming, no other measure will save the shipyards, because they simply will not be competitive by any other means.

That is something that should affect all the representatives of this State, and it is a position that the South Australian Senators should take. This House previously has sent resolutions to Senators for this State asking them to support, in what is supposed to be the States' House, a matter concerning the State. I believe that we should draw the attention of Senators to the situation, and require of them that they act on behalf of the people of this State to retain this vital industry, and ensure that the Commonwealth Government enters into negotiations with the industry, the State, and the unions to save the industry for this country.

Dr. Tonkin: What are you talking about?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: One would not have known from what the Leader has said earlier. It is vital that there be additional subsidy from the Commonwealth Government. Without that one factor, none of the other necessary measures will count for anything in saving the shipbuilding industry. There will be no other way to do it. I make clear that the Government of South Australia is fully prepared to play its part. We have made, to the Commonwealth Government, an offer that we were willing to discuss in more detail and to vary, if necessary, in order to obtain necessary assistance for the retention of this industry.

To date, we have had no reply to that lengthy and, apparently, praiseworthy submission (because Senator Cotton said how good he thought it was), and we have not heard anything further concerning it. I hope that all members will support the retention of this vital industry and support the motion regarding the approach we are making to the Federal Parliament, to indicate the views of the people of this State about the need for additional action by the Commonwealth Government.

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Now that the Premier has moved his motion on this matter, it has been pleasant indeed to hear him, at the conclusion of his remarks, agree with exactly what I said earlier, namely, that it is a three-way proposal, in that it is a Federal Government concern, a State Government concern, and the trade union movement's concern. The Premier has stated that twice now. I do not intend to go over these matters again, except to say that the Premier, in his insistence that it is almost entirely the Federal Government's responsibility, is once again engaging in Federal Government bashing, and nothing more or less.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It made a rotten decision, and you know it.

Dr. TONKIN: Without question, the matter concerns all three groups. I totally agree that the Federal Government has an obligation, and it has faced up to it. There is no reason why that Government should not review its decision. The State Government has a real part to play, as I have said earlier, yet the Premier has moved away from that role and has said that it is not important, that it does not matter, and that the matter is the responsibility of the Federal Government. The Premier already has defended the union movement. Despite the fact that shipyards all over the world are in difficulties and there is a slump in demand, because of our industrial situation and our labour costs—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Don't say that all the time. You know that the Koreans are dumping. Why don't you talk to Sir Ian McLennan?

Dr. TONKIN: —we cannot compete with industries overseas, and for that reason we can never afford to be complacent. Therefore, we must always try to work in a situation in which we will forever be able to compete with overseas firms. Alternatives for employment exist in Whyalla, and I have referred to two of them publicly: fabrication of containers, and the manufacture of prefabricated and predesigned bridges, modular bridges, that could be used in road building not only by the Eastern States but also by our South-East Asian neighbours to the north.

We have aid programmes operating, and there is no reason why we should not take up some of the activity in Whyalla in respect of which there will be redundancy if the yard is under threat, and we should move in actively and find alternatives for the people of Whyalla. However, the State Government apparently is not willing to do that at this stage. As I have said, a three-pronged attack is needed, involving the Federal Government, the State Government, and the union movement. The State Government and the Premier cannot wash their hands of this problem, but they are trying to do that by this motion. For that reason, I intend to move an amendment. I am confident that the Government will support the amendment, which is very much along the lines of what the Premier has said. I move to amend the motion as follows:

After "Senators" second occurring to insert:

The House further urge the State Government immediately to review taxation and legislative measures which have substantially increased production costs, and is of the opinion that the trade union movement should act to increase productivity and stop unnecessary industrial disputes.

The amendment will make the motion respectable and sensible, and one that has due regard for the people of Whyalla.

The SPEAKER: Is the amendment seconded?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): In speaking to the motion, I say seriously that this afternoon and in the past few days something that I never before realised has come home strongly to me. I am referring to the Deputy Premier's statement here a few weeks ago that members of this House represented people. Although I represent a city that is divided electorally, I assure the House that on this problem the city is very united.

The Leader of the Opposition makes me angry sometimes about what he says. A few weeks ago I drew the attention of this House to a statement which he made in Whyalla and which was reported in the local press there. The headlines of that paper state, "A criminal waste to close shipyard," yet the Leader does not state what he will do, on that basis, about the shipyard but says that he supports the Federal Government which, if it carries out its policy, will close the shipyard. I have no doubt about that. The headline continues, "Liberals will fight, says Leader." All I can say is that the Leader, this afternoon, apparently means by "fight" that he will blame the problems and the ills of the shipbuilding industry on the worker. It is the worker, he believes, who must come up with all the solutions for the shipbuilding industry's problems. These problems relate not only to Australia but to the whole world. However, the Leader gave me the impression that he wants to brush the whole issue aside, do nothing about it, and simply say, "We support the industry."

The Whyalla shipyard has played a very important role not only in this State but also in Australia. Although Sir Thomas Playford can take the honour for starting the industry in the Whyalla shipyards, it is the people who work in those yards—the workers and management—who have made this an important Australian industry. The yard has proceeded from building corvettes during the Second World War to building the biggest ships now built in this country—in fact, they are the finest ships built anywhere in the world. If members do not believe what I am saying, I would invite them to go to a wharf and compare a ship built at Whyalla with one built overseas.

Dr. Tonkin: They do a fine job.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Of course they do, but the Leader does not seem to realise that.

Dr. Tonkin: I just said it.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The Leader could have fooled me. People tend to compare Whyalla with Japan as far as shipbuilding is concerned. Whyalla shipyard was the first in the world to build an oil rig on a slipway and successfully launch the rig. Even people in the industry, although they are proud of that oil rig, do not really realise that fact. It never ceases to amaze me that the Leader, in all his remarks in this House over the past few weeks about the question of shipbuilding, seems to imply that somehow, by waving a magic wand, the State Government can solve the problems facing that industry. The State Government can do only what it is doing. It is doing its utmost: it is doing absolutely everything that it can possibly do.

As recently as yesterday in the local press B.H.P. Company management applauded the State Government for the assistance it is giving the company. Management is not applauding the Federal Government for the assistance it is not giving to the company, that is for sure.

Mr. Allison: It applauded the Leader.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The Leader is not supporting the shipbuilding industry, and no member opposite can convince me that he is. All the Leader has done in all the statements he has made in this House is to knock the worker. All we get out of the Leader of the Opposition

and the press is that the workers are somehow at fault because of the high cost factor involved in building ships. Most Whyalla shipyard workers are covered by the Metal Trades Award. Anyone with a semblance of an idea about industrial awards would know that that award is the mother of all awards and, although it sets the wage pattern for the country, it is usually the lowest award paid. Any former trade union official sitting on this side of the House would know that that award is the lowest paid award.

An unfavourable aspect of the matter, to say the least, was the B.H.P. Company's reaction to the statement that no more shipbuilding orders had been placed. Sir Ian McLennan said that, by the end of the year or by January, 1977, the company would retrench 50 employees a month (I think that is the figure he quoted).

Mr. Rodda: They have no morals.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is for sure. The honourable member has said it, not I.

Mr. Rodda: You said it.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I know. I am glad the honourable member has said it now, because I might be teaching him something. For many years the B.H.P. Company boasted that retrenchments had never occurred in its industry and that workers should therefore always accept a lower wage because they were assured of work. I do not believe that that policy applies now. If the company does retrench workers, I wonder whether those retrenched workers, with mortgages financed by an agreement with B.H.P., will have to pay double the repayment, as provided in the agreement for a worker who leaves the employ of B.H.P. I wonder what the company's reaction will be to that situation. In retrenching workers, will the company pinprick those who do not live in B.H.P. mortgage houses, or will it throw out the workers who do, anyway?

Mr. Harrison: That's a serious situation.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes, and neither the Federal Government nor B.H.P. has said anything about what will happen in that situation. Yesterday the Federal Government stated in the newspapers that it blamed workers for the high costs involved in this industry. First, it referred to wages. I reiterate that the wages paid to workers in the shipbuilding industry are based on the lowest wage structure of any industry that I could name in Australia. I do not know of any industry that would be covered so largely by a lower wage award. The Federal Government also states that too many stoppages have occurred. If people are really serious about this matter, they will realise that the number of stoppages in the Whyalla shipyard is far fewer than in any other industry that could be named.

Mr. Dean Brown: The facts don't show that.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes, they do. The Federal Government has also stated that too many demarcation disputes have arisen. Probably this is the main point that the Federal Government and the State Opposition can raise because, as I have often said, too many demarcation disputes occur. It seems to me that it is always left to the worker to solve the real problems facing this industry. A few years ago the trade union movement decided that unions should amalgamate because there were far too many unions in an industry and far too many awards covering those unions. The first two unions to amalgamate were the blacksmiths union and the boilermakers union. The Opposition opposed that amalgamation. We got through that situation successfully. Then the Amalgamated Engineering Union decided to amalgamate with the then amalgamated Boilermakers and Blacksmiths Society. Again

there was opposition in Federal Parliament to that amalgamation. Indeed, at one stage it was nearly doomed. Now, the latest move in this regard is that the shipwrights intend to amalgamate with the Metal Workers Union. This is a must in the industry: it has to come.

Mr. Mathwin: You'll get collective bargaining with it, too. You know that, don't you?

Mr. MAX BROWN: What will that do?

Mr. Mathwin: You know that, don't you?

Mr. MAX BROWN: Is the member for Glenelg suggesting that the worker will be able to get some gigantic gain out of an amalgamation?

Mr. Mathwin: I thought you supported the arbitration system, not collective bargaining.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I do not know what that means. I can only reiterate what I have already said. Many people do not realise that the shipbuilding industry is one of the biggest industries that exists in relation to heavy fabrication work. It is obviously lopsided in relation to union awards, and the trade union movement faces up to this. However, it does not want to be bashed on the matter. I point out that, as late as yesterday, the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union's research officer, Mr. Jim Baird, said that he was willing to call a conference of the unions associated with the shipbuilding industry, the Australian Council of Trade Unions, and representatives of shipowners and shipbuilders to try to reach some agreement (I suppose it could be termed a worker's agreement) so that, before any industry takes on a certain job, there will be an agreement in relation to that industry. This will go some way towards ending stoppages and demarcation disputes.

Once more, one sees all around the world that the trade union movements are trying to solve the problems that exist. Such attempts are not being made by the Leader of the Opposition in this place or his Party, and they are certainly not being made by the Federal Government. The Leader today did not make one constructive point regarding what could solve the problem, except to suggest that in some strange way the workers—

Mr. Dean Brown: How could you hear what he said? You were out of the Chamber.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Either the member for Davenport is an idiot, or something is wrong with him. I do not know what is wrong with him. At no time has the Leader of the Opposition, his Party or the Federal Government come up with any type of solution. Their only solution to problems in the shipbuilding industry that was vaguely put forward was that, for some strange, unknown reason, the workers would have to work for under-award wages. For some unknown reason, workers in this State must accept lower workmen's compensation payments, but work harder.

Mr. Evans: Did he mention any other factors which affect the industry on which action should be taken?

Mr. MAX BROWN: They are the main points of which I am aware.

Mr. Evans: You should have been awake for the whole speech.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Obviously, any scheme would have to be accepted by the whole industry. I do not know how members opposite could condone that sort of situation.

Mr. Rodda: What is your solution?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I have told members opposite my solution many times.

Mr. Rodda: Do you want an increased subsidy?

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes, that is the only positive answer at this stage. I also draw to members' attention the fact that, at some ungodly hour on Saturday night, I was telephoned from Adelaide by a fellow from SDN who calls himself Geoff Medwell. He made an interesting remark that sparked me off a little bit. Towards the end of the interview, he asked what was my opinion on whether we should be agitating for either the State Government or the Federal Government to nationalise the shipyard at Whyalla. I said, in reply, that two things worried me. First, to nationalise the shipyard at Whyalla would create many problems, as the shipyard is built on B.H.P. indentured land and, if one went out there, one would be trespassing. Secondly, it never ceases to amaze me that, when people examine the problems of an industry which is of national importance to the country but which is not a viable proposition, they talk about its being taken over by a Government. However, if the Government suggested that it should move in and take over an industry which is a viable proposition and which is of national importance, someone would say that it was socialism.

Mr. Mathwin: You say that Medwell was advocating that the industry be nationalised?

Mr. MAX BROWN: He was obviously advocating nationalisation of the shipbuilding industry. There is no doubt about that. It was my reply to him, and it is my reply to the honourable member, and to the Federal Government, that—

Mr. Gunn: But you advocated it yourself once.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes, I advocated that we take over the B.H.P., but the honourable member did not seem to see eye to eye with me.

Mr. Gunn: No, and I don't now, either. You're a crank.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The cold, hard facts are that the industry generally is obviously facing many problems, the major problem being that, with the oil market as it was some years ago, Japan moved into the area of building big ships and built oil carriers of 100 000 tonnes capacity. Then the oil industry changed, and it was found that the ships of that capacity were not needed. Japan immediately, not like us, said, "We will build a row boat if necessary, and we will subsidise that building," and that is what it has done. I am constantly amazed that in this country we have never got around to having a shipbuilding policy, although every other nation of which one can think has such a policy. When in power for three years, the Federal Labor Government went close to having such a policy.

Mr. Gunn: It refused a subsidy.

Mr. MAX BROWN: It did not. It came out with a policy that, if a shipowner bought a ship overseas, he had to replace it with an Australian-built ship. I remind the member for Eyre that B.H.P. has purchased a 105 000 tonne ship but has not replaced it. I support the Premier's motion. I know that the people of Whyalla are agitated about the grave situation obtaining in their city, a situation that needs more thought than is being given to it in the Federal sphere at present. I hope sincerely that this State's Federal colleagues and the Federal Government are made aware of this motion and that somehow the Federal Government will sit down and rethink the whole issue of shipbuilding in this country.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): Judging from that totally insignificant speech, I would not ask the member for Whyalla to defend me in any circumstances, let alone try to fight for an industry in a town in his district. This afternoon the Government made a shabby attempt to make

political capital out of an unfortunate economic crisis. It is the worst possible attempt any Government could make in a situation such as that existing in Whyalla. The Government is forgetting the people of Whyalla and the industries existing within the State, as it simply tries to score political points against the Federal Government, even though the decision of the Federal Government was one formulated by the Whitlam Government in 1973 and 1974. Let us forget this shabby attempt by the State Government to score political capital, and come back to the facts. The shipbuilding industry throughout the world is facing a crisis because of a surplus of shipping. Because of that crisis, the tender for a large ship at Whyalla could be about \$27 000 000 or \$28 000 000, while the tender for the same ship in Japan would be about \$11 000 000, and in Korea about \$10 500 000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Where are those figures from?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Those figures are a direct relation of current quotations received by the shipyards, I understand, for ships recently tendered for.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What is your source for those figures?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have a source. I ask the Premier to deny that these figures are correct. He would know only too well that they are accurate.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They are not figures of the kind given to me.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Federal Government is maintaining and has promised to maintain a 35 per cent bounty on the shipbuilding industry within Australia. By his statements, the Premier tries to give the impression that all subsidy for shipbuilding has been stopped, but that is not the case. He knows only too well, although he refuses to admit it publicly, that the present bounty is 35 per cent of the cost of building a ship, not of the cost of building a ship in an overseas country, but of building it in Australia. It is 35 per cent, for instance, of the \$27 000 000 I quoted for a large tanker.

The Whyalla shipyard is one of South Australia's major industries, employing about 1 750 people, and it is uniquely an industry in South Australia. It is the major shipbuilding plant for the whole of Australia, the only shipyard capable of building ships up to 50 000 tonnes or 60 000 tonnes, the dockyard in New South Wales being capable of building ships of only 20 000 tonnes to 30 000 tonnes. It is important to retain that industry, if possible, and for that reason the Opposition wanted to put forward an urgency motion and also supported the Government in the suspension of Standing Orders to debate this motion. However, we will not be one-eyed, and we will not try to make political capital out of the issue. We will look at the whole problem; that is why we have moved the amendment. Not only does the Federal Government need to reassess immediately where the shipbuilding industry is going but the State Government, the B.H.P. company, and the unions also need to take part in this reassessment.

The real reason for the crisis, apart from the international shipbuilding crisis, is the high escalation of wage rates in Australia. From 1971 to 1975, the average wage in Australia increased by 80 per cent, while for the same period the average wage in the United States of America, on an equivalent exchange rate basis, increased by only 18 per cent. We now have the almost farcical situation where, in Australia, the average wage is \$25 a week in Australian currency higher than the average wage in the U.S.A., taken on an equivalent exchange rate basis. How can Australia compete in the world economy when we have priced ourselves effectively out of the international market? That is

the real reason why the shipbuilding industry and other industries, including the motor car industry, are facing a crisis in Australia. We will not get out of it by subsidising the industry. The Premier knows that.

It needs much more than that. It needs a responsible attitude by the entire Australian work force, far better management, co-operation between management and employees, and, most important, Governments that are willing to play their part. We do not need a Government such as we have in South Australia, with the highest growth rate in the Public Service sector of any Government in Australia (even including the Whitlam Government in Canberra from 1972 to 1975), a Government that will increase the taxation level faster than any other State Government in Australia. We need Governments prepared to show moderation in their demands. We know that the State Government's demands through taxation and workmen's compensation have significantly increased the cost of producing ships at Whyalla.

Earlier this afternoon, the Premier read most eloquently a list of the financial promises he had made, provided that the Federal Government increased its financial assistance over and above the 35 per cent. We have this unique South Australian industry that the Premier pretends to defend, but that pretence is so shallow that he is not willing to put one cent of his money into this industry until the Federal Government increases its present bounty of 35 per cent. What a shallow promise from the Premier! Obviously, he has no regard for that industry, even though it is unique to South Australia. He will not fight to defend it. He will make political capital out of it, waiting until the Federal Government has given further financial assistance. It has already given its assistance: we would like more. His Government is not prepared to put one cent in until he receives further Federal assistance. It shows the extent to which the Government case has been a shallow promise, trying to create a political issue out of an unfortunate situation.

Mr. Langley: What would you do?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I know what the Minister of Mines and Energy would do. He would do as he recommended the ratepayers in my area should do about water rates. He suggested that if they could not afford to pay the rates they should move out. Applying the same principle, he would say that if we cannot build ships cheaply we should move out of shipbuilding. I will now show the extent to which the Dunstan Government is trying to play politics against the Federal Liberal Government. On December 18, 1973, the Whitlam Government took the existing subsidy policy for the shipbuilding industry and reduced the long-term benefit to the industry in this State. On that occasion, the State Government did not criticise the Federal Government, but the present Government is simply carrying on that policy of the Whitlam Government in Canberra. That Government formulated the policy. The Premier would not play politics two years ago, but he will play politics now against a Federal Liberal Government. Again, that shows the extent of his shallow political efforts in turning this into an issue. On December 18, 1973, the Whitlam Government, after stating as its policy its intention to provide assistance which would assure the continuing development of a rationalised and efficient shipbuilding industry in Australia, proceeded to decrease the level of assistance available, thus exposing the industry to more direct world competition. It is that world-wide competition that has now brought the Whyalla industry to its knees. Can members recall any outcry

and any expressions of indignation from the State Government on that occasion? No! There was not a murmur from the Government, which accepted it. But now, because there is a Federal Liberal Government, the State Government cries.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Where were your cries at that time?

Mr. Evans: We did not want to play politics.

Mr. Langley: At that time, every second speech condemned the Whitlam Government, and you know it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In 1972, under a Liberal Government, it was established that the bounty should be 45 per cent, and that bounty would be reduced in 1976 to 35 per cent, giving, hopefully, four years for the industry to become competitive on the international market. It was the Whitlam Government that reduced that period and, therefore, reduced the industry's ability to compete on the international market. Then, from the 35 per cent tariff level, it is to be reduced in 1980 to 25 per cent. It was only 10 years before that (in 1971), when there was a floating subsidy of between 25 per cent and 35 per cent, that the Whyalla industry was able to compete for a large tanker on a subsidy of less than 30 per cent. So, only five years ago, it was an efficient industry. But, after three years of the Whitlam Government and five years of the most unfortunate Dunstan Government, that industry can no longer compete. So, the real villains are not members of the Federal Liberal Government, as the Premier would have South Australians believe: the real villains are Labor Administrations at Federal and State levels.

The amendment refers to some of the disadvantages in the area of demarcation disputes and other disputes. This is most important. The industry cannot ever hope to be competitive against world-wide competition unless the productivity of the labour force is increased. I know that some of that increase in productivity obviously must come from improved management facilities and technical equipment, but it must also come from reductions in absenteeism and in the number of industrial disputes. Of the cost of a \$26 000 000 ship, 5 per cent was accounted for by industrial disputes and absenteeism—completely non-productive factors associated with a somewhat disenchanted workforce.

My source of information is a report produced independently by the University of New South Wales and presented on March 4, 1976. Apparently the Minister has not bothered to read this enlightening and important report, the most recent and up-to-date report, which clearly states the position of the Whyalla shipbuilding industry in the world market. Yet the Minister pretends to fight for the industry, although he has not bothered to read the report. Further, 73 per cent of the industrial disputes resulted not from management but from either demarcation disputes between unions or national disputes. So, it is unfair to put the blame on management for the loss of time and salaries and the increases in costs; at least the major responsibility must lie with the unions involved.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Who commissioned the report?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The ship industry. The Minister is trying to say that the University of New South Wales is not independent. Or, would he now deny that? Of course he would not accuse the University of New South Wales of producing a biased report. The report also clearly states that, before the industry can hope to be

competitive in even the short term, it needs an increase in productivity of 75 per cent. In other words, productivity must increase by a factor of 1.75. Then, with a 25 per cent bounty in the long term, the Whyalla industry could compete on an international basis, provided it received in the meantime short-term assistance to carry it over the world-wide economic crisis in the shipbuilding industry. So, the present crisis is not a matter of what happens in the long term, because the Federal Government is maintaining initially a 35 per cent bounty and then a 25 per cent bounty: the present crisis is related to what we do to maintain the industry in the short term.

From the facts I have produced, it is clear that all the industry needs is short-term assistance, yet the Premier is willing to stand here and criticise the Federal Government for not giving greater assistance, when his own Government has not yet offered one cent of assistance. It will give no rebate on pay-roll tax until further assistance comes from the Federal Government. The State Government has introduced legislation, particularly workmen's compensation legislation, which has caused significant increases in labour costs in the shipyard. Recently the Premier at a dinner admitted that the legislation had many deficiencies and should be altered, but he is powerless in Caucus to muster the numbers to remedy the defects in the legislation.

Mr. Wells: What stupid rubbish!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I was at the dinner where the Premier criticised the legislation and where he promised employers that he would amend it if he could. I can show the honourable member the exact words that the Premier said. This afternoon we have seen a shabby attempt by the State Government to turn the entire blame for the unfortunate position of the Whyalla shipyard on to the Federal Government, but we have shown that the Government's argument is hollow. The Premier's own Government is not willing to raise one finger of support to keep the industry going, irrespective of what the Federal Government does. All of the Premier's promises of assistance are conditional on what the Federal Government does; that is all the support that the Premier really wants to give. I suspect that he almost sighed that the Federal Government refused to give further support to the shipbuilding industry. From the way the Premier has spoken, I do not think he really wanted to defend the industry. However, the Opposition takes a totally different line. It wants to maintain the industry and ensure that there is additional work there; if it cannot be in shipbuilding, it should be in other areas. That industry must continue, and the Liberal Opposition pledges its support to ensure that it continues, if not in the area it is in at present, in other areas.

The entire future of the shipbuilding industry needs an agreement between four parties. First, it needs continued and, if possible, increased support from the Federal Government; I do not deny that. Secondly, the industry needs immediate, direct financial assistance from the State Government—not conditional assistance. Thirdly, it needs a review of some unfortunate legislation, such as the workmen's compensation legislation, which the State Government introduced. It needs a general reduction in the overall taxation level imposed by the State Government. Further, it needs an agreement by the unions involved to increase productivity by about 75 per cent in the short term. Finally, it needs a bilateral agreement between the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited and all the employees who are concerned to keep the industry going that they will work together to ensure that the industry becomes more efficient and can survive in the long run. I support the amendment.

The Hon HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): The honourable member said that the Liberal Party would pledge itself to continue the industry, if not in the area of shipbuilding in some other area. Sir, have you ever heard a statement like that? In other words, the Liberal Party is going to pledge itself to continue the shipbuilding industry, if not in shipbuilding in some area other than shipbuilding. I do not know what that means. I do know, however, that this State will continue to be poorly served while the Liberal Party outside this Parliament dredges up some of its dregs and puts them into Parliament as its representatives.

We are told by the member for Davenport that action by all sides is required, yet the Leader of the Opposition made no mention of B.H.P. in his motion or in his comments. The Leader took the line that it was basically the fault of the State Government and the unions. It was another union-bashing attempt. At least the member for Davenport did say that some effort by B.H.P. was required: there was not the implication there that was in the Leader's remarks that all disputes were the fault of the trade unions. However, the member for Davenport did not have the intellectual sense to see that the motion he was supporting singled out the trade union movement. I think it can be said clearly that the propositions put by the State Government were discussed with B.H.P. before they were formulated and submitted to the Federal Government.

Mr. Max Brown: And supported by the management of the shipyard.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is right. So far as B.H.P. is concerned, if the State Government were to provide help on its own, that would not alter the decision that the shipyard would have to close down. It is absolute nonsense and tommy rot for the member for Davenport and the Leader to carry on as they did, suggesting that the State Government support was conditional on additional support from the Commonwealth Government, that that in some sense was a disgrace. The honourable member knows that this industry will shut down without additional assistance from the Federal Government. He knows that within its own resources the State Government will not be able to pick up the tab for the shipbuilding industry.

The proposition put by the State Government (which was not known to members opposite before this afternoon) involved guaranteed loans for re-equipment and that, if B.H.P. will go ahead with re-equipment, the repayment of pay-roll tax as a direct grant to the B.H.P. shipyard would be made. The offer in relation to pay-roll tax alone amounts to 5 per cent of labour costs. Are members opposite so blind with prejudice that they will not listen to what the Premier says? Are they so blind and stupid that they are not prepared to recognise that even assistance of 5 per cent will not rescue the industry? Are they so idiotic as to fail to recognise (although the member for Davenport recognised it partly, although he conveniently forgot about it) that at any one time an international comparison of costs depends on the exchange rate, which is not given by God or by the Commonwealth Treasury.

Mr. Dean Brown: It was given to us by Gough.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Well, we have had it for nine months under the present Prime Minister, who recently went on record in the United States as saying that it would be maintained. Does the honourable member want to say that there is a possibility of devaluation at the present time and that a devaluation of 10 per cent, for example, would produce the same result on the Whyalla shipbuilding industry as an increase in the subsidy by 10 per cent? That is obvious.

Mr. Dean Brown: Are you advocating devaluation?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not advocating that at all. The member for Davenport has a peculiar habit of setting up Aunt Sallys with a couple of false assumptions or fallacious arguments and then trying to say, "You are shot down in flames." It is a pity we have to put up with such an idiot.

Mr. Gunn: That is unparliamentary.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I said that, if there were a devaluation of 10 per cent, that would produce an equivalent result to an increase in the subsidy from 35 per cent to 45 per cent.

Mr. Dean Brown: I am asking you whether you support a devaluation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We have listened to the member for Davenport already. If over the past four years there had been a general revaluation of the Australian currency relative to other currencies, that would have had an adverse effect of about 20 per cent on shipbuilding as much as on other industries which have to face competition from imports or which are export industries. No-one can say when that sort of international change in exchange rates takes place that the industries that are now adversely affected (when they were efficient five years ago) have suddenly become inefficient. The member for Davenport mentioned the exchange rate, yet he had the innocence, the stupidity or prejudice to try to claim that this industry in some sense was efficient five years ago but that it is no longer efficient today. He completely ignored the consequences of the change in the exchange rate. The rural members of the Liberal Party—

Mr. Dean Brown: Are you advocating a devaluation?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —would allow him to ignore that if we were discussing the problems of the beef industry. He would not be saying the beef industry is inefficient just because of the revaluation of the Australian dollar relative to other currencies.

Mr. Dean Brown: Do you believe there should be a devaluation?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The answer to the honourable member is that it is not up to even a Minister of a State Government except in extreme circumstances to propose changes in the exchange rate that might help speculative activities and, even though there is a different Government in power in Canberra, I do not propose to comment on the exchange rate. All I am saying is that, when the honourable member said that the industry was efficient five years ago, he failed to take into account that five years ago the exchange rate was different from what it is today and that five years ago there was not the degree of competition that there is today, from South Korea in particular. I challenge the figures the honourable member gave on shipbuilding costs, because I was told by Sir Ian McLennan that South Korea was undercutting the Japanese to a considerable extent.

I think it is highly relevant to note the kind of extra support currently required for the shipbuilding industry in order to persuade B.H.P. to purchase its ships from its own shipyards: it is not just an issue of other operators in Australia purchasing ships from Whyalla. Admittedly, B.H.P. will pay some higher margin to get a ship from its own shipyard in order to maintain the long-term viability of that shipyard, but it cannot be expected to meet the full difference that exists at present. For the same reason, the State Government on its own cannot meet that full difference. We are saying that additional assistance is required from the Federal Government if the answer to the question, "Do we need a

shipyard in this country?" is "Yes." If we need that from a long-term point of view, appropriate ways and means have to be found to continue the shipbuilding industry. That is the issue, and it is not good enough for a Federal Government, captured by a doctrinaire Treasury point of view, to say, "We will not change the subsidy," when it knows full well that the decision is likely to lead to a complete collapse of the industry.

If a collapse of that industry were to take place, it would be a long-term tragedy, not just for Whyalla and the people associated with Whyalla but for this State and the nation as a whole. We would not be likely to see the redevelopment of that industry. The issue is quite clear. The honourable member for Davenport in saying that the Liberal Party is pledged to maintain the industry either in shipbuilding or in some other area, is really saying "No" to the question, "Do we need, in the long-term, a viable shipbuilding industry in this country?" The honourable member for Davenport has said "No" to that question, because he is not necessarily going to maintain the industry in shipbuilding; he will put it in something else. The honourable member repeated that twice: I nearly fell out of my seat when he said that, because apart from its being horrid English, it implies an incredible attitude. Why does he not say to the honourable member for Millicent, "Look, it is quite all right, Mr. Vandepier, if you lose preselection we will maintain you either in Millicent or somewhere else." He does not tell us where the somewhere else is. I can imagine how pleased the honourable member for Millicent would be about that type of approach. I challenge the honourable member for Davenport to go to Whyalla and tell the workers, "Don't worry, the great Liberal Party is pledged to maintain you in this industry, or somewhere else in some other industry." I have never heard anything so incredible in all my life.

One of the critical factors that applies in this situation (and it also applies in many industries in current Australian circumstances) is that in some sense we have done a little too well with exports of iron ore and coal. The member for Eyre can look puzzled, but as a representative of primary industry he should pay attention to what I have to say.

Mr. Gunn: We listen to you so often.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am stating a fundamental fact that he, as a representative of rural interests, ought to learn. The exports of iron ore and coal have become of such magnitude and earned so much export income for this country that they have been the fundamental force at work in the revaluation of the Australian dollar. Without the expansion of iron ore and coal exports that has taken place in recent years, the Australian dollar would have a lower value than it has today. The Norwegians have seen this kind of problem arise in relation to their own traditional exports and have said, as a deliberate policy, that they will limit the rate of exploitation of their oil industry so that their export earnings do not grow too massively, resulting in the Norwegian kroner becoming too strong. If the kroner rises in value to too great an extent in relation to other currencies, the traditional export industries would be in difficulty.

Mr. Becker: They would have to devalue.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. If the Norwegian kroner becomes stronger and stronger because of export income, all that happens is that these traditional export industries are put out of business.

Dr. Eastick: How do Norwegians build their ships?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Under subsidy, but the shipbuilding industry in Norway is in trouble for reasons similar to those which have put the Australian shipbuilding industry in trouble. The Norwegian kroner has increased in value in relation to other currencies.

Dr. Eastick: How do they stay in business?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Only by increased subsidy in present circumstances.

Dr. Eastick: There is another factor, too.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member might want to knock the Australian industry and the Australian worker: that is his prerogative. No doubt he may want to say that the industry here is inefficient, but the honourable member has a chance to speak and, if that is what he wants to say, he can do so.

Mr. Dean Brown: You are pathetic: you try to wriggle out of every argument advanced.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I would not expect the member for Davenport to understand a single argument I have advanced. One of the reasons that primary product prices are not higher than they are is because of the increase of coal and iron ore exports. This is a fundamental fact of life. Also, I point out to members opposite who represent rural districts that it is indeed strange that the Leader of the National Country Party (the Deputy Prime Minister) presides over the national resources portfolio and is responsible for the expansion of mineral and coal exports, and later, uranium exports, exports which will have tremendous effects on Australia's export earnings and which may cause not a devaluation (and an easier situation for the shipbuilding industry) but a possible further revaluation. It is strange that the Deputy Prime Minister should be in charge of that portfolio, with the expansion of industries falling within its responsibility.

Mr. Russack: Did you say that devaluation would be easier for the shipbuilding industry?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Devaluation of Australian currency would make it easier for the Australian shipbuilding industry, yes.

Mr. Russack: Do you agree with that?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I did not think that the member for Gouger would be as dense as is the member for Davenport. I made clear previously that I did not intend to speculate.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The Minister continues to refer in a disparaging manner about various personal attributes and abilities of members on this side instead of getting to the point and going on with this debate. It does not help him or his case if he does that. I suggest it is unparliamentary.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I withdraw the remark that the member for Gouger is not as obtuse as is the member for Davenport. It is highly relevant to point out that changes in the exchange rate, which are not the result of changes in efficiency within the shipbuilding industry, have a basic effect on the well-being of the industry in the same way as they have a basic effect on the well-being of the beef, wool or wheat industries. In any of these basic industries, what happens to the Australian exchange rate is fundamental, and one cannot blame the industries for what is happening necessarily to the exchange rate.

I prefer in present circumstances not to raise any speculation about our exchange rate, but merely to say that I believe the Federal Government should increase the level of subsidy. True, if there were a devaluation (whether

one advocated it or not) it would have the same impact. The Leader has moved an amendment that is prejudiced in the way in which it is framed. It takes no account of the suggestions advanced by the State Government, after consultation with B.H.P., involving the complete removal of pay-roll tax once sufficient work is undertaken in re-equipping the industry, and involving guaranteed loans to help with the re-equipping of the industry.

Clearly, B.H.P. has found these suggestions to be acceptable, but it will not do enough on its own. The company recognises that the State Government cannot do enough on its own. First, there should be some recognition that the State Government has already played its part. Secondly, any amendment moved to the motion should contain recognition that industrial relations are a two-way thing: it is not just the trade union movement that has to cop all the blame. Therefore, in order to get general agreement on this matter, I intend to move a further amendment, that is, to add the words—

Mr. Coumbe: Don't you think much of your Leader's motion?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Your Leader moved—

Mr. Coumbe: No, your Leader.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am happy to support the motion in its unamended form, but I should like to see a degree of unanimity in the House. The Opposition has raised initial points in complete ignorance of what the State Government has done in any way, and in a way that is somewhat prejudicial regarding the trade union movement. I should like to secure some measure of agreement. We should be united on this question because the issue of Whyalla and its future is far more important than the petty Party-political arguments that have been advanced this afternoon. I move:

After the word "Senators" second occurring to add the words: In addition, this House commend the action already proposed by the South Australian Government for it to play its part in assisting the industry, and request the Government to secure the co-operation of the trade union movement and Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited in the formulation of its policies.

Mr. Dean Brown: The State Government has done nothing. Why should we congratulate it for that?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member persists with his stupid fallacies. I know the Leader wants to protest about this, but I wish he would stop his colleague from being stupid. If he is going to knock over the member for Glenelg in his preselection, then I wish we could get a rise in the intellectual standard of the member for Davenport.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I hope the Minister will keep to the motion. Also, I ask members of the Opposition to cease interjecting.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Can we have a copy of your amendment?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, it is available. The fundamental points to be made are these: first, assistance to the industry must be while the Australian exchange rate stays at its present level, at a level massive enough to ensure the long-term continuance of the industry; secondly, it is a valid proposition that the State Government on its own cannot pick up the tab for the entire industry; and thirdly, it is a reasonable proposition that the State Government should do what it can to assist. It can assist in relation to the re-equipping of the industry, and, when that takes place, it can eliminate pay-roll tax. That suggestion has already been advanced in discussions with B.H.P., and put to the Federal Government.

It is absolutely improper and completely in ignorance of the ordinary arguments that should concern this House for the member for Davenport to say that the State Government does not care and has done nothing. The honourable member is distorting facts in his usual form. It is something that honourable members should ignore, and Opposition members should tell the member for Davenport that they are sick and tired of that sort of thing.

Mr. Venning: He's too good for you.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Anyone can get up and raise scare issues and completely false arguments.

Mr. Becker: You've done a good job.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have not done a good job in that respect. The member for Hanson is not capable of refuting any point I have made on this.

Mr. Dean Brown: You advocate devaluation—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of his seat.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Regarding any increase in costs that has arisen from industrial disputes, I suggest that the industrial record at Whyalla is much better than is the record at Newcastle.

Mr. Nankivell: That's not saying much.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The South Australian record is much better than is the Australian record. So, it would be part of that general pattern. It is fundamental in the securing of industrial peace that there be effective co-operation between management and the men. If the State Government is involved in trying to secure effective industrial co-operation in order to improve the situation, both the company and the men must be involved in that process. That is obvious to anyone, and that is catered for by my amendment.

Let us be clear: if we removed pay-roll tax from the company, if there were a 5 per cent reduction in wages, and if we had complete co-operation between the men and the company with no industrial troubles at all, without further action from the Federal Government the industry would go under. That is the fundamental point and, if the Opposition cannot convince its colleagues in Canberra that if there is no further change in the exchange rate soon, an increased subsidy must be paid, then the Federal Government stands clear on this matter, because it is answering "No" to the question of whether Australia needs a viable shipbuilding industry in the long term. That is what the Commonwealth Government's answer would mean. We do not know yet. All we know is that on the facts that have been submitted to the Federal Government, and on the price of ships available from South Korea at present, no Australian ship operator would buy locally produced ships. That is clear, and the Federal Government must know that. It also knows that when present orders are finished, the yards will have to close.

The Federal Government must know that, if the plants at Whyalla and Newcastle close, those industries will lose their workers and there will be a run-down in the plants. The plants would not be maintained in a condition so that they could readily be put back into production again. That would be the end of the industry in this country, unless some fairy godmother came along in the future and was willing to pay millions of dollars to start it again. If someone were willing to do that, what a stupid policy it would be for the Federal Government to follow. Surely, we can expect from the Federal Government a reply to the question, "Do you want the industry to continue?" The only truthful thing the member for Davenport said was that, at this stage, the Federal Government was committed not to an expansion but to reduce

the subsidy in 1980 from 35 per cent to 25 per cent. It is nonsense for any Treasury adviser or economist to lay down hard-and-fast rules.

Dr. Eastick: What are you on your feet for?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I happen to be a representative of people, no matter what my previous occupation was.

Mr. Venning: Or will be?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have not referred to the honourable member's previous occupation, so what right does that give him to interject? What right has he to interject, if I have no right to be on my feet? It is nonsense for any Treasury adviser, economist, or politician to lay down a schedule of what the future levels of subsidy will be. Who could predict what the future exchange rates will be? Changes in the rate could make absolute nonsense, one way or the other, of predicted levels of subsidy. That is a nonsense position, but that seems to be the position that has been taken by the present Federal Government and by the previous Government. They have both been guilty of nonsense positions. I believe that both those Governments, on this issue, have been dominated by the Treasury, whose advisers have been saying to the Government, "This is an inefficient industry. We should get rid of it. We are better off buying our ships from South Korea." Our answer is—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. Is the amendment seconded?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): The Minister should mouth the words "a nonsense", when one takes heed of his contribution and of his prediction of a devaluation situation, and his move for an amendment, which states nothing about the devaluation to which he has referred. This whole business has become a nonsense by way of the attitude expressed by Government members this afternoon and by the fact that the motion introduces the word "deplore". "Question", yes: "deplore", no. It simply indicates the level to which the Government will stoop in its thrashing around to attack the Federal Government. Every member should question the decision that has been made: that is the attitude expressed earlier this afternoon by the Leader. It is a correct question to ask: it is one that is being asked far beyond this Parliament, and it requires an answer from another Parliament. I believe that, in the announcements made by Mr. Nixon and by Senator Cotton, it is obvious that there will be answers to those questions.

They have said that there will be no immediate approval of an increased subsidy or continuing subsidies of the nature requested until the matter has been properly researched. If any member questions what I am saying, I ask him to consider the original statements of these Ministers, in their joint announcement of a need to examine the whole matter, to recognise that subsidies can only possibly be one component of the whole, and that other facets of the whole matter require urgent examination.

The Minister made great play of the Norwegian situation. Sweden, one of the Scandinavian countries, has had the unfortunate experience of living under a socialist doctrinaire Government for 43 years. The Minister indicated that there was a subsidy payment, but the Swedish industry calls for the construction of the aft end of ships it builds to be built in Portugal and Spain, where they can be built much more cheaply than in Sweden. The aft ends are then floated to Sweden and joined to the stern section, which is built on its home slipways. By so doing, the Swedes can compete on the

market. The Norwegians are able to provide a shipping service for the distribution of goods with ships which do not have to be purchased at exorbitant prices and which do not require freight charges that would price them out of the market.

Mr. Coumbe: Why didn't the Minister mention that?

Dr. EASTICK: Because he did not want to come face to face with reality and recognise that we cannot take one aspect of this matter in isolation from the other aspects. The Leader's amendment goes a long way toward recognising the fact that other important components are also involved. Quite apart from the argument that is put forward from the benches opposite about Opposition members being union bashers, the principle I enunciate is that we believe that the unionists are being exploited by their own hierarchy.

Mr. Olson: That's rubbish.

Dr. EASTICK: That is not rubbish: that is absolute fact. They are creating situations, such as they have in this area, and they run the grave risk in many other areas of entirely pricing themselves out of the market.

Mr. Mathwin: That's what it's all about.

Dr. EASTICK: I indicated to this House earlier that, in the company of the former Minister of Labour and Industry (the former member for Pirie), I listened to an address by the Sales Manager for Australia of General Motors-Holden's. He spoke to a large audience; he made the point (and I repeat the exercise, because I think it is important) that, in the early days of the export of the Holden vehicle when they went to Korea and the northern areas, they were sent in a knocked-down form as a complete unit. Not long after the company was advised, "Please send us the knocked-down unit but eliminate the engine." Why eliminate the engine? Because a factory had been built in South Korea that produced the engine unit and allowed it to be put into the finished article in the north more cheaply than it could be put into the unit exported from Australia.

Soon after a message came through, "Please send us the knocked-down unit without the engine and without the transmission." Why "without the transmission"? Because a factory had been built in the Philippines that produced the transmission units, and they could be supplied much more cheaply than could the Australian product. So the importers at the other end said to the exporters at this end, "Sorry—you have priced yourselves out of the market." That situation has continued, and is continuing now, obviously, in the shipbuilding industry. If we heed the statements made by Government members for a long time, it will continue to happen until it is recognised that the future of Australia and its industrial base depends upon a responsible attitude not only by the employers and the Government but equally and most importantly by the union hierarchy, who at present are not speaking for their rank-and-file members.

We can refer to recent press announcements of surveys that have been undertaken, in which people were questioned about their attitude to the services now being "done" for the union members by their present leaders. Obviously, rank-and-file members of union organisations are gravely concerned at their own future because of the demands made in their name but not by their vote. Members who have been in this place since 1970 may well recall that the member for Gouger, on November 18, 1970, in a debate which is reported at page 2790 of *Hansard*, stated:

I desire today to move the following motion of urgency: That this House at its rising this day adjourn until tomorrow at 1 o'clock p.m. for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that in view of the importance of the automotive industry to South Australia, the industrial unrest in that industry, and the threat posed to South Australia's whole economy by agitation for a 35-hour week, the Government should immediately use its influence with the trade union movement to ensure that no direct industrial action will be taken in this matter outside of the arbitration system established by law.

Mr. Coumbe: Who moved that?

Dr. EASTICK: That was moved in this House by the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Hall) and it was supported by Opposition members, and there was a protracted debate on it by members of both sides. The member for Albert Park, whose contribution is to be found at page 2803 and onwards of *Hansard* clearly indicated that what the hierarchy of the union movement was looking for at that time was not a 35-hour but a 30-hour week. I refer to his actual statement.

Mr. Gunn: It was Mr. Harrison, was it?

Dr. EASTICK: It was Mr. Harrison, who said:

I do not deny anyone their democratic right to say what they like, when and where they like. The people who attend those meetings and make suggestions have to influence the rest of their members and the executive in control of the union; this has not yet been done. Particular reference was made to the proper legal approach that can be made to the Industrial Court, and it was said that we do not want to see a 35-hour week introduced here. The Leader of the Opposition undoubtedly would not have read the paper to which I am referring, but at the recent Federal conference of my organisation we decided to serve a claim on all vehicle industry employers, in which we are asking not for a 35-hour week but for a 30-hour week. Therefore, the people who are raving and ranting at the moment are out of order, because the executive of the Federal congress of our organisation took that decision. Not only that: we are also asking for a minimum weekly wage of \$200. Members opposite may laugh at that, but if they refer to statistics released by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics last December, they will find that the value of money (money which they are so worried about losing and of which they say they have not enough to spend) has fallen drastically, and that \$1 is really only worth 35c.

We accept that the honourable member was formerly Secretary of the Vehicle Builders Union in this State. One could make other comments on this matter, but what is the situation in respect of the most recent claims by the same organisation in seeking a wage increase? I ask members to recognise this situation against the background of the whole approach to industrial affairs and the industrial future and job opportunities in South Australia. Here are some of the 48 demands made on the General Motors-Holden's company recently by the Vehicle Builders Union:

Wages—\$20 across the board increase to all classifications.

Casual employment: That any reference to "casual hire" be deleted from the award.

Special rates and allowances: That all special rates and allowances under clause 12 be increased by 50 per cent and adjusted automatically each quarter with the movement in the c.p.i.

Meal allowances: To be increased by 50 per cent where they appear in the award. Payment is to be made whether the employee has received notice to work or not.

Relief: Increase relief time on a regular eight-hour shift from 36 mins. to 48 mins. and on self-relief from 20 mins. to 30 mins.

Holidays: Where Anzac Day falls on a Saturday or Sunday the following Monday shall be observed as Anzac Day. In addition, show day in S.A./Vic. will become a public holiday, and Easter Tuesday in other States.

Payment of annual leave: The annual leave loading shall be paid on termination of employment. To be increased from 17½ per cent to 50 per cent.

Bereavement leave: Increase time from three to five days. Delete "in Australia" and add grandparents and *de factos*.

Shop stewards: Shop stewards to be allowed time to interview their members during working hours. The company to pay shop stewards normal weekly wages whilst they are attending a trade union sponsored training course. Allowed to meet fortnightly in company time.

Overtime: Double time for all overtime.

Unapprenticed juniors: Adult wages to be paid to juniors at 17 years of age.

Right of entry—union officials: Accredited union officials to have unrestricted right to enter factories at any time and to hold meetings of members on job without loss of pay.

Sunday work: Payment for work on Sundays to be triple time.

Holiday work: Payment for work on holidays to be triple time plus a day in lieu for work on public holiday.

Education: Migrants to be taught English during working time.

Maternity/paternity leave: As applicable to the Australian Public Service.

Child care centre: To be established with trained supervision.

Car parks: Adequate protection to be provided for members' cars in car parks.

Vending machine allowance: A \$5 a week vending machine allowance to be paid to all workers.

Air-conditioning: All closed cabin vehicles used by employees in the course of their duties to be air-conditioned.

They are only some of the 48 claims that have been levelled against General Motors-Holden's.

Mr. Abbott: That's an ambit log of claims.

Dr. EASTICK: The member for Spence obviously is agreeing to and accepting the validity of what I have said: the claims to which I have referred are in the ambit log of claims. Can anyone estimate the cost to the motor car industry of accepting the claims I have read? Can any member opposite disagree that, by making that sort of claim on the employer, the union is seeking to cut down worker involvement in the industry? I say that because more and more materials will be provided from the oversea country to which the product is now exported. In fact, there will be a direct decline in our exports because we will have priced ourselves out of the market.

I say these things because the amendment recognises the reality of a proper tripartite agreement, a proper approach in all these matters relating to the industrial situation in South Australia, in whatever area of production. The State will lose if this is to be the attitude to management and the reason for the recent industrial unrest and wildcatting against the motor car industry in this State.

The Minister of Mines and Energy suggested that what had taken place in relation to the attitude of the present Federal Government Ministers responsible was doctrinaire. I refer him to a previous debate in this House in which every member of the House supported a motion from this side that we express grave concern at Mr. Connor's attitude and its disastrous effect on the Redcliff petro-chemical project, and I ask the Minister whether he is aware of the response to that motion that we received from the Senators for South Australia. I can give the Minister the replies which I received and which showed that all Liberal Senators said that they would press the point and express the views of this House, on behalf of the House and the State. Some Labor members expressed the same attitude, but I also have letters from some Federal Labor colleagues of members opposite indicating that in no circumstances would they interfere with Mr. Connor's attitude.

In other words, they thought that our motion meant nothing, that it did not bind them, on behalf of their colleagues in this State, to seek reassessment of the position from Mr. Connor: the matter was not going to be on their shoulders to raise in Caucus. I wonder what

would have happened if the Premier had taken the same attitude on that matter as he subsequently took on the Industries Assistance Commission report on the motor car industry, when he was invited into the Caucus room and, as a result, we had for a time a definite improvement in the Whitlam Government's attitude to the motor car industry and a reduction in the number of confrontations on the shop floor. I wonder what those same Federal Labor members who refused to intrude on behalf of South Australia would have done if the Premier had sought access to Caucus on that matter.

Much has been said on other matters involving the future of industry in this State, and I make no apology for having departed from the question of Whyalla, because that city is part of the whole State and, if Whyalla goes to the wall, the whole of South Australia will suffer, as it will if the motor car industry or any other of our major industries goes to the wall. We must consider the whole matter and get away from the pure political hocus-pocus evidenced in the Premier's motion this afternoon, particularly in the use of the word "deplore".

The Minister for Mines and Energy has sought to include self-praise by the words "this House commend the action already proposed by the South Australian Government". If that action is worth anything, it should not be necessary to have this House commend it. I suggest that, when we vote, the original motion and the Leader's amendment be supported and that the second amendment be opposed, because it proves nothing. Members, in supporting the original motion and the Leader's amendment, should turn their attention to the word "deplore", which does the Government no credit and which shows that it has completely misunderstood the situation and has attempted to misrepresent it to the people of this State.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I welcome the opportunity to contribute to this debate. I am indeed sorry that I am not following the member for Florey who, I understand, has been gagged in this debate by the Government.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Come on!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Florey was busy preparing a speech to make in this debate. We always look forward to his contributions because he is a Government member to whom we can listen with some attention. At least he is straightforward and does not beat about the bush in what he has to say. The Opposition is sorry that the Government is so insincere about this subject that it is gagging its own members. One of the most forthright speakers on the Government side, a speaker who could probably contribute to the debate, in contradistinction to the Minister of Mines and Energy, has been gagged. What a complete disgrace! I am sure the member for Florey agrees with me on that matter.

As usual, the Minister of Mines and Energy began his tirade by abusing the Opposition. We always know when we have made an effective political contribution that discomforts the Government. It has happened today. The Minister abused the Opposition and spoke about pre-selection and other matters that had nothing whatever to do with the motion.

Mr. Millhouse: They're fascinating matters though.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: They may be, but the Minister was right down in the sewer in his personal abuse of the member for Davenport and other members on this side of the House. His abuse proves the point that the Opposition must have been effective and must have scored points, which the Government did not like. It happens all the time. The Minister has moved an amendment which, in

effect, pats the State Government on the back. The Government should not be repeating an exercise in which it so often indulges, saying, "We are the greatest. This is what we are doing." After all, that is what the Minister's amendment does. The motion is intended to pat the Government on the back in relation to what it is doing for the Whyalla shipyards.

What is the Government doing at Whyalla? As far as I am concerned, the Government is doing nothing for the shipyards. Reference has been made to the efforts of the Whitlam Government. It was in 1972, during the term of that Government, that the scheme was first introduced whereby the subsidy would be reduced gradually from 45 per cent to 20 per cent by 1980, the current subsidy level being 35 per cent. We heard nothing from the Whitlam Government about a subsidy reduction for the shipbuilding industry. The reason for the scheme was to make the industry competitive. It is easy to criticise the present Federal Government, but why are the people of Australia in these present economic circumstances? It is the Whitlam Government, not any other Government, that has largely made the whole of our industry uncompetitive in the world scene.

Surely inflation has a tremendous impact on the operation of the shipbuilding yards. Inflation has had a tremendous impact on wage levels in this country. The member for Light quoted some of the quite unrealistic demands put forward in the current economic climate by unions. Where did this situation have its genesis? It had its genesis during the regime of the Whitlam Government. It is all very well for members opposite to try to sheet all the blame on to the present Federal Government. It seems that it is convenient to forget the disaster (which is not too strong a word for what happened) that befell this country when the Whitlam Government was elected to office.

All members of this House realise that the Whyalla complex is most important in the South Australian industrial scene. The history of the Whyalla shipyards can be traced back to the early days, I understand, of the Second World War. I understand that the first ship launched at Whyalla was the *Whyalla* back in the early 1940's when everyone in Australia had an incentive to produce, to do the right thing and to get on with winning the war. Everyone had his endeavours directed to the war effort. That, really, is the genesis of the shipbuilding industry in Whyalla.

Under succeeding Liberal Administrations, a basic tenet of whose policy was to encourage and stimulate industrial development, the shipyard prospered. We all know that shipbuilding throughout the world has fallen on hard times. This is largely the result of the oil crisis which occurred a couple of years ago and which saw a large drop in orders being placed for tankers, especially super-tankers. Orders simply evaporated. On the world scene, the capacity exists to build far more ships than are required. Australia, at the best of times, is not situated favourably to withstand the economic winds of competition. That is especially evident when one considers what can be achieved in other countries.

The shipbuilding industry has probably been the least capable of any industry to withstand these chill economic winds. It has been suggested that, economically, it would be more profitable for the Australian community to pay shipbuilding workers a substantial living wage (and I am not talking about unemployment benefits), which has been calculated as being about \$8 000 a year. If these workers were to be paid such a wage to stay at home and Australia bought its ships overseas, it is suggested that we would be

better off than we are now. We all understand that the same sort of calculation has been made in connection with the car industry. I have been led to believe that, if we paid our car workers \$4 000 a year to do nothing and imported overseas cars without duty, we would, as a nation, be better off economically.

No-one suggests for a moment we should not support industrial conditions in Australia because, after all, conditions should be superior to some of those that apply in other countries where labour is particularly cheap. However, when one considers the wage to which I referred in connection with the shipbuilding industry, obviously one sees that something is grossly wrong. The Leader's amendment, which was referred to earlier today in an urgency motion, was moved in an attempt to put the whole question in perspective whereas the Government wishes to conduct a single-pronged attack on the Federal Government. The fact is that we are not competitive on the world scene. It is no good the State Government's washing its hands of its contribution to industrial conditions obtaining in this State. The South Australian Government is proud to proclaim itself as the pace-setter in these areas in Australia. One result is that we have lost our competitive position in relation to the other States. More significantly, as can be seen from this motion, we have completely lost our competitive position in relation to overseas markets.

About the only major group that can compete on the open market overseas are our primary producers, who produce a large slice of the national wealth in the export field. In no other significant area of industry can we compete. It therefore ill behoves the Government to suggest that it is taking some real initiative in this matter or that it has done anything over the years to encourage industry, particularly the shipbuilding industry, to remain viable in this State. As the Leader said, there has been only one major industrial development (and I refer to the refinery development) out of the 14 developments that have occurred in this State in the last three years.

There is an obvious lack of interest in this matter from the Government benches, as Government members are contributing very little to the quorum of the House, and as the Government gagged one of its members. We all know of the effects (which the Government has acknowledged) of some of the Government's pace-setting legislation on industrial development in this State. All sorts of benefit have been and will continue to be handed out to one section of the community in South Australia in the name of pace setting.

Probably, the piece of legislation that has done as much damage as any in recent years in relation to increased costs to be borne by industry in South Australia has been the workmen's compensation legislation. Even the Minister of Labour and Industry, who normally aligns himself with the left wing of the Labor movement which has become dominant in the Party Caucus and in the Trades and Labor Council, acknowledges that there is an anomaly in legislation that results in a worker, who stays home through illness, getting more money than his workmates, who have stayed on the job.

A Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act will soon be introduced in this Chamber and I expect the Government to support it. Basically, it is a fair Bill, which will not involve worker bashing or union bashing but which will try to be fair to everyone in relation to a fair level of workmen's compensation. In effect, that Bill seeks to remedy some of the nonsensical and so-called enlightened industrial legislation that the Government has forced on industry in this State in the name of pace setting.

For the Government to ignore the effects that its legislation has had is just not good enough. This Government has contributed largely to increased costs that are being incurred in all areas. One could refer to a whole range of areas in which we have lost any cost advantage that we had. I refer to housing, consumer durables, and so on. The relevant aspect in this debate is the cost to industry. I repeat that, perhaps with one exception, despite what the Premier has said publicly, there has been no significant development in this State in the last three years.

The Government must take its fair share of the blame for what is happening not just in South Australia but all over Australia. Does it intend to disclaim the Opposition's statement that militant unionism has played a significant role in the situation that has developed in the shipbuilding industry? There is plenty of evidence to show that there has been industrial unrest at the Whyalla shipyard and in the city of Whyalla even this year. Today, the painters and dockers at Whyalla are on strike because they say there is a threat of redundancy 12 months hence.

Dr. Eastick: That doesn't sound like a responsible attitude.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It does not sound as though those people are particularly concerned about their fellow workers, who could be faced with redundancy as a result of the Federal Government's decision. They are on strike today, and sea trials cannot be undertaken there with one of the vessels, the name of which escapes me.

Dr. Tonkin: The *Rotorua*.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: They cannot undertake sea trials with the *Rotorua*, because the painters and dockers are on strike, and they have a guarantee of employment for at least the next 12 months. There is plenty of evidence of industrial unrest and militant union activity in Whyalla. I now refer to some reports that have appeared in the press this year, one of which, headed "Wharf strike extension will hit B.H.P. hard", states:

Seventeen blast furnace wharf workers today voted to continue their two-week-old strike, which is causing serious disruptions at the B.H.P. plant. The strikers, members of the Australian Workers' Union, are seeking pay increases. They decided to meet again on Monday to hear a report from the union's industrial officer, Mr. J. Lewis, on a voluntary conference before Commissioner Pryke in Adelaide tomorrow morning.

Industrial disruption will become widespread and retrenchments seem likely following today's decision to extend the strike. Whyalla's acting Town Clerk, Mr. W. Robinson, said it would have a disastrous effect on the city. "The strike will affect the city quickly, especially if retrenchments are necessary," he said. "When you have a situation where the majority of your work force is employed by the one company, B.H.P., then it is obvious there will be problems."

So, this interaction is occurring from union to union within the Whyalla complex. Even the Town Clerk acknowledges this. That does not seem to me to be particularly responsible action when the shipbuilding industry is threatened with complete annihilation. Is the Government trying to suggest that the unions have played no part in this sorry situation that has developed? Another report headed "Strike hits steel works" states:

A strike by mooring gangs threatens to close the Whyalla steel works. The strike, by 14 men and three women, is starving the steel works and blast furnace of coal because ships are unable to berth at Whyalla. The General Manager of the B.H.P. at Whyalla (Mr. J. C. Risby) said last night the situation was "desperate". Unless the dispute was resolved by the week-end the steel works would begin to shut. This would result in retrenchments.

Coal stocks had reached a critically low level and the safety of the coke ovens battery was a cause for concern. . . . The mooring gangs, members of the Australian Workers' Union, have been on strike for two weeks over a pay dispute. They also want a guarantee there will be no further transfers for their gangs.

In other words, because people have been transferred into and out of their gangs, they are on strike. Then, of course, there are the inevitable wage demands. Is the Government saying that the union leaders have no responsibility in this situation, and that they have in no way contributed to this cost structure that has made the Whyalla shipyard completely non-competitive? Let us examine what one of their unionists has had to say. I refer to a man who was on the eve of retirement and who had the courage to speak up. Although many unionists may feel this way, I doubt, having seen what we have seen from some union leaders in relation to the Medibank strike, whether they would find the courage to do it. One man who spoke up was reported in the *Australian*, on August 4, as follows:

Cyril Roebuck and Tony Kirchmer might easily be symbolic of the rise and fall of their home town, Whyalla. "Chook" Roebuck, 65, and about to retire, can look back to practically every launching at the shipyard since 1941. Tony, 19, an apprentice boilermaker, who was born in the town, accepts that he may have to leave.

That article later states:

"Chook" Roebuck, a foreman rigger at the yard, says, "There would be no lack of orders if there were fewer demarcation and inter-union disputes and far less industrial unrest."

A fairly eminent South Australian, Sir Thomas Playford, echoed those sentiments. No-one wants to see South Australia disadvantaged and losing its industry but, instead of simply blasting the Federal Government, let us get an overall view of the situation and apportion the blame where it can be apportioned. Let us take a long-term view of how we can promote conditions in which industry can survive. What Mr. Roebuck has said shows him as a courageous unionist; it is straight shooting.

Mr. Max Brown: He is not a unionist. Don't believe what you have got there.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He is a foreman rigger.

Mr. Max Brown: He is not a unionist.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Obviously, he was involved as an employee in the shipbuilding process, and that is what he had to say. I cannot see that he has any axe to grind on the eve of his retirement, either for the employers or for the employees. It sounds as though he is an honest South Australian speaking his mind. If the Government wants to discredit Mr. Roebuck, the member for Florey, whom the Government has gagged, should speak in this debate and put the record straight. The Government is so eager to push this motion through and so concerned about the future of the shipbuilding industry in Whyalla that it is gagging its own members. Let members opposite refute that. I take off my hat to Mr. Roebuck for speaking out. Do not let the Government say that industrial unrest has not been prevalent at Whyalla and that industrial unrest, as well as irresponsible union leadership and union actions, have not led to the dilemma in which we find ourselves. The name of Mr. Scott inevitably comes up when we discuss union matters. He had a contribution to make at the annual convention of the Australian Labor Party. These were his sentiments on that occasion, as reported under the heading "Subsidy abuse claimed," as follows:

The Broken Hill Proprietary Company had used the Federal Government subsidy for its Whyalla shipyards to buy scooters, utilities and air-conditioning for supervisors, the Australian Labor Party convention was told yesterday. The

State secretary of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union (Mr. J. L. Scott) accused the Broken Hill Pty. Co. of gross mismanagement and inefficiency. He was supporting a motion which backed last year's Australian Council of Trade Unions policy on shipbuilding and demanded that "every endeavour is made to see that the Whyalla shipyard is maintained at full working capacity". The convention adopted the motion. Mr. Scott said that it was constantly stated that shipbuilding at Whyalla was inefficient because of demarcation disputes, but an examination had shown that management promoted these disputes. The Australian Metal Workers Union had held a long inquiry into the Whyalla shipyard and had concluded that the Broken Hill Pty. Co. never fully used the Federal Government subsidy available to it. The company had bought "utilities, scooters and air-conditioning" for supervisors, charging the amounts against the particular contracts. Some shop delegates had stated they had gone to the shipyard to work overtime on a weekend and "never opened a tool box". One of the tragedies of shipbuilding was that there had been no major capital expenditure to bring shipyards up to date. Mr. Scott said it was important the Whyalla shipyards be brought under State control and inevitable that the Australian shipbuilding industry would be nationalised.

If ever there was a recipe for disaster, it would be to nationalise the industry in the terms of Mr. Scott's sentiments, in which event the militant unionists would have a field day and be in control. The general public would have to subsidise to the extent of about \$20 000 a man a year in that event. Let me read now what Mr. Dalziel had to say in refuting Mr. Scott's sentiments. This was reported shortly after the quotation I have just read. The article states:

In the past four years years \$1 440 000 of capital expenditure had been authorised to acquire new equipment and facilities at the Whyalla shipyard, the general manager of the Whyalla Shipbuilding and Engineering Works (Mr. D. J. Dalziel) said yesterday. Mr. Dalziel was commenting on a reported statement by the South Australian secretary of the Amalgamated Metal Workers Union (Mr. J. L. Scott) at the Australian Labor Party convention at the week-end. He said that Mr. Scott's statement showed he was ignorant of the way the shipbuilding industry operated in the past, and lacked understanding of the problems facing it.

Later, it states:

. . . it was strange Mr. Scott should accuse the yard of inefficient operation and then complain that motorised transport had been supplied to certain supervisors to enable them to perform their duties more effectively, and that air-conditioning had been installed to create a better working environment for office-based employees. His claim that the management had deliberately promoted demarcation disputes was completely without foundation.

"He knows that demarcation disputes arise from disagreement between two or more unions as to whose members should do certain work," Mr. Dalziel said. "Such disputes place management in a position, because if they direct that members of one particular union should perform the work, they are immediately in dispute with the other union or unions."

"The management of the Whyalla shipyard has never claimed that demarcation and other industrial disputes are the only problems facing the shipbuilding industry, but they are certainly important problems and, of course, they lie within the field in which Mr. Scott should have something constructive to contribute."

"It is disappointing that, rather than use his influence in this direction he introduces red herrings and resorts to the time-worn cry that State control is the complete answer to all the industry's problems."

In other words, he was referring to the nationalisation advocated by Mr. Scott. We have heard Mr. Scott's name in this House a few times in recent weeks. It ill behoves people in his position, a position of influence on the executive of the Trades and Labor Council, an influential figure in the trade union movement, and also in influencing the Labor Party in this State, to continue with that negative attitude which is completely unhelpful in the present situation at Whyalla.

Mr. Evans: Industry bashing.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Either Mr. Scott is telling lies or Mr. Dalziel is telling lies. It is ludicrous to suggest that the management of the B.H.P. shipyard is deliberately fomenting industrial demarcation disputes. It is nonsense for Mr. Scott to suggest that. I have been at functions where Mr. Dalziel has been present, and I heard him speak to a group of people who certainly would not gain the commendation of members opposite. I have heard him speak about the worry in the shipbuilding industry, and the concern about whether the industry could be maintained at Whyalla. It ill behoves the Government to seek to place all blame for what has happened industrially, the conditions in industry in South Australia, on the Federal Government now in office when the Whitlam Government made a major contribution to industrial disaster in this country. I believe that the major problems which presently confront this nation and which the present Commonwealth Government is trying to grapple with are inflation, unemployment, and the high level of wage escalation, and that these result from the Whitlam Administration. We cannot support this mealy-mouthed amendment of the Minister. We should support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, thus giving some qualified support through that amendment to the Government's original motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I understand that this matter has in one form or another been debated for the whole of this afternoon. I am not sure that I missed much through not hearing the first two hours of it. I have been listening to the debate now for an hour or more, and I have to say, with due deference to both sides, that I have not been much impressed by the speakers from either side. I came into the Chamber when the Minister of Mines and Energy was about a third of the way through his speech.

Mr. Gunn: He didn't say anything.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know that he did say much. On the other hand, I have to say to the member for Eyre that I am not sure his colleagues have said much, either. This is the first debate I have heard in the House for about 10 days, because I was away for the whole of last week—and that was probably noticed. One advantage of getting away from this House is that one gets rather more into perspective the pettiness of the Party politics that are thrown from side to side of the Chamber. I must say that the speeches I have heard this afternoon have, in that regard, become pettier and pettier, yet this is a matter that should be, if there is any matter that is important to South Australians, beyond argument between the Labor Party in Government and the Opposition Parties.

I cannot believe that if there had been a Labor Government in Canberra we would have had a motion like this from the Government, justified though I believe it is today. The fact is that the State Government does these things only when it thinks it will score a political point off the Liberal and National Country Party Government in Canberra. This is a prime example of it although, as I say, it is justified. Had the Whitlam Government still been in office in Canberra we just would not have had a motion on this subject at all or, if we did, it would have been much different.

On the other hand, the Liberal speakers I have heard have been, if I may say so, fairly wide of the actual subject matter of either the original motion or the amendments. Liberal speakers have gone in for their usual line of anti-unionism. However, I do not want to speak for more than a few minutes, as I have given an undertaking to the Government Whip that I will go for no more than for another five or six minutes. I simply want to say why I

support the motion, and perhaps I shall be going briefly over some of the ground that has been tilled this afternoon.

I do it on two grounds. First, Australia is a maritime nation and it does, at its peril, abandon its shipbuilding industry. The whole of history is a testament to the foolishness of a country like ours not having any capacity to build ships, whatever the cost may be. Probably, the following example has already been given (it comes readily to mind): the English Merchant Navy was fostered because English goods had to be carried in English bottoms. It was not a matter of the best economics of English trade 300 or 400 years ago: it was simply a matter of encouraging the English shipbuilding industry.

Although the Australian shipbuilding industry is not competitive on the world market (and we know that, although it is not because of imposts levied by the State Government), I do not believe that the shipbuilding industry is any less efficient or more prone to strike action than is any other part of Australian industry. This industry should not be singled out, as it is being singled out now, for extinction, in any case.

The second ground on which I support the motion is that all South Australians have a stake in the future of Whyalla. Whyalla might not support members from this side of the House politically, but that, to me, is utterly irrelevant. Whyalla, if not the biggest, is one of the biggest regional centres in this State, and the health of South Australia depends on its preservation. For those two reasons (one a national reason and the other a State reason), I support the motion.

I do not like (and I must say this) the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, for the reasons I have given, that is, it is a bit cheap and a bit Party-political. I prefer the amendment (if an amendment is necessary at all: I do not know why the motion cannot stand as it is) of the Minister of Mines and Energy. If we are to have an addendum to the original motion I, if forced to choose, would have to choose to support that amendment rather than the first one. That is all I have to say. I hope I have not transgressed in regard to time, but I hope I have made my position clear.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): It has been interesting to observe the reaction of Government members, especially the lack of back-bench support in this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member please take his seat. The honourable Premier.

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

That the sittings of the House be extended beyond 6 o'clock.

Motion carried.

Mr. GUNN: It is interesting to note the lack of support by back-bench members of the Government. I should have thought that Government members with a trade union background would rise in their places and defend strongly the course of action that the Government has put forward. Opposition members have listened for a long time to members of the Government Party claiming to look after the welfare of the workers of South Australia. Clearly, by their lack of action today members opposite can be described only as seat warmers, because of their inaction. Members opposite are here only to fulfil the wishes of the Premier and the front bench or take direct instruction from the Trades and Labor Council. Obviously, Government members are not permitted to rise in this debate. Only one Government member (the member for Whyalla) spoke, and he talked a lot of nonsense.

Mr. Max Brown: This speech will go in the *Whyalla News*.

Mr. GUNN: I hope the honourable member will quote some of the statements I will read out.

Mr. Max Brown: I hope you will come up and tell the workers about it.

Mr. GUNN: When the honourable member has finished, I will continue. We had an interesting contribution by the member for Davenport, who clearly proved to the House that the Government was two-faced. His speech was followed by an abusive contribution by the Minister of Mines and Energy, who advocated to this House and to the people of South Australia a devaluation of Australian currency. This matter has been discussed at great length in the past few months in Australia. We experienced revaluation under the Labor Government, but the Minister of Mines and Energy has now indicated his support for the devaluation of the Australian dollar.

I recently took the opportunity to write to the Federal Treasurer regarding this matter, because I believed that it was important to know the Government's attitude on devaluation and how it would affect the people of this country. I will quote from page 2 of the letter I received in reply, written on August 6 under the Treasurer's letter-head, as follows:

Secondly, devaluation would increase prices, and inflationary expectations, in Australia. Import prices would be affected immediately and prices of local goods competing with imports could also rise. These price rises would make it more difficult to restrain wage increases (especially in the context of wage indexation) to levels needed if inflation is to be brought under control. As you know, the Government believes that lasting economic recovery cannot be sustained unless inflation is overcome. That is why control of inflation is our top economic priority. Devaluation would jeopardise this objective.

I am sorry that the Minister is not at present in the Chamber. The letter continues:

I believe that the inflationary consequences of a devaluation would be most harmful to rural producers. Experience overseas and in Australia shows that the initial stimulus to rural (and other) incomes resulting from a devaluation tends to be quickly dissipated by cost rises, especially in circumstances where the pre-devaluation inflation rate is high.

That applies in Australia now. The letter states that the Commonwealth Treasurer was pleased that I supported the stand taken by the Prime Minister when he was in the United States of America. I will now quote from a report from which the member for Davenport has also quoted, and I hope that the member for Whyalla will have this inserted in the *Whyalla News*.

Mr. Jennings: Get on with it!

Mr. GUNN: I do not intend to be told to get on with it by the member for Ross Smith.

Mr. Langley: You know all about Whyalla?

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member does not know anything about anything.

Mr. Langley: Yes I do. I have just been—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: Page 29 of the report states:

May 31, 1972: Imports on the horizon. The Government acted on the Tariff Board report in May, 1972, 11 months after it was presented. The maximum level of subsidy was raised to 45 per cent, as the board had suggested. This level was to continue to the end of 1975 to assist much needed development in the yards. It was then to be reduced to 35 per cent until the end of 1980, when it was to drop to 25 per cent.

That action was taken by the McMahon Government. Page 37 of the report states:

December 18, 1973: Imports at the door.

The Minister at that time was Charlie Jones, obviously a friend of the member for Whyalla and the Minister for Transport.

Mr. Becker: He's had an engine named after him.

Mr. GUNN: Yes.

Mr. Langley: There have been a few changes in the Liberal Ministers, too.

Mr. GUNN: Perhaps the honourable member is concerned about Mr. John Scott, Mr. Apap and the member for Salisbury. The report, together with the press statement released by Mr. Jones, clearly proves to the people of South Australia and Whyalla that it was the Whitlam Government which initiated the reduction of the subsidies from 45 per cent to 35 per cent. All that the current Commonwealth Government has done is continue that policy. We never heard any criticism of Mr. Jones (when a member of the Whitlam Ministry) when he took this course of action. For the benefit of the member for Whyalla I point out that, for most of the past three years, we were under the Whitlam Government and during that time three major shipyards, namely, Adelaide Ship Construction Company, Walker's Limited, of Queensland, and Evans Deakin Limited, of Queensland, were closed, but our State Government did not roundly criticise the Commonwealth Government. The State Government is being completely hypocritical and trying to make a cheap political point over an issue initiated by the Whitlam Government, through its Minister (Mr. Jones). It ill behoves the Minister of Mines and Energy to try to advocate devaluation as the answer to the problem of the shipbuilding industry when that decision would cause far greater problems to the community.

Mr. Max Brown: He didn't advocate that.

Mr. GUNN: Of course he advocated it. He spoke in this House for 30 minutes, and he did two things. First, he launched a personal attack on the member for Davenport and other members on this side.

Mr. Max Brown: He asked whether you people wanted to devalue, because that was the alternative.

Mr. Dean Brown: He did three things.

Mr. GUNN: Yes. He made a complete fool of himself, and I hope the member for Whyalla takes the speech that the Minister made and has it printed in his local paper; or perhaps he could put it in the mail boxes of the houses in Whyalla; then he could let the people judge who has been talking nonsense. I challenge the member to do that. I support with pleasure the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, because it is realistic and proper, and in the interests of the people of this State.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I have great difficulty in supporting the amendment that the Minister of Mines and Energy has moved, but I should like first to speak about the motion moved by the Premier. He set out to say that it was not a Party-political debate and that he did not wish to make politics out of the debate, but he used the word "deplore"—he deplores the decision of the Commonwealth Government. Immediately, he set out to make it a Party-political debate; there is no doubt about that. That was his intention, the purpose being to try to gain a political point against the Federal Government. What are the reasons for the present position of the shipbuilding industry of South Australia? First, we must admit that there is a lack of demand in the world for new ships or vessels: they just are not required. Secondly, we have priced ourselves out of world markets; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. Max Brown: The Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited will require four ships.

Mr. EVANS: The B.H.P. may require four, but that is not my point. My point is that there is a lack of demand in the world for ships. Admittedly, the B.H.P. is looking for four new vessels it has ordered, but can we go on subsidising our own industry if within the industry we are not looking at the real problem? We do not have it only in the shipbuilding industry: we have it in most other facets of our industrial base in this country, no matter whether it is the motor car, the shipbuilding or any other field. We have priced ourselves out of the world markets. We cannot compete and, if we cannot compete, we are in trouble. So our first real trouble is in the shipbuilding industry at Whyalla.

If the B.H.P. did order the four ships from Whyalla, how much longer would it survive? Would that solve the problem? Would the State Government back the Whyalla project any more than it has backed projects in the past? Will the trade union movement settle down and realise that it is pricing itself out of the market? Will it realise that it is exporting jobs, that its own members are being put out of work because of its action, mainly by the leaders of the unions? The rank and file member of a trade union nowadays realises that he has priced himself out of a job, but the leaders still take control of the unions and force them often into a position of going on strike or calling for demarcation disputes. It is no good kidding ourselves: the position is serious, and what we see at Whyalla is only the tip of the iceberg. If anyone here believes that by solving the position in Whyalla in one or two years we shall solve the problems in industry, he is hiding his head in the sand. We know that that is not the case and that we have priced ourselves out of world markets in virtually everything. People in industry already are asking for a 35-hour week: they know, and we know, that that cannot be afforded.

We should be advocating a 40-hour week in all sections of our work-force, at the base rate. The only way in which we will get out of the present situation is by working our way out. If price control is needed in some areas, we should take that action, too. We will not get out of trouble at Whyalla or in the motor car industry by saying that fewer hours should be worked for more money, more days off, or more benefits.

Mr. Max Brown: Haven't you read today's *Australian*?

Mr. EVANS: The honourable member knows that what I am saying is true, and that we cannot afford to reduce working hours. We should be increasing them, because that would help to improve the unemployment situation. If we did that, we would create more jobs, because we could sell more items outside Australia. The Leader's amendment urges the Government to reduce taxation and take measures that would increase productivity.

[Sitting suspended from 6.02 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. EVANS: The Government could grant pay-roll tax concessions, if it were really concerned about the situation at the Whyalla shipyard. The Premier admits that South Australia will have a Budget surplus of \$27 000 000, and part of those funds could be used to benefit the shipyards. Likewise, the Premier could encourage other industry within the locality to create jobs, so that if the worst does eventuate at the shipyards and B.H.P. had to reduce considerably its staff, other employment opportunities would be available at Whyalla. We know that that

situation could not be achieved overnight, but the Government should be working actively by at least offering to any industry that is willing to go to Whyalla a benefit by way of pay-roll tax reduction.

Workmen's compensation legislation no doubt places a heavy burden on industry when the provisions of that legislation are carried to the degree that benefits have now reached. No-one suggests that a person should lose financially if he is injured. However, many people can gain financially by being away from work because they have suffered an injury. I am not saying that, in the sense of physical pain, inconvenience, or incapacity, they should not be compensated: what I am saying is that people in that category can never be adequately compensated. However, in monetary terms some people can be over-compensated when compared to other workmen who are fit and able to work. Workmen's compensation legislation should be amended to overcome that anomaly and, if such action were taken, the result would benefit not only Whyalla shipyards but also all other industry. If, because of a reduction in work available, people had to move into other industries, such industries could be given an incentive to create employment opportunities for people. During this debate the Minister of Mines and Energy advocated devaluation. No-one could doubt that.

Mr. Langley: I doubt it! I don't think he said that.

Mr. EVANS: The member for Unley doubts it. However, knowing the Minister's past capacity to speak about a subject and to promote that subject, the idea he has in mind on this issue is that someone, for instance, the media, will take it up and peddle it. The Minister obviously intends that that proposition should come forward. He did not have the courage blatantly to put his name to it; he did it by using a back-door method. It is an attribute that he has had for as long as I have known him. He would not deny that he advocates devaluation but, in the House, he will not admit that he believes that we should devalue. I hope that his Party does not have too much pull over him to stop his saying it. I would hope that he is a man who would say it rather than introduce it by a back-door method, which is what he tried to do in the House this afternoon.

I know that Australia has a problem not only in its shipyards but elsewhere, too. Unless Government administration, industry, and the trade union movement take the initiative to eliminate the problems of low productivity and high costs, we will be in trouble. Perhaps we should introduce automation and more methods of decreasing the use of manpower: we may need to do that in the shipyard, if wages are one of the factors that are pricing us out of the market. That is what is happening all the time, and it is one of the problems leading to our unemployment rate.

I object to the word "deplore" in the Government's motion, as it is an unsatisfactory word to use in the present circumstances, if we expect both Parties to support the motion, and I do not like the amendment moved by the Minister of Mines and Energy. I appreciate that the Leader, in his amendment, has at least tried to place the blame in all courts where the problem lies. I support the Leader's amendment.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): We are discussing a matter involving people who live in the North of the State. We are also speaking about a great industry and the future of a prominent, large city located in the iron triangle. We are referring, too, to an industry that was established

just before the Second World War, during the term of office of Sir Thomas Playford as Premier. He gave incentive to the industry, as a result of which it flourished and built naval vessels. Since then, it has had a remarkable history of building fine ships. I have visited Whyalla many times and, indeed, have sometimes witnessed the launching of a vessel. I have also had the chance to climb over vessels and inspect the type of construction, design, and workmanship, and I am proud that we in South Australia have been able to build this type of vessel.

Dr. Eastick: But what's happened?

Mr. CUMBE: Today, unfortunately, there has been a complete about face. This debate revolves around the people of Whyalla, their livelihood, and their future in this State. I refer not only to the people but also to the future of the city of Whyalla and of this important industry. I listened with considerable interest this afternoon to the contributions made to the debate by members on both sides, and came to the conclusion that we are, after all, after the same thing. We all have one thing in common: the preservation of this industry, the city, and the jobs and welfare of the people who live in the area. It is only the method of dealing with the problem on which we differ.

I am the first to admit that there are faults on several sides in this matter. Having had some experience in this industry, I am aware of those faults, which have been referred to today. I have also taken the trouble to study world-wide trends in this maritime industry. I know that shipyards in Japan and Korea went mad a few years ago.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You just go on your hardest, John, because I always like to listen to you.

Mr. CUMBE: Insults will get the Minister nowhere. However, I am grateful for his encouragement, not that I need much of it. My understanding of the situation on a local basis is that the yards in Japan and Korea went mad building super-tankers. Today, we have a glut of these tankers: some of them are tied up and others have been converted. Indeed, berthed at Outer Harbor a few days ago was a smaller tanker that had been converted for sheep carrying.

Dr. Eastick: Unfortunately, some of them have sunk.

Mr. CUMBE: That is so. Some of these super-tankers created their own problems, as they could not berth in many ports in the world. Those vessels had problems in loading or unloading their cargoes of crude oil or refined spirit. I know of the position in Scandinavian countries and in some of the United Kingdom yards, especially in Scotland, where some of the finest vessels and engines have been built on the Clyde, and also in Ireland. The problem is world wide, and it has been reflected in Australia. The major yards with which we are concerned are Whyalla and the Cockatoo yard in New South Wales: I think Williamstown is in a different category; and Evans Deakin has closed in Queensland, having gone by the board. I listened with some interest earlier to our economic expert, the Minister of Mines and Energy, speaking about devaluation. We need not talk about that: it could well be on tonight, although I have some doubts about that.

Mr. Jennings: I think it will be on, because Fraser denied it in the United States.

Mr. CUMBE: I see. The Minister's comment was interesting. He was almost postulating reducing our exports of minerals. That was a most extraordinary statement from any Minister, let alone the Minister of Mines and Energy, whose job I would have assumed would be to promote the exploration, winning, and export of

minerals from this State. He was putting forward an economic theory, showing the academic ivory-tower approach to the problem of development, and how it fell to the ground! The member for Light gave a death-blow to the Minister's theories when he so tellingly put forward his points. I want to pose some questions. This problem has not arisen overnight: it has been developing for several years, so why did not the Whitlam Government, when in power last year, go above the 35 per cent subsidy?

Mr. Becker: Couldn't afford it.

Mr. Abbott: It can't afford it! The Senate won't let it.

Mr. CUMBE: I thought the member for Spence might come in.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: It was a member on your side who said that.

Mr. CUMBE: No, it was the member for Spence. The 35 per cent subsidy is being sustained: in other words, the situation left by the Whitlam Government is being sustained by the present Federal Government. Why did a large subcontractor in Whyalla close down last year? This was most unfortunate, but there had been a slowing down in the number of orders at the yard. As I understand it, when the present orders are completed no more are to proceed. That is why we are anxious that the naval vessel *Tobruk* should be built at Whyalla. It is a most important matter. The vessel is to be built for the Royal Australian Navy, and the present Government has said that it should be built in Australia.

Mr. Max Brown: Under what subsidy?

Mr. CUMBE: Just a momeent. I am trying to find out whether the member for Whyalla really wants this vessel built at Whyalla. We are referring to a naval vessel, and we are not asking about a subsidy, because the taxpayer will be paying. The people of Australia will be the owners. The owner will not be a private organisation, but the Australian Government and the Australian people. It does not matter where the subsidy goes: it is important to ensure that the vessel is built.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What about the A.N.L.?

Mr. CUMBE: I am speaking about one vessel at a time, which was referred to this afternoon. The Australian National Line position is a *fait accompli*. Regarding the future (we must not dwell too much in the past), the *Tobruk* must come to Whyalla. I think the Premier said today that this will not solve the long-term problem but, at least, let us get the *Tobruk* here. I would be the first to promote a higher subsidy or further methods of assistance to such an industry. This industry should receive a greater rate of subsidy or assistance, and I make that point clear, so that there can be no misunderstanding about it.

I assure Government members that the Leader's amendment seeks to achieve that, and that is why I support it. The position is (and I am sure the member for Whyalla will appreciate it, because it arises from talks I have had with several people) that the amount of undercutting achieved by Korean shipbuilding yards especially is so large that in South Australia, even if all the steel required to build the tanker or bulk carrier were provided free, we would still be unable to compete regarding costs. True, B.H.P. has an advantage because it can supply steel at cost compared to other yards. This is the whole tragedy. In fact, we could even provide for nothing a significant part of the labour cost and still be unable to compete. How far will we go to assist this industry? The industry merits, deserves, and must receive further assistance. Many figures have been quoted in the past about increasing the 35 per cent subsidy.

Some members, including the member for Whyalla, have referred to labour problems. The worst type of industrial dispute is a demarcation dispute. Unfortunately, such disputes have occurred at Whyalla, and they had occurred in the Adelaide Ship Construction establishment. I had been previously involved with that company, and was able to obtain extra orders, but, unfortunately, it is now closed. I hope such disputes will not continue at Whyalla because, first, costs are increasing, and, secondly, delivery dates cannot always be guaranteed. We should all be considering this problem, not from the point of view of the different political Parties but from the aspect of what we can do for the people in Whyalla and for the industry. I support the Leader's amendment, because it is a better way of seeking assistance for this industry and I believe every member wants greater support for this industry.

The House divided on Dr. Tonkin's amendment:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Allen, Allison, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Vandepeer, Venning, Wardle, and Wotton.

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Arnold. No—Mr. Keneally.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson's amendment carried.

Motion, as amended, carried.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 1)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

CONSTITUTION CONVENTION

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

That whereas the Parliament of South Australia by joint resolution of the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly adopted on September 26 and 27, 1972, appointed 12 members of the Parliament as delegates to take part in the deliberations of a convention to review the nature and contents and operation of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia and to propose any necessary revision or amendment thereof:

And whereas by resolution of the House of Assembly of Thursday, August 28, 1975, and agreed to by the Legislative Council on the same day it was *inter alia* resolved that the Hon. J. D. Corcoran be appointed as a delegate to take part in the deliberations of the convention:

And whereas it was further resolved that each appointed delegate shall continue as a delegate of the Parliament of South Australia until the House of which he is a member otherwise determines notwithstanding a dissolution or prorogation of the Parliament:

And whereas the convention has not concluded its business:

Now therefore it is hereby resolved:

1. That the appointment as a delegate of the Parliament of South Australia of the Hon. J. D. Corcoran be revoked and the Hon. P. Duncan be appointed such a delegate in the place of the Hon. J. D. Corcoran; and
2. That the Premier inform the Governments of the Commonwealth and the other States of this resolution.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution, and requesting its concurrence thereto.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS

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

That the House of Assembly request the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment for the present session of a joint committee to which all consolidation Bills shall stand referred, in accordance with Joint Standing Order No. 18, and to which any further questions relative thereto may at any time be sent by either House for report.

That, in the event of the joint committee being appointed the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members, two of whom shall form the quorum of the Assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolutions.

That the Premier, and Messrs. McRae and Vandepeer be representatives of the Assembly on the said committee.

Motion carried.

INFLAMMABLE LIQUIDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Inflammable Liquids Act, 1961-1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: 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

The whole purpose of the Inflammable Liquids Act is to ensure that those inflammable liquids that will readily ignite are stored and conveyed in a safe manner. Motor spirit and kerosene are inflammable liquids to which the Act applies, whereas diesel fuel, because of the low temperature at which it will ignite, is not subject to the Act. The distinction that has existed for many years contained in the definition of inflammable liquids in the principal Act is that the Act applies to inflammable liquids that have a flash point of less than 150°F., which is about 65°C.

Heating oil as produced some years ago ignited at a temperature just over 150°F. Because of refining practice necessary with Australian crude oil, heating oil now produced in Australia ignites at a slightly lower temperature. In recent years consideration has been given by the Standards Association of Australia as to whether it is necessary

for heating oil now produced to be subject to the same control as is necessary in respect of motor spirit and kerosene. The association has recommended that the flash point temperature should be reduced to 61°C, and action has been taken in all other Australian States to amend the legislation to adopt this lower flash point.

The purpose of this short Bill is to amend the definition of inflammable liquids by reducing the flash point from 150°F to 61°C, a reduction of 8°F or 4°C. The effect of the amendment will be that heating oil will not be subject to the provisions of the Act. This change has been sought by the oil industry. As public safety will not be affected, and the change is made as a result of a recommendation of the Standards Association of Australia that has been adopted in all other States, the Government intends that this amendment be made. Clause 2 is the only operative clause that gives effect to the above amendment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION BILL

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

That the South Australian Health Commission Bill, 1975, be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill, pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act, 1934-1975.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE moved:

That the report of the Select Committee on the Bill be brought up on Wednesday, August 18.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 12. Page 623.)

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): When I sought leave to continue my remarks last Thursday, I had been discussing matters of concern to my district. The next matter to which I refer is the condition of roads in the Coober Pedy area. I have received a letter, dated August 9, from the Secretary of the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners' Association, which states:

I have enclosed with this letter a copy of a letter which was sent to the Highways Department and also to the Premier's Department but, as yet, there has been no action taken, let alone a reply to our letter. The Highways Department has been in this area for nearly a month now but our inquiries to them did not extract any definite statements only more promises such as they would attend to the main bitumen road on July 24, but still nothing has been done. We, of Coober Pedy, like to try and contribute what we can to the State but we do not wish to add to its death road toll.

That is signed "J. Thrower, Secretary". I should now like to quote from a letter that the Secretary of the Progress and Miners' Association wrote to the Commissioner of Highways on August 9:

It has been brought to the attention of our committee the shocking state of our two main roads, the central bitumen road and the 14-mile road. As these roads carry constant traffic, all of which has to zigzag between the pot-holes, most of which are near corners or bends, it is feared by the committee that some serious accidents may soon occur. Through previous correspondence over the last three months your department has promised to attend

to this matter, but so far nothing has been done and the condition of the roads worsens. The committee would therefore appreciate it if you could give this matter your immediate consideration. I have just received a complaint from the police this afternoon about this very subject and how serious it has become. I am therefore forwarding a copy of this letter to the Premier's Department to see if anything can be done immediately.

That, too, is signed by the Secretary. I sincerely hope that the Minister of Transport takes immediate action to upgrade that road. Some months ago, during a visit to that part of my electorate, I myself noticed and had drawn to my attention by a constituent in that area, the shocking condition of those two roads, and the pot-holes in the bitumen. It was obvious that unless some action was taken the roads would continue to deteriorate. The Highways Department should immediately take the necessary action to rectify these problems. The people living in that part of South Australia have many problems to contend with and are entitled, as citizens of this State, to get a fair go from the Government. This Government likes people to play their part by paying their taxes; these people have to pay their registration and drivers' licence fees. Surely they are entitled to receive back a little money by way of expenditure on their roads.

I received today from the Minister of Transport a letter about the Stuart Highway, in which he indicates that the Government has received a report from a working party about the route that that road should follow. I hope that after both the Commonwealth and State Governments have considered the report it will be made available to all members of the House and to the public. During the speech made by the Treasurer in this debate, he made great play of the problems facing this State in relation to the financial policy of the current Federal Government. The current Federal Government has adopted the proper course of action to solve the economic ills of this country. We are aware that the current State Government intends to starve country towns in South Australia so that it can continue with the Treasurer's pet baby, Monarto, a project that is not required at this stage. We in the Liberal Party believe that that land should be leased back for agricultural purposes and the funds now being spent on that project should be given to existing country towns so that they can be upgraded by their local government authority.

I cited the other night in this House problems that I have in my electorate at Ceduna and that the LeHunte council has: it cannot get even a few thousand dollars to have a survey carried out by the Health Department to put in an effluent drainage system. Yet the Government can pay \$100 000 to the former Chairman of the Monarto commission. The Government can spend millions of dollars, but what have we got from Monarto—a few glossy reports, some red and yellow flags, and the only success so far has been a few trees. It does not take an enormous staff and expenditure to achieve that small aim. This Government must wake up to itself and come to its senses. If it stays in office, I predict we shall see the existing small and medium size country towns starved of their rights so that the Government can continue with the Monarto concept, a figment of the Treasurer's imagination that should be stopped immediately. We on this side of the House are not ashamed to state our case clearly, and we have done it right from the outset. The member for Mount Gambier obviously needs funds in his area but he will not get them while Monarto continues. Every member on this side of the House who represents country towns has problems but, as long as good money continues to be thrown after bad money, we shall see nothing in the country areas. All we shall see is the Treasurer

standing up and talking nonsense, as he has done for the last three or four years about the great benefits of Monarto.

Who will live in Monarto? It is obvious that the Treasurer will conscript those people currently employed in the Agriculture, Lands, and Environment Departments. People will not go there voluntarily. What industries will be set up there? When we are discussing decentralisation (and that is what Monarto is supposed to mean) we must protect existing industries in country areas and not let them run down. As long as we continue with the Monarto concept, we shall destroy existing country industries.

One final matter that I want to draw to the attention of the House is a report in the *Commonwealth Record* of July 12-18, 1976. It is a statement by the Federal Treasurer, Phillip Lynch, which completely contradicts what the South Australian Treasurer has been saying. He states:

The Treasurer, the Hon. Phillip Lynch, said today that on present estimates the States would receive some \$93 000 000 more in revenue sharing this year than they would have received under the previous Government's arrangements. The Treasurer said that some \$30 000 000 of this was the result of a Commonwealth Government decision taken today. In giving details of today's decision, Mr. Lynch said that the figure of \$93 000 000 was a substantial increase on the expectation at the June Premiers' Conference that the States would gain by some \$55 000 000 as compared with their position under the previous Government's arrangements. On present estimates the States would receive an increase of almost 21 per cent in general revenue assistance over last year. It was estimated at the June Premiers' Conference that the States would receive in 1975-76 in general revenue assistance the equivalent of 33.6 per cent of personal income tax collections in that year. In the outcome, personal income tax collections for 1975-76 were \$9 219 400 000, as announced by the Treasurer on July 7. This would have produced a percentage of 33.3295 for the tax-sharing formula to be applied to collections of personal income tax in 1976-77. However, in view of the fact that the June conference had in mind 33.6 per cent the Government had now confirmed this percentage for the purpose of the tax-sharing arrangements. This figure was now final and would be the basis of calculating the States' share of personal income tax in future. As well as the estimated \$93 000 000 in additional general revenue for the States, the Commonwealth Government had decided in May to provide \$140 000 000 this year for local government—an increase of 75 per cent on last year. The new arrangements were generous, especially so in view of the Commonwealth Government's determination to relieve the burden on taxpayers. The Commonwealth Government was applying stringent economies to its own spending. The States should do likewise. The States would need to understand that they could not continue to spend more and more each year in real terms and expect the Commonwealth to foot the bill.

I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it a set of figures clearly outlining the general purpose funds for States and authorities for the forthcoming year.

Leave granted.

General Purpose Funds for States and Authorities

	(1) Level of Funds 1975-76 \$m	(2) Estimated Level in 1976-77 \$m	(3) Increases \$m	
Financial assistance grants/tax sharing entitlements . . .	3 072.8	3 716.2	643.4	20.9
Local government assistance . . .	79.9	140.0	60.1	75.2
Loan Council programmes—				
State Govern-ments . . .	1 291.0	1 356.0	65.0	5.0
State authori-ties . . .	809.7	960.0	150.3	18.6
Total . . .	5 253.4	6 172.2	918.8	17.5

That concludes my remarks.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I join with members on this side of the House in supporting the first line of the Loan Estimates. The consideration of the Loan Estimates is one of the most important functions of Parliament in the financial year. It sets the programme of capital works proposed by the Government for the State, and all those works should be of benefit. The Treasurer states in his second reading explanation that we should consider Revenue Account along with Loan Account.

When I first became a member of this House, I got into trouble for infringing in a debate about revenue, but things have changed and this document even has a bearing on what we discussed earlier today. The Treasurer got his oar in early in his explanation by saying that last year payments from Loan Accounts were about \$270 000 000 and that that underlined the need for further school buildings, public transport facilities, water and sewerage extensions, and many other capital works. The Opposition agrees with that.

The Treasurer also stated that what was proposed this year was woefully inadequate and that it presented a doleful picture as a result of two actions by the Commonwealth Government. He chided the Prime Minister first for cutting back specific purpose loans and grants and, secondly, for the increase of only 5 per cent for Loan programmes, saying that cost levels called for an increase of 15 per cent to maintain necessary capital works. That shows the difference between the philosophy of the Government and that of the Opposition and underlines the approaches of the two major Parties.

One may ask the Treasurer where the money to meet his proposed 15 per cent will come from and how he expects the Federal Treasurer to raise the money. Is the example to be followed of those in-line Whitlam Government Treasurers who changed from month to month, some of whom were experts with the printing machine? The Treasurer stated, in referring to the Revenue Budget for 1975-76, that, after taking into account considerations for the provisions in the departmental estimates as a result of the carry-on effect of wages and salary awards that became operative in 1974-75, it was estimated that amounts of about \$82 000 000 and \$16 000 000 would give safe cover against future wage and salary increases and price increases.

In other words, an amount of about \$98 000 000 was the built-in component to meet the extra cost of the preceding awards. Hindsight was working well for the Treasurer, and that type of approach has been the principal cause of part of the unfortunate position at Whyalla shipyards. The Hayden Budget of August, 1975, had a claw in regard to income tax. High wages were pushing the humble people throughout Australia into higher tax brackets, and the merry-go-round of inflation had begun, with the value of the dollar crumbling and with dire results for everyone. Every member of this House must know from experience of the drastic increase in the cost of living following the Hayden Budget, commencing in the spring of last year. We remember the drastic and dire political climate from that period until the change of Government in December last year.

The Treasurer has stated that Parliament recently has had to consider Revenue Budgets and Loan accounts in the overall financial situation. He stated that we had gone into a changed financial situation and that pressures on Loan works expenditure or capital works expenditure were far greater than those on Revenue Account. He stated that his Government found it more appropriate to think of allocations from Revenue to support capital

works programmes. We have seen these inputs into the Loan programmes to bolster capital works. The Treasurer stated that, towards the end of 1975, it had become apparent that his Government's Revenue Budget was progressing towards a more favourable result than had been forecast originally. Therein lies the tale, and it is a matter for public memory.

We all remember the outcries against land tax, against the effect of pay-roll tax on industry, and against increases in motor registration fees. Land tax has attacked some of my constituents so savagely that they have had to sell properties. In one case, the family savings were cleaned out after an unfortunate death, with the people involved paying more than a six-figure amount in succession duties. Then followed a savage revaluation that brought about a forced sale of a valuable property, especially because of this high land tax level. Last year the members for Gouger, Goyder, and Rocky River raised the matter of the effect of the savage impost of land tax on their constituents.

Landholders in the Adelaide Hills have been affected, and families in the metropolitan area are being priced out of their houses because suddenly they have been brought into the range of a valuation which, involving a change from existing use to potential use, puts their properties into a position where these people can no longer afford to pay the high charges.

The Treasurer cannot have it both ways. On one hand, he has said how well his 1970 Budget has been progressing, but he turns a blind eye to the misery and hardship by painting a rosy picture about his Budget finance and the source of the money. In many cases, this taxation of the tall poppies, as we have heard them called, has brought misery to many of our good people. We remember his recent time-honoured utterances on a popular radio programme when the Treasurer spoke about windfalls. I am sure that country members and members of the Government must have been faced with scores of cases involving high valuations. The improved financial situation in South Australia is the result of those high valuations which have yielded funds in excess of those appropriated by Parliament, and this has left a trail of misery behind it. At page 512 of *Hansard* the Treasurer upbraided the Fraser Government for not agreeing to a Loan programme that would match a demand in cost levels approaching 15 per cent a year. When economic pressures hit the community it is always prudent for the family to go light, and it calls for an understanding of these difficult times. Cries of union bashing or farmer bashing, which we have heard from my friends opposite, do little to solve any of our problems.

Southern Australia is experiencing one of its characteristic climatic rest periods—drought. A severe drought is raging throughout that area, and will cause a greatly reduced rural output from the 1976-77 harvest. We can do little but accept that situation. Added to that problem is the greatly increased burden of high costs that are savagely affecting all industrial and commercial activities. One has only to look at city shops to see the streamlining of staff and the self-service operations that are taking place, customers being required to pay their accounts at a central point, and shopwalkers trying to keep people honest. It is this sort of situation that highlights the difficulties that have arisen in the current economic climate.

Manufacturing industries, too, are finding it extremely difficult to balance budgets against the fall-off in sales and the high wage costs that confront them. The farm situation is very much the same; in fact, it is tragic. In the

district I represent farmers now do all their own work. A considerable work force lives in major rural towns, for example, in my district, and I am sure in other districts, too. My son, aided by his wife, has crutched his own sheep this year and, between them, they are also erecting several kilometres of fence, a job that should be done by a contractor. They are doing this work because they are forced to do so by the economic conditions applying in the rural sector. These conditions are bad for the industry and the country. The man on the land just cannot afford to pay the high wages demanded by the workmen who usually carry out this work.

The huge cost of workmen's compensation legislation and holiday loadings paid to workmen are also having severe consequences. We all take in each other's washing, and we should be able to live harmoniously with one another. I hope that the Budget that is being handed down this evening by our Federal colleagues will set the ball rolling so that Australia can get back to a situation where the farmer or businessman can be more efficient and can offer jobs to people who need jobs. The inefficiency that has crept into business and the rural industry is dictated by the economic crisis we are experiencing.

On paper, the State's funds look attractive. In fact, some are attractive. A transfer of \$20 000 000 from the Revenue Account to Capital Account is to be made for urban transport to buy 310 Volvo air-conditioned buses. In times of high prices the purchase of these buses could be described as an extravagance. People living in possibly hot houses in Salisbury, Felixstow or Torrens Park will not, in the economic crisis we are experiencing, install air-conditioners in their houses, but they will travel in the lap of luxury on these buses, and that situation just does not measure up. The Government should have perhaps bought ordinary buses rather than spending \$20 000 000 which could have been used at places such as Whyalla. Perhaps the family could go light whilst one gets his priorities right.

Governments must set an example. Two years ago in his 1974 report, the Auditor-General stated:

... I was not satisfied that the principles of real budgeting were appreciated or practised in some departments. To illustrate my contention, appropriate comments have been included following the financial statements of certain departments in this report. I consider that a prerequisite to financial budgeting is a clear definition of the objectives and functions of each section of a department, together with the preparation of plans setting out performance targets approved by the head of the department in accordance with Government policy. The resources of manpower, equipment, materials, etc., essential to achieve those programmes should then be determined and a financial budget prepared. At appropriate intervals reports should be prepared showing performance and cost against their respective targets for that period.

Perhaps those words should again be heeded, and we should consider some of the events that have taken place since then. We have had examples of a Government attempting to raise, with dire results, a loan outside the regular requirements of this country. Indeed, we have never got to the bottom of the Khehlani loans affair. The capital works programme we are now considering involves a not inconsiderable sum of money. Properly proceeded with, I am sure that that programme will produce for the State necessary developments and that everyone concerned will work enthusiastically to complete those programmes. If these programmes are completed they will go far towards contributing to South Australia's economic recovery. One hopes that South Australia will not have excessive hold-ups, strikes or wage demands. If people

make an honest effort to carry out the programmes outlined by the Treasurer, a fruitful result will be achieved for South Australia.

Regarding afforestation and timber milling, the Treasurer referred to a sum of about \$7 500 000, including a provision for chipping and debarking equipment at Nangwarry sawmill. A total area of 1 300 hectares is to be set aside for afforestation. I cannot emphasise too much that many landholders are interested in utilising portions of their holdings in the higher rainfall areas for growing *pinus radiata*. Indeed, one private company has a successful wood lotting operation in Victoria, and it should be established in this State. I commend to the Minister what that company is doing as a programme that could be beneficial to South Australia. Timber is the second largest Australian import, and the higher rainfall areas of the South-East, across the border into Victoria and up as far as Orbost in New South Wales are areas in which we could take up the slack and meet our timber demands until well beyond the year 2000. This matter should therefore be seriously examined.

I note that the sum of \$8 500 000 is allocated for harbor accommodation. It is pleasing to see that the Port Lincoln harbor is to be included in this year's work. I was Minister when that project commenced in 1970, and it will be a pleasure for me to see it come to fruition. This service will make the life of the Eyre Peninsula farmer much more bearable.

I should also like to refer to the school programme. A considerable school building programme is set out in Appendix I. In this respect, I draw attention to the needs of two or three schools in my district. For a long time, there have been discussions at Keith regarding the establishment of a library. I believe that the project got to the drawing-board stage at one time but, because of priorities, had to be removed. This type of library would indeed be good for the community. Already, the Further Education Department is established in the area, and there would be nothing like a good library in the centre of a district to improve the community's outlook. The people of Keith are anxiously awaiting the building of this facility.

Also, other capital works have still to be undertaken at Keith. I refer to the paving of the school yard and the fencing of the arboretum block and of one of the recreation areas. This work has been outstanding for a long time, and is long overdue. This is a large centre, and about 700 students attend the school. Although the Treasurer did not refer to this aspect, I hope that much of this work will be included in the minor works programme under the miscellaneous appropriations that the House is now considering.

I refer now to the Lucindale school, some of whose timber-framed buildings were refurbished last year. I looked in vain for its name on the list of projected works, but it was conspicuous by its absence. I believe Kingston has had some blessing in this respect, about which the member for Millicent will undoubtedly speak. However, the Lucindale school is well behind the eight ball in relation to the construction of its demac building. It is a progressive centre, and this is the missing link in relation to modern buildings that its community needs. I therefore draw the Minister's attention to this matter.

A considerable sum of money will be spent in my district, and I will refer to specific lines in Committee. Despite all the gloom and protestations that have been expressed, this is not an inconsiderable appropriation. I say to the Minister of Labour and Industry, who is the only Minister in the Chamber at present, that if all the

works are properly and conscientiously carried out, and if everyone (and I do not exclude Opposition members) puts his best foot forward, South Australia should, after the completion of this programme in 12 months' time, get some value from the expenditure of \$262 000 000, and be a better State in which to live. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I, too, go through the formality of supporting the second reading. As the member for Victoria has said, this is an important debate. I wondered why there were so few Government members contributing to the debate, but that is usual.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Then why did you wonder?

Mr. CUMBE: I am not referring to this evening only, as this debate has been continuing for several days. I was about to say that I do not mind speaking under some difficulties and subject to some competition, because, although we are debating the expenditure of \$270 000 000, someone is speaking on television in an adjoining room about the expenditure of so many billions of dollars. Therefore, let us keep ourselves in proper perspective. There is an old adage that, if one looks after the cents, the dollars will look after themselves. If members equate that to millions of dollars, they will keep on the same track.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Have you practised that yourself?

Mr. CUMBE: I had to, and I have had to go without, too. I studied the Treasurer's statement with interest. I believe the Treasury officers have made a remarkable effort in preparing this document. I came to the conclusion that the whole document, including the Treasurer's statement, was marred by the Treasurer's intemperate handling of the matter. As I have said before, I think the Treasurer's personal spite and venom show through in just about every second paragraph. I have done some research regarding the allocations that have been made over the past few years compared to this year's appropriation. Indeed, I found that Estimates of Expenditure for the last few years were: in 1974-75, \$211 000 000; in 1975-76, \$241 000 000; and in 1976-77, \$262 000 000. Of course, the over-spending that occurred last year took that financial year's total to \$271 600 000. One can therefore see the progression that has occurred, and I suppose it will not be long before we reach the \$300 000 000 mark.

I have also examined the position regarding the Loan Account. This evening, we are discussing this State's Loan Estimates, which I regard as the State's balance sheet in relation to capital works. It has nothing to do with the revenue that is collected or the expenditure resulting therefrom. Therefore, I should like for the present to forget about the Revenue Account. The Treasurer stated that at June 30, 1974, this State had a surplus of Loan funds of \$4 500 000. At June 30, 1975, the surplus had dropped to \$1 900 000, and at June 30, 1976, we had a deficit for the first time, and it was \$8 855 000. That was a complete reversal of the practice that had prevailed until 1974 under the present Government. Successive Governments of both persuasions had kept a fair amount in kitty on Loan Account as a cushion against a rainy day. I hope, of course, that we will soon have a rainy day in South Australia, in relation to Pluvius rather than in relation to finance.

Now we are using the Revenue Account to make up deficits in the Loan Account. That can be done without penalty, but doing it the other way would attract a penalty. This gives us, in effect, a deficit in 1975-76 of \$10 750 000.

If one looks at the statement of the Loan Account, one sees that this State has overspent to this extent; because of the credit of \$1 900 000, we have finished up with a deficit of \$8 855 000. Therefore, last year the Government overspent by \$10 750 000. One must ask why this occurred. In the time I have been in this House (and I hope I will have many more years here) I have never seen such a deficit in the Loan Account. Why has the Government overspent to this extent? Last year's Estimates of spending for the greater part of the financial year were based on the Hayden Budget of the Whitlam Government, because at the Loan Council meeting in 1975, and in the Budget of that year, the amount of money available to the State was determined. Yet the Treasurer has voiced his venom and spite against the present Federal Government.

An examination will show that this overspending has occurred on the amount of money made available by the Whitlam Government through the Hayden Budget. Hayden was only one of three Treasurers, although perhaps he was the best. One Treasurer did not even present a Budget. Poor old Frank Crean presented a Budget, but in saying that Hayden was probably the best of the lot I am not necessarily being complimentary. The only conclusion one can draw is that the Whitlam Government last year did not provide sufficient money, yet the Treasurer would have us believe that the Fraser Government was the nigger in the woodpile. One could be excused, perhaps, for postulating an argument that our State Government had deliberately overspent so that it could castigate the present Federal Government if it was cut back. This is the first time I have seen such overspending, and it must be taken into account sooner or later. The Treasurer has said that this year's deficit of \$8 855 000 will be carried throughout the year so that the deficit at June 30, 1977, will be \$8 855 000. I turn now to an interesting comment in the Treasurer's statement, as follows:

In 1975-76 the maximum limit up to which individual statutory and local government bodies could borrow, without that borrowing counting against the State's semi-government allocation, was \$700 000. For 1976-77 Loan Council has approved an increase in the individual limit to \$800 000. This will be very useful to a number of authorities.

We are talking about \$100 000, and talking of semi-government and local government authorities. The quotation continues:

I point out again that for both the larger and smaller semi-government authorities it is a borrowing programme which has been approved. The raising of the funds depends on the liquidity of the institutional lenders and on the willingness of other lenders to advance moneys at the interest rates determined by the Loan Council from time to time. Nevertheless, we have succeeded in raising the full programme in other years and I believe that we will continue to receive the support from lenders to enable us to raise the total sums approved. The Government is grateful for their support.

In relation to the Australian Loan borrowing programme, there seems to be confidence overseas and within Australia in raising the money required by the Loan Council for borrowing for these purposes. As I have said, the Loan Account is a balance sheet of the State in relation to capital works. I wonder how many members opposite have read the figures and whether they have sunk in. Some members may not have read them. We are looking at this deficit at a time when the Treasurer has said that we have in the Revenue Account an accumulated surplus of \$27 600 000. I looked at last year's figures as well as this year's figures. We are all worried about inflation, but I have found some curious anomalies in the Treasurer's figures and some discrepancies that are important.

In the statement for 1975-76, tabled on August 14, 1975, the Treasurer said that the previous year's revenue estimate took into account a possible increase of 20 per cent in the level of average wages and also that, when the Australian Government brought down its Budget in mid-September, it had included financial assistance grants to the States on the assumption of a 25 per cent increase in the level of average wages. This year the Treasurer said that the Revenue Budget for 1975-76, introduced to Parliament on August 28, 1975, forecast a balanced result for the year. It did not balance, of course, but finished up with a surplus of \$27 600 000. That is the first anomaly. The Treasurer also said that it took into account a possible increase of 21 per cent in the level of average wages, based on the assessment made by the Commonwealth Government in determining the level of financial assistance grants to the State for 1975-76. That again is the Hayden Budget. Reference was made to 21 per cent. In his statement last year the Treasurer made several references to the inflation rate, but this year he made only one reference to inflation. Surely inflation is a matter about which we are all concerned: it is one of the major financial problems in Australia. All leading economists agree on this point, and I believe that not one member of this House would disagree on that. Yet the Treasurer has made only this one reference to inflation.

Why is this? Reference has been to a rate of inflation of 25 per cent in one year and 21 per cent in another year, yet now there is no reference whatever. Several recent statements have been made about inflation. Inflation was one of the factors leading to the downfall of the Whitlam Government, and it resulted from the financial mismanagement of that Administration. One cannot deny that when the Whitlam Government came into office there was an inflation rate of 5 per cent or 6 per cent. It rose to a mighty high level. An allowance was made here in 1974-75 for a 25 per cent increase in wages.

Concerning more recent figures, several statements have been made, some official, some the result of surveys, and some the result of cogitations, assumptions and research by learned economists and students in this area. We have been told that the existing rate of inflation could be between 12 per cent and 13 per cent. A rate of 12.3 per cent has been suggested as the accurate figure. If we multiply the c.p.i. figure by four we would get close to that figure. In considering financial references to it, the Public Works Committee has had an average inflation rate of no more than 15 per cent stated by witnesses.

It can be seen that there has been a definite reduction in the rate of inflation. The curve has now stopped rising, has tipped and is now on a downward slope. Certainly, any members knowing anything about mathematics will appreciate this point. Recently, I looked at another set of curves produced in an opinion report by the Economics Editor of the *Advertiser*, Edward Nash, who is noted for his conservative reporting on economics. He showed a curve dealing not entirely with inflation but with another set of figures, and pointed out that since 1972 Federal Government taxation revenue to December, 1975, had increased by 104 per cent, that average weekly earnings had increased by 82 per cent, and that the c.p.i. had increased by 60 per cent. From these figures we can see what has been happening in Australia. I was interested to note the latest figures announced regarding the food prices comprising the c.p.i. In the month of July, in the September quarter, Adelaide had the highest rate of increase of food items of all Australian capitals, with a 1.5 per cent

increase. The national average was a 1.1 per cent increase.

I turn now to figures dealing with manufacturing industry. Manufacturing industry in South Australia employs a large sector of our work force. The report to which I refer is available to all members to examine, as it appeared in the country edition of the *Sunday Mail* published on August 15. It states:

The number of people employed in South Australian manufacturing industries fell by 12 700 between 1974 and 1975.

That is a staggering figure. The report continues:

This startling conclusion is drawn from statistics contained in the monthly bulletin prepared by the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

That is an impeccable source. The period referred to is from June, 1974, to June, 1975. The report continues:

The statistics also show that, whilst the number of people employed in South Australian private enterprise decreased by 4 000, the number employed by Government rose by 2 300.

In case members believe that the two figures I have quoted do not relate to one another, I point out that one relates to total employment and the other to manufacturing industry. I refer to the following figures from that article to illustrate the position:

In December, 1974, private enterprise employed 320 000, while the Government employed 123 700. In December, 1975, private enterprise in South Australia employed 303 300 whilst the Government employed 130 600.

This is a startling comparison. More than a third of the South Australian work force is employed by Government, whether Commonwealth, State or local government. The remainder, the productive ones, are employed in manufacturing or other industry. This is a startling situation. Those who produce goods for revenue comprise less than two-thirds of the total South Australian work force. All members will be interested to hear the Budget to be brought down by the Federal Treasurer this evening. I have not heard what is his figure for inflation. However, the figure I have worked on from my research and from the State Treasurer's statement, based on the Whitlam Government's figure of a 25 per cent increase in the level of average wages in 1974-75, is about 12.3 per cent. Surely all honourable members will commend that reduction in the inflation rate.

The other night I listened to the Minister of Education replying to a question concerning school buildings, and he referred to the Thebarton Community Centre. I know of some problems associated with that project, but listening to the Minister one would have imagined immediately that, because of Senator Carrick (the Federal Minister for Education) or the Federal Liberal Government at any rate, the centre was a non-goer, or had been stopped in full flight. This project has not yet even been referred to the Public Works Committee for inquiry. So much for the Minister's glib reference to that project, and his blaming the Federal Government. I am well aware of some of the difficulties, including the acquisition of certain properties, that have delayed this project in the past. What has occurred is that The Parks Community Centre, near Regency Park, is to go ahead: it has been approved by the Public Works Committee and there is approval on the Loan Estimates for this project to at least start.

The Thebarton Community Centre can go ahead as regards its planning, because it will take some time for the project to be prepared and to be considered by the Public Works Committee. The Minister's statement, like his other recent statements, makes sheer political capital out of the precarious position in which he has found himself. His predecessor as Minister of Education has

gone to greater heights, leaving Dr. Hopgood (the member for Mawson) to carry the baby at a time when education is beginning to go sour in this State. Once again, I refer to the Hayden Budget. Do members not recall the momentous decision made by Mr. Kim Beazley (the then Labor Minister for Education) regarding the 12-month pause on tertiary education funding? We are still, unfortunately, reaping the results of that decision. There was a complete 12-month pause on university and college of advanced education spending, and it was the end of triennial funding as we had known it for some years.

Mr. Allison: The squeals were muted.

Mr. CUMBE: Yes, they were muted, and I thank the honourable member for making that cogent point. It so happens that Government members were buddies with those in Canberra at that time. If that decision had been made by the present Federal Minister for Education (Senator Carrick), the cries would have gone to high heaven: but, when the decision to stop that funding was made last year, all we heard were little whispers of protest here and there. It was shoved under the carpet, whereas now it is being dragged out again and blamed on the present wicked Federal Government! Other members and I are interested in tertiary education, and we were appalled at the 12-month pause and the end of triennial funding as we had known it for a decade or more in university and college of advanced education spending. It all came to a halt, and goodness knows how we will get it started again.

I know of several projects that had to be deferred because of a decision by Mr. Beazley and Mr. Hayden, and brought down in the Hayden Budget. Let this Government not try to get away with that. This Government is making two assumptions now, and it has switched neatly. The Treasurer is taking every chance he can to blame the present Federal Government for the fiscal results recurring as a result of the Hayden Budget last year, including the gross overspending he has incurred in this State of about \$10 750 000, and he will blame the hole into which he has got himself on the Fraser Government. The other assumption is that, in educational spending, a campaign will be whipped up, and blame will be laid on the present Federal Government, whereas the result was brought about by Mr. Beazley (the member for Fremantle and Minister for Education in the Whitlam Government) and Mr. Hayden (the then Federal Treasurer). That puts the position in its true perspective, and I hope that the people of South Australia realise the charade this Government is putting up in this respect. The Treasurer has vented his spleen in every other paragraph of the document, which has been well prepared by the Treasury officers but which has been marred by personal references.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): One cannot get too enthusiastic about the Loan Estimates, because when introducing the Bill the Treasurer did not paint a good or confident picture. Unfortunately, he decided to play politics and continued to berate the present Federal Government's actions. I remind the Treasurer that on July 18 the Federal Treasurer (Mr. Lynch) made a long statement in replying to some of the States' criticism about their not getting a fair go. Mr. Lynch hit the nail on the head, and I quote from his statement as follows:

The Treasurer (Hon. Phillip Lynch) today called on the States to join with the Commonwealth in a national fight against inflation. The Treasurer said he was rejecting claims that the States had received unfair financial treatment.

If anyone had listened to the Budget debate this evening, he would have found that the States had not done too badly. Mr. Lynch's statement continues:

Mr. Lynch said he believed that, rather than spending their time complaining, the States would be better employed undertaking the kind of thorough expenditure review which the Commonwealth had undertaken. It was time for the States to accept that all Governments must be responsible for their own actions.

That is the crux of his statement. That has come out more loudly and clearly than ever, and it comes out clearly in the Treasurer's introduction to the Bill. I believe that, as the State Government has not planned its capital works programme in a careful way, it finds that it now can no longer continue the rapid development for which it had hoped. The Government is finding that some of the programmes it started will be costly, and detrimental to other essential services. The State Government must set its own priorities, because it can no longer go running cap in hand to the Commonwealth Government and saying, "We want this, and we want that" for whatever reason (generally for political purposes, as we have seen during the past three years of the Whitlam Government). The State Treasury has a real problem, because it must do all it can to curb inflation: it must try to increase employment opportunities in the State, provide more housing, more hospitals, more beds for pensioners seeking geriatric accommodation, and it must do something to what is probably one of the worst transport systems we have had in this State. The Government should consider its priorities in that order. Many other facets of Government services and departments need a considerable injection of funds.

Mr. Langley: Should we help the unemployed?

Mr. BECKER: If the honourable member had been listening, he would have heard that employment was at the top of my priorities. That is my priority list, and I offer it to the Government to consider further. The State Government should do all it can to reduce unemployment in this State.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What about the Federal fellows helping a bit?

Mr. BECKER: The honourable member has misunderstood the whole concept of federalism. He is getting his piece of the cake, and it is a fair share of the cake, as has been explained this evening. The honourable member's Government must set its priorities and make decisions itself. Members opposite cannot go running to their Federal colleagues, who are no longer in power, and say "We want this" and "We want that." But, when members are in Government, they cannot dictate from Canberra what the States want to do.

In his opening remarks, the Treasurer pointed out that the expenditure proposals in the Loan Estimates aggregated nearly \$262 600 000 compared to \$271 600 000 of actual payments in 1975-76. The 1975-76 payments included a special appropriation from Revenue Account of \$20 000 000 allocated for housing. I have no argument with that figure, but it is unfair to say that there will be a reduction in the capital works programme when we had a deficit of \$10 758 000 in the Loan programme for the previous financial year, but an extra \$20 000 000 was injected from the Revenue Account by way of cash grants, so about \$30 758 000 extra is written into the overall expenditure for that financial year.

The proposed payments for this financial year are a real increase over the previous year, and the Federal Government has allowed the States to increase that by 5

per cent. We must bear in mind the statement made by the Federal Treasurer that the States must, in their own way, take every precaution they can to control inflation. I listened to the Treasurer as he tried to explain the background to the Loan Estimates and the financial situation of the State, and found that again he was trying to confuse readers of the document by speaking about Revenue Account and Loan Account. The trend today seems to be to link the two accounts, whereas they are really as different as chalk is from cheese. The Loan Estimates are a capital works programme and the Revenue Account is the daily cash fund-raising from taxpayers, either through Government charges or through indirect taxation. We are now dealing with Loan Estimates.

The Treasurer said that the Government took into account a possible increase of 21 per cent in the level of average wages when it planned the Revenue Budget for 1975-76. Of course, that would have an effect on the Loan Account. This was based on the assessment made by the Commonwealth Government in determining the level of the financial assistance grants to States for 1975-76, on the advice of the Whitlam Federal Treasurer. Fortunately, there was not a 21 per cent increase in the level of average wages, so the State benefited. The State budgeted for what it was told by the Federal Treasurer at that time, a 21 per cent increase in the level of wages but that did not occur, so the Government ended up slightly in front in that area. The Treasurer, in ascribing these reserves mainly to the Revenue Account (I still maintain that it is wrong), states:

Towards the end of 1975 it became apparent that the Revenue Budget was progressing towards a more favourable result than had been forecast originally.

I would not complain that, in the previous financial Revenue Budget, the Government planned to balance the Budget but, to go back to about this time last year when the Federal Budget was brought down and there was a plan for a massive deficit Budget, it was a worry to the people of Australia that the economy was going downhill fast and inflation was rising. There came about a situation of confusion and, of course, the Liberal Party, when in Opposition in Canberra this time last year, was creating doubts in the minds of the people and the Government about whether the Federal Budget would pass through the Senate. Because of all the uncertainty and the politicking in Canberra then, everything came to a halt, and the State Treasury benefited by this uncertainty in Canberra, which eventually erupted on November 11, and the Australian people made their decision early in December.

It is fair for the Treasurer to say that there was an improvement in the State Revenue Budget; of course there was—there had to be, because there were several months of this uncertainty, when everything was more or less at a standstill. Yet, the South Australian taxpayer was being taxed at a higher rate than he had ever experienced before and, of course, the Treasury was getting the real benefit. A document I have had sent to me from the Treasury indicated there would be a Revenue Budget surplus of about \$20 000 000 to \$25 000 000. So perhaps we can thank the Liberal Opposition in Canberra in one respect, in the month leading up to November 11 of last year, for creating a situation in which the State Treasury really benefited, and so this Government benefited. As we got further into the financial year—February and March—things were improving at an even greater rate, and well before June 30 it was expected that there would be a \$50 000 000 to \$55 000 000 surplus in the State Revenue Account.

That would have been a time of success for the State Government had it finished the financial year with a

\$53 000 000 surplus, but there was a problem. The Government would have had to transfer all of that money into the Reserve Account, if it had wished that money to remain there after June 30, so the Government and the Treasury decided to spend \$50 000 000 immediately. Early in June we passed the Supplementary Estimates, and allocated \$20 000 000 to Loan Account, earmarked for housing; \$20 000 000 for urban public transport; and also \$10 000 000 to assist employment, and there were other smaller appropriations for specific capital works.

I am not arguing about the \$20 000 000 going to Loan Account for housing, but I do argue about the \$20 000 000 allocated for urban public transport, because that is about the most stupid thing I have ever heard of—paying \$20 000 000 for 310 Volvo buses. We will deal with that later. The appropriation of \$10 000 000 to assist employment I support, because we cannot inject enough money into our own coffers to create further employment. But, of course, it creates a problem in that, if we can keep reducing unemployment in South Australia (and I hope we do), we shall have to watch out that we do not get border hoppers from New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia coming in and taking jobs that rightfully belong to South Australia. That in itself presents a problem to the State Government. However, when we sum up the whole situation, we find that \$50 000 000 cash, through Government charges and indirect taxation, has been allocated for specific purposes that would normally be covered by the Loan Account. The Treasurer is not here at present, and I find it hard to accept that situation from examining the Loan Account on that point only.

We have in reserves in the Revenue Account about \$27 600 000, and the only way in which the State Government can get its hands on that money will be by bringing in a deficit Revenue Budget. It will be interesting to see what the Treasurer does in that respect this financial year because, once that reserve has gone, he will find himself in a fairly awkward financial position. No doubt the Government benefited from a change in the Federal Government, in that inflation was reduced considerably: it was expected that 16½ per cent would be the inflationary rate for the 1975-76 financial year, when in fact it was about 12½ per cent, and the State Government benefited. When we take a \$1 000 000 000 Budget, as we had at that stage, there is a considerable saving, probably about \$40 000 000 at least.

For the previous financial year the Federal Government was kind to the South Australian Government, but it is a very different issue now, because the State Government must make up its mind and establish its priorities. The Treasurer also tells us that he dipped into the reserves of the Loan Account by about \$8 800 000, but he is hoping that he will balance the Loan Account for this financial year. However, to do it he will have to take \$15 000 000 from Revenue Account. Therefore, instead of giving relief to South Australian taxpayers through Revenue Account, he will take that \$15 000 000 and put it into Loan Estimates. I agree that I would not try to prune the capital works programme this financial year to make up the \$8 000 000 deficit in reserves, because I should not think that we could do that. Let us leave that deficit, and hope that it can be kept at that rate, but the Treasurer must remember he is to take \$15 000 000 from Revenue Account to just balance the Budget.

He is cheating, when the Federal Government has told him he must prune his costs and that he is limited to a certain amount for Loan or capital works: he has sneaked that \$15 000 000 from Revenue Account. All these

figures are hidden in the document before us. Also, there is a conservative estimate of repayments and recoveries from some Loan moneys that will be raised, and the amounts do not link with the recoveries last year. Of course, the Government tells us only what it wants to tell us, and it hopes that we will accept that without examination. The Treasurer also states:

If one has regard to the facts that the total of payments on Loan Account in 1975-76 was \$271 600 000, that there remains an urgent need for further school and hospital buildings, for public transport facilities, for water and sewerage extensions, and a host of other capital works, that there is a tragically high level of unemployment in the community, and that reductions in real capital expenditure by Governments must add to that national and personal problem of unemployment, then it can be seen readily that the planning by this Government on a capital programme limited to the new funds expected to become available, that is to say \$247 600 000, would be woefully inadequate.

I think I have covered that matter, by saying that the Treasurer is cheating in taking \$15 000 000 out of Revenue Account. That is the statement by the Treasurer and one that I believe is totally incorrect. The Government admits that it has not been able to grasp the nettle and set its priorities, when there will be cuts in those areas. The Government is putting forward the cuts in those areas hoping that the people will react with the Government and blame some authority other than it. However, the State Government must set the priorities.

If it cuts spending on hospitals, schools, public transport and water and sewerage extensions, and if it does not provide money to assist the unemployment position, that Government solely is to blame, because it is the only organisation in this State that can do something about the matter. When this Government says that it must cut down, it is playing politics with the lives and future of people, and that is a low standard of politics. By doing this in the Loan works programme, the Government is admitting defeat and saying that it has trapped itself by its forward planning. The Treasurer, in his explanation, also states:

This doleful picture is a direct result of two actions on the part of the Commonwealth Government: first, the decision to cut back on specific purpose loans and grants and, secondly, the decision to support an increase of only 5 per cent in general Loan Council programmes, despite increases in cost levels approaching 15 per cent a year.

That is another misleading statement and the Treasurer should be challenged, if he was at the Loan Council meeting in June and agreed to and accepted the Federal Government's statements. On July 18, the Federal Treasurer stated that he was concerned about the flow of misinformation to the public on the matter of Commonwealth assistance to the States. He also stated:

In any discussion on these issues it was important to keep the general background in mind. State expenditure has grown very strongly indeed in recent years. Over the five years to 1975-76, the annual growth in State Budget expenditures had averaged over 20 per cent; it had exceeded the growth in Commonwealth Budget expenditures (excluding payments to the States) over the same period.

Our State Treasurer is making misleading statements, but the Federal Treasurer has put paid to the misleading information by telling the people of the position. The message that must be got through is that the States have been increasing expenditure in the past five years at the rate of about 20 per cent a year, so our State Treasurer is doing what he has been doing to either mislead the people or play politics, when he is unable, in his own Cabinet, to make necessary decisions and set his own priorities. In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer also states:

Of the total semi-government programme of \$960 000 000, South Australia's share is \$45 200 000. Within that total of \$45 200 000 the allocations proposed for the individual statutory borrowers are \$12 500 000 to the Electricity Trust, \$12 200 000 to the Housing Trust, \$5 000 000 to the Pipelines Authority, \$2 500 000 to the Meat Corporation. . . .

I hope that my country colleagues will tell me how the Meat Corporation can justify increased capital expenditure without providing benefit to the community, especially to farmers. I think that pouring money into the corporation would be a waste of capital, and I should like to know who is getting the benefit. The Treasurer also stated that an allocation of \$4 100 000 was intended for the Land Commission, and an allocation of \$2 300 000 for the Monarto Development Commission.

We have had many conflicting statements about Monarto, and I do not know whether private enterprise will have a slice. The allocation of \$2 300 000 to the commission needs further examination, when we consider that the Federal Government has allocated about \$33 000 000 to growth centres but has not given anything for Monarto. That Government, like the previous Commonwealth Labor Government, does not rate Monarto on the priority list at all, but the State Government is putting money in to prop up a pipe dream about which we warned it.

An allocation of \$2 300 000 is also made to the Festival Centre Trust, and that is developing into an expensive capital programme. A further allocation of \$4 300 000 is to meet the needs of what are termed the larger local government bodies. I like that term, and I should like to know how the priorities have been worked out there.

Mr. Vandeppeer: Does that mean to the detriment of the little ones?

Mr. BECKER: That is right. It means also that, if the State Government has been unsuccessful in forcing certain councils to amalgamate, it will do it through the Loan Estimates. In my opinion, it would be almost foul tactics for the Parliamentary system to be used to crush councils that are supplying services and meeting needs in many areas in this State. I have referred to the priorities the Government should consider. I am disturbed that more money is not going into the area of housing. Young people have been told they must wait at least two years for a housing loan from the State Bank. They put their name down for a loan and are called up two years later, and it can take up to six months to process the loan application. This procedure means that, if necessary, they must use temporary finance to buy a house. Recently I told the House about a constituent who will have to use temporary finance for 2½ years before qualifying for a State Bank loan. In this respect the State Government is letting down the young people of the State.

If the housing programme could be boosted it would create a significant improvement in the employment situation in this State. The same comment applies not only to the housing industry but also to other consumer areas on which young people depend when buying their first house. I am concerned that the Government is not providing sufficient beds for pensioners requiring geriatric treatment. It is alarming that the State provides so few beds. About 167 beds are provided through the Hospitals Department, 114 through the Community Welfare Department at the Magill Home, 413 at the Home for Incurables and 31 at Kalyra Sanatorium. It is estimated that about 800 beds are necessary to meet the needs of pensioners in this State.

That is an alarming situation and, even though a tremendous sum has been allocated to the Home for Incurables

in order to provide about 400 beds, the number of beds needed is still far short of the estimate. I believe the estimate (based on 1971 population figures), stated by the Minister of Health in a reply to a question I asked, did not give a true indication of the hardships being experienced by pensioners in obtaining geriatric or nursing home accommodation at a price they can afford. Pressure is on the families of these people to contribute towards nursing home costs. In some cases up to \$40 a week is required to keep elderly parents in this type of accommodation where they can receive the necessary attention. The Government should have this matter high on its list of priorities.

I have always questioned the tremendous sums being injected into the Home for Incurables. Although it is a mammoth project, I often wonder whether, in the long term, it is really advisable to build such a huge place in one location and to provide so many beds there. The Home for Incurables does not go all the way towards providing total accommodation for those to whom I refer. I was surprised to learn that some people with incurable complaints are not admitted to the Home for Incurables. It suggests that much further groundwork should be done and that pressure should be put on the Government's Budget, when the Home for Incurables project is completed, with a view to ensuring that all handicapped people requiring this type of nursing home accommodation are covered adequately. At present it is necessary to provide funds for the Home for Incurables project, but once the project has been completed I hope that similar allocations will be made in other areas to relieve this problem.

At long last the pipeline from Darlington to Port Adelaide has been completed. It was installed to supply water to areas that urgently needed it and also to improve water pressure in areas such as Glenelg North and West Beach. However, that aim has not really been achieved. With all the money spent on the pipeline, one would have expected that it would supply the services people have asked for. On May 16, 1974, the Government announced that it would build an \$80 000 000 railway centre. Each year in the Loan Estimates we see an allocation for research and development under the State Transport Authority. The railway centre project is one of the greatest pipedreams of the Minister of Transport. When releasing the details of this \$80 000 000 programme, he said that it would contain a modern administration building for the railways, an international standard hotel, a large stadium with seating capacity for 8 000, buildings for the State Transport Authority, commercial development, flats, restaurants, bistros, etc.

Mr. Mathwin: We're not dealing with the international hotel again, are we?

Mr. BECKER: No, this project was to be built over the existing railway station. The project was announced just before the 1975 election. It was a build-up to that election. Hassell and Partners was engaged to draw up plans and designs, etc., but the whole project has collapsed because of a lack of finance. However, much money has been provided for research. In a report in the *Advertiser* of May 16, 1974, it was stated that work was not expected to be commenced until 1976. It is now 1976, but we ascertained only the other day that the Government could not go ahead with the Minister's pipedream.

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

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): When the Supply Bill and the Supplementary Estimates were introduced earlier, a topic for discussion was the railways deal with

the Federal Government. We were told that South Australia had taken the Federal Government to the cleaners over that issue. The Treasurer said that it was a pity that the Bill had not been passed earlier than it had been. I again take the opportunity to remind the Treasurer that, had he accepted the few minor amendments that were proposed last year, the whole matter could have been cleaned up. Instead, he called an election, and the result was not quite as he expected. In any case, the worries he expressed a few weeks ago have been dispelled, because the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon) said that the Bill was to be ratified soon when problems have been solved.

A question that caused me considerable concern is the \$15 000 000 question. The Treasurer said that that sum was a guard against uncertainty. What uncertainty? In 1973-74 the inflation rate was running at about 18 per cent, which was the rate South Australia budgeted for last year. In fact, the rate came down to about 12.3 per cent, which meant a massive saving in Public Service salaries and Government payments. If the State Government budgets for 12 per cent this year (and indications are that that is what we will be doing), we are promised in this evening's Federal Budget that, by the end of the year, the inflation rate should be down for the first time in a few years to a single figure. There again is a potential large saving in salaries. So, what is the uncertainty for which we are putting away \$15 000 000? That money could well be included in current expenditure instead of hanging on to it. It seems, too, that by deciding to hold on to that \$15 000 000 and to pay \$20 000 000 for buses that were never committed financially by a Federal Liberal or Labor Government the Government has made its own decision regarding transport or education.

Education has, of course, been a burning question during the Loan Estimates debate, as we have been told that the education budget would have to be cut drastically. In fact, we have \$15 000 000 hanging fire. One must question why it was being held. Probably, there is one obvious reason: that it would be a marvellous nest egg for pre-election promises, should anything happen in that direction over the next few months. The Premier would have a marvellous nest egg that he could use in marginal seats such as Mount Gambier. That is one of the reasons why I stood for election: so that that sort of offer would be made to a marginal district.

I am annoyed on behalf of a considerable number of public servants, not the least of whom are our teachers, who represent a large proportion of our public servants. The Government has for years been reneging on salary increases. Public servants have been robbed of the immediate effect of wage indexation, because the Government has been withholding payment of increases for as long as three or four months before making the money available to those salary earners. Currently, many public servants, including the teaching profession, have not been paid the last indexation increase, and they have now lodged a log for the flow-on of the recent wage indexation increase. That is grossly unjust, and probably accounts for another considerable proportion of the Government's surplus. People should be paid, especially when the Government says that it represents the workers. It claims to be helping the workers, and it is sorely critical of the Commonwealth Government's approach to this issue, yet it has consistently paid salary increases far too late.

To the Government, money in its coffers is far more important than justice to the worker. It is a case of lip service not being fulfilled by action. The Government has the prerogative of deciding whether to put that

\$15 000 000 and the \$20 000 000 for the buses either into reserve or into transport. However, it should not blame the Commonwealth Government, as it has been consistently doing over the last few weeks, because the decision is the State Government's decision. That is what the federalism policy is all about: the Government can make its own decisions, and the South Australian Government has done that. It can take the blame and the responsibility.

Every income earner in Australia has already received an 8 per cent salary increase by the simple method of the Federal Government's having reduced the inflation rate from about 20 per cent to 12 per cent. That salary increase was, of course, tax free. It simply means that the dollar that the worker earns is worth more. It is no longer decreasing in value at the rate of 20c a year. By the end of the current Budget session, the Federal Treasurer has promised that the inflation rate will be down to single figures, so that again will represent a considerable salary increase which is not taxable and which can be offset as money in real earnings. There is, of course, as a result, more value in pensions, and people feel that their savings are more secure.

There is, naturally, less fear and worry that one is caught on an inflationary spiral, and generally people should feel more at ease on a deflationary spiral. I point out that employment is created not by inflation but by deflation, and I am certain that the economy will be picking up by Christmas. This is, of course, one of the things that the Premier fears. This is why he has been constantly lambasting the Commonwealth Government, in the hope that people would take heed of what he has said and be as critical as he has been. Unemployment has been rising only slightly over the past few months after the record rate of the previous three years. If employers encouraged staff to work overtime instead of employing additional staff, it would seem to be because unions have pressed for salary rises and priced good men out of jobs. This is patently obvious. Further, worker benefits have advanced far more rapidly than industry's ability to pay for them, or for the price increases to be met by the man in the street, the purchaser. The demand for goods and work has dropped, and we cannot expect any improvement if we reduce working hours and increase salaries simultaneously, as unions have been asking. The member for Light gave us a marvellous example this afternoon of what the Vehicles Builders Union has been asking for. I will not repeat what he said, as it will be found in *Hansard*. However, it seems that the extreme left wing has been bent on bringing Australian workers into a chaotic situation.

I am pleased to note that a considerable amount of expenditure will occur in the South-East, particularly in Mount Gambier District. One of the first issues to which I refer is that of the Modulock industry, for which \$140 000 is allocated this current year. It is significant that this industry plans to employ about 30 or 40 men, which, on the surface, would represent decentralisation. However, to counterbalance this, I also point out that we have lost the Electricity Trust of South Australia major industry in Mount Gambier, which employed 60 men who were retrenched but for whom new jobs were not found. This means that we have a job deficit between the two of about 20 or 30 men. This will last for nearly a year before the Modulock factory gets into full production.

I am pleased to see that the Woods and Forests Department log mill is being streamlined as part and parcel of normal repair and maintenance work. My one fear is

that there are signs that automation will increase with stacking and destacking, for which \$300 000 is allocated. Automation means a possible decrease in staff. I hope that this will not happen, although automation invariably means a diminution of manpower. One would hope that increased productivity would make up for that, and that more men would have to be employed to handle the increased productivity, although, there again, I am told that general forestry production throughout the South-East is nearing a plateau and that, over the next 15 to 20 years, we cannot really hope for a tremendous increase in staffing.

The Port MacDonnell breakwater, which will be an advantage to the fishing industry and to tourism and recreation, is getting a continued grant of \$450 000 to enable the project to be completed. That work is proceeding well on schedule because of the extremely fine weather that we have had. The sum of \$431 000 is allocated for Mount Gambier's water supply. I am concerned here again that last year during the Budget debate I inquired about the possibility of having sewerage extensions from Mount Gambier to the coast investigated, with a view to putting a filtration plant somewhere along the line. There is a steady increase in effluent flow. This will result in greater coastal pollution, which has already been the subject of complaint from South-Easterners. I hope that in the other country sewerage allocation of \$89 000 there may be some provision for the South-East. However, as it is not specifically mentioned, this is not a strong likelihood.

The Mount Gambier Hospital's regional laundry is to receive \$20 000. I know that there are to be additions to the hospital, which are listed to cost \$302 000. I should like to inform the Minister that I will be asking questions about that when we deal with the individual lines. An unspecified amount is put down for the Mount Gambier High School for a major addition. I shall address a query to the Minister of Education regarding the auxiliary classrooms at the Mount Gambier North Primary School. This is an expanding area. The results of a hastily conceived survey after several months of requests showed that the research and planning staff of the department did not do such a good job, because they omitted any provision to find out how many pre-school children from nought to five years would be attending the school. As a result, the school staff undertook of their own accord to compile an additional survey to obtain statistics for the Minister. This shows a remarkable concern on the part of the staff, who want to get these statistics and are anxious that their school will not be overcrowded. It has been overcrowded this year with the leakage of the junior primary into the upper primary school, the staff being split.

An allocation of \$40 000 for the South-East College of Further Education will serve to centralise the storage facilities, bringing them away from the Commercial Street East site and into the college site, with a great saving in transport movement to and fro. That will be an asset to the college, making it much more complete. I am pleased that the Mount Gambier Gaol is to receive a grant of \$200 000. This underlines the high cost of punishment. The member for Hanson was informed this afternoon in answer to a question that the cost of keeping juvenile delinquents in one of the institutions in South Australia was \$18 000 a year an inmate, or about \$90 a day. It makes one wonder where such costs will end and whether the end result justifies the large sums involved. This is an area for a great deal of investigation. The Mount Gambier courthouse will be finished, with a final expenditure of \$5 000.

I am concerned about the housing situation in Mount Gambier. The South Australian Housing Trust programme is continuing, after the lowest ever programme in the year before last, followed by an increase last year. One would hope that local builders in the South-East will continue to have their services used in constructing houses in the district. I made strong representations several months ago on behalf of local builders who thought they were being omitted from contracts and who were extremely concerned that Adelaide construction firms were getting tenders in preference to local builders. Fortunately, that situation has been remedied by the Minister, and at the moment several local builders are employed on contracts.

In reply to a question today, I was told that two areas are being developed in Mount Gambier by the Land Commission. A development of 63 allotments will be available for sale in March, 1977, and a further 57 allotments will be available in June, 1977. The areas are adjacent to the Fletcher Jones industrial development. I hope that Land Commission development will stabilise prices for allotments, although I have no great evidence that land prices in Mount Gambier have been rocketing. I have heard fears expressed by at least one local land agent who had a major subdivision that his and other subdivisions might be retarded because Land Commission developments were being given priority. We have had assurances from the Minister that this will not be so, but it is a situation in which I shall be taking an interest. I shall be watching carefully, and I will be anxious to see whether Land Commission sales have any bearing on land prices in the South-East, especially in Mount Gambier. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): I wish to bring to the attention of the House a matter of some sensitivity. I refer to the relationship of alcohol to the road toll and to the anomalies regarding the implementation of some sections of the Road Traffic Act when the medical profession and police officers are confronted with an accident situation when a person is taken to hospital. Section 47i of the Act provides:

(1) Where a motor vehicle is involved in any accident, and within eight hours after the accident a person, apparently of or above the age of fourteen years, who suffered injury in accident attends at, or is admitted into, a hospital for the purpose of receiving treatment for that injury, it shall, subject to this section, be the duty of any legally qualified medical practitioner by whom that patient is attended, to take as soon as practicable a sample of that patient's blood (notwithstanding that the patient may be unconscious) in accordance with this section.

(2) A medical practitioner shall not take a sample of blood under this section where, in his opinion, it would be injurious to the medical condition of his patient to do so.

(3) A medical practitioner shall not be obliged to take a sample of blood under this section where the patient objects to the taking of the sample of blood and persists in that objection after the medical practitioner has informed him that unless his objection is made upon genuine medical grounds, it may constitute an offence against this section.

The regulations, under schedule 2, refer to proclaimed hospitals, as follows:

Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Royal Adelaide Hospital, Flinders Medical Centre, Modbury Hospital, Lyell McEwin Hospital, Mount Gambier Hospital, Port Augusta Hospital, Port Lincoln Hospital, Port Pirie Hospital, Whyalla Hospital, and Wallaroo Hospital.

The anomaly to which I refer is illustrated in the following situation. Were I to be admitted to a hospital at Wallaroo in a state of even partial inebriation, I would have no option but to undergo a blood alcohol test to determine whether I was under the influence of alcohol, whether I liked it or not. If the medical officer said that I could be guilty of an offence, it would be obligatory for me to undergo a blood alcohol test.

However, were I to be in the same condition and admitted to another Government-subsidised hospital (for example, Maitland Hospital), I could escape this provision of the Act. First, the police officer would have to ask me whether I was willing to take the test and, naturally, I would refuse, because I would know that the Maitland Hospital was not a proclaimed hospital subject to the provisions of the Act. If a doctor, on the instruction of a police officer, proceeded to take that test against my will, he would risk a charge of assault for sticking the needle into my body to make it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Assault on the needle?

Mr. BOUNDY: It could be assault on the needle, but it could also be assault on the body. This anomaly creates all sorts of problem for police officers and medical officers in country districts where this situation applies. The ploys used by some people when confronted with this situation would, if the situation were not so serious, be comical. It is possible for an inebriated man to be met on a country road by his mate before the doctor gets to him. When the police and the doctor arrive to take the necessary action, the injured person's mate could say, "It is no good doing an alcohol test on him. He was so shocked and shaken that we had to slip a couple of brandies into him to quiet his nerves." On many occasions the provisions of this measure have been escaped by such a move. It is common knowledge and of concern to all of us what is the cost to the community of such irresponsible behaviour. The cost of third party insurance cover is obviously increased by alcohol offences, as also is the cost of comprehensive insurance and the legal battle of proving who is guilty. We have a situation where in one hospital it is arbitrary for action to be taken to prove that the injured person had been an irresponsible member of the community, whereas in another hospital that is not the position.

Much has been said recently about this matter, and much concern has been expressed in the community. Suggestions have been made of lowering the permissible blood alcohol content to 0.05 per cent. When Mr. Hender, previously of the Police Department, was appointed Chairman of the Road Safety Council, he referred to this matter. Reference has also been made to random breath tests, which I do not favour, because they put the police and the public in a difficult position, namely, that of suffering the odium of this type of deterrent. I do not think it should be a major part of drink driving strategy. It is all right if the person so tested is guilty, but the possibility of wrongfully detaining an innocent citizen for up to half an hour of tests would be embarrassing, to say the least.

It is none of my business what a man drinks, nor is the degree of his sobriety, but it is my business when he is in charge of a vehicle and endangers the lives and property of others. It is well known that during the week vehicles hit stobie poles and trees, but at the weekend some people claim that trees and stobie poles come out on to the road and hit their cars. Obviously, the weekend increase in the

road toll and accidents is due largely to alcohol, often causing a tragic loss of life or bodies broken for life. I believe that a simple means exists to reduce this terrible toll: make the Act consistent simply by amending it so that the list of proclaimed hospitals does not obtain and so that it is arbitrary for a qualified medical practitioner at any hospital in the State to take the test and prove the person guilty.

Penalties need overhauling. I understand from police officers that the fine for being illegally on premises is double that for the first offence of driving under the influence. The Government should act in this matter and on the question of penalties so that this serious cost to the community is reduced and so that people do not act irresponsibly. The matter I raise this evening of concern about anomalies in the Road Traffic Act is that, whereas one area of the State is covered by an arbitrary need for a blood test on a drink driving charge, country districts are exempt from it. Police and medical officers in many country towns are in a difficult position when they see young lives lost and broken but they are unable to sheet home to alcohol the blame for what is a serious community concern.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Henley Beach): I take this opportunity to make one or two comments on the Federal Budget we have heard delivered this evening. It was very disappointing to me, but perhaps pleasing to all of us to note that there will be no dramatic tax increases (we were thinking of wine, in particular, and that would have been tragic had it been proceeded with). Nevertheless, at a time when we have an unemployment figure of over 300 000, with a tremendous number of children who will be leaving school to join the work force at the end of this year, the fact that the philosophies of the Fraser Government have been clearly exemplified in this Budget shows that there has been no real move to try to stimulate the employment position, which is something we should all be concerned about. It is quite clear that the Fraser Government is still holding the strange view that it expressed before the election when it said, "Elect a Liberal Government; we will cut down on public spending and the private sector will take up the slack. We will find some miraculous confidence in the Government, which will work some sort of miracle."

It certainly has not worked in the nine months so far, and the next 12-month period will show very little improvement in our general unemployment position. I am certain that all members will be disappointed at the lack of initiative, when initiative was so badly needed.

But, on a more specific issue, I am disheartened that the Federal Government has refused to provide any funds for Monarto development. It is little wonder, perhaps, that this has occurred, because it is quite clear that all members of the Opposition are totally opposed to the development of Monarto. They have made that abundantly clear.

Mr. Allison: You must be joking; you got a start on it last year.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I thought the honourable member was suddenly going to deny that he was opposed to Monarto; but obviously he is. As I was saying, it is most unfortunate, and I honestly believe that the present Opposition will be known in years to come by only one act—that it was the Opposition that was prepared to oppose the development of something that this State in years to come will be pleased that the present Government undertook. I think I would feel somewhat disappointed if I was a member of an Opposition who was remembered as one of those persons who were opposed

to the development of Monarto. That is certainly the way in which members opposite will be remembered, because I believe the Government here in taking that step recognised that the growth of metropolitan Adelaide would reach proportions by the year 2000 that would put a tremendous strain on the way of life of dwellers in metropolitan Adelaide. The work we are doing in this respect not only will ensure that the way of life of the South Australian community will continue to be as pleasant as it is at the moment but will be brought about only if we can continue with the development of Monarto.

I recently drove to McLaren Vale, where I had not been for some six months previously, and I was stunned to see the tremendous development taking place there. I was not pleasantly surprised, because frankly I used to prefer to drive through that area and see the rolling plains. I received no great pleasure from noticing that those Hills areas adjoining the road were being mushroomed by housing development. Nevertheless, the position is not intolerable. However, if we are not provided with the option of Monarto, one's mind boggles. We can look 20 years into the future and imagine all the housing that will be required both north and south of Adelaide to take up the tremendous increase we shall be having in our population. It is tragic that Opposition members in this State have undoubtedly had a strong influence on the Federal Government's decision not to fund Monarto.

Mr. Arnold: We had no influence on the previous Government, the Labor Government.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: That is probably just as well. The South Australian Government received substantial support during the term of office of the Federal Labor Government in relation to Monarto, and the honourable member has a short memory if he cannot recall that. Last year we received considerably more than we have received this year, and honourable members should know that large sums of money were put into developments such as Monarto. Irrespective of what may have occurred last year, the Whitlam Government, in its three years in office, made available a substantial sum of money for Monarto, and this would have continued if that Government had remained in office.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Henley Beach is getting far too much competition.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Leader of the Opposition takes much pride in making public announcements that he visits Canberra and has discussions with Ministers. He may give them their instructions. When he comes back, he never says that he has been able to achieve anything positive for the State, and he airs the excuses that Federal Ministers have for not assisting the States, particularly South Australia. I think I can say that he has spent some time in encouraging the Federal Government to cease supporting Monarto.

Mr. Whitten: He spends time knocking this State, too.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes, and it is sad that this State and the people will suffer. The question of developing Monarto should not be placed in the political arena as it has been, and all members of this Parliament should consider it in terms of value to the State rather than for its political ramifications. I am not alone in saying this, because businessmen at Murray Bridge were reported in the *Advertiser* recently—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I know that the member for Mount Gambier does not like it, but a recent survey of the businessmen of Murray Bridge showed that 70

per cent of them wanted Monarto to go ahead. The honourable member thinks that that is not a fair assessment, because he normally thinks that a 30 per cent judgment ought to be accepted, and all other Opposition members think the same way.

Mr. Allison: Much of your legislation is minority legislation.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member may also care to reply to a further press report, which states:

Monarto also received a boost yesterday from the honorary secretary of the New South Wales Division of the Australian Institute of Urban Studies (Dr. R. J. Solomon). Dr. Solomon, a former Liberal M.H.R., said the development of growth centres such as Monarto was important. "I think centres like Albury-Wodonga and Monarto could work," Dr. Solomon said. "The Federal Government should undoubtedly be contributing to these growth centres."

It seems that, once people no longer are Liberal members of the House of Representatives, they can make public statements without political restraint and can say what they honestly believe rather than what they are committed to by their Party's decisions. I do not know how members of the Opposition in this House would line up in their thinking if they no longer were guided by the restraints of their Leader on this matter. Again, I hope—

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

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): I rise this evening to discuss a matter of grave concern that has come to my notice. It relates to accidents caused to and the poisoning of children and also to the number of children being admitted to the Adelaide Children's Hospital for these two reasons. The matter was brought to my attention recently when one of my children was in the Adelaide Children's Hospital. At that time I had the opportunity to speak to many of the doctors and staff of that hospital about that matter. Much has already been done in this field, particularly by the Standards Association of Australia and by the Child and Home Safety Advisory Committee of the National Safety Council of Australia (South Australian Division).

The Executive Officer of that organisation, Mrs. Rosemary Davies, has been outspoken for some time about this issue. Reports of her concern regarding this matter have appeared in several newspapers. One of these reports was issued towards the end of last year, almost into the Christmas season, and stated:

Badly made toys could turn Christmas into a day of tragedy for some families. They almost certainly will be responsible for some children needing medical treatment. Some toys were dangerous—they could injure, maim or kill, a safety expert warned yesterday.

It was up to parents to choose carefully and to examine those given by other people, said Mrs. Rosemary Davies, executive officer of the Child Committee, National Safety Council of Australia, South Australian division.

A survey at Adelaide Children's Hospital had shown that safety was the most important consideration when buying toys. Toddlers were most likely to be victims of unsafe toys. Those treated at the hospital had ingested or risked choking on pieces of building sets, marbles, plasticine whistles, small car wheels . . . dolls' jewellery . . . Other dangerous toys were glass eyes on teddy bears which were easily shattered or pulled off, revealing sharp metal spikes; a toy "hero" with a knapsack to be filled with water to put out fires, which tempted children to light fires; and celluloid Mickey Mouse cake decorations which exploded into flames when the birthday candles were lit. Children handling glues or pressure cans of paint for hobby crafts should be warned of the need for adequate ventilation . . . Wooden toys from the Nordic countries usually were of a high standard, but many imports were of poor quality, easily broken and with in-built hazards.

Australian toys generally were well made, but were outnumbered by imports. Although the Customs Department banned dangerous toy firearms and vetted other potentially hazardous toys, those which filtered in included some painted with a higher than acceptable lead content paint, sharp or jagged edged metal toys, highly inflammable celluloid articles and cheap wooden ones with protruding nails.

Some of the stories told by the staff of the Adelaide Children's Hospital about this matter are rather staggering. Around Christmas time last year it was estimated that, by the end of the year, Australians would have spent about \$50 000 000 buying children's toys, the average child under 10 receiving about \$20 worth. Most of the toys added to the collection of young Australians would have been perfectly innocent, innocuous and, it was hoped, a source of much pleasure. Many of them, however, were potentially highly dangerous. We are all aware that some excellent toys are on the market, but many of them fall into the category of being extremely dangerous. Predictably, most injuries caused by toys result from small things that can be swallowed or caught in the throat, or by sharp edges that can scratch out eyes, and so on.

In another recent report, the Standards Association of Australia announced the release of a consumer leaflet entitled "Is that toy safe?" in which it deals with many aspects of gift buying for youngsters. It says that the choice of a suitable toy is the responsibility of the child's parents, relatives or friends. It is important when selecting a toy to take into consideration the age of the child and the nature and stage of his or her mental or physical development. Care should always be taken to make sure that toys intended for use by older children do not fall into the hands of much younger children, who may not appreciate the consequences of incorrect use. It is also important to see that children do not play with defective or damaged toys, or use toys for purposes for which they were not intended. Although much has been done regarding hazards in industry and those relating to road accidents, much more needs to be done in relation to hazards associated with children's accidents.

Another matter regarding children that has come to my notice relates to the number of poisoning cases. In the

Adelaide Children's Hospital report for 1974, it was shown from information gathered by the poison information centre that there were 2 360 telephone inquiries for poison information. A total of 1 283 patients was treated, 282 patients were admitted, and there were three deaths. I have been trying to obtain later figures, although I believe that the figures for that year are general and have been continued through the past two years.

The Standards Association has done much in trying to take steps to keep children out of harm in the home. It also has issued many statements regarding this matter. A new draft Australian safety standard aimed at reducing the risk of poisoning in the home has been published by the association. The standard was requested by the South Australian Division of the National Safety Council of Australia after records at the Adelaide Children's Hospital showed that a total of 3 800 children had been hospitalised or treated for poisoning in the three years from 1970 to 1973.

In its initial discussions, the committee constituted by the Standards Association decided to widen the scope of the draft standard to include not only medicine cupboards but also child-resistant cupboards that could be used in any domestic situation to reduce the risk of possible access to poisons, solvents, detergents, pesticides and dangerous tools.

There is a great need for the Government to investigate this matter. I should like to see the Government do so and publicise the results of its investigation so that the people may be more aware of the dangers that exist for young people through dangerous toys and in relation to other dangers resulting in accidents, and particularly so that the public may be more aware of the number of poison cases that are admitted to the Adelaide Children's Hospital. I believe such a survey would prove that the present situation is critical and that it should be examined by the Government.

Motion carried.

At 10.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 18, at 2 p.m.