

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, September 14, 1976

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

PETITION: SEXUAL OFFENCES

Mr. VENNING presented a petition signed by 75 electors of South Australia, 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.

QUESTIONS

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

ADELAIDE TO CRYSTAL BROOK RAILWAY

Mr. VENNING (on notice):

1. How much was spent in 1975-76 on the construction of the standard gauge railway between Adelaide and Crystal Brook, and what are the details of this expenditure?

2. What amount was spent on this project prior to 1975-76?

3. What commitments on this project were pending, or were required to be met, since July 1, 1976, out of the sum of \$2 000 000 allocated in the Commonwealth Budget?

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

1. An amount of \$4 894 000. Details are as follows:

	\$
Engineering design and survey	884 000
Tracklaying materials	2 495 000
Land and property acquisition	44 000
Signalling equipment	157 000
Rolling stock construction	1 314 000

2. \$818 000.

3.

	\$
Completion of main line design and contract documentation by consultants	300 000
Departmental salaries and wages . .	300 000
Rolling stock construction	125 000
Land acquisition and compensation . .	50 000
Rolling stock and signalling materials on order	470 000
Contingencies	50 000
	<hr/>
	\$1 295 000

MORPHETTVILLE PARK BUS DEPOT

Mr. MATHWIN (on notice):

1. Are the fuel tanks at the Morphetville Park bus depot to be placed underground, as recommended by the

Environment Department, and, if so, in which part of the depot are they to be situated, and how deep are they to be placed?

2. If the tanks are not to be placed underground why are the recommendations of the Environment Department, as laid down in the environment impact study, being disregarded?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The original environmental impact statement showed the fuel tanks located above ground on the Morphet Road boundary screened by trees. The Environment Department expressed concern about this arrangement. To retain the advantage of above-ground fuel storage and overcome the department's concern, the State Transport Authority intended to move the tanks to a position east of the wash bay building where they will be screened by the building. This proposal was made to the Environment Department at a conference held on February 24, 1976, and was accepted by the department as meeting its requirements in a letter dated March 5, 1976. The tanks have now been installed in the agreed location.

Mr. MATHWIN (on notice):

1. Has any noise specification which is satisfactory to the Public Health Department been recommended by the Environment Department in relation to the installation of a cyclone cleaning unit, or of an air compressor unit, respectively, at the Morphetville Park bus depot, and, if so:

(a) what is the specification; and

(b) was the specification included in the tender documents for these two units?

2. If a satisfactory noise specification has not been recommended, has any such specification been made at all in relation to this depot and, if so, what is it?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The cyclone cleaning unit is being installed by the State Transport Authority's own personnel and no specification covering the whole installation has therefore been issued. However, the unit has been designed to keep the noise levels as low as possible and in this regard the following steps have been taken. The cyclone itself will be rubber lined, and will be enclosed as far as possible by means of brickwork; the motor and fan will be located at ground level, using resilient mountings to reduce vibration to a minimum; and there will be no metallic attachment between the roof and any part of the cyclone equipment. Compressors are items purchased complete, and rotary compressors were chosen for the low-pressure air system because they are quieter. A reciprocating compressor was necessary for the high-pressure air system. An effective silencer will be fitted to this compressor if found necessary. In order to comply with the requirements of the Environment Department to keep noise levels to a minimum, it was decided to enclose the compressors in a brick building. These proposals were discussed with the Environment Department at a meeting held on February 24, 1976. The department has acknowledged the efforts of the State Transport Authority to control noise levels in a letter dated March 5, 1976.

Mr. MATHWIN (on notice):

1. Before the Morphetville Park bus depot becomes operative will the installation be carried out of each of the proposed activated school crossings on:

(a) Morphet and Oaklands Roads, for the use of students of the Glengowrie High School;

(b) Morphet Road for the use of students of the Morphetville Park primary and infants schools; and

(c) Morphet Road for the use of children crossing this road to the Warradale primary and infants schools?

2. If these crossings are not to be installed before the depot becomes operative, why not?

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

1. (a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) No.

2. (Reference 1 (b)): A school crossing already exists at this location, and it is intended to convert this crossing to pedestrian actuated signals during 1977-78, subject to the availability of funds.

(Reference 1 (c)): Traffic associated with the bus depot is not expected to be significant at this location.

LAND TAX

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. In the period from January 1 to August 31, 1976, how many persons applied for exemption from land tax?

2. Will these applicants be given the right to support their written cases by appearing before the officers who made the recommendations on these applications and, if not, why not?

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

1. Applications for remission of 1975-76 land tax on the grounds of hardship were received from 20 persons in respect of 22 ownerships. One application was subsequently withdrawn.

2. Detailed applications were lodged by each applicant and, where further information was required, the applicant was asked by letter to supply such information. Only two applicants requested the chance to discuss their submissions, and the Rural Industry Assistance Branch of the Lands Department, which assessed the financial position of each applicant, was advised of these requests. However, that branch considered that interviews were not necessary as adequate information was provided in the applications concerned. In these two cases land tax was remitted to the following extent:

	1975-76 tax \$	Amount remitted \$	Balance to pay \$
1.	3 351.97	2 750	601.97
2.	8 376.36	6 423	1 953.36

MONARTO

Mr. GUNN (on notice): How much has the Government spent on Monarto since its conception, and how many persons are at present employed by the Monarto Development Commission?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: To August 31, 1976, net expenditure of \$15 100 000 has been spent on Monarto, of which \$10 400 000 has been provided by the Commonwealth Government. In addition, an amount of \$2 000 000 is accrued in respect of interest on State and Commonwealth loans, payment of which has been deferred. The number of persons employed has declined to 59.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What is the estimated cost of planning, staff, and construction to be carried out at Monarto during the next 5, 10 and 15 year periods, respectively?

2. What new construction work is expected to commence during each of these periods?

3. What is the expected population of Monarto by 1980, 1985, 1990 and 2000 respectively?

4. Does the Government still expect that several thousand people will be living at Monarto by the end of 1978?

5. What Government departments are intended to be moved to Monarto, and when is it proposed that major portions of these departments will commence relocation?

6. When does the Government intend to announce revised schedules for all work to be carried out in relation to Monarto?

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

1, 2 and 3. A final decision on the rate of development at Monarto cannot be made until clear and definite advice is received from the Commonwealth Government as to its willingness to provide financial support for growth-centre projects in future years.

4. Because of the delay in commencing construction, it is unlikely that the first new residents will be accommodated at Monarto before the end of 1978.

5. It was announced in 1973 that it would be necessary to relocate elements of the State Public Service to Monarto to provide part of the required employment base for the new city. It was decided at that time, that the three departments to be moved initially would be Lands, Agriculture, and Environment and Conservation. Considerable progress has subsequently been made with the Government's plans to regroup State Government departments as proposed by the Committee of Inquiry into the Public Service of South Australia (the Corbett Committee). It will, therefore be necessary to review the relocation plans when the Monarto programme is finalised.

6. See 1 and 3 above.

PUBLICITY SERVICES

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What salary and expense allowance does the position of Manager of Publicity Services in the Premier's Department carry?

2. Has Mr. J. Parkes been appointed to this position with a five-year contract?

3. What are the provisions and conditions for either party wishing to break the contract?

4. Will Mr. Parkes be taking over many of the responsibilities now carried out by the Tourist Bureau, or any other Government or semi-government instrumentality and, if so, what are they?

5. On what dates was the position as Manager of Publicity Services in the Premier's Department advertised, and where were the advertisements placed?

6. How many applications were received for this position, and what were the names of the applicants?

7. What previous positions has Mr. Parkes held, with whom has he held them, and what were the duties of such assignments?

8. Was Mr. Parkes made aware of the vacancy of Manager of Publicity Services at the time he was interviewed for the position of Director, South Australian Government Tourist Bureau?

9. What will be the total responsibility which Mr. Parkes will have as Manager of Publicity Services?

10. What staff will be under Mr. Parkes and what salaries will their positions command?

11. Is it expected that there will be an increase in staff under Mr. Parkes in the foreseeable future, and, if so, what is the expected increase?

12. Was a nomination recommended from outside the Public Service for a contract position as Manager of Publicity Services, and, if so:

(a) who was the nominee; and

(b) was the nomination rejected by the Government?

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

1. \$22 000 (EO1 level): Reasonable entertainment expenses up to a maximum of \$1 500 p.a.

2. Yes.

3. For breach of contract, four weeks notice. Either party may terminate agreement on giving not less than three calendar months notice in writing.

4. No.

5. The position of Manager, Publicity Services was advertised on three separate occasions. Firstly, on April 9, 1975, secondly, on August 2, 1975, and thirdly, on November 22, 1975. On each occasion the advertisement was placed in the *Advertiser*, the *Australian*, and the *Sydney Morning Herald*. Applications were also called on Public Service Board notices.

6. 58 applicants. It is considered that the names of individuals should not be disclosed, at least without their prior permission, since it could conceivably jeopardise their relationships with their employers or occasion some other personal embarrassment.

7. Mr. Parkes has held seven previous positions, and the duties of those positions are a matter between Mr. Parkes and his previous employers.

8. Mr. Parkes was not made aware of the vacancy of Manager, Publicity Services when he was interviewed for the position of Director of Tourism.

9. Control of staff engaged in the provision of journalistic, photographic, art, design and related services to departments; liaise with departments in developing and implementing publicity programmes; advise departments on media selection and use; advise departments on ways of achieving economies and on ways of improving quality in the production of publicity material; allocate work to appropriate commercial agencies and act as an intermediary between departments and agencies as required; report to the Government on the effectiveness of publicity programmes and suggest improvements; liaise with departments and the advertising agency in the placement of media advertising; and establish costing and charging procedures.

10. The present staff numbering 20 who receive salaries determined by the Public Service Board.

11. Yes. The Government is presently considering a report prepared by the Public Service Board and officers of the Premier's Department into future staffing of the branch, and is not in a position to state what increase can be expected.

12. (a) and (b). No nomination was made. No recommendation for a Public Service appointment was made. A selection was made of a candidate for offer of a contract position but on further investigation this was not proceeded with. No recommendation was made in Cabinet except in the case of Mr. Parkes.

VICTORIAN TOURIST BUREAU

Mr. EVANS (on notice): What amount of money has been paid to the Victorian Tourist Bureau as agent for the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau in each of the past four fiscal years?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The following payments have been made by the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau to the Victorian Government Tourist Bureau as commission on bookings made: 1972-73, \$121·58; 1973-74, \$225·52; 1974-75, \$284·98; and 1975-76, \$972·09.

SCHOOL LIBRARIES COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Did the committee set up to report on the community use of school libraries ever make a report, and, if so:

(a) when;

(b) what were its recommendations;

(c) what action, if any, has been taken as a result; and

(d) what further action, if any, is proposed?

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

(a) The committee presented its report in 1974.

(b) The major recommendations of the report are:

1. School community libraries be established in small rural communities; that is, communities where the total population effectively served is less than 3 000.

2. School stock be supplied and financed as for other schools and non-school stock be supplied by the Libraries Board under provisions of the Libraries (Subsidies) Act.

3. Hours of opening be determined by the local board of management.

4. Special design requirements be considered by planning authorities.

5. Staffing be the responsibility of the Education Department.

6. Teacher librarians in community school libraries attend a short inservice course conducted by the State Library.

7. Provision be made for teacher librarians to work outside school hours with time off in lieu.

8. Additional support staff in the form of Office Assistants (Library) be appointed.

9. The local board of management responsible for the community school library represent the school, the school council and local government, so that local government representation is in a minority of one.

10. Expenditure for building alterations or additions be borne by the Education Department (50 per cent), Libraries Board (25 per cent) and local government (25 per cent).

11. Community school libraries be established only in those areas where all the institutes involved agree to dissolve.

12. A community school library committee be established by the Minister of Education to advise him about all aspects of the scheme and to make recommendations concerning establishment and administration of community school libraries.

13. Amendments to the Libraries (Subsidies) Act and the Local Government Act be made to allow implementation of the scheme.

(c) The following action has been taken since the presentation of the report:

1. Copies of the report were forwarded to schools, institutes and local councils in appropriate areas.
2. The Minister has established a committee representing the Education Department, the Libraries Board and the Institutes Association.
3. The committee has met on a number of occasions.
4. Finance has been requested in the 1976-77 Budget Estimates for the establishment of some community school libraries.
5. Applications for the establishment of community school libraries have been invited.
6. Some legislative amendments have been passed.

(d) Further action proposed includes:

1. Requesting additional funding in future financial years for extension of the scheme.
2. Consideration of communities in small rural areas not covered by the proposals, such as areas where there is no local government which can make a contribution to library services.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

How many sets of traffic lights were installed in each of the last three financial years and:

- (a) at what locations;
- (b) at what total cost; and
- (c) who bore this cost and in what proportions was it borne, and by whom?

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

- (a) and (b) The number of new intersection signals, pedestrian actuated signals and school crossings installed in the last three financial years, and their approximate cost, was as follows:

Year	No. of Installations	Approximate Cost \$
1973-74	22	174 000
1974-75	24	306 000
1975-76	30	404 000

Details of the locations of these signals are provided in the Highways Department's annual reports for 1973-74 and 1974-75 and will be included in the 1975-76 report currently being prepared.

- (c) The cost was borne approximately as follows:

	\$
Highways Department	781 000
Local government	103 000

CHOWILLA DAM

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What is now the policy of the Government concerning the proposal to build the Chowilla dam?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Chowilla dam is one of the alternatives being considered in a study by the River Murray Commission to determine the next stage of storage development after Dartmouth dam. The Government will await this report from the commission before making any recommendation as to a commencement of construction.

TEACHING APPOINTMENTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): In each of the past three financial years how many graduates of colleges of advanced education and graduates holding a degree of Bachelor of Education, respectively, have received teaching appointments in the Education Department?

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

1. Graduates of colleges of advanced education. The totals provided include all of those appointed to teaching positions on completion of a teacher education course other than a Bachelor of Education at Flinders University, whether taken in a college of advanced education or at a university. Many students nominally attached to colleges of advanced education actually studied solely in a university.

	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
Primary	656	678	741
Secondary	600	610	702
Total	1 256	1 288	1 443

2. Graduates holding a degree of Bachelor of Education. In the three-year period about which the information is required no awards of the Bachelor of Education were made by colleges of advanced education. This group which therefore were trained at Flinders University do not actually have the Bachelor of Education degree until the end of the first year of teaching; that is, after satisfactorily completing the internship year. Appointments were made on satisfactorily completing the third year of the course, or the fourth year in the case of physical education students.

	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
Number	46	74	60

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): In making teaching appointments in the Education Department, is preference given to graduates from colleges of advanced education over university graduates with the degree of Bachelor of Education and, if so, why, and for how long has this been the practice?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Before 1974, when bonded allowances for undergraduate university courses were discontinued, B.Ed. students were bonded and were concurrently enrolled at Flinders University for course work and at Sturt College of Advanced Education for administrative purposes. No distinction was then made between graduates of the college and of the university for employment purposes. From January 1, 1974, unbonded allowances were available for courses of teacher education at colleges of advanced education only. In October, 1974, approval was given for the payment of unbonded allowances to Bachelor of Education students at Flinders University. Unbonded allowances for the B.Ed. have been offered every year since then. Applicants must have completed one year of university studies before they are accepted for entry to the full-time teacher education course at Flinders University leading to the award of the B.Ed.

Some B.Ed. students do not apply for the unbonded allowance, choosing to continue their courses with financial

assistance from other sources. No preference is given in employment to unbonded graduates of colleges of advanced education over unbonded graduates of Flinders University who hold the degree of B.Ed. Private students of colleges of advanced education and universities are offered employment according to the qualifications of the applicant and the needs of the department. In practice, all eligible and qualified B.Ed. graduates of Flinders University, including unbonded and private students have been offered employment.

RAINMAKING

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What work, if any, under the direction of the Government, has been done during the past three financial years in South Australia on rainmaking and by whom and with what results?

2. What such work, if any, is at present being done?

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

1. Rainmaking or cloud-seeding has not been researched in South Australia since 1968, when the Agriculture Department assisted a C.S.I.R.O. programme which cost more than \$26 000.

2. None. World experience has shown that techniques can be used to trigger clouds to produce rain, but there is no evidence that the clouds would not have produced rain anyway, and the techniques have no application in a drought year because the right types of cloud are not present to be triggered.

KANGAROO ISLAND TRANSPORT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Is it intended that any replacement for the *Troubridge* should be built at Whyalla and, if so, at what expected total cost, and when, and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We would expect that it would be built at Whyalla, but at this stage it is too early to provide details of the *Troubridge's* replacement.

METROPOLITAN TAXI-CAB BOARD

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Who are the present members of the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board?

2. Whom does each represent?

3. When does the term of each expire?

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

1. W. L. Bridgland (Chairman), G. Joseph, D. J. Wells, J. A. Mickan, J. G. Linn, W. Young, E. L. Calder, H. W. Bampton.

2. W. L. Bridgland, Adelaide City Council; G. Joseph, Adelaide City Council; D. J. Wells, Local Government Association; J. A. Mickan, Taxi-Cab Operators Association of S.A.; J. G. Linn, Taxi-Cab Operators Association of S.A.; W. Young, Taxi-Cab Owner Driver Section of Transport Workers Union; E. L. Calder, Commissioner of Police; H. W. Bampton, Minister of Transport.

3. All expire on March 31, 1977.

TAXI FARES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the present scale of taxi fares?

2. When was it fixed?

3. How was it arrived at?

4. Is the Government satisfied that taxi operators are receiving a proper financial return and, if not:

(a) what action, if any, is it proposed to take; and

(b) why will this action be taken and when?

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

1. Flagfall—45c which includes the first 180 metres; running time—5c for each additional 180 metres; waiting time—\$6 an hour; booking fee—20c; after hours—20c for each hiring between the hours of 8 p.m. and 6 a.m. Monday to Friday, 8 p.m. Saturday to 6 a.m. Monday, and on all public holidays. (The surcharge to be retained by the driver.)

2. September 2, 1976.

3. The fare schedule was arrived at by taking into account increased costs in vehicles, spare parts, labour, and fuel, as well as the consumer price index, since the last increase on December 18, 1975. The increase amounted to 11.45 per cent.

4. Yes.

RAILWAY ADVERTISING

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many advertising signs are there on railway property comprising the Adelaide Railway Station and the adjacent yards and, in each case:

(a) what does it advertise;

(b) for how long is the contract;

(c) what annual revenue does the State Transport Authority receive;

(d) who authorised the making of the contract and when; and

(e) is the contract to be renewed on expiration of its present term and, if so, why?

2. Is it proposed to make any more contracts for advertising signs on this property?

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

1. Eighty-two:

(a) Various types of merchandise and services;

(b) Generally, 12 months;

(c) \$20 533;

(d) Secretary for Railways, or Minister of Transport;

(e) Subject to decision on expiry of each contract.

2. Applications are dealt with on *their merit*.

CONTROL OF ADVERTISEMENTS ACT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. On August 1, 1973, did the then Minister of Environment and Conservation write to Dr. S. Milazzo stating that the Government intended to legislate to amend the Control of Advertisements Act at an early date and, if so, why has such legislation not been introduced?

2. Is it still proposed to introduce such legislation and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes, on August 1, 1973, the then Minister of Environment and Conservation wrote to Dr. S. Milazzo stating that the Government intended to legislate to amend the Control of Advertisements Act at an early date. The

Act is now committed to the Minister for Planning. Even the member for Mitcham would be aware that the drafting of legislation takes time. In this case, the nature of any legislation will require extensive consultations with local government and other organisations.

2. *Vide* 1.

PROPERTY VALUATIONS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Did the Valuer-General receive a deputation from the West Torrens council on or about August 3, 1976, and, if so, who comprised the deputation, what was discussed, and what was the outcome?

2. Is it normal practice for the Valuer-General to receive deputations?

3. What action does the Government intend to take to reduce valuations in the West Torrens council area?

4. Will the Premier have an independent inquiry held into the method and system adopted for property valuations for taxing and Government charges?

5. Are subcontractors used for valuing properties and, if not, why not?

6. Can the Premier state how the costs of valuing properties in this State compare with the costs of other State Governments and, in particular, Victoria?

7. Does the Government intend to adopt a different method of property taxation and, if not, why not?

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

1. Yes, the Valuer-General did receive a deputation from the West Torrens Council on August 3, 1976. The deputation, which was introduced by the Minister of Labour and Industry, comprised: the Mayor, Dr. Reece Jennings; the Town Clerk, Mr. H. Boyce; and councillors, Wells, Robertson, and Childs. Discussion concerned the relativity of new unimproved values recently made by the Valuer-General in the West Torrens council area that could have been used for rating purposes by the council. Apart from dealing with the normal valuation objections, the Valuer-General agreed to re-examine the unimproved values in the residential localities of Cummins Park, Novar Gardens, Fulham South, and West Richmond.

2. The Valuer-General is a statutory officer appointed outside of the Public Service to administer the Valuation of Land Act. As such it seems quite proper for the Valuer-General to receive a deputation connected with his administration of the Act.

3. The Valuer-General is the only authority empowered under the Act to reduce or increase valuations in any council area.

4. The method of valuing properties for taxing and rating has been the subject of inquiries since its inception. In Australia alone at least 11 such inquiries, including a Royal Commission, have been held in the past 40 years. The latest Australian inquiry was conducted in Western Australia last year. South Australia had its last inquiry in 1964, when the Ligertwood Committee reported to the Government on assessments for land tax, council rates, water rates, sewer rates and probate. None of these inquiries has been able to recommend a different or fairer method of property taxation than that based on land and property values. The same conclusion has been reached by inquiries held in other countries, the latest of these being the Layfield Committee of Inquiry into Local Government Finance in England, Scotland and Wales, which reported to the Government in May, 1976, and

concluded that rating on property value should not be abandoned. The extremely small percentage of valuation objections received from landowners each year against the valuation does not warrant a further inquiry at present or a change in the method.

5. Subcontractors are not used for valuing properties, as the Valuer-General is able to do the work for the Government far more economically and effectively.

6. To answer this question it would be necessary to request the Valuers-General or equivalent in each State to undertake an analysis of their budgetary figures. The request would most likely be rejected, because of the additional work and expense involved. The best method of comparison that can be made is the charges made by the various States for valuations to rating and taxing authorities and these are set out hereunder. In Victoria the Valuer-General and his staff supervise and co-ordinate the local authority valuations, which are made by independent valuers either under contract or in the employ of the authority.

Fees for Valuations from July 1, 1976:

South Australia: 50c a valuation initial cost, plus an annual charge of 50c for each supplementary valuation.

Queensland: Land used for business \$1.90 a valuation a year.

Other land:

Under 4 000 m² 79c a valuation a year
4 000 m² and over but less

than 20 ha 95c a valuation a year
20 ha and over but less

than 40 ha \$1.26 a valuation a year
40 ha and over but less

than 200 ha \$1.68 a valuation a year
200 ha and over \$2.31 a valuation a year

New South Wales:

City of Sydney \$1.10 a valuation a year
Others 45c a valuation a year

Tasmania: The Valuer-General adopts a cost a valuation for each area valued and charges the rating authorities at one-half of that cost, for example, one municipality in 1974-75 was costed at \$3.84 a valuation and the charge to the authority was \$1.92 a valuation. There is no standard fee.

Western Australia: Figures unavailable.

Victoria: Contractors:—

Industrial and Commercial . . \$5 to \$7 a valuation

Rural \$4 to \$8 a valuation

Residential \$1.50 to \$3 a valuation

Vacant land 50c to \$1 a valuation

7. See comments in 4 above.

CUMMINS PARK VALUATIONS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Why were properties in the Cummins Park and Novar Gardens areas revalued as shown in notices issued on August 17, 1976?

2. How many properties were affected?

3. What was the highest and lowest increase in valuations and the average increase in the revaluations of unimproved values and annual values?

4. Was an error made in valuations shown in the notices issued on June 8, 1976, and, if so, why?

5. Which valuations will be used for land tax and water and sewerage charges this financial year?

6. What is the system and method adopted in valuing properties in the metropolitan area?

7. Are the properties physically inspected?

8. What was the cost of the second revaluation?

9. How many objections have been received to date for the first and second revaluations, respectively, and have any appeals been decided and, if so, to what degree?

10. Did the Engineering and Water Supply Department accept the original revaluation in the West Torrens council area?

11. Why does a developed property have an unimproved value and:

(a) what significance is placed on that unimproved value; and

(b) is it a hypothetical figure?

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

1. Amended valuations for residential properties in the Cummins Park and Novar Gardens localities of the West Torrens council area were undertaken by the Valuer-General to correct an anomaly in the comparability of the new general valuations in those localities.

2. 320 properties were affected.

3. The highest increase in unimproved values was 33 per cent, the lowest 7 per cent and in annual values, 11 per cent and 4 per cent respectively with the average increase in unimproved values being 25 per cent and in annual values 7 per cent.

4. During the deputation from the West Torrens council on August 3, 1976, the Valuer-General examined the unimproved valuations of residential properties in the area, and was of the opinion from the evidence of sales of vacant land in the Cummins Park and Novar Gardens localities that some valuations had been incorrectly valued when compared to others. He had these valuations checked by a Supervising Valuer, who reported to him that the valuer who made the valuations, in his eagerness to maintain uniformity of assessments throughout the council, had overlooked that the assessments in the Novar Gardens and Cummins Park areas needed a much higher grading to make them truly comparable with his assessments of value in the other residential areas.

5. The amended valuations will be used for land tax and water and sewer rates this financial year.

6. Properties in the metropolitan area are valued on the basis of their highest and best zoning permitted use by reference to the most recent prices being paid for comparable land in the real estate market under prudent negotiation at the time of general valuation. The amended values in West Torrens have been determined at the level of values prevailing for the general valuation on June 8, 1976, as required by the Act.

7. All properties are physically inspected.

8. The cost of the amendments to the valuation has been calculated at \$115.

9. Objections received to the June general valuation of the Cummins Park and Novar Gardens area were 11, and as at September 10, 1976, there have been five objections lodged against the revised values including one who was a

previous objector. None of these objections has yet been determined.

10. The Engineering and Water Supply Department accepted the June general valuation of the West Torrens council area.

11. Developed properties are required to have an unimproved value determined for statutory rating and taxing purposes.

(a) Its significance is purely as a basis for the relative distribution of the tax rating burden across the community.

(b) The courts of Australia have ruled that unimproved value is determined by considering a hypothetical sale of the land void of any building improvements as between a prudent hypothetical seller and an equally prudent hypothetical buyer. This hypothetical sale price becomes the capital amount that the land might reasonably be expected to realise upon sale. The best guide to what that hypothetical sale price might be is determined by considering sales of unimproved land, or where these are not available, making an analysis of the sales of improved land to determine how much was paid for the land and how much for the added value of the improvements.

LOSS OF INDUSTRY

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many industries and businesses have closed down, transferred to other States, been wound up, or become bankrupt in each year for the past five financial years and:

(a) how many employees have been made redundant because of such action;

(b) why was such action necessary; and

(c) if figures are not available, what is the latest information or trends evident in loss of business in South Australia, and why?

2. What action is the Government currently taking to arrest the above situation?

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

1. There are no statistics available that would indicate the number of businesses which may have transferred out of South Australia in any financial year. The information on small and ordinary bankruptcies of individuals taken from the second schedules to the annual reports on the operation of the Bankruptcy Act, 1966-1973, by the Federal Attorney-General is as follows:

Year-ending	
June, 1971	611
June, 1972	622
June, 1973	528
June, 1974	358
June, 1975	427

The number of liquidations has been:

Year-ending	
June, 1973	66
June, 1974	66
June, 1975	87
June, 1976	63

The number of receiverships has been:

Year-ending	
June, 1973	35
June, 1974	26
June, 1975	48
June, 1976	18

(a) Not available.

(b) Not available.

(c) The number of business failures is believed to be declining.

2. To the extent that the situation is improving it would be undesirable for the South Australian Government to attempt to "arrest" the improvement.

PLANNING APPEALS

Mr. ALLEN (on notice):

1. How many appeals have been considered and determined by the Planning Appeal Board during the period July 1, 1973, to June 30, 1976, inclusive?

2. How many of the appeals heard during this period were determined partly or wholly in favour of the appellant?

3. How many of the successful appellants were represented by a barrister or solicitor, and how many of the unsuccessful appellants were represented by a barrister or solicitor?

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

1. 1330 appeals considered; 908 appeals determined; and 422 appeals withdrawn before hearing, withdrawn after hearing or presently part heard.

2. See Planning Appeal Board report.

3. The information requested would be too costly to obtain.

THE SCHEDULES

MATTERS LODGED WITH THE BOARD:

1967-1968	22
1968-1969	24
1969-1970	53
1970-1971	40
1971-1972	84
1972-1973	208
1973-1974	422
1974-1975	425
1975-1976	483

MATTERS LODGED EACH CALENDAR MONTH WITH THE BOARD IN:

	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
July	4	31	37	34
August	6	45	51	66
September	7	32	40	53
October	8	35	39	29
November	11	21	46	33
December	9	54	30	48
January	23	47	27	37
February	22	40	25	46
March	25	38	19	35
April	31	25	38	23
May	28	31	38	47
June	34	23	35	32
	208	422	425	483

CASES DETERMINED IN:

	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
July	7	18	28	14
August	2	22	33	23
September	3	17	36	67
October	13	18	15	25
November	9	23	31	28
December	6	16	28	27
January	3	19	15	20
February	13	16	21	26
March	23	19	18	45
April	22	30	58	23
May	14	17	26	22
June	21	12	17	35
	136	227	326	355

MATTERS WITHDRAWN BEFORE HEARING IN:

	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
July	Nil	3	Nil	3
August	Nil	2	9	5
September	Nil	1	1	1
October	1	2	1	1
November	Nil	6	3	Nil
December	2	1	4	10
January	Nil	2	4	3
February	Nil	5	2	3
March	2	2	2	1
April	1	2	5	2
May	1	8	3	2
June	Nil	3	1	2
	7	37	35	33

MATTERS WITHDRAWN AFTER HEARING DURING:

	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
July	1	2	4	3
August	Nil	3	4	9
September	Nil	2	1	4
October	5	8	6	6
November	2	8	4	2
December	3	7	3	6
January	Nil	3	1	6
February	1	10	13	9
March	3	18	7	7
April	8	1	10	5
May	6	12	13	7
June	3	3	5	4
	32	77	71	68

MATTERS PART HEARD OR AWAITING HEARING AT END OF YEAR IN:

1972-1973	1973-1974	1974-1975	1975-1976
78	169	162	189

Objector appeals brought against decisions of the State Planning Authority or of local government authorities about land-use matters in:

1972-73	18
1973-74	44
1974-75	25
1975-76	42

	Jurisdiction declined because beyond authority of board	Appeals won by objectors	Appeals brought by objectors where variation of decision ordered	Appeals brought by objectors withdrawn whether before or after hearing	Appeals lost by objectors
1974-75	2	6	10	3	4
1975-76	3	8	6	18	7

Matters in which it was alleged objector appeals were founded on vexatious or trivial grounds:

	Number	So Found	Not so Found
1974-75	Nil	Nil	Nil
1975-76	Nil	Nil	Nil

	Jurisdiction declined because beyond authority of board	Such appeals won by appellant	Such appeals where variation of decision ordered	Such appeals withdrawn whether before or after hearing	Such appeals lost by appellant	Total
Appeals, other than objector appeals, brought against State Planning Authority decisions in 1974-75 and 1975-76:						
1974-75	2	Nil	1	3	1	7
1975-76	Nil	2	1	5	3	11
Appeals brought against Director of Planning's Decisions in 1974-75 and 1975-76:						
1974-75	4	5	3	11	9	32
1975-76	Nil	10	2	10	9	31
Appeals brought against City of Adelaide Development Committee's decisions in 1974-75 and 1975-76:						
1974-75	1	Nil	Nil	14	Nil	15
1975-76	1	Nil	Nil	1	1	3
Appeals brought against decisions of local government authorities about the division of land in 1974-75 and 1975-76:						
1974-75	2	3	2	6	3	16
1975-76	Nil	5	1	4	4	14
Appeals, other than objector appeals, brought against decisions of local government authorities about land-use matters in 1974-75 and 1975-76:						
1974-75	5	7	11	56	23	102
1975-76	2	13	7	41	24	87
Applications made as to when consents given by the State Planning Authority or local government authorities should become effective in 1974-75 and 1975-76:						
1974-75	—	—	—	—	—	90
1975-76	—	—	—	—	—	161
Other applications made in 1974-75 and 1975-76:						
1974-75	—	—	—	—	—	145
1975-76	—	—	—	—	—	107
Applications withdrawn in 1974-75 and 1975-76:						
1974-75	—	—	—	—	—	13
1975-76	—	—	—	—	—	31

ROAD WIDENING

Mr. CUMBE (on notice): Is it intended to continue southwards beyond Regency Road, Sefton Park, the road widening works presently being undertaken on the Main North Road at Enfield and, if so, what is the planned schedule for this work?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes. Widening of the Enfield Avenue to Third Avenue section is scheduled for completion in December, 1976. Widening of the Third Avenue to Nottage Terrace section is scheduled for 1978-79 and 1979-80, subject to the availability of funds at the time.

RAILWAY WARNING DEVICES

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What are the 12 locations, in respect of railway crossing warning devices, referred to in part two Question on Notice on September 7, 1976?

2. Will any of the 19 other locations referred to in part three of the same question be funded in the 1976-77 financial year?

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

1. Kadina, Main Road; Penola, Robe Road; Keith, Emu Flat Road; Ceduna, Thevenard Road; Ceduna, Eyre Highway; South Hummocks, Ardrossan Road; Berri, Shiell Road; Bowden, Coglein Street; Tailem Bend, Dukes Highway; Evanston, Para Road; Glossop, Sturt Highway; Nuriootpa-Penrice, Penrice Road;

2. No decision has yet been taken.

TRAFFIC SIGNALS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice): What is the specific programme for 1976-77, in respect to traffic signals, referred to in the answer to Question on Notice on September 7, 1976?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The programme is as follows:

1. New intersection signals:

Ascot Avenue/Harris Road (Vale Park)
Belair Road/Princes Road (Kingswood)
Brighton Road/Jetty Road (Glenelg)
Commercial Road/Dale Street (Port Adelaide)
North East Road/Tarton Road (Holden Hill)
Main North Road/Womma Road (Elizabeth)
Main North Road/Woodford Road (Elizabeth)
Norrie Avenue/McBryde Terrace (Whyalla)
Norrie Avenue/Nicholson Avenue (Whyalla)
North East Road/Hampstead Road (Collinswood)
Payneham Road/Lambert Road (Evandale)
Salisbury Highway/Kings Road (Parafield Gardens)
Morphett Road/Baker Street (Morphettville)
Oaklands Road/Bus Depot (Morphettville)
South Road/O'Sullivan Beach Road (Morphett Vale)
Anzac Highway/Beckman Street (Plympton)
Anzac Highway/Leader Street (Keswick)
Brighton Road/The Crescent (Hove)
Fullarton Road/Ferguson Avenue (Myrtle Bank)
Fullarton Road/Grant Avenue (Rose Park)
Glynburn Road/The Parade (Kensington Park)
Goodwood Road/Grange Road (Westbourne Park)
Henley Beach Road/Victoria Street (Mile End)
Holbrooks Road/Hartley Road (Flinders Park)
Main North Road/Barker Street (Nailsworth)
Main North Road/Edgeworth Street (Sefton Park)
Main North Road/Saints Road (Salisbury)

Marion Road/Galway Avenue (Netley)
Portrush Road/Williams Street (Norwood)
South Road/Everard Avenue (Keswick)
South Road/George Street (Thebarton)
Sudholz Road/Danby Avenue (Windsor Gardens)
Torrens Road/Regency Road (Kilkenny)

2. Modified intersection signals:

Main North Road/Elizabeth Way (Elizabeth)
Main North Road/Philip Highway (Elizabeth)
South Road/Sturt Road (Bedford Park)
St. Vincent Street/Commercial Road (Port Adelaide)
St. Vincent Street/Nelson Street (Port Adelaide)
South Road/Cross Road (Emerson)
Hackney Road/North Terrace (Hackney)
Henley Beach Road/South Road (Thebarton)
Main North Road/Regency Road (Sefton Park)
Main North Road/Smith Street (Salisbury)
Marion Road/Cross Road (Plympton)
Morphett Road/Oaklands Road (Morphettville)
Portrush Road/Cross Road (Glen Osmond)
Brighton Road/Diagonal Road (Glenelg)
Dequetteville Terrace/Bartels Road (Kent Town)
Fullarton Road/The Parade (Kent Town)
Grand Junction Road/Addison Road (Rosewater)
Grand Junction Road/Briens Road (Northfield)
Grand Junction Road/Hanson Road (Athol Park)
Grange Road/Tapleys Hill Road (Fulham)
Marion Road/Sixth Avenue (Park Holme)
Marion Road/Thomas Street (Plympton Park)
North East Road/Sudholz Road (Gilles Plains)
Payneham Road/Magill Road (College Park)
Payneham Road/Portrush Road (Payneham)
Portrush Road/Greenhill Road (Tusmore)
South Road/Marion Road (Darlington)
South Road/Seacombe Road (Darlington)

3. New pedestrian-actuated signals:

Brighton Road, near Elgar Avenue (Somerton)
Gorge Road, near Jan Street (Newton)
Henley Beach Road, near Henley Street (Torrensville)
Bridge Road, near Lincoln Crescent (Pooraka)
Kensington Road, near Maesbury Street (Marryatville)
Churchill Road, near Palmer Street (Islington)
Oaklands Road, near Buckingham Street (Glengowrie)
Grand Junction Road, near Wandana Avenue (Gilles Plains)
St. Bernards Road, near Morialta Road (Rostrevor)
Gray Street (Kilkenny)
Hamblyn Road (Elizabeth)
Philip Highway (G.M.H.) (Elizabeth)
Trimmer Parade (Seaton)

4. Improved pedestrian signals:

Brighton Road, near Jetty Road (Brighton)
Cheltenham Parade, at G.M.H. (Woodville)

5. Signal co-ordination schemes:

Commercial Road/St. Vincent Street (Pt. Adelaide)
Dequetteville Terrace (Kent Town)
Glen Osmond Road (Parkside)
Main North Road (Salisbury)
Marion Road (Plympton Park-Mitchell Park)
Anzac Highway (Glenelg)
Goodwood Road (Daw Park)
Henley Beach Road (Brooklyn Park)
South Road (Darlington)
Torrens Road (Kilkenny)
Main North Road (Elizabeth)

6. New school crossings:

Piccadilly Road (Crafers)
South Terrace (Bordertown), (two)

Acre Avenue (Morphett Vale)
 Elizabeth Road (Christie Downs)
 Elizabeth Street (Banksia Park)
 Flaxmill Road (Christie Downs)
 Goodman Road (Elizabeth)
 Hancock Road (St. Agnes)
 Midway Road (Elizabeth Park)
 Milne Road (Ridgehaven)
 Valiant Road (Holden Hill)
 Whites Road (Salisbury North)
 Wright Road (Ingle Farm)
 Wright Road (Para Vista)

GREENOCH-NURIOOTPA BY-PASS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What progress has been made on the Greenoch-Nuriootpa by-pass?
2. When is it expected that the road will be opened for public use?
3. On completion of the by-pass project, is it intended to improve the Greenoch-Nuriootpa road and, if so, over what portion and on what approximate time schedule?

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

1. Earthworks and sub-base construction are almost complete. Placing of base course is 50 per cent complete. Of the two major bridges, one is almost complete and the other is 50 per cent complete.
2. Late April, 1977.
3. No.

RECREATION AND SPORT

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. Have recreation and sporting committees been set up at local government level, and, if so:
 - (a) in which local government areas;
 - (b) who are the regional officers employed;
 - (c) what moneys have been made available for each committee;
 - (d) who made the selection of the committee members; and
 - (e) what contribution to the committees is made by local government?
2. What role will the Recreation Advisory Council take in matters relating to recreation within the community?
3. What specific action will the advisory council be taking in the training of leaders and supervisors for recreation?
4. What funding is the council likely to have available for recreation purposes?
5. What action will be taken to increase recreation facilities within the community?
6. Will there be greater co-ordination of recreation activities and, if so, in what area?
7. By what method are persons elected to the Recreation Advisory Council, and is there a need for a more representative group of the community than presently exists on the council?
8. Who are the present members of the council?
9. Who made the selection?
10. Is it contemplated that the method of selection will be varied?
11. What are the names of the sporting associations informed of the umpires' courses available through the

Sports Advisory Council, and from whom were acceptances received for attendance at these courses?

12. How many and where have sporting club administration courses been conducted and:

- (a) is it intended to have further courses in other areas and, if so, what areas;
- (b) what criteria were used in the selection of centres for courses;
- (c) how many people attended these courses;
- (d) what fees are paid to tutors;
- (e) what is the total expenditure to date for tutors' fees;
- (f) what is the expected expenditure for tutors for 1976-77;
- (g) what sporting and recreational associations or clubs have been notified of the availability of the courses;
- (h) what are the hours during which the courses are normally conducted;
- (i) are the courses free to participants; and
- (j) is it intended that scholarships will be attainable through these courses, and, if so:
 - (i) what are the subjects which will be studied in attaining those scholarships; and
 - (ii) have all sporting and recreational organisations in the State been informed of the availability of the scholarship scheme and, if not, why not?

13. What are the criteria used for assessing the children who are suitable for admission to the sports school for gifted children and:

- (a) how many children presently participate in this school, and what are the numbers in each sport;
- (b) will the report on the evaluation of this course be made available to the public, and if not, why not;
- (c) does the school operate only within the metropolitan area, and if so, when is it to be extended to areas outside the metropolitan area;
- (d) who is presently in charge of the school; and
- (e) when do the classes take place?

14. Are members of Parliament to be informed when meetings concerning insurance for volunteers in recreation and sporting organisations are convened and, if not, why not?

15. What response has there been for insuring volunteers in recreation and sporting organisations and what evidence does the Recreation Advisory Council have of satisfactory feedback to these organisations from delegates?

16. What are the names of clubs that have been given advice of the availability of the scheme for insurance of volunteers in recreation and sport, and:

- (a) what further action will take place to inform sporting and recreation clubs and potential participants of the benefits available; and
- (b) when did the scheme become operative, and what are the basic requirements to join the scheme, including the financial commitment, and the amount of cover?

17. What criteria do a sporting or recreation club or association have to meet before being accepted as a suitable body for funding from the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department?

18. To what groups have junior sports coaching grants been made available, and to date what amount has been made available to each group?

19. Are proposals still being considered to establish a major indoor stadium, and heated swimming centre, for South Australia, and, if so:

- (a) what sites are being considered for such proposals;
- (b) who is expected to participate in the funding;
- (c) when is it expected final selection of a site will be made;
- (d) what is the expected construction time;
- (e) what would be the estimated cost of each project;
- (f) what is the expected spectator accommodation available, and what would be the main purpose of each centre;
- (g) which sites have been rejected;
- (h) what is the economic viability of such projects;
- (i) what consultants have been used to date in feasibility studies for such a project, and what are the amounts of money paid to consultants for their work; and
- (j) what amount of money has been allocated for continuing studies in this area during 1976-77?

20. Is there an opportunity for an Opposition member to be appointed to the Sports Advisory Council or any of the other committees that are investigating the sport and recreation needs of the State?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The honourable member asks for details to so great an extent that it is not considered reasonable to spend the time and public money necessary to complete such a series of interrogations.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE PARKING

Mr. COURCE (on notice):

1. When will the new car-parking facilities on the northern side of Parliament House in the festival theatre complex be available for use by occupants of Parliament House?
2. What security system will be used for this area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:
1. December, 1976.

2. Security in the car park will be provided by boom gates at all exits. These gates will be operated by magnetic card keys.

COUNCIL AMALGAMATIONS

Mr. COURCE (on notice): What councils have either amalgamated or indicated their intention to amalgamate soon following amendments relating to council boundaries to the Local Government Act.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The following councils have already amalgamated:

- (1) District Council of Tantanoola and District Council of Millicent into the new District Council of Millicent;
- (2) District Council of Encounter Bay and Corporation of the town of Victor Harbor into the new District Council of Victor Harbor;
- (3) District Council of Sedan and District Council of Marne to form the new District Council of Ridley;
- (4) District Council of Strathalbyn and Corporation of the town of Strathalbyn into the new District Council of Strathalbyn.

The district councils of Freeling and Mudla Wirra have reached agreement to amalgamate and their proposal will be advertised shortly, giving the ratepayers of both areas one month in which to demand a poll. The District Council of Kadina and the Corporation of the Town of Kadina have agreed to amalgamate, subject to satisfactory conditions

being agreed to by both councils. The District Council of Mordialloc and the Corporation of the town of Murray Bridge are at present discussing amalgamation and, whilst agreement in principle has been reached, discussions are continuing as to the special conditions which will apply to the amalgamation.

PUBLIC SERVICE POSITIONS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Is it a fact that the Public Actuary, Mr. P. D. C. Stratford, is currently on sick leave and is still a member of the Public Service and the occupant of that position?

2. What are the circumstances surrounding the advertisement, in Public Service Board Notice dated September 1, 1976, and in the press, of a vacant office of Public Actuary in the Treasury Department?

3. What are the circumstances surrounding the advertisement, on August 25, 1976, of a vacant office of Deputy Director-General in the Premier's Department, when the Premier stated in the House on September 7 that Executive Council had not yet created the position?

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

1. It is true that Mr. Stratford is on sick leave, is still a member of the Public Service, and is the present occupant of the position of Public Actuary.

2. Mr. Stratford has applied to be retired from the Public Service on the grounds of invalidity; that application is being dealt with as quickly as possible in accordance with the normal procedures. The Public Service Board, if it believes that a position may become vacant, has the power to call for applications to fill the potential vacancy. The board has done so in this case, in order to minimise the time before a new appointment is made, in the event of Mr. Stratford's application being approved. In taking this action, the board has the support of the Under Treasurer as head of the department. The Government believes, of course, that it is essential to avoid gaps in the staffing of the Public Actuary's Office as far as possible.

3. The statement made by me that the position had not been created was correct. The Public Service Board has power to anticipate the formal creation of an office by calling applications if it thinks fit.

CATTLE COMPENSATION

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. When does the Premier expect funds will be available to compensate farmers who avail themselves of the \$10 a head to slaughter cattle on their properties?

2. Who will be allocating the funds, and to whom should applications be made?

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

1. The Government is seeking from the Commonwealth clarification of this and a number of other issues concerning finance for drought relief.

2. See above.

PREMIER'S TELEVISION PROGRAMME

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Will officers of the Premier's Department be assisting the Premier in any way in connection with his proposed television programme and, if so, how many officers will be involved?

2. Is this proposed television programme a private undertaking of the Premier, and, if not:

- (a) when does the Premier intend to prepare material for the programme; and
- (b) how long will he be absent from the State each week recording the programme?

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

1. No.
2. Yes.

PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Who does the catering for entertainment, supplying liquor and working lunches in the Premier's Department?
2. Were tenders called for this catering and, if not, why not?
3. Of the entertainment expenses spent by the office of the Premier in 1975-76, what proportion was spent at restaurants and hotels respectively, and at which restaurants and hotels?

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

1. Nation Wide Food Services caters for working lunches in the Premier's Department. Liquor is supplied by the department.
2. No tenders were called. A management fee contract was negotiated in 1968 by the Hall Government with the one specialist company then engaged in South Australia in this field. This contract is renegotiated annually.
3. It is not practical to provide this information.

PREMIER'S CUP

Mr. BECKER (on notice): Why was the Premier's Cup for yacht racing not proceeded with, and will such an event be considered in future?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No firm date for the sailing of the Premier's Cup yacht race has been determined: if the race is sailed I shall be happy to provide funds for the Premier's Cup.

PETRO-CHEMICAL COMPLEX

Mr. VENNING (on notice):

1. What has been the expenditure each financial year, from conception to date, on the Redcliff petro-chemical project?
2. Has the Government any financial involvement at present with the Redcliff project or area?
3. What plans has the Government for the future of this area and the open spaces which were to have been associated with the petro-chemical project?

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

1. 2 695 hectares of land was acquired by the Government. The total cost of this land, including fencing, to date has been about \$130 000. Some additional amounts could be awarded to two of the former land owners by the Land and Valuation Court. From November, 1973, until August, 1975, the Director of the Development Division was acting as Chief Project Officer for the Redcliff petro-chemical project. About 40 per cent of his time would have been taken up with such duties. A senior project officer of the

Development Division was working nearly full time on this project during that period. In addition, officers of several Government departments were, in the normal course of their duties, engaged in negotiations and preparation of various reports, surveys and documents. Obviously the costs of the project cannot be extracted readily from the records of the various departments concerned without a great deal of unnecessary and wasteful effort.

2. Apart from purchasing the above land, the Government has currently no financial involvement in the project or area.

3. Various possibilities for the future use of this area are currently being looked at:

- (a) A petro-chemical project (currently studied by the Dow Chemical Company);
- (b) A hydro-carbon liquids fractionation facility and export terminal;
- (c) A uranium processing centre;
- (d) The area is being considered as a possible site for a power station, together with other possible sites.

PORT PIRIE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What changes in the population of Port Pirie have taken place during each of the periods 1965-70 and 1970-75, and what is the existing population of Port Pirie?
2. What is the projected change in the population of Port Pirie during the next 10 years?
3. What proposals does the Government have to create new employment opportunities at Port Pirie?

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

1. The data supplied relates to the population of urban Port Pirie—part of which is resident outside the city of Port Pirie boundary. The census years of 1966 and 1971 are taken as reference points since they provide the only reliable data for the period in question.

Year	Population	Change over previous period
June, 1966	17 107	
June, 1971	16 974	—133
June, 1975 (estimate) .	16 400	—574

The most recent available estimate of the population of Port Pirie is that of June 30, 1975, which indicated a population of 16 400 persons.

2. Population projections are subject to considerable uncertainty since they are usually based on the assumption of a continuation of past trends. The recent trend for the population of Port Pirie has been a slow decline. However, taking into account likely future development, it is expected that this trend will be reversed, and that the population of Port Pirie will experience a low rate of growth during the next 10 years.

3. In October, 1975, it was announced that new and expanding firms in growth areas could be eligible for payroll tax rebates. This generous incentive is available to firms locating in Port Pirie as that city is part of the iron triangle growth area. In addition, Port Pirie is eligible for the previously existing incentives of financial assistance, and provision of lease/purchase factory premises. The incentives available at Port Pirie add up to an attractive package, and we are confident that private sector firms will recognise and take advantage of the benefits afforded by a Port Pirie location.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE FURNITURE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What was the total cost of the new furniture which now furnishes the office of the Deputy Premier at Parliament House?

2. Where was this furniture manufactured and by what company?

3. What items of furniture are included in this order, what is the brief description of each item, and what type of timber was used in the manufacture?

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

1 and 2. All furniture used in the refurnishing of the office is antique, and belongs to the State Government. It was previously held in reserve by Public Buildings Department and is on loan to Parliament House.

3. Two desks, one desk chair, five chairs, one side table, one drop-side table, and one sofa. All furniture has been restored at the department's workshops at Netley, using an ebony finish and gold-leaf trim. With the exception of one item, which is walnut, the timber used is cedar.

PRESS SECRETARIES

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. How many press secretaries and public relations persons currently work for the Government, and what are their names and official positions?

2. What allowances for entertainment, travel and accommodation do each of these persons receive on a weekly or annual basis?

3. What is the annual salary for each of these persons?

4. Are these persons allowed to do outside work?

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

1. There are 14 press secretaries, including one allocated to the Leader of the Opposition.

Their names and official positions are as follows:—

Mr. Kevin Crease, Press Secretary and Media Co-ordinator to the Hon. D. A. Dunstan (Premier);

Mr. John Templeton, Press Assistant to the Hon. D. A. Dunstan (Premier);

Mr. Tom Loftus, Press Secretary to the Hon. J. D. Corcoran (Deputy Premier);

Mr. John Stubbs, Press Secretary to the Hon. H. R. Hudson (Minister of Mines and Energy);

Mr. Clarrie Bell, Press Secretary to the Hon. D. H. L. Banfield (Minister of Health);

Mr. Russell Stiggants, Press Secretary to the Hon. G. T. Virgo (Minister of Transport);

Mr. Peter Gurry, Press Secretary to the Hon. T. M. Casey (Minister of Lands);

Mr. Mike Zaknich, Press Secretary to the Hon. D. J. Hopgood (Minister of Education);

Mr. Jon Lamb, Press Secretary to the Hon. B. A. Chatterton (Minister of Agriculture);

Mr. Ron Sullivan, Press Secretary to the Hon. J. D. Wright (Minister of Labour and Industry);

Mr. Rhys Clarke, Press Secretary to the Hon. R. G. Payne (Minister of Community Welfare);

Ms. Carol Treloar, Press Secretary to the Hon. P. Duncan (Attorney-General);

Mr. Bruce Muirden, Press Secretary to the Hon. D. W. Simmons (Minister for the Environment); and

Mr. Peter Baker, Press Secretary to Dr. D. Tonkin (Leader of the Opposition).

2. No special allowances are paid to these persons. Public Service arrangements with respect to entertainment, travel and accommodation apply to these officers.

3. Each of these persons is paid an annual salary according to the Ministerial Officer range established through grades 1 to 5 in the Public Service.

4. These persons are allowed to undertake outside work with the permission of the Minister, and provided that work does not interfere with the officers' Ministerial duties.

MONARTO

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (August 19).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In relation to the question from the member for Light concerning the proposed use of the facilities of the Monarto Development Commission by the Darwin Reconstruction Commission in the planning of the new city, I wish to reaffirm that the approaches made to the commission were entirely genuine. In a letter to the Premier, dated July 30, 1975, the then Prime Minister (Mr. Whitlam), requested that "the manpower resources of the Monarto Development Commission could be made available to the Darwin Reconstruction Commission to help in its task for the period of the current financial year". The Premier replied that "the South Australian Government will be pleased to co-operate with your Government in this matter, but first it will be necessary to introduce legislation in the State Parliament to amend the Monarto Development Commission Act". I discussed this matter with the then Chairman of the Darwin Reconstruction Commission (Mr. Powell) when Mr. Powell visited Adelaide on August 5, 1975, for discussions with the General Manager of the Monarto Development Commission (Mr. Richardson). Some weeks after the legislation passed Parliament we received the information from D.U.R.D. that it was no longer the intention of the Darwin Reconstruction Commission to seek the services of the Monarto Development Commission, as the emphasis in Darwin had shifted from replanning to immediate construction. Circumstances prevented the commission from being involved in the work in Darwin. There was never any suggestion that the Monarto Development Commission was unwilling to undertake the work, and in no way was the proposal a ploy used by the Government to facilitate the passage of the enabling Bill.

KANGAROO ISLAND

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (August 19).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As a policy, the South Australian Housing Trust will support industrial developments wherever and whenever they occur in South Australia. The results of this policy can be seen in several programmes that the trust is currently undertaking in the support of such development. No particular studies have been carried out on Kangaroo Island in relation to the proposed development, but it is assumed that the lead time following a firm decision to establish the abattoirs would be sufficient to enable a housing programme to be mounted. I suggest that the Kangaroo Island Abattoirs Committee formally approach the South Australian Housing Trust as soon as a firm decision has been made so that a programme can be prepared.

WATER SUPPLY

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Works say, because of the critical state of Adelaide's water supplies for the summer, whether the Government will begin a campaign to educate the public in ways of saving water through this summer and the months leading up to summer? It is now almost a decade since an abnormally dry winter provoked a "save water" campaign in South Australia. That campaign proved to be most successful. This year, pumping has already been operating in South Australia for some time, and the Minister of Works stated recently that it would cost \$5 000 000 this year for pumping operations. Householders have already noticed the characteristic Darling water coming through their taps. Adelaide's reservoirs are well below their total capacity, and less than a month ago they were holding only about one-half the amount in storage as at the same time last year. As everything points to an extremely dry year, anything that can be done to conserve water, both now and in future months, should be done. First Creek, with which I have an intimate relationship, is now almost reduced to a trickle.

Every South Australian citizen has a part to play in conserving water. The Government should conduct an intensive campaign by placing posters on public transport and using the press, radio and television to get the message home. Schools could hold special projects, and families could be encouraged to place bricks in their toilet cisterns, limit showering time, use bath water for other purposes, ensure that taps are properly turned off, and replace worn washers on taps. The Government must consider such action in the best interests of the State to minimise the possibility of restrictions. Even if the situation improves, the exercise will not have been wasted.

THE HON. J. D. CORCORAN: I welcome the change of heart on the part of the Liberal Party. My memory goes back to 1967, when South Australia was in the grip of a drought and when the Government (under Don Dunstan, I think, at the time) was bitterly criticised by the Opposition for imposing voluntary restrictions and for not having the guts to bring down regulations and appoint inspectors, etc., in order to save water. It is indeed a pleasure to hear the Leader of the Opposition recite to us today what we, as the Government in office in 1967, did to conserve water. I do not entirely disagree with what he is about, but I have said to the Engineering and Water Supply Department that I am not going to cry wolf unnecessarily. It is extremely important that we tell the people of South Australia the truth about the water position in metropolitan Adelaide: that there is no need for restrictions to be imposed in Adelaide during the coming summer, because we have not only adequate water in reservoirs but also adequate facilities now that we did not have in 1967 to pump water from the Murray to metropolitan Adelaide.

Indeed, 80 per cent of the water that will be used in metropolitan Adelaide during the coming summer will come from the Murray, whereas we did not have the Murray Bridge to Onkaparinga main in 1967. We have not been sitting down in this matter. What I propose to do (this is more important from the point of view of water consumption in metropolitan Adelaide, and this programme is currently under way) is warn the consumers and the ratepayers of Adelaide of their likelihood of being faced with large excess water bills if they do not watch the consumption of water. I believe that that is what should be done, and not, as the Leader has suggested, telling people that we cannot supply the water. We can

supply the water, and are now producing a pamphlet which I hope will be available within the next month and which will show people how to use water properly and to the greatest benefit in their gardens, etc., so that, at the end of the coming summer, they will not find themselves the recipients of large and unwelcome excess water bills. That is the important thing about the dry season: not the conservation of water, which we can supply. I am sure that the Leader would agree with this move.

Dr. Tonkin: Don't you agree with my proposal?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, it is not in line with what I am saying. The Leader said that I should tell people to stop using water because we might be short of it, but we will not be short of water. The people of Adelaide can be supplied with all the water that they can use. What the people will be told is that they should be careful in their use of water because of the bill they would receive if they exceeded the normal rebate entitlement. That programme is well in hand and will be announced soon. There may have been a leak about this to the Leader, but, if there was, he got it wrong, anyway. I shall be very happy to gain the Leader's support and assistance.

Dr. Tonkin: You will have it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy, also, to have the support of Opposition members in promoting this programme to tell people to be careful about how much water they use, not because it cannot be supplied, but because they may be shocked if they have to pay for excess water.

DRUGS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the Minister of Education aware of any evidence of drug use among secondary school students in South Australia? What is being done continually to monitor the situation, and what action is being taken to safeguard schoolchildren against drug pushers? There have been some disturbing reports recently of the widespread use of marihuana in secondary schools in Canberra, and a recent report of evidence before the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare stated that students in some Sydney schools were using pharmaceutical drugs to get "stoned", to use the term in the report. I have had one visit from the parents of a student who was charged with a drug offence, and they were very concerned that others were involved at that secondary school. There has been another disturbing report from police in the past couple of days of an increase in the use of hard drugs.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: With the exception of the drugs of alcohol and tobacco, about which there is considerable disturbing evidence these days of indulgence by minors, I am not aware of widespread drug abuse amongst schoolchildren. Regarding efforts made in schools to warn children about the problems of drugs, the pilot health education course gives a certain amount of prominence to this problem, which must be handled with much sympathy and common sense. One of the problems that I understand health authorities occasionally have is that, following a drug education programme in a certain area, sometimes interest in drugs occurs. I guess this is related to something that is perverse in all of us—that although we are warned from time to time about things that will do us harm the very warning is sometimes somewhat of an attraction. I mention this because I do not suggest the specific course which will soon be widespread in schools and which highlights the dangers of drug abuse will in itself solve the problem, any more than the known dangerous effects of alcohol and

tobacco have over the year prevented young people from trying to experiment with those permitted drugs. I will endeavour through my departmental officers to obtain whatever information is available about the possibility of the abuse, particularly of hard drugs, amongst schoolchildren. The answer to the honourable member's specific question is that there is no hard evidence, at this stage, of widespread abuse. However, I would be surprised if there was not some abuse. We must be very alive to the danger.

A.C.T.U. SOLO

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Because my question relates to a matter of Government policy, I ask the Premier what assistance, if any, has been given to A.C.T.U. Solo to establish outlets in this State, and what assistance is intended for the future. My recollection is, and I could be wrong (and members on both sides will tell me that I am often wrong), that the Government made quite discouraging noises some time ago about the establishment of A.C.T.U. Solo outlets in this State, yet a South Australian outlet has been established. I have been prompted to ask the question because of a report that appeared in a newspaper yesterday about vandalism or worse occurring at the first such outlet that was opened last week at Hillcrest. Although the Government made discouraging noises at one time about the establishment of these outlets, we must all bear in mind that A.C.T.U. Solo is headed by the Premier's, indeed the Government's, close friend and political ally, Mr. Robert Hawke. I therefore wonder what is the Government's attitude now to the establishment of this outlet, and probably future outlets in South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member asked what assistance the Government has given—the reply is “None.”

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CHILDHOOD SERVICES

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a statement.
Leave granted.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It has been suggested that I make this public statement to clarify certain aspects of funding support for childhood service facilities. In accordance with its pre-election promise, the Government of which I am part has provided financial support to kindergartens in two forms: first, it directly meets the shortfall between actual staff salaries and the 75 per cent contribution made by the Commonwealth Government; secondly, it provides a sum based on a formula agreed with the union, which is designed, on an average basis, to meet basic branch operating expenses. This latter amount includes an in-built allowance for routine maintenance costs, which must be budgeted for.

As in the case of Government schools, the basic level of funding provided cannot meet every desired expense of conducting operations, especially as the circumstances relating to and the aspirations of the staff with regard to facilities vary considerably from place to place. Just as schools make a modest levy for desired consumables, teaching aids, and amenities beyond basic requirements, so also is it appropriate, and often necessary, for branch committees to do the same. At present it is generally considered that an amount of from \$2 to \$4 a term a

child would not be inappropriate in most instances. It will, of course, be for each committee, with the general agreement of the parents, to determine what is proper for its centre.

I must stress that Commonwealth funding is contingent upon each centre integrating and diversifying its services. Failure to meet this requirement in individual cases could result in the Commonwealth's withholding of substantial funding for the centres in question. Much has been said by the Childhood Services Council and the Kindergarten Union as to the options that should be considered in relation to diversifying services. I will not therefore reiterate this. However, I cannot emphasise too strongly that the Childhood Services Council is under considerable pressure from Commonwealth authorities to ensure that, in its diversification programme, day, occasional, or emergency care, after-school, and vacation care are given a high priority where such activities are feasible and a definite need can be demonstrated.

The present funding requirements pose considerable challenges to committees and staff alike. They especially involve a need to reassess traditional roles, responsibilities, and staff rostering. The rostering and mode of employment of teacher aides, and a greater voluntary involvement of parents and other interested members of the community (including secondary schoolchildren) should particularly be examined. Staggered rostering of aides and their use in the caring role, and extended hours operations, ought to be considered, as should co-operative arrangements between groups of kindergartens.

Every attempt must be made to cater for the educational, social, and caring needs of the wide age range of young children and their parents. Funds will need to be raised locally to expand equipment and other resource materials to achieve this. The challenge to committees is both present and real. The need to meet it is urgent, not only for financial reasons but also because it is inherently desirable to satisfy pressing community needs. I join with the Childhood Services Council and the Kindergarten Union in asking all committees and members of staff to implement these concepts as rapidly as possible.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: INDUSTRIAL DISRUPTION

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

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 express concern at the continued industrial disruption to a valuable South Australian industry, particularly at the Chrysler Tonsley Park plant, by a group calling itself “Rank and File” and urge the State Government in conjunction with the company and the Vehicle Builders' Union to take immediate action to overcome the severe loss of production within the motor car industry.

Does any honourable member support the proposed motion?

Several members having risen:

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

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

for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that this House express concern at the continued industrial disruption to a valuable South Australian industry, particularly at the Chrysler Tonsley Park plant, by a group calling itself “Rank and File” and urge the State Government in

conjunction with the company and the Vehicle Builders' Union to take immediate action to overcome the severe loss of production within the motor car industry. This most serious matter affects all members of this House and of the community. I do not have to go into detail about the extent to which South Australia, its economy and its well-being depend on the motor car industry. Without that industry the basis for this State's industrial prosperity would be severely limited. Although we depend so greatly on the viability of that industry in this State, the actions of very small groups of people affecting key personnel and key positions have in the past seriously disrupted production and now threaten seriously to disrupt production again.

The General Motors-Holden's plant at Elizabeth has experienced several examples of this sort of action. There have been cases in which seven workers, five workers (this occurred in March of this year), seven workers and two workers—a minimum number of workers—have brought an entire plant to a halt. I do not intend to go into the pros and cons of the disputes that led to those actions being taken, but the present situation at Tonsley Park is causing much concern, again because of the actions of a small minority that is motivated by reasons other than those relating to industrial conditions. Union officials who have been trying to determine the wishes of workers in relation to the overtime ban that has existed at Chrysler Australia Limited for some time have been prevented from doing so by violent and militant actions of a small number of people who have shown no regard for the democratic process. These militant extremists were obviously prepared to take almost any action. Following a meeting where the stage was rushed, the microphone cord pulled out and the proceedings abandoned, the union secretary concerned issued the following statement:

The unfortunate aspect of the meeting is that many people were misled by a so-called extreme left wing group within the union who act in a manner completely contrary to accepted conventions and rules of debate. This group deliberately created a state of chaos to suit their own aims, rather than the aims and welfare of the shop floor workers.

A division may very well have resulted in the motion being defeated, as the show of hands indicated. However, the democratic processes were not followed. Many people have, I believe, been cheated and railroaded into a position where their welfare is under a distinct threat.

The position is critical. We must get back to work at Tonsley Park if the industry is to survive. At present Chrysler has more than 1 000 cars awaiting completion because of hold-ups on the production line resulting from bans on overtime. The motor car industry in this State is in such a precarious position generally that it cannot afford this loss of production. The pertinent remarks of Mr. Commissioner Clarkson when hearing the case on overtime bans have obviously been regarded seriously by all members of the community and by all those in the industry, both management and union personnel. In the *Advertiser* on September 2 he was quoted as saying loudly and clearly that he would not make the new award benefits operative for Tonsley Park because he would not impose extra costs on the company while it was incurring these disruptions and the costs flowing from them. The report continued:

He thought the company's decisions, and his own, had gone as far as possible in imposing extra costs on the industry. "If the employees want to join the export trade and export their jobs overseas, they can do it", Mr. Commissioner Clarkson said. "I cannot stop them; the company cannot stop them. Costs in this country are getting to the stage where we cannot compete with overseas countries."

"If people think it will not happen here, let me remind them of what happened in England when Chrysler decided to shut its United Kingdom operations, which would have affected something like 22 000 people. The only reason it was not shut was because the Government came in with a massive injection of capital—something like £350 000 000—to keep it going. If anybody thinks that is likely to happen here, I think I need only remind them of the situation not so long ago with respect to Leylands, when it was found that Leylands was not viable and it closed its manufacturing operations."

The Premier, too, expressed grave concern last weekend at the future of the small engine plant and made the important point that the Astron 80 engine could be seriously at risk if activities such as this went on. Certainly, I believe that the union has adopted a far more responsible attitude in attempting to, first, determine the wishes of the workers involved and, secondly, conduct a secret ballot. Obviously it is essential that it does take this action. I admire it for the action taken, as I think all members will do.

Who is responsible then for the militant and disruptive actions that destroyed totally the meeting held at Chrysler last week which 2 500 workers attended, and at which a determination of the wishes of the workers was totally impossible to obtain? The answer is to be found in the publications issued regularly called *Rank and File News*. The so-called Rank and File group is responsible for these actions. One wonders how anyone in this State could possibly want to see our car industry brought to a standstill, so that it could even collapse and perhaps leave South Australia. Such is the ultimate effect these actions will have, and I hope, along with every other member, that that will not happen and that it cannot happen. However, it is possible and it can happen unless the activities of these people are curbed. I shall quote from some of the news sheets issued. The responsible actions taken by union officials are quoted. The news sheet states:

The only good thing about this statement is that it is just one more proof that the union bosses work for the company bosses.

That is a statement with which I am sure members would not agree. The whole sheet is full of extreme statements and criticisms, both of the companies and of the unions. I shall quote from the *Rank and File News* of August 23, 1976. The actions taken, allegedly as a result of the Rank and File group's activities (it is a very clever name to choose), are listed, obviously with some pride. The news sheet states:

The actions taken (listed below) took place despite company threats and devious attempts by the V.B.U. executive to phase out the fight by car workers in this State.

Later, it states:

The V.B.U. executive has been busily organising meetings at Lonsdale, G.M.H., Elizabeth and Woodville, for the sole purpose of getting all bans and restrictions lifted. The companies and the union officials want to bury our fight in the arbitration court again.

I am sure all members would agree that that is a totally irresponsible statement. The news sheet proceeds to give what it calls a list of actions taken last week, as follows:

The overtime ban remains. More and more unfinished cars are piling up in the yards around the plant. On Wednesday, there were three stoppages over issues like safety. All three took place in body build and lasted about 15 minutes each. A ban was put on night shift in the press shop by the action committee. Also, all new shifts are banned. On Thursday, 14 workers on the respot line walked off the job at 3.10 p.m. Because their jobs were not blacked, production was only affected slightly. On Friday, workers on the trestles decided to down tools and sit-in for one hour from 3.10 to 4.10 p.m. Their jobs were not blacked but production was disrupted as cars went down the line with essential parts missing (e.g. petrol tanks, fuel lines).

The people writing this garbage are proud of it and proud of the actions taken. In the *Rank and File News* of August 16 the following appears:

Throughout last week all workers in the V.A.P. worked to rule and worked without enthusiasm and succeeded in cutting production by almost half.

The whole business, to me anyway, is totally repugnant. There is a total lack of any sense of welfare for the industry as a whole and for the workers who work in it. The style is familiar; I have read it many times in student publications. The faces are familiar; I have seen them many times on campuses, in plants, and at just about any demonstration, particularly a militant one, that is going on anywhere. I can remember one, as the Premier will, outside the Hotel Australia. These people, who belong to the Student Worker Alliance, basically are anarchists, interested only in confrontation, disruption, and destruction. They wish to tear down our whole structure of society, and they do not care who is hurt when they do it.

They are bad news for the workers, for the unions, for management, and for the people of South Australia. The community must be protected from their activities, and the best way of doing that is by affording the unions and the union officials concerned the utmost protection and encouragement in taking the actions they have honestly tried to take. A secret ballot is now being organised, and the unions must be supported in this action. They must be supported, if necessary, by legislation providing that such a course of action is open to them and may be enforced if they wish.

As a matter of principle, the Government, the management, and the unions must co-operate to make sure that democracy prevails in the trade union movement in the industrial field and, of course, in this State generally. South Australia cannot afford to let anything happen to its car industry. It is a matter of grave concern that the actions of a small group of fanatical, radical, stop-at-nothing militants can have the potential to cause a complete upheaval in the South Australian economy, if their actions go unchecked. I strongly support the motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The motion is one of urgency requiring that the Government, the company, and the union take immediate action to overcome the severe loss of production within the motor car industry as a result of the matters the Leader has talked about. The motion is carefully non-specific and so, of course, was the Leader's speech as to what it was that the Government, the company, or the union should do that is not already being done. The Leader does not contend that there is any support in any way by the Government for the Rank and File committee to which he has referred; there is not. There is no lack of support by the Government for the responsible officials of the Vehicle Builders Union. We have the closest association and co-operation with those officers, we have great confidence in them, and we have given public support to them and urged the workers to accept the recommendations of responsible union officials.

There is no lack of support by the Government for the company. I have been in touch personally with Mr. Webber concerning this matter, which has been discussed in Cabinet. The Minister has been in touch with the unions and there is no lack of support by the Government for the proper courses to be taken to resolve this matter according to law. The Leader has suggested that some form of legislation is required to enforce secret ballots. A secret ballot is now being taken in accordance with the

law under the auspices of the Commonwealth Electoral Office. There is no necessity for South Australia to pass legislation in relation to that; the law already prescribes what can be done.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: It is a Federal award.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is a Federal award, in any case.

Mr. Harrison: It has been there a long time, and used.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member was a secretary of the relevant union and he knows the situation within his own sphere. The law is already available. The Leader has said that the action of the so-called Rank and File committee at Chrysler is to be condemned. I agree. Neither I nor the union believe that the course it has followed is to the benefit of the workers in the plant. The Labor Party and the Labor Government thoroughly support the responsible attitude taken by the officers of the V.B.U. in this matter. The situation must be resolved by the men themselves and by the necessary persuasion and good reason, and that is the course the union is following. If there is anything the Government can do to support it, that assistance is available. The Leader is being woefully imprecise in suggesting what it is that this Government and this Parliament should do in addition to the action already being taken to resolve the matter according to law. We cannot propose that, in South Australia, we are suddenly to pass legislation legislating people back to work and legislating that somehow, in relation to a Federal award, bans and limitations are to be banned by South Australian law. It would be unconstitutional for us to pass any such law, and it would not work.

Mr. Harrison: As a matter of fact, it would only aggravate it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course it would. The sensible course is the one being taken by the union. I know that the company has made reasonable and proper overtures and suggestions so that the dispute can be resolved, and I commend the Chrysler management on this score for acting responsibly. It has been constantly in communication with us and with the trade union movement, and I believe that that is the proper way to resolve the matter. To suggest that some imprecise Draconian measure of some kind be taken by this House will not improve the situation but will make it worse.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: They don't tell us what, though—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, we have not heard yet.

Mr. Dean Brown: It's one for you, though.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member has any brains, perhaps he could tell us what we should be doing that we are not doing. We are in precisely the same situation that we used to be in when in Opposition and all the Liberal Party could do in relation to an industrial dispute was to ask the Labor Party in Opposition to use its good offices to settle the matter. We are using our good offices—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: And sense.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —and sense, and will continue to do so.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): This motion has two specific parts: first, that this House express grave concern at the industrial disruption and strife now being carried on within the motor vehicle industry. We know the real purpose behind the disruption and we know the

people responsible for it. The second part of the motion is that the Government in consultation with the company and the unions should as quickly as possible ensure that the motor vehicle industry in South Australia is free from continuing industrial dispute: the sort of industrial dispute that is now threatening the existence of Chrysler and G.M.H. in this State, has forced Nissan and Toyota to develop in another State rather than in South Australia, and is now threatening the existing motor vehicle production in South Australia.

The first part of this motion can be considered as non-Party political and, as the Premier has said, I am sure that everyone would support the motion and support our concern about industrial strife: if members do not support that concern, they do not deserve to be members of this House. The Leader quoted an extract from a weekly newsletter that pointed out that production had been almost halved in one week. The newsletter does not refer to the possible effects of that on the log of claims but rather boasts that, slowly but surely, the motor vehicle industry is being shattered in South Australia. Last week's newsletter No. 149, produced on September 9, openly boasts about the disruption that was caused at the meeting at Chrysler last Thursday, and states:

Today, Thursday, the V.B.U. is having a mass meeting at 9.30 a.m. At this meeting, the union officials and some of the shop stewards are going to recommend that all bans and limitations be lifted because "meaningful negotiations" are meant to be in progress. The union officials and shop stewards want Chrysler to report progress of investigations into superannuation within two weeks. Rank and File believes that this V.B.U. proposal is a sellout for the following reasons.

Three reasons are given, and the newsletter continues:

We have not yet got a satisfactory reply from Chrysler on the log of claims. Therefore, we should keep the bans on until we get a definite reply.

Obviously, this is the group of people responsible for the disruption and for stopping a democratic vote being taken at last Thursday's meeting. Not only did this group stop the chairman from counting hands during the vote but it also jumped on the stage, surrounded the chairman, and pulled the plug from the microphone. These people are straight anarchists of the type that this House should strongly condemn. Unfortunately, these people masquerade as the workers' friends, and the Government could play a responsible part in exposing and condemning this group by saying that its actions are against the best benefits and long-term advantages of the workers and are threatening the industry and employment opportunities.

The Premier has asked what action should be taken. First, the newsletter circulated by these people, which is their voice piece within the plant at Chryslers, is an illegal publication under the provisions of section 5 of the Imprint Act, 1951. The Premier told the news media this morning that if he knew that the publication was illegal he would take legal action. It is not for me to enforce the law in this State: I can only point out to the Government where the law is being breached, and it is for the Government through its officers to ensure that the law is enforced. It is for the Government and not the Opposition to take the necessary action. We are not in Government and therefore are powerless to take any action. If the Government wishes to abrogate its responsibility or is unwilling to take action, it should remove itself from Government and allow the Opposition to take the appropriate action.

Secondly, the Premier should show strong support for the motor vehicle industry in this State by condemning the actions of this group and of others involved in the continuing industrial disputes in this industry. However, the

Premier's statement on this subject at the weekend consisted of only two sentences: it was a weak statement. What we are looking for is the full backing of the State Government to protect this most important industry. We have heard how much the Premier has said about the ship-building industry recently, but he can offer only two sentences at a time when the entire motor vehicle industry of this State is being threatened. We want strong support from the Premier, who should condemn these disruptive actions and ensure that they are stopped as quickly as possible.

At this stage the union is taking a responsible stand and is trying to have the bans lifted so that the final point concerning superannuation can be negotiated with Chrysler. Unfortunately, the union has not been lily-white throughout this dispute. Originally, it brought on the dispute. I do not condemn its present actions, because it is acting in a responsible way, but the Premier could have taken a stand through his friends, the officials in the V.B.U. and other unions involved in the motor industry, to ensure that those people took a more responsible line than they have taken previously. Originally, they were responsible for the introduction of these bans, and their actions were criticised by the Commonwealth Commissioner, Mr. Clarkson. I believe that the trade union officials did not take an appropriate stand at the hearing of this dispute. If they had done so, it would be easier now for the bans to be lifted. I am sure that the position of the Rank and File group would have been weakened if the union had taken a stronger stand earlier against these disruptions.

The case is simple: surely this House will condemn the disruptions that have occurred. The future of our motor industry is at stake, and I hope that, if the Premier is sincere about his concern for industrial development in this State, not only will he worry about the lack of industries coming to South Australia but will also fight to retain the industries we already have. I hope that the Premier will give a lead to the unions involved and encourage them to adopt a secret ballot.

Again, I congratulate the unions for deciding last Friday to introduce a secret ballot on the lifting of the present bans. I understand that the ballot, which will take two days, will commence this evening. I came out last Friday morning in the news media in support of this stand, not by sitting on the seat and thinking that it might be a good idea but because three sections of workers at Chrysler contacted me and requested that action be taken by this State's Parliamentarians. They were concerned about the future of the industry, and they asked for secret ballots. They said that surely at last the Government could take a strong line on this matter and protect their employment and job opportunities. It is on this ground that we ask the Government to join with us in expressing our concern about these disputes. Also, we strongly urge and support action by the Government to ensure that these disruptive disputes stop as quickly as possible. It is in the interests of this State, the motor vehicle industry and employment opportunities that the Government does so.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I have never in the whole time I have been in the House (about six years) seen a more innocuous document than the motion we are considering.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: It's utterly lacking in sincerity.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is a farce, and that is what it is intended to be. The motion means nothing; it does nothing; it cannot be carried, because there is no vote on the motion. What could it do, even if it were carried?

It does not call on the Government to do anything. There is no direction in the motion. It was the Opposition's intention not to place any direction in it, because it well knows (or, if it does not know, it should learn quickly) that any interference in disputes such as this dispute only inflames the situation. There is no question in my mind that the actions taken by the member for Davenport over the past few days have assisted and will continue to inflame this dispute or any other dispute in which he interferes. He may be getting some telephone calls, but it is strange that I have not received any, because, normally, when there is a dispute I get calls from the unions and requests for interviews, which they can always have. However, on this occasion I have not had one phone call, letter, or criticism. I do not know why they have not been contacting me, because I can do more than the member for Davenport can do. Like the Premier, I do not support this kind of hooliganism in unions. If the honourable member had read my article on Friday he would understand that I support and believe in industrial relations, and I have offered some suggestions to people in South Australia to adopt those propositions I have put up, thus making South Australia a better State in which to live. I do not support this kind of conduct in any way.

It is peculiar that not one Opposition member referred to the causes of the dispute. Disputes do not just occur; there is some reason for them. These men (and I am not suggesting that I support the way in which they tried to disrupt the meeting) evidently have a legitimate claim, because they want to improve what is evidently a poor superannuation scheme. That is what the dispute is all about. However, no Opposition speaker mentioned that. They said that it is a dispute and that again the workers were to blame.

Mr. Dean Brown: I referred to superannuation.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member did not say whether the workers had a case. He did not bother to ascertain whether they had a good or bad superannuation scheme. All that the member for Davenport wants to do every time he speaks in the House or at any public forum at a university or elsewhere is condemn the trade unions. He has got on to something for which he knows he can get some support, because no-one supports this sort of activity. He, more than anyone else in South Australia, is responsible for the inflaming of disputes. The trade unions abhor every statement he makes, and wherever one goes one hears criticism of his conduct. Some paraphernalia was read by the Leader, who has some property belonging to the Rank and File organisation. However, he did not bother to read out the sensible statement made by the Secretary of the V.B.U. last Friday, reported as follows:

Mr. Foreman issued an official union statement which says: "The unfortunate aspect of the meeting is that many people were misled by a so-called extreme Left-wing group within the union who act in a manner completely contrary to accepted conventions and rules of debate. This group deliberately created a state of chaos to suit their own aims, rather than the aims and welfare of the shop floor workers. A division may very well have resulted in the motion being defeated, as the show of hands indicated. However, the democratic processes were not followed. Many people have, I believe, been cheated and railroaded into a position where their welfare is under a distinct threat."

Dr. Tonkin: I read that in full.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I did not hear the Leader read that statement in full, but I will check the *Hansard* report. The report continues:

"It is our contention, and this is the opinion of the shop stewards, that the company investigations into the superannuation scheme will lead to an improved scheme. Because of the restrictive indexation guidelines imposed upon the union movement, this is the only claim which can be

pushed. Unfortunately, for the great majority of members, the so-called militants at Tonsley Park have brought about a tense and desperate state of affairs whereby the State executive is forced into a position of having to decide the issue. We hope and trust that the level-headed, responsible members at Tonsley Park will put an end to the disruptive influence in the plant to allow us to return to normal, reasonable and responsible industrial relations."

I do not have to tell the House that the union and its leaders have acted responsibly. They have tried to subdue this unwanted movement, and I extend my congratulations to them for their actions and courage. I believe that what they have done will certainly pave the way at least to being able to extract from the workers in the factory a reliable vote. I will not suggest whether or not the vote will be in favour of lifting the bans, because it has been my experience over the years, and the experience of anyone who has bothered to read the Donovan report, that the be all and end all of industrial disputes is not secret ballots, because many times, the trade unionists have strengthened their position when secret ballots have been forced on them. That information is contained in the Donovan report.

Mr. Dean Brown: Would you encourage them to lift the bans?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Of course I would. I would support the lifting of the bans immediately so that useful negotiations could take place. That would be my solution to the problem, and the sooner the better, because no-one in his right mind wants to see the dispute continue at the risk of the industry here. The Premier said that, and that is also my stand. I do not believe (and this is the essential part of the motion) that it is the responsibility of the House or of any Government or Opposition to interfere in the affairs of trade unions, because that cannot properly be done. If one examines closely the Leader's speech, one will see that he did not know what he was talking about, because one of the propositions he put to the Government was that it should introduce legislation to control secret ballots. I do not know how that can be done when we are living and working under a Constitution, because it would be totally ineffective, and it would be quite illegal even to attempt to do that. Even if we could do that, this Government and I would be totally opposed to it. As far as this Government is concerned, the only people who can solve these disputes are the trade union officials leading the unionists, or the unionists themselves. In my article on Friday I laid great emphasis on the rank and file unionists having a proper say. I also encourage trade unionists and employers to employ people who are able to report back to them properly. This is one of the things occurring not only to employees but also to employers: that nobody is properly able to explain the situation, and chaos follows.

I reiterate, as I have said many times before, that it is not the responsibility of Governments, outside people, courts, policemen or anybody else to interfere in these disputes, or any disputes, because immediately an attempt is made to do that barriers that have never been there before are raised. Hostility is created, which will get out of hand and which will not be able to be controlled. I will offer some advice to the Leader (I know the member for Davenport will not take this advice, because it suits him to inflame every dispute and keep it going for political purposes), because I accept that he is a more responsible politician than is the member for Davenport. I appeal to the Leader to keep the member for Davenport out of all these disputes, because there is no question in my mind that every time that mouth speaks the dispute is inflamed.

The sooner that that member wakes up to that and accepts some responsibility towards this State the better will industrial relations be. I do not come out and criticise companies.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Not half.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What about insurance companies?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: That was not an industrial dispute: it was a dispute concerning premiums on workmen's compensation. It was nothing to do with industry at all. I have made one public criticism of a company since I have been in this office and that was about Chrysler. That was not an inflammatory statement but a statement of fact. The member for Davenport interferes in these disputes when he does not know what he is talking about: he has no contact with the union officials (I doubt whether any self-respecting union official would bother to speak to the member for Davenport) so it is no good his setting himself up as an authority on industrial relations in this State, because he does not know anything about them, as has been proved conclusively time and time again I suggest that in the interests of this State the Leader ought to control that mouth.

As no vote will be taken on this motion, my Government, of course, could not support it. It is not an objective motion and it does not intend to do anything. It was never intended to do anything in the first place: it is merely for the Opposition to use to try to blame the Government for something without putting up any proposition about how we should control such a dispute. One thing members opposite did not say but would like to say is that we ought to be picking these fellows up and exporting them out of the State. No concrete proposition was put before the House to advise the Government how this dispute ought to be settled. My advice is to keep out of these disputes, leave them to the persons concerned, and they will resolve the matters themselves much more speedily.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): We have just been subjected to one of the strangest speeches that it has been my experience to hear in this place. The Minister puts forward as a proposition that any union affair is not a matter for the proper consideration of this House. What absolute nonsense! It is quite competent for the Government to bring legislation before this House to compel workers to belong to trade unions, however. We know very well that that is a matter of industrial disputation. The Government is quite happy to put before this House emergency legislation that compels all people in this State to obey the dictates of the Government in an emergency, but it exempts trade union officials in these circumstances. Is the Government trying to create a race apart in this State? Surely that is not a reasonable proposition for the Minister to be propounding.

This House is competent to discuss anything except industrial matters, he says. The Minister went further, yet all the motion seeks to do is quite properly express the concern of this House in what is a matter of vital concern to the people of this State, that is, the future of the car industry. The Minister stated in his earlier remarks that this motion was a waste of time because there would be no vote. Is he suggesting that an urgency motion is outdated in this Parliament? Of course, an urgency motion applies when situations of urgency arise, and this is one. The Minister went further and said that the Government would vote against the motion if a vote was taken. What sort of an admission is this?

The Minister was more intent on denigrating the member for Davenport than on doing anything else, but when he did express an opinion it was a most irresponsible one.

Mr. Dean Brown: He is supporting anarchy.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: One even gained the impression from his speech that he was supporting this radical group.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That is not true, and you know it. I said I wasn't.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In answer to an interjection, the Minister made the situation clear when he said he supported Mr. Foreman, but this group is not of trade unionists. We are asking for an expression of concern from this House, a very proper concern and a very proper expression of opinion, and the Government is not prepared to support that. We know what is the attitude of the Government. People in this State are looking for some leadership in these matters. When the steel strike was at its height (and that dragged on for many months) the Premier kept his head down and the Government kept its head down, saying that it was a Federal matter. Finally, they decided to encourage action in the Industrial Court, but for months they kept their heads down.

Last week I asked the Minister of Transport a question about what was the Government's attitude to the claims made by the Secretary of the A.R.U., Mr. Marshall, for the South Australian Government to pay the Medibank levy. In his reply the Minister said that I was not very well educated, and he asked whether I did not know that it was a Federal matter and that the Government was powerless to act. Obviously Mr. Marshall, the Secretary of the union, is also uneducated because he put forward a log of claims containing, I think, 13 points, one of which was that the South Australian Government pay the levy. The Government again ducked its head and dodged the issue.

The people of this State are looking for the Government to come out and give a lead in these matters, not for it to duck for cover. We know that the Government has trouble within the industry at the moment. I do not know whether the Minister has seen publications by the people calling themselves Rank and File. I suggest that they are not rank and file members. Despite the charges made by Government members, I have a very high respect for the average working man in this country, but every time Opposition members attempt to give a lead, as the member for Davenport does, we are accused of union bashing. I have a high respect for union members in this State.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You could have fooled me.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It suits the Government's political purposes to call us union bashers, because the Government knows there is a growing division of opinion in the union movement and that union members are rising up against some of the irresponsible militancy that is rearing its head in this country at the present time. We saw an example of that happening during the recent Medibank strike. Unfortunately, Mr. Hawke, who is not the most radical union leader, was manoeuvred into a situation by left-wingers to call the strike, which was, to the average unionist, a flop and a fiasco. People in my district who went to work that day have been sent threatening letters fining them \$40 for going to work. Among responsible union members there is growing evidence of disenchantment with their leaders. The Leader and the member for Davenport have referred to some of the material, churned out by the group calling itself "Rank and File", in which union leadership is attacked directly.

In *Rank and File News* of August 16, the following statement is made:

And it is clear what the attitude of the executives would be. Despite the fact that workers have been waging a tit-for-tat battle with the car monopolies all over Australia, Dom Foreman, V.B.U. State Secretary, came out and said, "From the outset I was of the opinion that it is fruitless to wage a campaign around the claims at this time." (*Advertiser*, August 14.) The executives just happened to seem to feel this way all of the time! If this is the kind of support the V.B.U. executives give us, what type of "results" will they get with their talks with the bosses?

That is a definite attempt by this group to undermine their democratically elected leaders. What I have quoted is the tenor of the publication: anything that causes loss to industry is highlighted in the publication. As the Leader pointed out, this group records in their news-sheet, with an obvious degree of pride, that they have been able to cause disruption every day of the week by having a few key workers employ these guerilla tactics.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: How did you get on the mailing list?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Minister believes in open Government he should be pleased for Opposition members to—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: All I am asking is how you got on the mailing list. I'm not on the list.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If one knows anyone who works at Chrysler he can get access to this material. One paragraph in the publication complains about Chrysler paying only \$37 000 in council rates. The Opposition's concern is for the future of the motor vehicle industry in this State. We expect the Government to stand up and be counted in support of elected union leaders in this State. The Minister and the Premier are not disposed to do so. In fact, the Premier has been strangely silent on the issue. It is all very well for the Minister to say that, by speaking out, we only inflame the issue. That is complete nonsense. The public and decent trade unionists are looking for leadership in these matters.

The Minister is afraid that the Government might offend someone, so the Government is sitting on the fence on this issue when it should be willing to be counted. It is all very well for the Government to criticise the Opposition by saying it is union bashing. At least Opposition members are willing to stand up and be counted. We are not bashing unions; we are bashing only those people whose one concern is to cause disruption in this industry. I am shocked that the Minister is unwilling to accept this proper expression of concern by the House. For him to suggest it is not a proper matter for discussion is absolutely ludicrous.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: When are you going to tell us something?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I hope that the Minister will not in future consider that all urgency motions are irrelevant. I hope he will stand up and be counted and give leadership as this motion seeks should be done.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 3) 1976

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 7. Page 836.)

Dr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): Whatever was expected of the Labor Government's great big Budget show, this measure has certainly been an anti-climax. As

the first South Australian Budget to have been introduced since the implementation of the federalism policy, which has given greater financial autonomy to the States, it could have been a challenging and exciting measure.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Autonomy without finance!

Dr. TONKIN: That is an interesting comment with which I will deal a little later. As it is, the Budget is pedestrian and mundane, and is preoccupied with electioneering.

Mr. Becker: It's a fizzer as far as the taxpayers are concerned.

Dr. TONKIN: As far as most taxpayers are concerned, it is. The Treasurer is obviously still bitterly resentful of the new Federal Government and its policies and, unlike his colleague in New South Wales, Mr. Wran (one might almost say his competitor) he is not willing to give them a fair go. Let us analyse what the Treasurer had to say about the new tax-sharing arrangements. His criticisms may be summarised as follows: first, lack of consultation by the Commonwealth Government; secondly, lack of assurances regarding State entitlements beyond the first four years of the new arrangements and continuing uncertainty for States; thirdly, the prospect that the States will be obliged to make increasing use of the surcharge power and will be increasingly dependent on the Commonwealth; and fourthly, a general inadequacy in relation to the amounts of funds (including specific purpose programmes) provided to the States from Commonwealth sources. I believe that that was what the Minister of Works was referring to.

The Treasurer's first criticism related to a lack of consultation by the Commonwealth Government. Let us consider that aspect. The Treasurer refers to decisions to introduce full indexation of personal income tax in the first year, the introduction of the Medibank levy, and the change from tax rebates for dependent children to new child endowment arrangements. How valid are these criticisms? The intention to index personal income tax was foreshadowed long before May 20, and was noted explicitly by the Prime Minister at the April Premiers' Conference, where the States did not make any submission or put forward any arguments or suggestions in that regard at the time. I know that the Treasurer had only just flown back from overseas at the time that conference was held, but he was there. If he was to make any comment at all or to object in any way, that is when he should have done so.

The Medibank levy was clearly introduced in the nature of a special surcharge imposed for a special purpose. In terms of the arrangements discussed between the Commonwealth and the States in February and April, its revenue effects were clearly to be excluded from the calculations of the States' entitlements. The arrangements agreed at the Premiers' Conferences included that the yield or costs of special surcharges or rebates applied, in appropriate circumstances, by the Commonwealth would not be included in the base figure from which the States' entitlements would be calculated, yet we heard nothing about that matter from the Treasurer at that time; he put forward no contrary argument. If one assumes that he followed what was happening at the time, apparently he accepted what was suggested.

The agreement with the States to allow them to share in the additional revenue resulting from the abolition of rebates for dependent children was clearly a concession to the States. Obviously, the States would have no argument with such a concession, so I cannot understand why the Treasurer raises that matter as an objection to the present

arrangement. Finally, the points of agreement with the States include that the States will be fully informed of relevant tax changes by the Commonwealth and the effects of those changes on the States' entitlements. Provision has been made for review processes to be entered into should changes in Commonwealth tax legislation have significant effects on the States' entitlements.

His second criticism concerned the lack of assurances regarding State funds beyond 1979-80 and the uncertainty that he alleges will result from that long period. This objection refers to the guarantee that States' entitlements are to be no less than the formula amount extending up to 1979-80, that is, for the first four years. The Treasurer carefully does not mention, as is his usual wont, first, that the States are also guaranteed indefinitely to receive in any year no less than the entitlement in the previous year; secondly, that the States will automatically enjoy a share of the increase in revenue from income tax as the economy and incomes grow; thirdly, that the agreement regarding review procedures mentioned above should any change in tax laws affect States' entitlements is relevant to this problem; fourthly, that it was agreed that the longer-term trends in regard to changes in the relative importance of personal income tax *vis-a-vis* other taxes will be kept under notice between the Commonwealth and State Governments; and fifthly, that during the first year of the new arrangements the States are in fact estimated to receive substantially more (\$89 400 000) than the former financial assistance grants formula would have provided and 21 per cent more than these funds in 1975-76. In fact, South Australia will receive \$10 000 000 more in general revenue this year than the old formula would have given us. I hope the Deputy Premier is now listening and is regretting his interjection. If he has been listening he will know that he has no interjection to make to that, because it applies to subsequent years as well.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What about next year?

Dr. TONKIN: Obviously the Deputy Premier has not been listening to what I have been outlining so carefully, especially for his benefit.

Mr. Venning: One year at a time.

Dr. TONKIN: That is what we have been doing for some considerable time, and I intend to canvass that matter. The Treasurer's third criticism referred to the use of State surcharges and the dependence of the States on the Commonwealth. This refers to Commonwealth powers to determine personal income tax levels and specific purpose payments and a presumed exercise of power over States to limit the use of surcharges under stage 2 of the arrangements. (It is within the power of States to impose a surcharge or rebate over and above the rates set by the Commonwealth.) Once again the Treasurer does not mention that the Estimates for 1976-77 show a significantly faster growth in general purpose funds for States and local government compared to specific purpose or tied funds, thereby encouraging States' flexibility and independence in financial matters. There is the autonomy to which I have referred. We have not only the autonomy but also the finance, and the Deputy Premier has been proved wrong yet again.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I am in Government, and I have tried to get some autonomy, but I can't.

Dr. TONKIN: I cannot really argue about the Deputy Premier's problems with his Treasurer. The States' independence is also enhanced by automatic entitlement to a share of personal income tax, which even in a year of suppressed economic activity will prove more generous than former arrangements. Also, the guarantees and agreed review processes, referred to above, indicate the co-operative

nature of the new arrangements and, while it has been agreed to maintain a uniform income tax rate structure and assessment provisions, there is nothing in the agreed matter to suggest that the Commonwealth will limit the States' powers with regard to surcharges or rebates. It will be entirely up to the States themselves how, if at all, they will apply them.

I am dealing with the criticisms in detail because they have been raised by members of the Government at every conceivable opportunity, and the Treasurer has simply summed up their objections. The fourth criticism related to the alleged inadequacy of State funds from Commonwealth sources. The Deputy Premier has been the last person to complain about this. The Treasurer referred to "cuts in real terms in a number of specific purpose programmes and in the capital works and housing programmes". It is correct that specific purpose payments are to grow more slowly in 1976-77 than are general purpose funds, and in some areas there will be decreases in real terms. However, after adjusting for prepayments for hospitals in late June, the estimated increase in specific purpose payments to all States in 1976-77 is 9.4 per cent. Moreover, this follows increases of 92 per cent in 1974-75, when the Whitlam Government swung so solidly to the tied grants control, and 34 per cent in 1975-76. The increases in general purpose capital funds (5 per cent for the States and 18.6 per cent for State authorities) are also to be viewed against the longer term trend; that is, they follow a 20 per cent increase in 1975-76 which raised the level of these funds to a significantly higher level in real terms. Overall, funds for the States and local government from Commonwealth Budget sources are estimated to increase by 12.6 per cent in 1976-77 and, after adjustment for prepayments in June of hospital funds, for 1976-77 the increase is 14.6 per cent, excluding non-recurring unemployment relief funds in 1975-76. It may sound complicated, but it represents a significant estimated increase in real terms. Thus, Commonwealth funds for the States are estimated to grow slightly faster than will other Commonwealth Budget outlays in 1976-77, and this follows a marked trend in the same direction in recent years. The Treasurer's basic attitude to the tax-sharing arrangements is summed up by the following statement made in the Budget document:

Those matters lead me to believe that the States face the prospect, after 1980, of having to rely heavily on their surcharging powers or of using existing taxing measures to make good any shortfall if the Commonwealth Government places relatively less emphasis on income tax as a revenue raising measure.

We have already scotched most of that criticism. The Treasurer continued:

As it is unlikely that the Commonwealth Government will permit the States to enter the income tax field in other than a marginal way, for fear of weakening its powers of economic management, the burden could well fall back on the States' traditional taxation fields.

What is new about that situation? The regular pilgrimage by the Premiers to Canberra was never more exploited by any Prime Minister and his Treasurer than it was by Mr. Whitlam and his various Treasurers. Even at the last Premiers' Conference before the change of Government last year, Mr. Whitlam made quite clear to the Premiers that they would have to find more money from State taxation. Our Treasurer complained bitterly about this, as he had done previously about similar situations, in rather more lurid terms, and at that stage it was obvious he was not able to see further ahead than the next Premiers' Conference. All members will remember the pitiful document on the Loan Estimates that he presented to this House last year, where there were so many uncertainties and

qualified statements, all dependent on Federal Labor Government decisions. But now he complains, apparently, because he is able to see as far ahead as 1980. Of course this arrangement is a tremendous improvement on the old situation, with all its uncertainties, but the Treasurer somehow affects not to see it that way. Such a complete reversal of form is not unusual, however, and everyone must now see the ridiculous aspect of the Treasurer's attacks on the federalism tax-sharing arrangements, when remembering that he himself advocated such a scheme at the 1974 A.L.P. State Convention. Indeed, he was most vocal about it.

Mr. Venning: When things are different they're not the same!

Dr. TONKIN: As the member for Rocky River says, "When things are different they are not the same." That could well be the catch-cry of the Labor Government. The *Advertiser* leader of September 8, 1976, injected a healthy note of cynicism when it said that the Treasurer's fears "seem based less on hard evidence than on a continuing and unfounded suspicion of the aims of the Fraser Government's new federalism policy". The Treasurer is certainly a versatile showman, and can change his act to suit any set of conditions. Of course, it suits him constantly to be fighting the Federal Government of the day, especially when it is one not his own Party. Political survival is the name of the game, and the Treasurer could not care less about the inconsistencies he builds up. The show must go on, regardless. South Australia is receiving some \$10 000 000 more in general revenue this year than it would have received under the old arrangement, and no amount of talking and complaining and creating a show can alter that fact.

Looked at superficially, the Budget could be described in some of the many words of the leader writers and columnists as "a cheerful document", "a pleasing document", "keeping a low profile", or "a pre-election Budget", but a closer and deeper examination reveals the flaws in these earlier assessments. The same leading article which described the Budget as "a generally cheerful document" went on immediately to say:

It is true that some increases in taxes and charges had already been announced and that the growth element built into taxes such as the pay-roll levy ensures increased revenue. But this should not detract from the pluses.

I have a suspicion that he was wearing his rose-coloured spectacles that day. The quotation continues:

In achieving a balance while confirming concessions in land and pay-roll taxes and giving a little more relief in stamp duties, the Treasurer and his Treasury officers are shown as prudent housekeepers. The overall approach adopted by Mr. Dunstan appears to be one of "steady as she goes". In contrast to previous years, there are no bold new programmes or policy initiatives.

That is one thing I have to agree with. The quotation continues:

But this is probably in accord with public mood as well as with the straitened times. Such action as has been taken is geared towards providing a stimulus for economic expansion and reining in inflation, in so far as this is in the power of a State Government. That is also in accord with political realities. The Opposition has been fast gaining ground with a sustained attack on high taxes. Mr. Dunstan has now largely pre-empted them, a fact which will give him much satisfaction if the much talked-about early election does eventuate. Regardless of that, however, it is a cautious, practical Budget that is in line with South Australia's needs.

I have quoted that leading article in full, because it is a rose-coloured spectacles article. It ignores so many features and so many factors. Obviously, the writer had not done his sums when he wrote the article. Far from the minuses

detracting from the pluses, or even achieving a balance, the amount of tax concessions will be markedly outweighed by the additional revenue to be ripped off from the South Australian community by the increased State charges gradually phased in over the past three months.

Mr. Mathwin: And announced in the press.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, and announced in the press. I intend to deal in detail with the various headings, but, put simply, the cost to the Government of the concessions made this year, compared with what we would have received this year, will be as follows:

	\$
Land tax	6 400 000
Stamp duties	2 000 000
Succession duties	Nominal increase only
Pay-roll tax	500 000
Total	\$8 900 000

This cost to the Government of concessions is almost completely paid for by the net amount which it received in taxation, more than it expected to get last year. This figure, this unexpected bonus out of the blue which came about from the remarkably high levels of State taxation, was made up as follows:

	\$
Land tax	500 000 extra
Stamp duties	10 000 000 extra
Succession duties	2 600 000 extra
Pay-roll tax	6 500 000 less
	\$6 600 000 net extra

That was \$6 600 000 more than the Government expected to get. Of course, it is easy for the Government to make tax concessions when last year's taxation was so much higher anyway; all the Government has done is take up the surplus, the bonus which resulted last year, and apply it to concessions for this year. In other words, we have already paid in last year's taxation for most of the concessions we are to get this year. In itself, this is a pretty good piece of showmanship. It is a juggling act, perhaps; and there is more to come.

Even with the announced concessions, the Treasurer states that stamp duty receipts will increase by \$9 000 000 this year. That is a pretty good act, and obviously it has conned quite a few people. If we get any benefit from the concessions this year, we must remember that we have already paid for most of them in excessive tax last year. They are expensive concessions!

It must not be thought that the Liberal Party does not support the concessions that have been made, at least as far as they go, but we contend that the Labor Government has done only as much as was necessary to be able to announce concessions, and to make a show. As has been said by many people, the Opposition's attack on the Government's continued maintenance of high rural land tax, succession duties, stamp duties, and pay-roll tax, despite a favourable budgetary position (the Treasurer had regularly boasted of the surplus funds he had up his sleeve), had begun to hurt the Government. An article in the *Australian* on September 9, 1976, states:

Always the pragmatist, the Premier did not allow them to hurt for long, and, while on the one hand defending their generality as essential to the overall health of the State Budget, he has progressively dispensed with those parts which annoyed the electorate the most, but Government finance the least.

In other words, he has performed a cunning conjuring trick with figures to make a show of helping a great deal, when in fact the help is not very great at all.

Mr. Mathwin: He should wear a top hat.

Dr. TONKIN: A top hat, a cane, and soft shoes.

Mr. Mathwin: Yes, and produce a rabbit.

Dr. TONKIN: The way he has been producing these concessions, he could well have been pulling them out of a top hat, just like producing rabbits. The Liberal Party will make significant concessions, aimed at helping all the community. Abolition of succession duties on that part of an estate passing to a surviving spouse was first announced by the Liberal Party in February this year. The Treasurer announced the adoption of this policy as one of his pre-Budget releases on August 4, having said in February that the Liberal Party moves were "a deliberate move to look after the more wealthy people in the community". As I said before, when things are different they are not the same. Do we hear him saying anything about that policy now that he is adopting it? Of course we do not. Certainly, there is no mention of that.

Yet the Liberal policy went further, and among other things called for an overall reduction on the entire scale of rates where duty was payable, and a form of indexation to counter the effects of inflation. We made no secret that we would ultimately like to see an end to succession duties but, by taking these measures at this stage, everyone in the community still subject to this tax, whether rich or poor, would be helped. The Labor Government's proposals do not go far enough; worthwhile they may be as far as they go, they do not relieve the burden that presently still applies to many people. Has then the Labor Government's announcement on succession duties really pre-empted Liberal policies, as has been suggested by some? On the surface, perhaps it may seem to have done so. In reality, we have more to offer to more South Australians, and they will be the judges.

A reference to land tax concessions was the next pre-Budget announcement made: abolition of rural land tax and changes which, supposedly, would mean relief in metropolitan land tax. What a complete reversal of form for a socialist Government, and yet another Liberal Party policy adopted, or so it seemed, by the Labor Party. We have for many years advocated the abolition of rural land tax.

The media took up the Government's announcement enthusiastically, giving it headlines. Yet careful examination of the statement showed that, although some rural land-owners would receive significant relief, the concessions did not offer the major benefits for the general community that the original fanfare implied they would. Indeed, the Labor Party's policy actually discriminates against people in the metropolitan area (many of whom support the Labor Party), as many of them will not benefit from the measures in any way. This is the people's Party that brings down a discriminatory Budget of this kind!

Let us examine rural land tax first. Rural land tax has been paid by about only 15 per cent of the primary producers outside the metropolitan area, that is, about 3 800 out of 28 500. With any increase in valuations, more and more would have been paying, and the Liberal Party, for that reason, has strongly advocated the total abolition of rural land tax for the future. The Government's acceptance of this part of our policy is pleasing, and some primary producers will benefit. However, to cite a desire on the part of the Government to help the whole rural community in a time of drought and economic crisis, as the main reason for the move, is cynical and dishonest and, to say the least, disturbing. It clearly implies that rural land tax will be reintroduced when the crisis is over, because the Government has left its options open and can reimpose the tax

when it considers that the market can stand it. It is not guaranteed that the tax will not be reimposed. That is where the Government's attitude differs so markedly from that of the Liberal Party. While we believe in the complete abolition of rural land tax as a matter of principle, the Government regards it simply as a cosmetic measure, a matter of making a show to appeal to the rural community as a pre-election gesture. In the metropolitan area the measures announced will benefit only a few people, and there is certainly nothing further to encourage house ownership. Setting the minimum level for charges at \$40 000 unimproved value means that, whilst various anomalies based on high valuations will be overcome, few metropolitan house owners will receive any relief from land tax payments.

We support the relief of the anomalies that have unjustly occurred, but we are concerned, too, for all members of the community. Young people, who find it hard enough to buy a house, will be no better off with regard to land tax, and pensioners and people on fixed incomes will be no better off. Generally, there are no significant concessions for these people and, in fact, the measures that have been announced discriminate against lower income groups. Once again, we have words and high-sounding promises, cosmetic promises, but no actual benefits for most members of the community.

The Liberal Party will undertake, at the appropriate time, to announce a land tax policy which, as in the case of succession duties rates, will bring positive relief to all sections of the community who pay land tax. The Liberal Party will do everything possible to encourage house ownership and to help people remain in their houses. Once again, the Government's proposals, as far as they go, are worthwhile, but they do not go nearly far enough. We are concerned about all sections of the community, no matter where they live.

Pay-roll tax concessions will be of great help to many small businesses, and will tend to relieve the unhappy situation in which workers have had to be laid off because of increased costs. Pay-roll tax concessions for the iron triangle, the green triangle, and Monarto were announced by the Government some months ago, but little use has been made of these concessions, because, in order to qualify, it has been necessary to establish a completely new industry in the area. You, Mr. Speaker, would know that in Port Pirie few, if any, businesses would receive pay-roll tax exemptions under the terms of the announced conditions. Industrial development in South Australia is still at a critically dangerous low level. Worthwhile though they may be in their own right, expansions of Woolworth's stores in South Australia and the Northern Territory are not really what is meant by industrial development. It is a measure of the Treasurer's desperation that he seized on the projects as another chance to make a big show.

We have as a Party for more than 12 months made the strongest possible pleas for significant pay-roll tax concessions in order to encourage industrial development and to maintain industrial viability in South Australia. Now the Government has given some concessions, and they will certainly help some people. But do they go far enough? No, they do not, and we find that the Government is too short-sighted to see that industry needs this encouragement, as part of a total package of industrial harmony, reasonable labour costs (I refer to workmen's compensation legislation especially), and a responsible attitude to worker involvement, not worker control, if it is to establish in South Australia. It is not enough to help some people, and to make a show of it: it is the industrial future and prosperity

of South Australia that matters. The Liberal Party would make significant concessions to encourage industrial development, because this is important for the prosperity of us all.

Stamp duty concessions are also welcome. Again, some people will benefit. Rather than go into detail, I remind honourable members that, in spite of the concessions, the Government still expects to collect an additional \$9 000 000 this year. Is the Government doing all it can, especially to help young people and the elderly? That is the show it is putting forward, but what is it really worth?

If it comes to that, what are all these concessions really worth, when we consider the exorbitant rates of State taxation during the term of the Labor Government? It is only now, as it begins to run scared, that it has taken any significant action. To realise how heavily the South Australian Labor Government has been taxing us, it is informative to compare South Australia with the other States. South Australia's relative per capita tax rate can more easily be seen if all States' per capita rates are ranked from the greatest to the least for each financial year since 1967-68. Since these figures were the subject of disagreement by the Treasurer some weeks ago, I remind him that they were made available by the research service of the Parliamentary Library.

In 1967-68, under the Labor Government, we paid the second highest rate of any State in taxes. In 1968-70 under a Liberal Government, South Australia paid the second lowest rate in taxes. Since 1970, under the Labor Government, we have risen from the second lowest to third highest in the rankings. The Treasurer in a recent television appearance said that we were the fourth highest State in 1974-75. The facts do not seem to back his assertion, but that is not unusual. When we examine comparative State figures for annual increases in all States' per capita tax rates, we see, in fact, that South Australia is ranked second highest of all States. Our rate of taxation has been increasing at the second highest rate of any State in Australia.

There can be little doubt that Labor Governments in South Australia have imposed high levels of State taxation, even when there has been a surplus of funds. I repeat that the cost of the present announced concessions, \$8 900 000, is not much more than the extra, unexpected taxes, \$6 600 000, collected last year. The balance will be more than adequately made up by the rip-off in State charges that have been increased this year. As yet, we have examined only one part of the great big Labor Party confidence trick. Just as some of the concessions were announced ahead of the Budget, increases in State charges were gradually phased in over a period of weeks before the Budget. It is part of the showman's art not to let the members of the audience realise just how they are being got at.

Motor registration fees and drivers' licence fees were increased early this financial year. Even after allowing for natural increases, this will return about \$9 000 000 more to the Government this year. Water and sewerage rates will return an additional \$7 000 000, although the Minister originally quoted \$5 000 000 when he announced the increases early this financial year, and the rates will continue to be calculated on a valuation basis. Port charges were increased from the beginning of September, and will return an additional \$2 300 000, allowing for natural increases. These three factors alone (and there are others) add up to \$18 000 000, and by themselves would more than make up for the concessions. It is certainly not a

matter of balance (as a leading writer said), or of detracting from the concessions: it is a matter of the increased receipts overwhelming the concessions.

Is it any wonder that the Treasurer was able to plan a balanced Budget? Something would be radically wrong if he did not come out with a healthy surplus at the end of this financial year, just as was the case this year, when he had planned for a balanced Budget. Increased hospital charges and electricity charges have not been taken into account either. Overall, the total receipts from State taxes and charges will increase by about \$50 000 000 this year. Yet the Treasurer, as part of the great big Labor Party show, is able to claim that no new increases in Government charges are announced in this Budget. However, showmanship will not make those State taxes and charges fall any less heavily on the people of South Australia, nor will a soft-shoe shuffle divert their attention forever.

Many details of the Budget document will be examined most carefully by Opposition members. I need hardly remind members of the most unfortunate and disgraceful episode that occurred last year involving the guillotine. The Budget details are possibly one of the most important documents to come into the House, and I am sure that a similar denial of free speech by the Government will not occur again. Possibly one of the most important features of the Budgets over the past few years has been the evidence that each one shows of the continued growth of the Public Service, and the continued increase in cost. South Australia is fortunate indeed in being served by a fine body of public servants but, despite some comments to the contrary, a change is creeping over the activities of departments. It is only slight at present, but it is reflected in the changing numbers in some departments.

Before making my speech, I undertook inquiries some days ago to try to determine how many staff members there were now in the Premier's Department. The Public Service list for this year has not yet been tabled. I went through the Parliamentary Library Research Service. There seems to be a remarkable blanket of silence surrounding the staffing of the Premier's Department, because so far it is impossible to determine, I am led to believe, the exact numbers in the Economic Intelligence Unit, in the Policy Secretariat, and particularly on the Ministerial staff itself. It is impossible to know how many workers are on contract work, but the evidence presented (and I look forward with much interest to the lines, where we can ventilate this subject) seems to show that the Premier's Ministerial staff, the Policy Secretariat, and the Economic Intelligence Unit have expanded considerably over the years.

Mr. Becker: There are a few surplus boys in Canberra.

Dr. TONKIN: Although I have heard those stories, I cannot confirm them. There can be little doubt that policy decision-making is tending to be concentrated more and more in the Premier's Department, and that the financial control over the State's resources and institutions that is now being organised, together with the media-monitoring service, will ultimately give this policy group almost unlimited power of its own. The administration of this State may be in the hands of its excellent public servants, but the direction of policy in a growing number of areas is in the hands of Ministerial staff of the Premier's Department, ultimately controlled by guidelines set down by the Labor Party convention and the left-wing Trades and Labor Council.

The Treasurer commutes regularly in and out of the State, either from overseas or other States. He is constantly attended by his personal officers, such as his secretary, bodyguard, press officers, and research assistant

(call them what you will), all at the expense of the taxpayers of South Australia. In fact, his constant travelling to other States is one of the few matters that he does not feel should be exploited by his publicity machine. Cassandra's recent comments in the *Sunday Mail* sum the situation up well: "Poet, author, cook, elephant rider, entertainer, champagne drinker and now a T.V. compere on a soap box. One wonders how the Premier gets time to run his State." The plain fact is that more and more the Treasurer is leaving the running of the State to the Ministerial staff, the political contract appointees in his department, and decisions made at staff management council meetings.

Mr. Mathwin: He certainly can't ride an elephant.

Dr. TONKIN: The less said about that the better, because it is probably a painful subject. The present conflict in his own department over the appointment of senior departmental officers must have brought home to the Treasurer, as nothing else could have done, the absurdity of his own worker participation policies, but it must also have impressed him with the doctrinaire obsession held by many of his advisers. One wonders whether he any longer has sufficient authority as Treasurer to overrule the decisions which are obviously being made by meetings of his staff, and whether or not he allows his senior officers to have the necessary authority, too. One wonders whether other members of Cabinet cannot be overruled by these officers. The Treasurer is becoming little more than a figurehead, his executive authority being gradually usurped by this group of his staff who are young, impatient, and militant. Of course, he has time to indulge in all his other personal publicity-grabbing activities, but he is doing so at the expense of the State.

He is an able politician and a showman, but it is the showman who is now predominating and, unfortunately for the people of South Australia, it is showmanship which is now intruding into the political and governmental affairs of this State, mostly by default. Cassandra could have added to his list the tourist films starring the Treasurer that have been shown in other States, and the Government's so-called information films in which the Treasurer has promoted himself here at home, again all at the taxpayers' considerable expense. Showmanship obviously is the name of the Treasurer's game. Even the show pieces publicised in the propaganda films as evidence of the Government's achievements are carefully selected. How many schools enjoy the facilities he so proudly presents as an example of the Government's programme? How many hospitals enjoy those facilities? How many other examples are there? The money spent in promoting these show pieces would be better spent helping to spread improved conditions throughout the community. That is what this Budget is all about. Nothing has really changed—the Government's policies on worker participation, compulsory unionism, and high State taxation are still there, despite the smokescreen. The people of South Australia will not be taken in by the great big Labor Party show. Certainly, they must be told the truth about what is happening to them. The Liberal Party has not been pre-empted by these announcements in any way, although the Government would obviously like the voters to think so. By its approach to this Budget the Australian Labor Party has demonstrated to everyone clearly its weaknesses in its attitude to State taxation. Nothing it has done in the Budget has changed its deliberate desire to rip off the people of South Australia as much money as it can possibly get away with at every opportunity. This desire is what will bring the Government down.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The Treasurer's Financial Statement, which accompanies the other Budget papers, is, as usual, full of political comment. Some material, which has obviously been prepared by Treasury officers, is straight-forward Treasury material that we find quite acceptable. However, the Treasurer, as usual, has intruded with the sort of political humbug that is not at all helpful to the people of this State or to the members of this House. I shall try to deal with the realistic comments in the Treasurer's statement, and then comment on some of the more political material.

One thing acknowledged is the fact that the State would now appear, on the surface, to be in a healthy financial position. The Treasurer last year forecast that we would have a balanced Budget in South Australia. In fact, the Government collected far more by way of State taxation from the public than it had budgeted for. The other significant point to be noted from the result of last year's activities was that the escalation of wage costs and salary expenses (which are the main items in the Government's Revenue Budget), was not as large as had been anticipated. This indicates that responsible efforts of the Federal Government to come to terms with economic reality in this country are having some effect.

We all know very well the way in which the Commonwealth Government has argued before the Arbitration Commission for increased wage restraint. It has been rightly said that excessive wage demands are pricing people out of employment. Mr. Street, the Federal Minister, in a very responsible manner is gaining public support for what the Government is seeking to do. It is a fact of life that by large increases in salaries people are being priced out of a job. We will not see any great improvement in the unemployment situation until the average person in this country comes to terms with that economic fact of life. I believe that there is evidence that the people are coming to terms with that economic fact.

The Labor Government wants to have it both ways. It wants to pander to the acquisitive instincts of all people by saying that they should have increased benefits and increased wages, and should expect increased services, as the Treasurer often states in this House. But the Government has little to say about how these things will be financed. Of course they must be financed in terms of the economic productivity of this country. The Treasurer keeps on saying that there are demands from the public of South Australia for increased services and benefits. I do not hear those demands as loudly as I hear demands for some moderation in Government spending and in the exorbitant level of Government charging in South Australia. The people at large are being educated on this point by the responsible efforts of the Federal Government but, until the Labor Governments in this country and the Labor Government in this State are willing to support those moves that will in fact bring about wage restraint and moderation in salary increases, it is irresponsible for those Governments to complain about the level of unemployment. The only argument this Government or the Whitlam Opposition in Canberra can use to try to denigrate the efforts of the Federal Government is to say that unemployment is at an unacceptable level. We know very well that unemployment was at an unacceptable level, and reached that level during the terms of a series of unsuccessful Labor Treasurers in Canberra.

Early in the Financial Statement I read with concern the fact that the Government intends to intervene in the Cooper Basin activities. It seems to me that, in this regard, there will be a conflict of interest. One of the major users of the gas produced in the Cooper Basin is the South Australian

Government. The Government is involved in any price negotiations for this commodity, yet the Government seeks to get a share of the action by becoming a major owner of the production of the gasfield. There would appear to be a definite conflict of interest involved in this highly questionable move. We are not very well disposed towards Governments intruding into business activities when private enterprise can quite well cater for and serve the public of South Australia efficiently. We argued this way strongly when the Government sought to enter the insurance field. I do not believe the State Government Insurance Commission has done anything to benefit the people of South Australia. I do not believe it has increased competition in any meaningful way. The Opposition opposed that move, and I believe we opposed it rightly. The fact that the Government is intruding in the Cooper Basin activities is open to serious questioning.

The Treasurer states that the Government has doubts about the tax-sharing proposals. Here we get on to the political material in the statement. As this has been dealt with at some length by the Leader, I do not intend to repeat what he said. I ask the Treasurer what he would have expected the Federal Government to do in the situation in which it found itself. The Treasurer complains about there being a lack of information for forward planning. In his Financial Statement, he states:

We all know that the Commonwealth Government is strenuously pursuing a policy of reduced public spending both in its own area and that of the States. I have said several times both publicly and to the Prime Minister himself, that I believe this policy can only increase unemployment beyond the already high and unacceptable level, reduce consumer confidence, discourage private investment and generally lead to an overall economic decline. It ignores the present plight of the building and construction industry which is operating at about only 75 per cent of its effective capacity in this State and which is in even worse straits in some other States In trying to look into the future and to plan for it, we do not know how long the Commonwealth will persist with its present policies, and we certainly do not know how tough that Government will be in its approach to specific purpose grants to the States and to support the Loan programmes in 1977-78.

I submit that the Commonwealth's approach is entirely reasonable, given the chaotic situation in which it found this country as a result of the activities of the previous Labor Administration. How on earth can the Treasurer expect the Commonwealth Government to keep making money available to South Australia when the money is just not available. I know that the Commonwealth Government would like to reduce the astronomical deficit that exists in Federal finances more rapidly than it is reducing that deficit. I know that the Federal Government does not like budgeting for a \$3 000 000 000 deficit. I know that that Government is also concerned about unemployment and about stimulating economic recovery.

However, the Commonwealth Government must at least follow a responsible line in trying to come to terms with economic reality. The wealth of this country can be measured only by what it produces and sells. We know perfectly well that the major goal of the Federal Government is to restore economic stability to this country. Let me remind the House of some of the initiatives the Federal Government has taken to stimulate economic recovery. I do so to give the lie to the sort of statement that the Treasurer is trying to intrude into his Financial Statement when he complains about the lack of direction from the Federal Government. The Federal Government has been unwavering in its attempts to come to terms with economic reality. It ill-behoves the Treasurer to complain in his statement about the way the Commonwealth Government is moving. The

Liberal and National Party Coalition Government promised to get the economy moving again. It tackled inflation as a first priority in getting people back to work. Who can argue with that priority?

The Commonwealth Government is having some success in coming to terms with inflation. The inflation rate in Australia is falling, although not as dramatically as we would like it to fall. We must remember that we are dealing with a \$3 000 000 000 deficit and that wonders cannot be worked overnight. Consumer demand and national productivity have begun to grow again in the final half of 1976. Surely that is an encouraging sign. Major new developmental projects are under way. A \$76 000 000 Ford plant expansion is to be established. Nissan is to establish an engine plant, too. A substantial expansion in the chemical industry—

Dr. Tonkin: Are these to be established in South Australia?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No. South Australia is at a disadvantage when one considers the interstate scene, because South Australia is a high cost State.

Dr. Tonkin: Are we missing out on much?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: My word we are! These developments have occurred in Australia during the life of the present Commonwealth Administration, an Administration about which the Treasurer is complaining. The Commonwealth Government has altered the increases in the Government's share in the gross domestic product. That illustrates a basic difference in philosophy between the Labor Party and the Liberal Party. In many areas we believe that the people can spend their own money more effectively than the Government can spend it for them. The Treasurer claims that the South Australian public is demanding that the Government spend more money—that there is a proper demand for increased services. I do not believe that that is the case. It is certainly Labor philosophy for Governments to do more and more and for the people to be fleeced and taxed more and more. The Treasurer used to talk about taxing the tall poppies; we all know that that was just some emotional nonsense to try to catch a wave of favourable public opinion. We all know whom he is taxing.

Let us consider what else the Federal Government has done to get the economy moving again. It has given clear foreign investment guidelines that are equitable to all parties. Those guidelines have been adopted. Compare that policy to the confusion that existed in the days of Crean and Connor, when anyone overseas who wanted to invest in this country was considered to be an enemy to be kept at bay at all costs. The Commonwealth Government has also given specific help to business to provide jobs. It has introduced an investment allowance, initially of 40 per cent; it promised to take that action, and it has done so. The Federal Government has relaxed the conditions on which interest on convertible notes is deducted; and it has suspended quarterly taxation payments for the duration of the economic crisis. It has introduced a stock valuation adjustment in line with the Mathews report recommendations; it has implemented a 50 per cent introduction of these recommendations and will fully implement the recommendations before its term is up.

The Commonwealth Government has also increased the retention allowances for private companies. It is following consistent economic policies. The strategy that was outlined at the time of the recent election has been followed consistently. The Commonwealth Government's unswerving priority is to reduce inflation and eliminate unemployment.

The Federal Government has intervened in wage cases to ensure that national economic objectives are continued. It has done that responsibly, because it is taking a long-term view of the economy, whereas the State Labor Government is taking—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! We are considering the South Australian Budget, not the Federal Budget. The honourable member must come back to the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am elaborating on a quotation I used earlier in the debate in which the Treasurer complains about Federal Government policy. That was an extensive quotation from page 822 of *Hansard*.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are referring to a statement in relation to the Bill before the House?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, the statement by the Treasurer in relation to this Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does he refer to the Federal Government?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Does he ever! I do not wish to read it again, however.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I shall listen intently to the honourable member from now on.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I made the point earlier that, as usual, the statement contains political references in which the Treasurer is critical of the Federal Government. I wish to put the record straight because what the Treasurer has said is untrue, and to do so will take some time. The Federal Government has intervened in wage cases and has, I believe, gained increased public acceptance for the stand it is taking in that regard. That Government has ended the taxation rip-off caused by Labor inflation. It has indexed personal income tax 100 per cent in the first year, and that is a remarkable achievement. It has paid special attention to the disadvantaged and those in need. That has given the lie to the claim that Liberal Governments are not interested in social welfare.

I believe one of the major achievements of the Federal Government has been the family allowance scheme. There is no doubt that the family where the wife stays home to look after the children has been severely disadvantaged in our modern society. Because of the economic situation in the country, more and more families are depending on two incomes. This has been an undesirable trend. I believe the family allowance scheme introduced by the Federal Government has been a great boon to those families where the wife has accepted the role of homemaker and has stayed home to look after a large family. These are positive achievements which the Treasurer is not prepared to acknowledge.

The Federal Government introduced a home savings grant to assist first home buyers. The Treasurer complained that money for housing was not increased by the Federal Government. He said his Government had put aside \$20 000 000 of revenue into the Loan Account and, as a result of the announcement from Canberra, he had now decided to channel that sum into housing. The Party of which I am proud to be a member believes that home ownership is highly desirable and that, if we can encourage young people to own their own house, we are doing something for them and for the country. It is no good the Treasurer's complaining in this document that his Government has not received the funds it wanted for housing. The Federal Government has done something really constructive in relation to housing: it has introduced a home savings grant to assist first home buyers to bridge the deposit gap. It has also retained the interest deduction scheme. I could continue and show the complete hypocrisy

of statements made by the Treasurer in his explanation of the Budget papers. The Federal Government has attempted to come to terms with economic realities, and it is being denigrated for doing so.

The Treasurer said there was an increasing call for hospital services. I make no bones about the fact that I have grave reservations about the Medibank scheme introduced by the Labor Government. I believe that unfortunately we are now stuck with a Medibank scheme in some form or another. In his explanation the Treasurer said:

By now members will be well aware of the changes which the Commonwealth Government has made to the Medibank arrangements. The precise effect of these changes cannot be estimated with any accuracy, but to the extent that the introduction of the Medibank levy induces people to take out extra health insurance there will be a saving to the Budget in the net cost of providing health care.

I commend to members articles about Medibank by Dr. Peter Richardson that appeared in the *Australian* on September 6 and 7. Dr. Richardson, who is a Liberal M.P., has grave doubts about Government medical schemes in general, and I share those doubts with him. No overseas scheme has been proved successful, they lead to over-use, abuse and a deterioration in overall care as well as a dramatic increase in cost.

I endorse the remarks in the Treasurer's speech about the need for accountability in Government departments, but I am disturbed by references in the Auditor-General's report to the lack of accountability. On page 1 of his report the Auditor-General refers to the necessity for greater accountability in general in departments. On page 77 of his report the Auditor-General refers to the deficiencies in the Education Department in this area, and on page 96 he says there is an urgent need for the development of financial systems in the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

The Treasurer seeks to propagate the false impression that he is not increasing State charges in this Budget. We know perfectly well that this has been his ploy in the past few years. These charges have already been increased. When the Government was in office in 1970-71 the cost of water in this State was 7.7c a kilolitre, and this year it is 16c a kilolitre. I recall the Treasurer's complaining about the possibility of an increase in stamp duty on motor vehicles. The effective increase in stamp duty on motor vehicles under a Labor Government has been 500 per cent in six years. One of the new charges levied by the State Labor Government was that imposed on the profits of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. That is the Government's contribution to the taxing of the tall poppies! What nonsense! That is the Government's contribution to inflation. The tax on electricity has increased from less than \$500 000 to \$5 800 000. The State Government levied a tax on the State-run Electricity Trust, simply because it was profitable. The State Government is increasing charges secretly where it can do so.

A new tax has been levied on gas. That is not taxing the tall poppies; it is taxing every housewife who uses gas. We know, as does the Government, that, to finance the services it claims the public is demanding, it is taxing the public at large.

On August 1 last, registration fees were increased dramatically by about 30 per cent for commercial vehicles and 25 per cent for private vehicles. That is not taxing the tall poppies; it is taxing the average John Citizen. We know that the Treasurer is a master showman who was a member of Actors Equity. He has an army of people paid simply and solely to promote him, and they do it most effectively, but the taxpayers of South Australia must not be

deluded by his showmanship. South Australians are being bled white by the level of State taxes and charges, and the small tokens given by way of land tax and succession duties reductions are merely a drop in the bucket. What I have said is completely pertinent to this debate. I hope that further common sense will prevail in the direction that the Government follows.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): No dissertation on the financial affairs of the State, no document prepared in relation to those financial affairs, necessarily permits precise statement. Obviously, these Budget documents, by their very nature, are documents of expectation in a general manner. However, if one refers to earlier Budget documents, one sees that they were relatively precise, correctly arranged, based on programmes of activity and promotion of the State which had been well thought through, and based on a realistic attitude and approach to the urgent requirements of the people of South Australia. This document is not precise in many areas, is completely mischievous in some areas, and has become nothing more than a political document used in an attempt to knock the Fraser Government. It has in many respects a doomsday attitude: it predicts that certain dire consequences will follow, but gives no information about how they will arise. It is based on the political philosophy of the Treasurer and his colleagues, and does not relate to the advice obtained from various departments, which advice is more clearly stated in the reports of the departments tabled in this House.

I am concerned, as any member should be, that the Government is seeking to abdicate its role of an honest and sincere approach to the major issues and major problems of South Australia. Earlier today, we had an example of the failure of the Government to take a leading role in a vital industry, which employs directly about 16 per cent of the total work population of the State and indirectly about 21 per cent of the work population. I hope I am a realist; I do not believe that a Government can do everything at all times to create a smooth industrial situation, but there are occasions (and this is one) where the Government has failed miserably to do the important things it should be doing.

I ask members opposite to take serious heed of the recent statements of Mr. Commissioner Clarkson. Those statements were not idle and not based on some self-promotion to get into the newspapers, but were based on a real assessment of the problem in a vital industry and on the fact that South Australia faces a deteriorating economy if this type of activity continues. Our State economy will further deteriorate if the consequences which are a distinct possibility, both at General Motors-Holden's and at the Chrysler organisation, resulting in cutting back production or completely moving out of production in this State, were to become a reality. I trust that situation does not arise; I hope that common sense will prevail. I am looking forward to common sense being a feature that the Government will accept as a responsible requirement, just as I believe it seems that many floor members of the union movement are adopting a common-sense attitude, realising that they are suffering from their own inadequacies in relation to people they have elected to represent them in the recent past.

That is not directly associated with this document, other than that to maintain even a semblance of the production required to meet \$1 171 000 000 requires that we have a State economy which is functional and which does not have to be propped up. Many people have expressed

concern at the failure of the Government to look realistically at its employment scheme, and its failure to employ that one extra person in six which would be possible with the expenditure of the same sum of money, by making employment not casual, but based on the realistic figure of an ordinary adult wage in respect of the category of employment, instead of the false and completely unsatisfactory scheme that involves the employment of a person on the adult wage plus 20 per cent. Mental arithmetic will show quickly that such a course of action means that one person in six is denied a job, and is unable to fend for his or her family by having a job to go to. The Government clearly is working on the basis of fattening some and keeping others thin, an attitude inconsistent with its public claims for the system, brought previously to the attention of this House.

Political opportunism is apparent in many places in this document. It is unusual to find that the Government occasionally suddenly accepts that the course of action being taken by the Federal Government has advanced the cause of certain of its activities. I emphasise the area in which the Government refers to the failure of the Federal Government to make additional sums available for specific projects, and I ask Government Ministers and members to study the total amount being made available by the Commonwealth Government and then recognise that this Government is being placed in a position, which did not prevail whilst the Federal Labor Government was in office, of being able to determine its priorities and to inject funds into its immediate programme and not into areas suggested by the programmes of the Commonwealth Government. The State Government cannot have it both ways, and I would not want to see another situation such as the first half of 1974-75 and of 1975-1976, when increased Federal funds were made available to the State but not less than 61 per cent of the extra money spent was predetermined by the Commonwealth Government. This Government has a responsibility to determine its priorities. In his explanation the Treasurer stated:

The Commonwealth Government's refusal to provide the States with an assurance beyond June 30, 1980, that funds under the tax-sharing arrangement will be at least as great as those which would have resulted from a continuation of the formula. In seeking a long-term guaranteed arrangement, I and other Premiers had in mind the possibility that the Commonwealth Government might place less emphasis in the future on income tax as a revenue source.

In that, as in other statements, the Treasurer is saying, "I do not want as the elected Leader and as Treasurer of this State to undertake any actions that will bring odium on me and my Government. I am happy for the Federal Government, regardless of its political persuasion and especially if it is a Liberal and National Country Party coalition, to raise as much as it likes and feed it to me, because I can spend it, and it is the Federal Government that will get the odium for the original collection." Obviously, it is the State Government's responsibility to provide services for its people and also to accept the odium for that collection, rather than hide behind the skirts of the Commonwealth and make out that that Government is in constant error whilst the State Government's position is clear and lily-white.

It is regrettable that this Government has been allowed to get away with the false promotion that it has not increased taxation and charges. The Treasurer's statement does not refer to them, but there have been many other references to such charges in large doses. The Government has done it in a way that is not immediately apparent, and we will see a dramatic increase in the amount extracted from the people of South Australia as the Government continues to uphold a fictitious and mythical

valuation system that is archaic. It might have been, as the Treasurer delighted in telling the member for Heysen last week, created during the time of a Liberal and Country League Government in this State, but that does not get away from the fact that, because of inflation and other factors that have arisen, it is not now a realistic or appropriate method of valuation to be used to inflict taxes and charges on the people of this State.

Indeed, in several parts of his statement, the Treasurer admits as much, and has stated that the degree of valuation saw marked increases in returns to the Government, increases which were beyond its expectations but which related to the increased valuations of property. This system is having a serious effect on the value of houses in the metropolitan area and on the value of houses and property in the outer metropolitan and rural areas, and every person is seriously affected by this mythical and fictitious valuation system. The Treasurer made great play of the increased money that would be available from Housing Trust activities, and stated:

I have already mentioned welfare housing and the acute lack of funds in this area. Suffice it to say now that the adverse effects of the Commonwealth policy can be measured against the background in this State of a waiting list of over two years for a State Bank loan and, with the exception of a few country areas, a waiting list in excess of three years for a Housing Trust rental house.

The Government has consistently refused to be realistic concerning Housing Trust rentals. Recently, it made a move, but by no stretch of the imagination could it be agreed that many people enjoying trust accommodation are in straitened circumstances, nor can they justly claim that the minimal rental they are being asked to pay is realistic, compared to the rent being paid by a person who owns his own house or by one who rents a house outside the trust.

I believe that the Treasurer's statement is a condemnation of the Whitlam regime, but he has failed to identify it with the event. If one considers the waiting time for a Housing Trust house, one must also realise that, until recently, a waiting list was not referred to in this statement. With the rapid escalation in costs and the gay abandonment with which the Federal Labor Government threw money around, escalation in costs in the building industry was greater than in many other areas, and, by the Treasurer's own admission, costs for Government buildings, schools, and the like have escalated by more than 100 per cent in five years, and 62½ per cent of that escalation was in the last two years of the Whitlam regime. A similar situation applies with regard to the Housing Trust. Many people are being denied the opportunity of Housing Trust accommodation because the Government has refused to increase rentals realistically, thus allowing further funds to be put into the building of additional trust units. In addition, the Government was willing to accept all it could grab from the Whitlam regime and did not attempt, as it should have done if it was genuinely interested in the well-being of South Australians, to put the brakes on the wanton expenditure coming from that source.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Would you like to comment on the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement?

Dr. EASTICK: I will deal further with this matter, because what I have to say touches on the matter the Minister of Education has just raised. I predict that, unless the Government is more realistic in relation to spending Land Commission funds, we will see a deteriorating housing position in South Australia, because the Gov-

ernment will have massive sums tied up in land, and in its development, and will not have the money to enable houses to be built on the developed blocks. There is a movement in the community by private enterprise to develop blocks of land. Some of the development taking place now would appear to represent direct competition between the Land Commission and private enterprise. I am not suggesting that either party should have *carte blanche*; what I suggest is a balanced approach to this matter. Where private enterprise has already provided serviced blocks, the commission should undertake its function in a different area, so that there can be a reasonably rapid turnover of serviced blocks, and the money, instead of being tied up against some housing development later, can be used in providing housing. Then we would move ahead with a balanced approach both to the development of blocks and the building of houses.

We cannot undertake a programme that leaves one of those two ingredients isolated from the other. Until the Government readjusts its thinking on this matter, I predict that the housing situation unfortunately will deteriorate even further than the gloomy state that the Treasurer painted in his statement. I precommit myself, as indeed I have on other occasions, to one aspect of the document, as follows:

As a result of this work—

the document is referring to Government financial considerations—

it may be necessary to ask Parliament, at some later stage, to consider modifications to the presentation of formal financial information in Budget papers and Treasurers' statements.

As I have said before, it is most important that we get into a method of financial responsibility which does not create peaks and troughs but which permits a proper flow-on of proper financial actions. We do not want departments or individual units in departments wantonly spending large sums of money in the last two months of a financial year because it is suddenly available and not required for other contingencies. The result can be a large payment for overtime or for extra costs for materials in short supply, so that we have an artificially inflated value. We should not attempt to complete jobs in a time less than that required for an effective and proper completion of a project.

This syndrome of rushing in at the last moment to get money off the slate is disastrous to the State's financial management, and it makes a mockery of the claim that the Government is devoid of the necessary funds to provide the priority projects a community wants. Only by looking to the long term and carrying over funds for committed projects in a responsible manner will we offset the impossible situation which has developed not during the tenure of office of this Government but which dates back almost to antiquity. It is not a satisfactory financial method as we approach the 1980's.

I am concerned with the continuing doubt about the opportunity of the South Australian wharf system to attract the right type of overseas shipping. The Government has made the point that large sums come in by way of charges imposed at wharfs and that, indeed, with the container port now nearing completion at Port Adelaide, the facility will allow for much greater use of containerisation. Only this week, we have seen once again a statement that the long haul up to Outer Harbor and the Port River is adversely affecting the shipping industry and, therefore, the likely use of these new facilities. We must take a more positive role than we have taken hitherto. Having a facility is one thing, but it is equally important

to have an effective method of enticing shipping companies to want to use the facility because of what we can offer them, either in management or in guarantees from those maritime unions and associated organisations involved. On the one hand, there are the figures available of the large quantities of cargo still by-passing our own ports and being sent by rail to the Commonwealth's advantage in the direct sense and partially to our benefit by the value it is to the Commonwealth's transport system on this side of the border, but getting actual funds into the State's coffers is another important issue.

One area of income highlighted in the document of actual receipts shows that the Government expected that, from the Betting Control Board's commission on bets for 1975-76, it would receive \$1 660 000, whereas it received \$1 708 404; in 1976-77, the Government expects to receive \$1 925 000. This is an important part of the Government's income, although against the total of \$1 171 000 000 it is infinitesimal. The racing industry was advised recently that this sum would increase further so that funds would be made available back to the industry. Cabinet failure to uphold a decision it had made earlier will be felt by the racing industry at a time when it is under pressure because of the down-turn in Totalizator Agency Board revenue associated with the new computerisation programme.

At Cabinet level, too much Ministerial interference led to a situation in which the racing industry was put into an impossible position. A certain assurance was given and a new course fee for bookmakers in the three codes was negotiated on the basis they were to receive a benefit back from the Government. The loss of the expected benefit has therefore seriously disadvantaged the racing industry. I believe that a racing commission is urgently needed which is separate from Ministerial control and interference and which works through control bodies for the three codes. This would put the racing industry into a realistic position that will enable it to advance. If we are to continue to have Ministerial interference there will be a deterioration of the position of the racing industry, a circumstance that we cannot tolerate.

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

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I have pleasure in supporting previous speakers, especially the member for Light in his appeal for a racing commission in this State. In the expenditure section of the Budget is an allocation of \$200 000 to the South Australian Jockey Club, no doubt to compensate the horse-racing section of the racing industry for the loss of revenue and costs incurred by the T.A.B. There has been no allocation to trotting or greyhound racing. Greyhound racing clubs are still paying for being accepted on to the T.A.B. There should be a racing commission which is fair to all sections of the industry and which has no political interference. I will support the member for Light in the future when he makes that appeal to this House. We hope that the Minister responsible will accept the situation. He has promised for some time to introduce legislation in relation to greyhound racing organisation, and several amendments to the Lottery and Gaming Act.

The Minister and some of his staff have been making some weird statements behind the scenes to solve the problem. The best advice is to establish a racing commission and give greyhound racing a board of five instead of 12 members, as is suggested around town, and then perhaps the industry will establish itself as one of the best and most competitive in Australia.

Mr. Evans: Do you think it should be classed as an industry or a sport?

Mr. BECKER: It is an industry and a sport. It is a professional sport in one sense, but amateurs are involved as well. When one looks at the whole of racing one must consider it an industry because breeding is one of the most valuable and important facets, apart from the revenue the Government raises in relation to betting. I class it as an industry because it employs many people. There is concern in my area that the Bart Cummings stable is no longer profitable to operate in South Australia. It would not surprise me if one day he concentrated on racing in New South Wales and Victoria. South Australia cannot afford to lose a trainer of that note. It is encouraging to see that he has people from overseas on the premises at the moment and is training them to help them establish the racing industry in South-East Asian countries. I compliment him on that.

Looking at the Treasurer's statement, one can say that, to the average taxpayer, this Budget would be a non-event. As the Leader rightly stated, all the decisions affecting taxpayers were made before this document was introduced, and we are left to dissect it. I appreciate that the Treasurer has brought down a balanced Budget. I have always said that this is what the Treasurer and the Government should do. He would not have had a very finely balanced Budget last financial year if he had not taken about \$50 000 000 and spent it in the last few weeks. This saved him from having an embarrassing surplus of about \$52 000 000. The balance of the Consolidated Revenue Account at the beginning of the financial year shows a surplus of \$25 300 000. The surplus for the year was \$2 200 000, and we have now in reserve \$27 500 000. Had there been a \$50 000 000 surplus, it would have made it difficult for the Government to get its hands on that reserve. Even though we have a \$27 500 000 reserve, at some time in the future the Government can get its hands on that money. Although the Treasurer says that he has brought down a balanced Budget, if he wants it, and the Treasury officials are astute enough (and I believe they are, because we are fortunate in this State to have first-rate Treasury officials), we will see this reserve disappear either this year or next year. I believe that, whilst we are told this is a balanced Budget, there is no guarantee that we, the taxpayers, will see a surplus. It is more likely that there will be a deficit. The Treasurer has \$27 500 000 to put his hands on.

The disappointing feature of this document and the document we received recently in relation to the Loan Account is that the Treasury for some unknown reason is trying to link both documents together. In doing that it is trying to confuse the average observer of the State's financial situation. When one analyses the figures, one finds that there is partly money in the Loan Account and partly money in the Revenue Account reserve. While there is a Loan Account with a deficit of \$8 900 000, there will not be the confusing statement that we are a lot better off than we were.

During the last financial year we were told how well South Australia was doing financially and the figures did contain the balance in the Loan Account. On the first page of this document the Treasurer says that special allocations of \$27 000 000 are for two major provisions, one of \$15 000 000 to support the 1976-77 operations of the Loan Account and one of \$12 000 000 to augment development and exploration activities in the Cooper Basin gasfield. If money is to be taken out of the Revenue Account to prop up the Loan Account, that is being

deceitful to the taxpayers of South Australia. The State Treasury has given us guidelines in relation to the Premiers' Conference and Loan Council meetings about how much will be raised and how much allocated on Loan programmes. Here we find the South Australian Government not strictly conforming to that practice, because it is obviously going for a deficit in the Loan Account, and propping up the Loan Account by taking money out of the Revenue Account. I refer to the day-to-day cash basis of taxpayers' income and the revenue derived by certain departments. I believe that is deceitful, and I challenge the Treasurer in what he is doing.

The level of taxation in this State is extremely high, and this Budget does not give the average man in the street relief in that respect. Instead, the Treasurer has taken advantage of the high rate of taxation to which we have become accustomed in this State in the past few years to put surplus money in the Loan Account. By taking that action he boosts construction activity and, we hope, creates employment opportunities. To use revenue money for normal Loan programmes is, in my opinion, deceitful. The sum of \$15 000 000 will be used in that area. Last financial year about \$10 000 000 was used in that way, and \$20 000 000 cash was used to pay for buses. That \$20 000 000 should have come from Loan Account and not from Revenue Account. The sum of \$12 000 000 is to be used for certain development explorations in the Cooper Basin gasfield. That sum should have come from Loan Account because it relates to capital expenditure. The Treasurer is not being sincere with the people of this State when he does that sort of thing. Regarding Cooper Basin, the Treasurer states:

I referred earlier to a special allocation of \$12 000 000 to augment development and exploration in the Cooper Basin gasfields. The South Australian Government's main concern is the level of exploration which needs to be undertaken in order to assess the extent of the reserves and to permit planning of their future use. In particular, we wish to ensure that adequate gas supplies will be available to Adelaide consumers beyond 1987.

No-one would quibble with that or deny the Government the right to ensure on behalf of its people adequate gas reserves. The Treasurer continues:

I am sure that members would be well aware of the financial difficulties and protracted negotiations which have faced members of the producer consortium developing this important energy resource. The previous Commonwealth Government took an equity interest in the project at the time when some consortium members were seeking to overcome their financing problems. The present Commonwealth Government now seems anxious to divest itself of the equity interest.

One would assume that the consortium would be given a fair go in this country to develop in its own right without Government interference. The crux of the issue is as follows, where the Treasurer states:

The South Australian Government has made an offer to acquire this equity as the most effective avenue of assisting the producer consortium to achieve an adequate level of exploration, and also of obtaining a voice in the management of the Cooper Basin resources.

That is the punch line: the State Government wants a voice in the management of Cooper Basin resources, not because it wants to ensure gas supplies for South Australia but because it is Government policy in this State through its industrial democracy programme to obtain equity in any organisation it can. Members opposite can accuse the Opposition of union bashing or anything else for saying that, but we know that the present Government's long-term plan is a voice in the management of various businesses.

That is borne out clearly in the Treasurer's Budget statement in relation to the Cooper Basin resource. The Treasurer continues:

In these Estimates it is proposed to set aside \$12 000 000 as a contribution to the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, \$9 500 000 being to finance the acquisition from the Commonwealth Government and \$2 500 000 being to provide some funds for exploration.

He refers to the sum of \$12 000 000, \$9 500 000 of which will be used to acquire the Commonwealth Government's share in the resource. The balance will be used for exploration and will come straight out of the cash account. That practice is completely dishonest, because it takes funds that were contributed by taxpayers. The money should have come from Loan Account. I challenge the validity of the State Government's wanting to acquire part of the Cooper Basin resource. It is nationalisation through the back door. We know that only the State Government can nationalise an industry or take over a natural resource such as the gasfields. This could be the first step in nationalising the Cooper Basin resource and South Australian gasfields.

The Treasurer also warned us that further significant allocations of funds would be required from time to time for exploration and development, and that information concerning this would be put before Parliament. We do not know what will evolve from that, but we can rest assured that, if the Government wishes to have a voice in the management of the Cooper Basin resource, industrial democracy will certainly be forced into that area. With industrial democracy at the Cooper Basin gasfield there could be a stranglehold on the power resource of this State, and this could bring industry and the people of this State to their knees. It is the first step in the master plan of the next decade to obtain a great dream for South Australia. About forward planning, the Treasurer states:

On previous occasions I have stressed the benefits to be obtained from the long-term planning of our financial resources and the desirability of considering each year as only one step in that long-term planning process. In case anyone wishes to refer back, I spelled this out in my 1974 Budget speech.

No doubt I commented in 1974, as I am doing now. I have no doubt that long-term planning exists to tax the people as much as possible when it is known that projects are coming up towards the end of a financial year. In this way the Government has sufficient money in Loan Account, taken from cash reserves, to effect the takeovers it wishes to make, such as in the case of Cooper Basin. There was also the \$20 000 000 to prop up the State Transport Authority. Through no fault of its own, the Government must find \$11 000 000 for drought relief. When those sums are added up, and particularly had that sum not been necessary for drought relief, land tax could well have been abolished in South Australia this financial year. However, I will deal with that matter later. The Treasurer also states:

Perhaps I could refer briefly to two matters to give members some idea of the Government's purpose in this matter. First, in education, where there is likely to be a decline in primary and secondary enrolments over the next 10 years, it is vital that planning initiatives be taken now so that school-leavers do not embark on a tertiary course in the expectation that employment in the teaching profession will be readily available in either Government or non-government schools.

What an outstanding admission! I remember a few years ago the previous Minister of Education making great play at State and Federal elections about an education crisis and how the number of students in each classroom was far too high. What has happened in the past few years? Have we

seen a reduction in the number of students in each classroom? Not on your life. The reduction has been only two or three students in some cases. We still have crowded classrooms, and the Government is flat out improving poor facilities in our schools and establishing schools in new and expanding suburbs. The Treasurer admits that he does not want more teachers to undergo courses, so this Government is doing little to reduce the education crisis referred to by the previous Minister of Education. The Treasurer continues in his statement by saying:

Secondly, the rapidly-expanding call on our hospital facilities and the increasing cost of operating those facilities makes forward planning of staffing and associated needs imperative. The Government's present planning in this area will now be incorporated in a co-operative exercise with the Commonwealth in proposed forward Budget plans as part of the new Medibank arrangements for hospital financing.

In this area the Government will feel the crunch, because it is in this area and in community welfare that the greatest costs will be involved in future. The number of students in our schools will remain static, but the population will grow older. Medical science can solve many health problems, so there will be greater pressure on Government because there will be more older people.

I turn now to the Auditor-General's Report for 1976 and some of the effects of the present Budget. The Hospitals Department is doing a good job. It is one area that must be watched continuously, but we can see some benefits from Medibank, and we must recognise that. On page 139 of the report, we see a comparison of receipts on Consolidated Revenue. As at June, 1975, total patients' fees outstanding amounted to a little more than \$7 700 000, but at the end of June, 1976, the amount outstanding was a little more than \$5 000 000. Obviously, there has been some benefit from Medibank. The report states:

Vehicular accident fees outstanding—Fees outstanding as at June 30, 1976, were \$3 113 000. In the past, long delays have occurred in the payment of vehicular accident accounts because of the time taken in establishing legal liability. The department has now finalised an agreement with the State Government Insurance Commission dealing with the payment of vehicular accident hospital claims to be operative from July 1, 1976.

It will be interesting to see how the State Government Insurance Commission can speed up those payments. Its reserves and profitability will be affected. This has been an area of great concern to all hospitals, whether Government or semi-government owned.

When one looks at a Budget of \$1 171 000 000, one worries about the competence of the Ministers and of the Government to handle the finances of the various departments. Some interesting figures appear on page 138 of the Auditor-General's Report in relation to hospital supplies and services. Workmen's compensation insurance premiums in 1975 amounted to \$526 000, and in 1976 to \$958 000, an increase of \$432 000.

Mr. Evans: Nearly 100 per cent.

Mr. BECKER: Yes; telephone costs amounted to \$475 000 in 1975 and \$606 000 in 1976, while transport costs increased from \$551 000 in 1975 to \$885 000 in 1976, and community services payments increased from \$324 000 in 1975 to \$1 189 000 in 1976, an increase of \$865 000. The report states that part of the increase in transport costs was due to the charging to the department for the first time of the cost of transport concessions to pensioner patients. The estimated cost of these concessions was \$166 000. The report then deals with food costs, and states:

An investigation was made into the procedures and controls over foodstuffs with particular reference to the Northfield Wards. The examination disclosed that internal control was weak or non-existent, budgeting poor, reporting ineffective and the records inadequate. A reply has not been received to the report.

I wonder why the Auditor-General goes to all the trouble to check these departments and make reports when nothing further is heard about whether the problems are overcome. The report, in dealing with drug costs, states:

I forwarded a report to the department in January, 1976, on costs of drug purchases, drug manufacturing and drug breakdown. The department agreed to carry out an in-depth study of pharmaceutical costs to ensure controls were adequate and costs for the various hospitals were reasonable and to advise if the extent of breaking down and manufacture of drugs should be extended or curtailed. The departmental study has not yet been completed.

Dealing with telephone costs, the report states:

An examination of telephone costs showed that over half the costs related to rentals. There were large comparative variations between hospitals in the number of official phones rented and the rentals for private telephones paid by the department. A report on these matters was forwarded to the department in May.

Still we have seen no action and no advice of what is happening. This is taxpayers' money, and as taxpayers we are entitled to know what has happened. We would like to see value in our hospitals, because that is so important. On page 140, under the heading "Internal audit", the report states:

Internal auditing provides an independent appraisal of management operation within an organisation. It evaluates the effectiveness of control, extent of compliance with policies and procedures and enables remedial action to be taken where necessary. The lack of effective internal audit was commented upon in my 1975 report. Further weaknesses in control raised during the year emphasised the need for the early establishment of an effective internal audit group.

That is the Auditor-General's comment. Why should he have to come back 12 months later and still comment on that issue? Either the Government takes little notice of the Auditor-General's Report, or the officers concerned (or someone else) do not really care how the taxpayers' money is spent. As the representative of about 19 000 taxpayers, I can assure you, Sir, that we are concerned and that we demand a fair go with the money taken from us and spent willy-nilly. Obviously, some Government departments could not care less how the money is spent, and it is time something was done about it. Turning to page 185 of the Auditor-General's Report, dealing now with the Marine and Harbors Department, under the heading "Budgeting procedures", the report states:

Further to previous comment regarding improvements considered necessary in budgetary control and responsibility accounting in the Glanville workshop, the department has now advised that this matter has been deferred on account of other work of higher priority.

Quite frankly, if the Minister of Works was employed in private enterprise he would be sacked. When an auditor says that he is not satisfied with the handling of the accounts—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You worked in private enterprise?

Mr. BECKER: Yes, and I would not hesitate to sack a man who did not take any notice of what I requested. Here we are handling taxpayer's money. This is typical of the Marine and Harbors Department. Turning to page 186—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You will put us all to sleep.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BECKER: I will not put the Minister to sleep. The Education Department last year was subject probably to one of the most intensive audits—

Mr. Langley: What did your Government do when you were in office?

Mr. BECKER: I was only a boy then. The Minister who is interjecting has nothing to be proud of in the handling of the finances of his former department. I do not know how he supervised it, but I feel sorry for the present Minister of Education. On page 186, the report deals with the Boating Branch, and states:

The provisions for the licensing of operators applied from June 1, 1976, and at June 30, 20 697 operators had been licensed. This figure included 70 special permits issued to children aged between 12 and 16 years.

A summary of receipts and payments for the year is given. I thought the licensing of boats was not to have been a rip-off. The balance in the deposit account at June, 1975, was \$36 904. Receipts for registration fees, licence fees, and sundry receipts totalled \$152 000, giving a total of \$189 000. Details of payments were shown. Printing, stationery and postage cost about \$20 000, computer services \$8 000, office furniture and equipment \$3 000, repairs to boats and trailers \$3 000, and the total payments were \$141 000, leaving a balance of a little less than \$48 000. About 20 000 operators have been licensed, although about 60 000 boats must be licensed. We have had extensions of time, warnings, probationary periods, and so on. Here is the greatest rip-off of all time, because it is getting nowhere at all.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What were you talking about?

Mr. BECKER: The competence of Ministers to supervise the operations of their departments. The Minister of Works should be severely rapped over the knuckles by Cabinet for not seeing that his departmental officers carried out the requests of the Auditor-General. We know his attitude, because he got most upset when it was found that \$300 000-odd was being spent on rental for accommodation that was not being used.

It is interesting to note from page 292 of the Auditor-General's Report that the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission has so far cost \$10 402. The member for Unley should appreciate that sum having been spent to enable him to keep his boundaries intact. The Electricity Trust is one of the disappointments of the financial year, its profit having been only \$248 000. The statutory contribution to State revenue was \$5 800 000; that is the Government's share of the trust's income. Because the Government has taken \$5 800 000 from the trust, the taxpayers of this State who consume electricity will have to pay 12½ per cent more for that commodity in future. The Government is unfair, as it takes half the profits from the Savings Bank of South Australia.

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

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Henley Beach): I should like to say a few words in support of this Budget, which is the best one that has been introduced since I have been a member of this place. It may be for that reason that Opposition members who have spoken on it have been so desperate to try to find some criticism of it. The member for Hanson, who has just resumed his seat, spent much of his time going through the Auditor-General's Report and picking out minor matters. If that is the only form of criticism that can be levelled against this Budget, it shows how good it is. In support of my statement that this is the best Budget that has been delivered

since I have been a member, I remind members that it provides for no new increases in State taxation or charges.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Members may laugh, but I shall be interested to see whether they can point to anything of this nature in the Budget. We will end the financial year with a balanced Budget.

Dr. TONKIN: On a point of order, I thought the evening performance did not begin until 7.30.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Leader of the Opposition must be getting agitated if he has to make a point of order of that nature. However, I cannot blame him for wanting to interrupt me. Not only are there no new increases in State taxation or charges in the Budget but also we will end the financial year with a balanced Budget, at the same time providing substantially increased payments for a large section of the community. I can therefore understand the difficulty being experienced by members opposite, who have had much difficulty trying to criticise the Budget. The best they have been able to say in this debate or outside this Chamber has been, "We agree with what has been done in the Budget, but we would have gone a little further." When the Opposition, which has no real responsibilities in Government, is limited to criticism of that type, it is a credit to the Treasurer.

I now refer to a report headed "Dunstan Presents an Election Budget" in the September 8 issue of the *Australian* newspaper. I do not know what led the writer to suggest that this was an election Budget. I can only say that, as the Government has two full years to run, there is no reason for the Treasurer now to be introducing an election Budget. I am sure that I speak for all my colleagues when I say that, if there was an election between the presentation of this Budget and the presentation of the next Budget, I would be proud and happy to fight it on this Budget.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Members opposite, who are so busy fighting amongst themselves for pre-selection and in other activities, must shudder to think that the writer of this report may have been correct in his assumption. That writer reports the Budget in the following way:

The South Australian Premier, Mr. Dunstan, yesterday brought down a pre-election Budget reducing a range of taxes and largely defusing Opposition claims of unfair impositions on the public. The Premier, who is also State Treasurer, predicted a balanced Budget of \$1 171 000 000, a record, with no increases in taxes and lower stamp duties on land, housing and small business transactions. He also announced pay-roll tax relief and confirmed fore-shadowed concessions in land tax, and succession duties.

Budget confirmation of an end to rural land tax and lower rates for large metropolitan properties substantially undermined the Opposition's exploitation of hardship cases. The pay-roll tax concessions, lifting the exemption figure to \$48 000, and removal of death duty on estates passing to spouses, also counter recent Opposition criticism.

They are not my words but those of an independent press reporter. Members opposite laugh. I can only assume that they think the writer of that report which appeared in the *Australian* is not independent but is an active supporter of the Government.

Mr. Evans: Who was he?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Mr. Eric Cummins, the person who wrote that report. However, I must say that I agree with what he has said.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Without knowing this gentleman, I can say that he has made the point that this Budget is a good one. He said it was an election Budget.

Dr. Tonkin: You said it wasn't.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I did not. I said that, were it to be an election Budget, I would be proud to go to an election with such an excellent Budget behind me.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Even Fraser thinks it's an excellent Budget.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes. He has made the point that the State Government has taken steps that are in the best interests of the community. I sympathise with members opposite, because they undoubtedly are being faced by constituents who are saying that, despite all the Commonwealth Government's stringencies and reductions in almost every field, the Dunstan Government seems to be able to arrange its affairs and balance its Budget in a way that does it credit. Accordingly, having had this response (I know that I have certainly had it from Liberal voters in my district, so I assume the same applies to Opposition members), Opposition members must be concerned. I sympathise with them for the difficulties they have had in trying to criticise the Budget.

I repeat now some of the highlights that have been included in the Budget. I refer to remissions on succession duties; the indexation of pay-roll taxes to ensure that small and medium-size businesses will not be hit by rising wage levels; further pay-roll tax concessions as incentives to industries wishing to set up or expand in South Australia; stamp duty on property purchased to be eased at a cost of more than \$3 000 000; the appropriation of \$11 500 000 for drought relief; the provision of \$12 000 000 for the development and exploration of the Cooper Basin gasfields; and a \$15 000 000 allocation to ensure the maintenance of South Australian construction programmes, a programme that has enabled the Government to ensure that construction work in this State in relation to hospitals, schools, community welfare facilities and other public works will be included.

More than \$23 000 000 has been set aside for highways work, which is an increase of \$11 000 000. The sum of \$243 500 000 has been allocated to secondary and primary schools, a rise of \$16 800 000 on last year's figure. Further education is to receive \$29 500 000, an increase of \$4 100 000; independent schools are to receive \$6 300 000; hospitals \$173 000 000, public health \$7 900 000; and community welfare \$22 600 000. These are clear examples not only of the Treasurer's balancing the Budget but also of providing additional funds for facilities for the community and to help the building industry to continue work that does not seem to be available in other States. In reply to the only criticism I could find of the Budget, a matter concerning the special allocation of \$12 000 000 to augment development exploration in the Cooper Basin gasfield, I remind Opposition members that the Treasurer stated:

The South Australian Government's main concern is the level of exploration which needs to be undertaken in order to assess the extent of the reserves and to permit planning of their future use.

Any Government that did not concern itself with the issues to which the Treasurer has referred would not be undertaking its fair responsibilities. The sum of \$9 500 000 will finance repayment to the Commonwealth Government for

the money it has paid to assist this project, and \$2 500 000 will provide money for exploration. The Treasurer also stated:

Further significant allocations of funds will be required from time to time for exploration and development, and information concerning this will be put before Parliament, of course.

Are Opposition members saying that the Government is doing a dreadful thing in trying to develop the Cooper Basin to its fullest extent?

Dr. Tonkin: It's taking it from Revenue Account.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Opposition members should recognise that, unless the resources of this field are fully developed, the tremendous advantages to the State may be delayed or lost. Opposition members criticise the Government for not going far enough in some respects but, obviously, if they were in Government and forced to make decisions they would be reluctant to do so. It is easy for Opposition members to say what additional taxes should be imposed or what public works should be abandoned in order to provide additional concessions that they say the Government should make. Are they saying that, if they were in Government, they would not provide additional funds for the Cooper Basin? If that is so, the public should know the attitude of the Opposition and that it would deprive this field of funds so that they could be used in other areas. Opposition members should outline their attitude in this matter, especially in relation to the development of our natural gas resources.

The Treasurer deserves much credit because he has been able to provide a balanced Budget with the tremendous disadvantage of having a Federal Liberal Government in power. I do not think that Opposition members will deny that the Federal Government's policy in relation to the economic difficulties facing Australia has been made clear. It is supported by them at every chance, but the Federal Government has stated that it will reduce public sector spending and that the slack will be taken up by the private sector, thus resulting in a serious increase in the number of unemployed persons.

Dr. Tonkin: I can't understand what you are saying.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am quoting what the Prime Minister said in relation to the Federal Government's method of improving the economic situation in this country. However, the private sector has not taken up the slack, and unemployment figures are increasing month by month.

Mr. Gunn: Caused by the Whitlam Government, the worst band of villains one could find.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: If that were true, before the recent Federal election the present Prime Minister had said that, if he were elected, he would correct the failures of the Whitlam Government, but the Liberals have not been able to do anything, because its policies are wrong. Its strange policy is having a dramatic effect on our finances, but despite this situation the Treasurer has been able to provide a balanced Budget. If Opposition members deny what I am saying, I wish they had the courage shown by some of their Canberra colleagues. A report in the *Sydney Morning Herald* a week ago, under the heading "Government resists pressure on jobs", states:

The Federal Government stood firm today against back-bench pressure to do more to relieve unemployment, particularly among young people. Ministers made it clear at the weekly meeting of the coalition Parties that "band-aid" proposals would not be adopted.

Why cannot Opposition members, instead of knocking the State, join their Federal colleagues and ask Fraser to do something about the situation? As they do not have the

numbers, the Commonwealth Liberal back-benchers would need the good offices of Opposition members. The report continues:

The veteran N.S.W. Liberal M.P., Mr. W. C. Wentworth—
Mr. Becker: Dear old Bill!

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member may not agree with him, but in this case he is correct. The report continues:

The most vocal critic of the Government's economic policies, took his fight into the Party room today. He proposed an emergency scheme to provide some jobs for the more than 100 000 young people who will be looking for their first job at the end of this year. They would be given work on approved projects—normally those of benefit to the general community—and be paid \$2.50 to \$4 a day, as well as unemployment benefits, he proposed. After the meeting, Mr. Wentworth said he was not putting forward the scheme as anything more than a stop-gap measure to deal with the emergency which would face the Government on unemployment by the end of the year.

However, some senior Liberals backed Mr. Wentworth, including the former Housing Minister, Mr. K. Cairns. Mr. Wentworth's supporters said there were signs of a growing feeling among back-benchers that more measures should be taken. The debate developed into a 45-minute discussion on unemployment and "dole bludging".

Liberal Party back-benchers in Canberra are concerned about the 100 000 young people who will be unemployed by the end of this year in addition to the many hundreds of thousands who are already unemployed, but all they can do is discuss dole bludging. Opposition members here should join the majority opinion of their Federal colleagues.

I am concerned at two cuts made by the Federal Government. I enjoyed the job and received much satisfaction as the Minister for the Environment and for Recreation and Sport. I have been saddened that the Commonwealth Government has reduced activities in those areas to virtually nothing. So, not only is the community suffering financially in almost every way under the Federal Government's policies but also many important community activities are affected; for example, the development of our national estate, the development of our sporting and recreational activities, the cuts in the Land Commission's activities, and the cuts in housing finance. The fact that this State has been able to weather the storm is a credit to the Treasurer and the Government. I hope that this State, despite what happens federally, can continue with the sort of excellent Budget that we are now debating.

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): What can one say to someone who makes so many specious claims? Two or three examples immediately spring to mind; for example, the claim that \$11 500 000 is being made available for drought relief, of which \$10 000 000 is coming from the Commonwealth Government, and the recent claim that very little was being allocated to sport. We have had a letter from the Federal Minister for the Environment, Housing and Community Affairs claiming that the *Advertiser* report was incorrect and that \$11 000 000 will be made available for sport. The Minister's letter can be tabled if necessary. Another claim is that the Cooper Basin had been sabotaged by the present Federal Government, when it was the Whitlam Labor Government that scotched all mining programmes throughout Australia.

This Budget seems to be a long-term, deliberate attempt to belittle the whole of the Federal Government's policies when, in fact, there are few shortcomings so far in the Federal Government's policies since that Government came to power last December. The Federal Labor Government forced Australia and particularly South Australia to plan for a 20 per cent inflation rate, which was a gloomy

prospect indeed in last year's State Budget. But what happened? The Federal Liberal Government's plan to reduce inflation resulted in a \$42 000 000 credit in wages in South Australia alone. If that did not go a long way in solving our problems last year, I need a great deal explained to me. The Federal Liberal Government has also given an additional \$50 000 000 above last year's formula to the State Government. That is a substantial increase that is well worth placing on the credit side in relation to the Federal Liberal Government. The Federal Liberal Government's plan for tax sharing has proved favourable in all aspects, when considered as an overall package deal. There is little need for the State Government to belittle anything that the Commonwealth Government has done so far.

Let us examine the surpluses that arose last year as a result of the Federal Liberal Government's controlling inflation. We had a belated declaration that we had \$50 000 000 to spare: \$20 000 000 went to metropolitan buses, \$20 000 000 to housing development, and \$10 000 000 to assist the unemployment situation. This should be done by proper methods—by sponsoring new industries. We still fall short of the Victorian Government's concessions to decentralised industries. I say this every time I talk about the economic situation. It is patently clear that country-based decentralised industry in South Australia stands a cat in hell's chance of being promoted, because we still do not have a sufficient industrial base in Adelaide.

I noticed with pleasure today that \$160 000 had been made available belatedly to the Premier's Department to attract overseas industries to South Australia. Further, I notice that \$160 000 is already included in this Financial Statement; it was mentioned as part of a general decentralisation incentive to industry. I should be pleased to learn whether the two sums of \$160 000 are the same amount, which is being made to do two jobs expediently. It makes one's dollar go twice as far. Repeatedly, last year's bills are being paid this year, and it looks as though new work is taking place.

The Government was further enabled by the surpluses of last year to declare that from the Loan Estimates the surplus of \$27 600 000, a massive amount should be held to cushion the adverse effects if new funds are not available in 1976-77. Well, they are available, from what we have seen of the State Government's Budget and the Federal Government's Budget. What a delightful pre-election nest egg that is for those vote-winning promises, not for cushioning but rather for padding if and when an election should come along. It stands out a mile. Everyone can see that. Even the dogs are barking it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I challenge the honourable member to ensure that there is no padding in his Leader's policy speech when he makes it.

Mr. ALLISON: The Deputy Premier and the Minister of Transport, in spite of the rather gentle Federal Budget that was introduced, much to their surprise, declared on the morning following its introduction that extra road charges would have to be imposed on South Australians and that water charges would have to be increased. That statement had obviously been prepared before the Commonwealth Budget was introduced. It was announced that South Australians would have to pay an additional \$13 000 000 in road taxes, an additional 25 per cent on private vehicles, an additional 30 per cent on commercial vehicles, and an additional 20 per cent on licence fees. Such increases are way ahead of the inflation rate.

The Treasurer's total concessions in connection with land tax and stamp duties amount to \$5 700 000, and rather

naively I have offset that against the additional \$6 000 000 collected last year in revenue that was not expected. It is really paying back to Peter what he had already paid in taxes last year, but that has not been mentioned. The pay-roll tax remissions are a belated attempt to keep pace with indexation. Everyone else is being asked to keep pace with indexation. More than \$17 000 000 of additional income will come to the State as a result of the pay-roll tax deductions for this year. Further, there will be a \$7 000 000 increase in water rates, and the levy on the Electricity Trust of South Australia has been increased by another \$1 000 000. So much for the statement of the member for Henley Beach that there are no increases in this Budget! In every single line, wherever the State Government is responsible for collecting taxes, there is an increase, almost without exception.

Housing Trust rents were increased recently, although I am not complaining about that. Hospital receipts are up by \$25 000 000. The Treasurer was gracious enough to admit that the Medibank agreement had left South Australia in a more favourable position than he had expected. In almost every field covered by State taxation, there is an increase in the sum coming in this year, and sometimes it is substantial. Last year, I said that we should mark time for about 12 months to help reduce inflation. The Treasurer has not been satisfied with that, because State revenues have increased, even though wages and other things are indexed. The State Government is still covering itself for a \$43 000 000 increase in wages (based on the same rate of inflation as we experienced last year) and another \$11 000 000 in possible increased charges, despite the fact that, in the Education Department alone, any salary increases granted as a result of indexation have invariably been paid months after the making of the award. Therefore, in that area the Government has a regular nest egg stored away.

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

Mr. ALLISON: To give some idea of the sum involved, I point out that over 39 per cent of the total Budget allocation is to the Education Department, or over \$300 000 000, so that any salary increase is substantial. To retain that amount in the Treasury for several months gives the Government a considerable advantage in funds to play with before the next Budget.

Dr. Eastick: I thought it did that only with accounts.

Mr. ALLISON: I think that this is the form of accounting about which the honourable member has complained many times, namely, the fact that the Education Department pays so many of its accounts tardily. I am inclined to agree with him, having received several complaints in my district about departmental accounts not being paid in time.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Have you seen enough of the Treasurer in Mount Gambier lately?

Mr. ALLISON: We have seen more than enough; we are thinking of providing a Government flat in the South-East as a result of the 40 Ministerial visits in about 50 weeks. This has involved quite a sum in accommodation payments.

Dr. Tonkin: Is there a residential Ministerial staff?

Mr. ALLISON: Probably, but on an unofficial basis. It is a pleasure to see people down there; I regard it as a personal compliment and I hope that they keep it up. Despite the \$300 000 000 Education bill, our library service, which was said only this week to be the worst in Australia, still qualifies for only \$4 460 000. Although I am inclined

to agree with the State Government that the Commonwealth Government has also been remiss in not providing more funds, we should be looking after our own State better in the way of library provisions. I hope that some radical change will be made during the next few months in that direction.

We are finding that people from universities down to employers and parents are increasingly asking for Governments to make the Education Department more accountable rather than less accountable, because we seem to have discontinued so many examinations or yardsticks by which we can assess the way in which our children are being educated. People are saying that, if such vast sums are spent on education, the department should be thoroughly accountable and we should see that we get the utmost value from the amount of money spent. Many of the teachers with whom I have spoken over the past few months have said that they would like to see less gimmickry and more attention paid to the calibre of staffing, and here again I am inclined to agree with them.

In my opening remarks, I said that the Government had made the Budget a political document, with incessant criticism of the Federal Government. The Treasurer says that he fears three factors, one of which is that the Medibank levy may not provide sufficient funding to the States. I can hardly see where his fears lie, because we must consider that the total Medibank bill will be about \$11 billion, which will be paid for out of taxes. These taxes will not be deductible at the end of next year when we pay tax and, therefore, a considerable proportion of the \$11 billion dollars will revert to the States as their share of income tax. Therefore, I can see the States accruing far greater sums of money as a result of that measure rather than losing money, as the Treasurer seems to foreshadow.

The second factor is the Commonwealth Government's refusal to provide the States with an assurance beyond June 30, 1980, that funds under the tax-sharing agreement will be at least as great as those that would have resulted from the continuation of the formula. I cannot see that worrying beyond 1980 will serve any great purpose. Any Government can worry any year about a possible change in the formula in the following year or two, because present indications are that inflation will continue, but at a diminishing level, and State taxation will steadily accrue. If there is any change in the formula, I cannot see the mainland States or Tasmania agreeing to accept any great reduction in the amount of money they currently receive; it is just not on, whichever Government is in power. It does not generally happen that the States receive a reduction in the previous year's allocation. The Treasurer is taking a far from realistic point of view.

The third factor is that child endowment, which the Federal Government pays, comes out of that Government's share of taxation. The States, on the other hand, will again receive benefit, because the children in a family will no longer be tax deductible. This will mean that more money from income tax will progress through the Federal coffers and be disbursed once again as the States' share of the income tax redistribution. The three fears the Treasurer expresses in his Financial Statement would seem to be easily rebutted, because simple calculations seem to indicate that we will receive a far greater share of revenue as the State's share in tax disbursement. I cannot see that there is any point to be made, other than the purely political one of forecasting economic destruction and political gloom as long as the Federal Liberal Government is in power. That seems to have been the pattern of this Labor

Government's attack during the past few months since the Liberal Party's accession to power in Canberra. This will not wash, because the figures speak for themselves.

The Treasurer also states that the concept of formally introducing a capital works Budget five years ago on a rolling programme has assisted in cushioning the adverse impact of recent economic decisions taken by the Commonwealth Government. Once again, I ask what adverse impact is referred to. We have all seen from the few statistics that I have produced this evening that we are generally better off as a general package deal from the Commonwealth Government. I agree with the Treasurer's remarks that there is an urgent need to replan the education system, to review the aims of education and, furthermore, to co-operate with the Federal Government's recent announcement made by Senator Carrick that all States should co-operate with the Federal Government in revising the education programme. I know that the State Minister resented, probably correctly, the inference that the States would have to co-operate, but I think that common sense dictates that we should do that. Even if we think that South Australia has the best education system in Australia, it will not do us any harm to collaborate with the Commonwealth Government to ensure that all in all we have an exchange and some similarity of approach to education in Australia, particularly with regard to the recognition of tertiary and secondary qualifications, degrees and diplomas, where there seems to be much dissent and confusion. This is only one aspect.

The Treasurer uses a political ploy by saying that, in looking at the major financial factors that influenced the 1966-67 Revenue Budget, the most important is the financial policy of the Commonwealth Government and the ill effects flowing from that policy. In cruder terms, one can only say that there is a considerable degree of "bull" in that statement, because the State has so far profited considerably from the Federal Government's fiscal policies and the way in which it has managed to control inflation. An inference can also be drawn from the Treasurer's statement regarding the acute lack of funds from the Federal Government to be used on welfare housing. By "welfare housing" I assume that any young people who are getting married and looking for a house would have to be looking for private flats or welfare-type housing to be included. I did some research and asked the Minister only last week a relevant question about Mount Gambier. If one combines these statistics with the State figures on housing, it is patently obvious that the State Government in this instance cannot blame the Fraser Government.

The figures speak for themselves. From the Bureau of Statistics figures from 1938 to 1975 I have extracted the more important period when houses were in great demand, in the 1950 to 1976 period, and it is interesting to note that from 1950 to 1968, which saw predominantly Liberal Governments in office (but with also at least one Labor Government, the Walsh Government) the average throughout that period, including the Walsh regime, was 3 200 houses a year completed for the Housing Trust. It is equally significant that in the period since then, and in particular from 1970 to 1974, the average number of houses completed dropped to less than half; it became 1 515 houses a year at a time when housing was acutely in demand. Since Malcolm Fraser was not in power but Whitlam was, and we had the Dunstan Government in South Australia, only one inference can be drawn—that housing in South Australia, and possibly throughout the whole of Australia, was grossly neglected, and particularly within the Housing Trust.

The recent allocation of \$20 000 000 from the surplus accruing from last year's Budget was a cosmetic approach; it was an attempt to reduce the deficit over the previous three years, and it was long overdue. It is not fair for the Treasurer to say it is a move to counter the present lack of funds from the Fraser Government, because the damage had already been done during the preceding four or five years. For example, I received a reply from the Minister that, in Mount Gambier, only 50 houses were completed in 1970-71, 23 in 1971-72, 42 in 1972-73, increasing to 56, 60, 99, and 126 for the last four years. So there is a steady increase. But more depressing is the fact that the waiting list in Mount Gambier is typical of that in the rest of the State. In spite of the now increasing number of contracts being let, there is still a terrible backlog to be dealt with, and currently applications are being dealt with for the last 2½ years in arrears. The State average is about three years, so we may not be quite so badly off as are some other areas.

Another significant figure is that only 15 purchase applications are extant in Mount Gambier currently, and I put this down to the fact that at \$30 000 a Housing Trust purchase house can no longer be regarded as cheap accommodation. Young couples are unable to afford first and second mortgages and a substantial deposit, so they are having to look for rental accommodation, either trust or private. That cannot be laid on the Fraser Government's doorstep; we are currently trying to cope with a five-year cumulative deficit.

The Treasurer also refers to \$160 000 provided as a range of incentives to industries wishing to establish or expand their operations in South Australia. I took that to be some counter to Victorian incentives to decentralise, but the statement on the radio today, as I said earlier, probably referred to the same \$160 000, the sum being used by the Premier's Department to try to attract overseas companies to South Australia. We could do with two lots of \$160 000 at least; and that sum would not go very far towards attracting city-based companies into the State.

The pay-roll tax reductions, which have been referred to as concessions, are rather belated. They are only meeting indexation, and many industrialists in the South-East have pointed out to me that the pay-roll tax deductions are still really a great penalty on any company that wishes to expand its industry to employ more people. That really is the acid test: are we to expect people to employ more staff at this critical period of unemployment when, as soon as they employ more people, they are up for many additional charges, not the least of which is pay-roll tax, plus a host of extra provisions which have gradually been applied to workers during the last 18 months and for which the unions have fought? This situation is gradually putting the unions in a position where they can no longer bargain effectively. I know that many unionists in the Mount Gambier District fully appreciate this. They are a reasonable group of people who were strong-armed into the Medibank strike. The statement by the Treasurer that the pay-roll tax remissions were expected to cost about \$1 000 000 in a full year is a drop in the ocean when we consider that several million dollars in additional funds will be raised through pay-roll tax in the coming year, so the concession is minor when assessed against the whole pay-roll tax income that the State receives.

I now mention the Eight Mile Creek drainage scheme. The drainage rates appear once again in this Budget, and there appears to be some vast anomaly in the way that rates are charged in the South-East of South Australia. I

am assured that the overall cost for the South-East is 17c a hectare for drainage but that that rates paid by the Eight Mile Creek settlers are \$7 a hectare. That means that they are paying about \$6.83 more a hectare than any other people in the South-East for draining their small areas of land. That does not seem to be fair. I hope that the recent Bill that was passed to alter the Eight Mile Creek drainage legislation is merely an interim move and that soon there will be even stronger moves to abolish this tax altogether. I have a petition at the moment asking the Minister to do that; I shall be presenting it to him shortly. It is hardly fair for one section of the community to be discriminated against so extremely, as the Eight Mile Creek settlers have been.

Mr. Whitten: I don't think that's quite the full story.

Mr. ALLISON: It is the full story as far as I am concerned. I have met these people, I have inspected the land, and I live down there. That was the first place where I settled when I came to South Australia. The position of soldier settlers in the area is a lengthy subject, but I think I am fairly *au fait* with that.

I am not a professed racing follower, although I do enjoy an occasional flutter. The South-East racing community has persistently brought to my attention during the past eight or nine months (and I have brought it to the attention of the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport and the Deputy Premier) the fact that many races in the country have been in great danger of being cancelled because of the gradual reduction of Totalizator Agency Board refunds to the racing communities.

Mr. Whitten: You don't bet, do you?

Mr. ALLISON: Of course we do.

Mr. Whitten: Have you ever had a lottery ticket?

Mr. ALLISON: Yes, I take a State lottery ticket. I support the Government in its aims to keep the hospitals going. That is the fourth way in which I provide for hospitals; the other three are the various normal taxes. Let us get back to racing, and talk of hospitals and betting afterwards. The Adelaide clubs and the few provincial clubs outside Adelaide had a meagre surplus at the end of last year's turnover. The country clubs need protection urgently if they are to keep going. They provide training facilities at the tracks and on-course and off-course betting when they have a T.A.B. allocation. The Government decides how much money goes to the South Australian Jockey Club, which then allocates money as it sees fit. One thing that strikes me, in conversation with various members of the racing fraternity, is that the bookmakers do not seem to be losing in this matter. There has been a rather vicious rumour that perhaps the bookmakers' turnover tax may be increased by a nominal amount of .3 per cent. That rumour may have been put around by some Labor member who goes to the South-East frequently. I do not know where it came from, but obviously it came from the Government. The rumour was that the Minister who put the idea forward was overruled by other Ministers. It is an interesting theory.

Mr. Evans: It could be a political move.

Mr. ALLISON: It could be; I do not know. The Government is not losing, because its funds are increasing steadily, and, the people who operate the Totalizator Agency Board are not losing, because I understand that they receive about \$6.50 an hour after 8 p.m. That is probably fair enough: They are working for a living and working late into the evening. However, what about the Government, the bookmakers and the T.A.B.? They are

not losing, but, they seem to be combining to kill the goose that lays the golden egg—the racing industry itself.

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

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I have pleasure in speaking in support of the Bill. I heard the Leader of the Opposition refer to the Treasurer's explanation as an election speech. If it is not an election speech, it sounded like a policy speech. Throughout, the Treasurer was saying how grand a fellow he was and, on the other hand, was taking the opportunity to slam the Prime Minister. If one makes a serious examination of the document, one sees that the good sense and good wording put forward by Treasury officers unfortunately has been marred by the Treasurer's personal feelings.

The first thing that struck me was in the first paragraph, where the Treasurer referred to a balanced Budget. I remember only two or three years ago expounding the theory of having a balanced Budget, and I was soundly criticised by Labor members opposite, who at that time were all in favour of deficit budgeting. I was roundly criticised for saying then that we should go in for a balanced Budget. The impression given by successive Government speakers in the debate then was that the theory of a balanced Budget was complete anathema to them. Being Fabian socialists, they were full of the Keynesian theory of deficit budgeting.

However, now we are expected to approve a Bill that provides for a balanced Budget. The irony of the thing is that, when things alter, they are not quite the same. Frankly, I support the idea of a balanced Budget, because sooner or later deficits catch up with a Government and the taxpayer of South Australia has to pay one way or another. Deficit budgeting, as part of the Keynesian theory, was hammered in England by Sir Stafford Cripps and made that country a socialist welfare state, crippling the country in the process. That occurred back in the days of the Attlee Government. Mr. Whitlam certainly went in for deficit budgeting in the three years that he was in office, and we are still suffering from that policy. I will refer to that matter again later.

This evening we are dealing with a Budget in which receipts and aggregate payments are each expected to reach \$1 171 000 000, which is a large amount for a State like South Australia. For the year ended June 30, 1976, about \$43 000 000 for the possible cost of new salary and wage rates was allowed for, and about \$11 000 000 was allowed for possible increases in the year in the price of supplies and materials. These figures are important.

The Treasurer goes on to say that, in his Consolidated Revenue Account, he had a surplus of \$22 800 000 at June 30, 1975. He got a completion grant of \$2 500 000 from the Federal Grants Commission during that year, but there will be no Grants Commission completion grants in the future: they are finished. We ended 1975-76 with an effective surplus of \$25 300 000. The Revenue Budget for 1975-76 took into account a possible increase of 21 per cent in the level of average wages during that year. Those figures were provided to South Australia by the Whitlam Government during that financial year and they were used as the basis for budgeting in this State. However, what is the position this financial year? The Treasurer states:

On the figures given from the Commonwealth Treasury this year, that 21 per cent inflation rate has dropped to 16 per cent in the level of average wages.

Dr. Eastick: It looks like going below that.

Mr. CUMBE: It certainly does, because the average rate of inflation now has dropped from 20 per cent, the figure that was used commonly, to about 12.3 per cent a few weeks ago, according to the Bureau of Statistics figures. The increase in wages is a large component of inflation, and last year, on the advice of the Whitlam Government, this Government allowed a 21 per cent increase in the level of average wages, but this year it can reduce its allocation for salaries of public servants in this State and also reduce the provision for the cost of goods and services that the Government buys from 21 per cent to 16 per cent. That is a significant decrease in real money terms and a very real saving for South Australia in the expenditure that it must meet.

Earlier this year it was obvious, as the Treasurer has stated, that he expected to have a Revenue Budget surplus of about \$50 000 000. When the Supplementary Estimates were brought in, certain funds were transferred to Loan Account so we ended up with a surplus of \$27 600 000. The effect of all this, in conjunction with the spending programme of the Government on the Loan Account (which is referred to in this document and which was dealt with in a recent debate) was that the Government over-spent last year on Loan work. Apparently, the funds received from the Whitlam Government were insufficient. The Government over-spent to the extent that it completed the year with a deficit on Loan Account (that is, on capital works) of \$8 900 000. Accordingly, the Treasurer transferred \$15 000 000 from Revenue Account into Loan Account for capital purposes. He hopes that that \$8 900 000 deficit in Loan Account at June 30, 1977, the figure he expects to reach, will be recouped progressively over the two following financial years. I shall be interested to see how that programme works out. I do not think the Treasurer will be able to recoup that sum, especially judging from the way last year's programme has worked out. On the other hand, I have noticed with some interest the paucity of capital works referrals coming before the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works.

The Treasurer talked about tax sharing. This is the first Budget we have had to consider under the new policies of federalism and tax sharing. Local government in this State will receive direct increases of 75 per cent over the income of previous years. The important thing to remember, however, is that this arrangement was to take effect from July 1, 1976. It is significant, despite all the rantings of the Treasurer regarding federalism and tax sharing and his snide comments to the Federal Government, that he was forced to say that the contribution under the old system of Financial Assistance Grants would have yielded \$428 000 000 for South Australia, whereas the new tax sharing scheme has increased that sum to \$438 300 000. We are to receive about \$10 000 000 extra under the new scheme, despite the disparaging comments the Treasurer has chosen to make.

Mr. Evans: It's better with Fraser.

Mr. CUMBE: It is better with Fraser than it would have been under Whitlam or the Whitlam scheme.

Mr. Vandeppeer: Did Whitlam have a scheme?

Mr. CUMBE: He had too many schemes, some foreign and some alien. South Australia is to receive more money under the new scheme than it would have received under Whitlam or under Fraser with the old scheme. The Treasurer has been forced to announce this, and it is the figure on which the Budget papers are constructed.

Mr. Evans: Are you saying the South Australian Treasurer claims he is better off?

Mr. CUMBE: The South Australian Treasurer is better off now.

Dr. Eastick: He can make his own decisions. They are not made for him elsewhere.

Mr. CUMBE: That is right. The only speaker in this debate from the Government side in support of the Treasurer was the member for Henley Beach.

Mr. Evans: He thought he was back on the front bench.

Mr. CUMBE: For a moment he had a lapse of memory and thought he was on the front bench. I wish he were. It was the best speech he had made for a long time; he has made some bad ones. I do not think he is naive, but he did say the Budget contained no increases. He said, "What a delightful Budget I am able to support, with no increases whatsoever." The very next line, however, refers to an increase in wharf charges. Also there is to be a 25 per cent increase in private motor vehicle registration and a 30 per cent increase in registration for commercial vehicles, to take effect from August 1. Drivers' licence fees are also to increase. The income on these lines is to increase from \$32 000 000 to \$45 000 000. The member for Henley Beach was suffering mental aberration; he was carried away with euphoria.

He did not have too much to say about health. Health and hospitals take some wading through. Some departments are under different Ministers, and a different accounting system is involved. Under the Medibank arrangement, this State is much better off than it was last year. I think the Treasurer had his tongue in his cheek, because he had to admit that, through subsidies, he was getting more from the Commonwealth, although he did not like to spell it out. I turn now to the Estimates of Revenue, because this is the only time we are permitted to discuss them. The first page contains what I call the balance sheet of the State, and the next page deals with the revenue to be derived. At first glance, one would think taxation had been reduced, but when one looks further one sees that it has been put mainly into the items dealing with public works and services and other receipts. That sum has increased from \$349 000 000 last year to \$419 000 000 this year, yet the Budget does not provide for any increases in taxes, so we are told; it is simply an increase of 19.2 per cent!

Mr. Evans: Only according to the member for Henley Beach.

Mr. CUMBE: The member for Henley Beach had a shot at the Fraser Government, but he did not say anything about the sum of this document showing the amount that comes from the Commonwealth—

Members interjecting:

Mr. CUMBE: I shall recite the figures produced by Treasury officers and the Treasurer. They show that contributions from the Commonwealth this year, quite apart from the figures for public works and services and other receipts, have risen from \$388 000 000 to \$478 000 000, an increase of 13.3 per cent. I did not hear any Government member say anything about that. On page 7, we find the figures for waterworks and sewers. Here again, the member for Henley Beach forgot to mention increases in water charges. A 15 per cent increase occurred in water rates, and the price of water has increased by 2c a kilolitre.

Mr. Langley: They still run at a loss, and you know it.

Mr. CUMBE: The honourable member cannot have it both ways. His colleagues said there had been no

increase. In fact, there was an increase of 15 per cent, and they were the figures of the Minister of Works.

Mr. Langley: Was there a loss when you were Minister?

Mr. COUMBE: I was criticised when I raised water charges, but I did not raise them to this extent. It is my turn now. The figures show that last year the estimate was \$60 500 000. This year the figure has risen to \$68 800 000. It is coming from the taxpayers, of course. The Electricity Trust levy will be increased from \$5 800 000 to \$6 700 000. The great increase in the levy from the people's bank, the Savings Bank of South Australia, is from \$360 000 last year to \$1 200 000 this year. That is what this Government is doing. We did not hear this mentioned in the laudatory comments of the member for Henley Beach. I invite honourable members to look at page 12 of the document, where we see figures relating to Commonwealth grants. They have increased from an estimated income of \$80 000 000 last year to \$110 000 000 this year. About 90 per cent of these are Commonwealth grants, and they have shown a considerable increase. The Commonwealth Government's share of net operating costs of hospitals has increased from an estimated \$46 000 000 to \$84 000 000 this year. And so it goes on. On the next page of the statement, which relates to fees and all sorts of things, the sum has increased from just over \$3 000 000 last year to \$12 500 000 this year, including \$8 500 000 received from the Commonwealth Government for drought relief, about which comments were made earlier today.

One can go right through this document and see how certain items have been switched from department to department. The poor old Services and Supply Department has been clobbered with many items totalling \$8 000 000, in addition to other figures to which I have alluded in my previous comments. This year, Commonwealth grants to South Australia will total \$478 000 000, compared to actual receipts last year of \$388 000 000. As I have said, that represents a 19.2 per cent increase.

I now turn to the Auditor-General's Report, which should be compulsory reading for all members. I wonder how many members opposite have taken the time to read this document, which is produced by an independent Parliamentary officer. It is interesting to examine a couple of items therein. I refer, first, to page 7 of that report, which deals with certain investments that were authorised by legislation way back in 1975. I note that public moneys deposited by the Treasurer with approved dealers total \$21 500 000. That is a tidy sum to have invested on behalf of the State. I have looked in vain to see where the interest that has accrued on that investment is shown in the document. Perhaps Government members will take the time to examine the document and tell me where this figure can be found. Comments were made earlier about the Cooper Basin, which matter has been canvassed thoroughly. At least, we have got out of the deadlock into which Connor put this country, particularly this State, a couple of years ago.

Dr. Eastick: It was a real stranglehold.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, a complete stranglehold. It was Mr. Anthony who freed some of these policies and now we are getting some exploration work done on this field. With luck, we will see in next year's Budget the royalties from that field increase, particularly when Sydney is connected to that main.

Mr. Langley: Do you think someone else should own our country?

Mr. COUMBE: It was all in one man's hands before. For the honourable member to put up that shibboleth, I can only state that, had it not been for a couple of

enterprising people, including those in a South Australian-owned company, in the first place, who had sufficient enterprise to get off their tails and go up to the desert and search for and find gas, the Moomba field would not be a reality today. It is the Liberal Party that sticks up for that sort of enterprise.

Mr. Becker: Private enterprise started it.

Mr. COUMBE: That is so. I will now return to the taxation aspect, to which I referred previously. I find an interesting table in the Auditor-General's Report. We have heard much about this Government and that it does not tax the people very much at all. It is interesting to note what the Auditor-General has said. He referred to certain taxes that had increased between 1974-75 and 1975-76. These increases are staggering. The Auditor-General referred to stamp duty receipts, which increased by 42 per cent. That was done by the Labor Government which, earlier this year, was talking about having a \$50 000 000 surplus. Why does it not decrease this surplus by relieving the burden of taxation on the people? There was an 18 per cent increase in pay-roll tax, and land tax, an adjustment to which has just been announced, increased 54 per cent from one year to the next. That is incredible.

Dr. Eastick: And the Government will get as much this year.

Mr. COUMBE: Of course it will.

Mr. Langley: Has the Government spent any of that \$50 000 000 surplus?

Mr. COUMBE: Of course it has. I make the point, however, that the member for Unley, if he is the great democrat that he says he is, should be relieving the people of this burden instead of supporting a Government that increases water rates by 15 per cent. Succession duty receipts increased by 22 per cent; motor vehicle registration fees increased by 9 per cent; business franchise has increased by 30 per cent, and under the Licensing Court, publicans' licence fees increased by 39 per cent. No wonder we must pay a little more for our beer!

I then came across some interesting figures in the Auditor-General's Report relating to the South Australian Public Service. Having worked closely with some members of the Public Service, I have a high opinion of them. The Treasurer has, on some occasions when pressed, said that he will introduce a programme of tight and close house-keeping and that he will keep the Public Service growth rate down to a minimum. We all remember his saying that. But what happened? In 1974-75 there was an increase of 3 900 personnel in the South Australian Public Service. Last year, that increase rose to 4 400, so that we now have 82 800 South Australian public servants. In this respect, I am referring to full-time members of the Public Service and not to weekly-paid or daily-paid employees or contractors.

The other item to which I wish to refer is one that I have followed with much interest over recent years. It deals with the Highways Department and the acquisition of land for freeways. I remember the Minister of Transport saying a couple of years ago (and he has repeated it *ad nauseum* since) that he was not interested in freeways, the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, or any of those things, and that he would not go on with freeways. He talks about clearways and all sorts of things. I exclude from my argument the South-Eastern Freeway, which I think is special. I find that the total sum of money spent on land acquisition in the year to June 30, 1976, was a cool \$969 000. That was spent on acquiring land for freeways only.

Mr. Mathwin: That's a naughty word.

Mr. CUMBE: I am using the word "freeways", because it is the word that the Auditor-General has used. There were several credits, as the Government was able to sell land which it had thought previously it needed but which it found it did not need. The South-Eastern Freeway, which one assumes takes up a fair proportion of this sum of just under \$1 000 000, accounted for only \$112 000 of it. Therefore, all the rest went on the central North-South Freeway, and on something in which the member for Tea Tree Gully and I are interested, the Adelaide-Modbury Freeway. There was a deficit on that, as some land that had been purchased was sold for more than the purchase price. The other went on the Hills Freeway, and the rest on the Islington Freeway. There was a total net increase of expenditure on freeways, not on high speed corridors, of almost \$1 000 000; this from a Government that has stated it will not build freeways. The Auditor-General's Report is produced by an independent gentleman who may criticise Government spending without interference from anyone. We will have a balanced Budget, but the Treasurer has let his personal spleen appear in some of his spiteful comments, and that has spoilt the document. We find that the State is receiving more under the new tax-sharing scheme with the Commonwealth than it would have received from Commonwealth grants under the Whitlam Government to the extent of at least \$10 000 000 to this date in this financial year, without taking into account any further increases that may be obtained. With those comments, I have no option but to support the second reading.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I, too, support the Bill. It seems to have been accepted that, in order to appreciate and judge this Budget, it is right and necessary to appreciate and judge the Federal Budget of August 17. I pose the question: what then can one reasonably say of the Federal Budget? First, it was realistic of the Federal Treasurer to identify inflation as the major problem facing Australia. Secondly, it was a Budget that was expected since the election of the Fraser Government. Thirdly, however clear it may be that inflation was the identifiable problem, it was also clear that inflation in the eye of the Federal Treasurer could only be cut back at a considerable community cost. Having said that, it would be fair to say that it is a most moderate political statement, and far less caustic than many other people would say. Those three observations deal only with the surface.

I turn now to the underlying assumptions of the Federal Budget, in the hope that I can be equally as objective. The first assumption was that, unless real wages were cut, there could be no economic recovery: that in itself is a logical statement. Also, it was assumed that, logically, stability and confidence could only be restored if real wages were cut. That is not logical or true, and I shall demonstrate in a moderate fashion how it is a total *non sequitur*. One may say just as easily that, if productivity were increased, although real wages were increased, and if the fruits of that productivity were turned into company surpluses, the situation would produce an answer to inflation. The whole underlying assumptions of the Federal Budget were wrong, and accepted to be wrong by many learned periodicals throughout the Commonwealth, and by banking institutions and others who certainly have no vested interest in the sort of rights that I seek to protect.

Mr. Evans: Some said it was the correct measure.

Mr. McRAE: Yes, and we have to consider those views objectively in order to determine who was right and who was wrong. I turn next to the implications of that Budget,

which accepted as an underlying and unavoidable consequence that unemployment would increase: so it has, and that is undeniable. The Budget accepted that by December of this year no less than 400 000 people in Australia would be unemployed, and the figure does not include the 100 000 school-leavers. Those facts are undeniable: if so, it is reasonable for me to ask why, in the situation in which the Federal Treasurer had funds to the extent of \$900 000 000 (that is in moderate terms) or about the total of the whole Budget we are considering this evening, was the Federal Treasurer so willing to accept the situation in which 400 000 people would be unemployed by December with worse to come by February of 1977? We have heard some caustic observations about the magnitude of this State's Budget and the capabilities of those invested with the duty of controlling it, but why did the Federal Treasurer, with the funds of the magnitude of what we are considering in our total Budget, allow this situation to occur?

Given that that reserve was evident at the time, and given that the consequences were also evident, why was a decision of such magnitude made in cold blood? Furthermore, why was the possibility of redeeming the situation, at least to some extent, not catered for? Would there be any member of this House who would not shudder to think in figures of that dimension and then to think of the shipyards at Whyalla, which have apparently been left to their fate and as the wind may blow, even though there was a reserve of such magnitude? Why did it all occur? I suggest two reasons: first, the Federal Government was willing to take a tremendous gamble. The only person who stood to lose in that enormous gamble was, in corporate terms, the work force of this country. Government, the private sector, and the public sector, all alike, stood in various ways protected. The person, in corporate terms, who stood at risk and almost inevitably to lose was the work force.

Mr. Mathwin: Mr. Cameron was somewhat at risk when he said that he would resign if the number of unemployed reached 200 000, but he did not do so.

Mr. McRAE: It was the work force which stood to lose, and the time and the tide have shown that the work force will pay for that Federal Budget.

Mr. Evans: Did the Budget brought down under the Whitlam Government cause some of the problems in the first place?

Mr. McRAE: Unquestionably, mistakes were made and admitted by previous Administrations, but no reasonable person can deny that, given an option of \$900 000 000, a sum in the magnitude of the whole matter before us tonight, that decision was cold-bloodedly made. Why was it made? The Federal Government was willing to take a cold-blooded gamble in a couple of ways. First, if things went right, after using that \$900 000 000 and handing out the most generous benefits to certain producers in the country that had ever been offered, and after it had provided for the very tall poppies, particularly the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, it had placed itself in a position where, if necessary, it could introduce a mini Budget or a few cosmetic changes as time went along. Only in the last few days we have seen one of those cosmetic changes introduced by the Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations.

One of the dangerous gambles emanating from this basically dangerous gamble was this: the Federal Government saw the possibility of using its fiscal policy to run its industrial relations policy. In fact, that is exactly what it has done. Its aim was to run an economic situation in the same way as it was run by the most conservative of all Federal Liberal Governments in the days of Sir Robert Menzies, by placing pressure directly on the work force

and using that pressure as the circumstances arose to pressure the work force into submission. In running that dangerous fiscal gamble, it ran an equally dangerous industrial relations gamble. But that all pales into insignificance against the real question, which is this: it was obvious that the Federal Treasurer saw that, if inflation fell, consumer spending would automatically rise, and that is, of all things, a *non sequitur*, and has been proved to be a *non sequitur*.

As I said at the beginning, it is logical to assume that, if real wages are reduced, inflation also will be reduced, but it cannot be equally assumed that, because inflation is reduced, consumer spending will rise; it has not risen. The Federal Treasurer has been buckled at the knees at the loss of that expectation. Time and again he and his Federal Leader have begged private enterprise to come in and spend. Time and again he and his Federal Leader have begged people in the community to come in and spend, but they will not because, on the corporate scene, they want Government aid direct; they want Government subsidies direct before they will spend. The Commonwealth Government is faced with that classic dilemma of stagflation. At this moment the Federal Treasurer is again asking the private sector to come and bale him out of the difficult waters in which he has stranded himself. There can be no question about one thing that the Federal Treasurer said; that is that Australia is the most over-taxed country on this earth.

Mr. Gunn: And the Dunstan Government has helped.

Mr. McRAE: I will deal with that question. Every member knows that, compared with Western democratic countries, the only group of countries with which I am willing to make a comparison, Australians are the most over-taxed people. It is strange that a Federal Liberal Government should have been party to a Budget which continued that over-taxation because, without that over-taxation, productivity could have increased, yet we have the Federal Treasurer openly admitting to this over-taxation and hoping that it may be reduced. He does this, first, in the name of his fiscal policy and, secondly, in the name of what has been termed the new federalism.

In this House and elsewhere I have been a persistent supporter of federalism and devolution of power, against in many cases the beliefs of my own Party, because I believe in freedom above all things, and I believe that the Constitution of this country provides the possibility, at least, for an inherent balance of powers, taxation and otherwise, between the various States for the ultimate benefit of the people. So, I have strongly supported without reservation the idea of a new sort of federalism. The member for Light, who spoke this afternoon, will know that I have crossed the floor at a Constitution Convention specifically on this issue, because those are the depths of my belief. In this new federalism I find a policy which, on the face of it, is something with which I can agree but, in its implementation, something with which I do not agree; indeed, I oppose it.

What has occurred is that throughout Australia there has been a manipulation of fiscal policies (highlighted by the State Treasurer's statement) which has led to those boldly stated policies being emasculated. It amounts to this, clearly and simply: when first announced in the Liberal Party's policy, no reasonable person could read into the statement anything other than this: in the areas of State administration, there would be a full grant of money that would permit the implementation of State policies, the only check being that, in terms of priorities,

each State would have to meet its own electors, and that is reasonable. What has now been super-added is this: in areas other than State areas, the Commonwealth Government will determine the priorities. This is how it does it. At the time of Federation, it was clear that issues such as defence, foreign affairs and the like would be in the hands of the Commonwealth Government; it has been that way under different Administrations during the past 70 or 80 years. The Commonwealth has abolished its own priorities in determining the amount it spent, and so, under the Fraser Administration, an enormous amount has been allocated for defence in this year's Budget.

However, the same situation does not apply to the States, because everyone knows that matters such as education, health and welfare housing have now reached the point where the States can no longer regard those matters, even though they are within their strict constitutional prerogative, as capable of being administered by the States without Commonwealth assistance. Therefore, we have to consider this question: if it is fair enough for the Commonwealth to determine its own priorities in relation to defence and the like, then surely in testing the validity of its new policy it is fair enough to ask how much the Commonwealth Government would have spent on education, welfare housing and on other matters such as health, which are, strictly speaking, not within its direct constitutional ambit, had it been the body directly responsible to the people.

Care has been taken in the Federal Budget to ensure a cut-back in those areas on which the State has the constitutional footing, but for which the Commonwealth has the purse strings, in an endeavour to embarrass the States. Not one State is happy, although the Opposition seems to believe that only South Australia is unhappy with the new federalism.

Mr. Gunn: You can discount Mr. Wran.

Mr. McRAE: That is not so, because he said, "I'll give the Budget a go." I agree with that, because I say, "Let's give it a go; something is better than nothing." If the Opposition honestly believes that South Australia is the only State complaining, it is being foolish, because Queensland, Western Australia, Victoria—many States—have complained vehemently about certain items of this broad policy. It is a credit to our Treasurer that he has been able to introduce a Budget of the type now before us. One of the main reasons he has been able to do this is the railways transfer agreement, which has permitted an element of stability not previously existing and which is the envy of every other State.

Mr. Rodda: You'll increase the Ministry out of it.

Mr. McRAE: I know of no proposal for that. The Opposition knows from its own experience in these matters that, if it could have negotiated such a deal as that, it would have been justly proud and noised it abroad to all its constituents as having been a wonderful thing—South Australia the only State in the Commonwealth which not only wrote off a debt but also accumulated capital out of a loss and then managed to write into the same agreement now accepted by the Commonwealth as being valid, the right to manage the property it had just sold.

Mr. Venning: A shonky deal.

Mr. McRAE: It is extraordinary that the Opposition, after agreeing with everything I have said, should say "A shonky deal," because presumably it represents this State. Put simply, if the Opposition was the owner of a rundown business losing \$30 000 a year and could sell it for a capital sum and divest itself of the loss, dictating

the terms to the new owner, it would be doing well and would be proud of itself. I do not believe that even the member for Rocky River, whose conservative views are well known, is abusing the Treasurer for what he did. I think that, of all Opposition members, the member for Rocky River and perhaps the member for Glenelg are two members who would appreciate that it was a magnificent deal, and secretly applaud the Treasurer for what he did.

In the brief time I have left, I will turn to some items raised by members, namely, succession duties, land tax, stamp duty, and pay-roll tax. In every instance there has been a reduction of tax payable by the South Australian taxpayers, because of the well-run finances of the State, despite the Federal Treasurer's policies. On the whole, the result before us is a sensible and well-balanced Budget, which the Opposition is scratching to attack, and it is really a credit to the ingenuity, in particular, of the Leader, the member for Light, and the member for Torrens that they could find anything to attack in the whole deal.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: They didn't mention anything.

Mr. McRAE: They referred to some matters, and I will refer to them, too. They said that the succession duties measure was some sort of gimmick. I remind them that about this time last year I asked in the House that succession duties, which at that stage had been relieved a little, be abolished totally, and they were. Certain members suggested that this was a gimmick on the Labor Party's part, but it was not, and at least one Opposition member strongly supported the total abolition of succession duties between spouses.

Mr. Mathwin: I think you're playing politics.

Mr. McRAE: It is not playing politics, because I did it about this time last year; that was a long time ago to be playing politics; and the remark is ridiculous. If the Federal Budget had been properly managed, and if the economy was moving along a little better than it is now (and as it could be, if the Federal Treasurer's mind was not preoccupied with his vague entry into the field of industrial relations), it would be possible to reduce water and sewerage rates, Electricity Trust and council charges, because in every case people are upset by them.

I will close on the question of Medibank. People have come to my electorate office and have been enraged by the current situation caused by the Federal Treasurer. Never has such a mess of mismanagement been seen in relation to what is basically a simple problem. People have been enraged by what is going on. They come in with a mass of unintelligible documents, if they can find the documents, because I understand that at present many of the official offices are totally out of the appropriate documents. They come in saying that they do not understand the situation (nor do I), and it is so confusing and complex that the Federal Government does not understand it. It takes two days to get an answer on the phone from people who are supposed to answer one's call. When one tries to give advice, one has about 102 unknown quantities on which to base one's reply.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: If you go into the office, you have to wait for three days.

Mr. McRAE: I understand it is more than three days now. One has to make an appointment five or six days in advance, and one may be lucky. Again, the much vaunted new federalism, which I supported and still support strongly because I think it is viable if people are prepared to put their backs into it, because of the lack of co-operation and this false front between the Commonwealth and the States has been reduced to a

sham, and people are legitimately angry and ferocious about what is going on; and they will repay in due course the Government that imposed this whole fiasco on them.

I do not agree with either this or the previous Government on Medibank. If I had my way, I would make the 12 000 000 people pay for the 2 000 000 who cannot afford it, and avoid the fiasco on either side. But, given the fiasco that both sides have created, surely we can do better than this. People are angry and ferocious about it, and I do not blame them. My general comment is that this Budget is one of which the Government can be justly proud. It is not everything that the Government would have wanted to give, but in the circumstances I think it is a credit to the Treasurer, and it is also a credit to certain Opposition members that they have been able to scratch around and find some grounds for complaint.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I was interested in the remarks of the member for Playford. Having listened to the honourable member's speech, I think the people of this State, in the relatively short time that this Government has run, would have been better served if the member for Playford had been the Attorney-General instead of the present one. It is obvious he is a reasonable person, and the people would not have had to be burdened with the present Attorney-General, who holds some of the most outrageous views on things that the public is concerned about. The member for Playford's speech was probably the most intelligent we have heard from the Labor Party's back-bench members in the last two or three years, except that he spoiled it at the finish: he had to join in the abuse that has been flowing from members of the Labor Party since November 11 of last year when the Governor-General had to give the people of Australia the opportunity to choose what they wanted—total economic chaos and collapse, or a responsible Government that would tackle the problems facing the nation, democracy at its best.

This Budget caters for an expenditure of some \$1 171 000 000 of the people's money. Normally, the Budget points out the direction in which the Government of the State wishes to lead the people and what type of economic system they should believe in—whether they believe, as we on this side do, that people should spend their own money. We believe that the people know how to spend their money better than any Government does, and that was the basis of the Federal Budget. I want to discuss the effects of the Federal Budget on the agricultural industries of South Australia and Australia which are so important to the future economic development and welfare of the people of this country. In the Budget speech that Mr. Hayden made last year (and, incidentally, he was the third or fourth Treasurer that the Labor Party had; one Treasurer never even got to the stage of introducing a Budget before he was sacked: I refer to Dr. Cairns, who was too busy organising Arab money) he said:

On the economic front, inflation is this nation's most menacing enemy—except the Labor Party—

We aim to curb it. Unless this aim is achieved, the nation's productive capacity will run down and job opportunities will diminish. Our present level of unemployment is too high. If we fail to control inflation, unemployment will get worse.

Mr. Hayden made that statement at the beginning of his speech, but unfortunately the Treasurer before him did nothing. Mr. Crean created the problem by his irresponsible

policies and Mr. Hayden, unfortunately, followed. The current Treasurer, Mr. Lynch, in his Budget speech had this to say:

As we have stressed from the outset, we have made our first priority the absolute necessity of combating inflation.

I want to quote what he had to say and some of the comments from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development meeting, which he attended on behalf of the Government and the people of this country. It is interesting to examine what the discussions were on that occasion, because it is relevant to the welfare of the people of this country. Mr. Lynch said:

At this year's Ministerial Council Meeting of the O.E.C.D., which I attended for Australia, the main industrialised nations of the non-communist world agreed on an economic strategy which had as its basic premise the view that:

"... the steady economic growth needed to restore full employment and satisfy rising economic and social aspirations will not prove sustainable unless all member countries make further progress towards eradicating (and I repeat, eradicating) inflation." . . .

As the communiqué says:

"... because of the virulence of recent inflationary experience, there is a danger that inflationary expectations could revive quite strongly if the pace of the recovery is too fast."

This Budget, which Mr. Lynch delivered on behalf of the Liberal and Country Party Government, which we are fortunate to have in this country, has set Australia on the road back to steady and responsible economic growth, which will benefit the total community. Let me quote what the Government, when in Opposition, put to the Australian people:

The aims are: To restore Australia's prosperity and growth; to introduce far-reaching social reforms.

Far-reaching social reforms will not be achieved unless inflation and unemployment are controlled, and no real benefit will accrue to the less fortunate in our community unless Governments can fund those programmes; this is something that Labor members opposite always refuse to recognise—all the great assistance provided since Federation has always been provided by Liberal Governments, because they are better housekeepers, they understand how business operates, and they create the economic climate in which the community can afford to fund those necessary social aims and goals which the under-privileged deserve and are entitled to have. Labor Governments create such economic chaos that they run down the economy and create unemployment and inflation, which hurt the less fortunate in the community.

Dr. Eastick: They want to get their fingers in the till.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, and they use inflation to finance their extravagant programmes. They deliberately created inflation to destroy the middle class, and they had no real aim of getting inflation under control, because it suited their socialist objectives. If we study the history of the Allende Government in Chile, a pro-communist Government with many communists in it which had the total support of the Attorney-General, I understand (and, if the Attorney-General supports that sort of economic philosophy, heaven help the people of this country, because democracy will be destroyed, and we will have a total socialist economic system, because that is what Allende set out to do—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Do you say you support the Fascist Government and don't prefer the Allende Government?

Mr. GUNN: I did not say that at all.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: You are saying that if you were attacking the Allende Government to that extent. You would not know what a *non sequitur* was.

Mr. GUNN: I will repeat for the benefit of the Attorney-General, the junior Minister in this Government, that I was explaining to this House the effect and aims of the Allende Government. In my opinion, the Government that has replaced it is no better. I do not support military Governments.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: It is not an elected Government, either; it is far worse. At least the Allende Government was an elected Government.

Mr. GUNN: With 33 per cent of the vote.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: That's not true; that's a lie.

Mr. GUNN: I ask the Attorney-General to withdraw that statement that what I said was a lie. He knows that is unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER: I must ask the honourable Attorney-General to withdraw the statement.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am pleased to withdraw the statement, but I wanted it noted in the record that the Allende Government at the most recent election received a 44 per cent vote.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the attention of the honourable member for Eyre to the fact that we are discussing the Appropriation Bill. It is out of order to bring in extraneous matter.

Mr. GUNN: I am pleased to return to the matter being discussed, because I was sidetracked by the Attorney-General. I am also pleased that he has put on the record of this Parliament that he was a supporter of an extreme pro-communist Government.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is that under the rules of debate, in Standing Order 153, no member shall use offensive or unbecoming words. The honourable member suggested that I supported a communist Government. I find that offensive. It is not the truth and I seek a withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: I must ask the honourable member for Eyre to withdraw that statement.

Mr. GUNN: I did not accuse the Attorney of being a supporter of a communist Government; I accused him of being a supporter of a pro-communist Government. That is not unparliamentary. If anyone checks the record tomorrow, he will see that what I have said is correct. I do not want to deliberately insult the Attorney-General but you would be aware that late last week he spoke at a rally in support of the Allende Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are getting too far away from the Appropriation Bill. I must call the attention of the honourable member to the fact that he must speak to that Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I was pleased that the Treasurer, in his statement leading up to the introduction of this Budget, said that he had decided to abolish rural land tax. The abolition of that tax has been the policy of the Liberal Party for many years. He also has agreed to abolish succession duties on properties passing between spouses. That also is Liberal Party policy, but it is a pity that, when he is pinching our policies, the Treasurer has not followed them right through, because the abolition of succession duties on properties passing between spouses is not really abolition of the duties: it is only a deferment of them.

What is required, and what the next Government, a Liberal Government, will do, is carry that policy further. Like the member for Playford, I believe in the total

abolition of succession duties, and I consider that, in the life of the next two Parliaments, they should be abolished, because if we did that we would be taking positive action that was fair, just and equitable. If we continued the past policy of capital taxation, which I am pleased the Treasurer belatedly was eased a little, we would destroy the free enterprise system, the best system for Australia, the best economic system yet devised, and one that guarantees continuation of our democratic processes. Under a socialist economic system, democracy is eventually destroyed. That is because, as the State involves itself more and more in the ever-day affairs of industry, business and commerce, so has it more and more control over the daily lives and affairs of individuals.

We must preserve the free enterprise system that we have in this country and, by doing that, we will preserve the Westminster style of Government, which is the best that has yet been devised. If we continue the socialist policy adopted by the Whitlam Government, by this Government, and by Mr. Wran in New South Wales, eventually we will destroy the democratic processes of which we should all be proud. It is enshrined in the Labor Party platform that, if ever it has absolute control for any length of time in this State or in the Commonwealth Parliament, it will destroy the democratic process, because the platform states what that Party would do with Governors, Governors-General, and Upper Houses.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must call the honourable member back to the Bill under discussion. I cannot see how the matter that he is putting before the House is at all relevant to the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I was interested to note that the member for Playford and the member for Henley Beach were given much latitude, and I sincerely hope that I am not being victimised because I am making statements—

The SPEAKER: Order! I demand that the honourable member withdraw that. I think I give everyone much latitude, but I still insist that an honourable member stick within the terms of the Bill under discussion. I therefore ask the honourable member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. GUNN: If I have reflected on the Chair and on you personally, Mr. Speaker, I certainly will withdraw it. When I was interrupted, I was leading up to the great benefits that the agricultural sector of the economy in this State has given. I am pleased that the two measures that I have mentioned will be of much assistance to that sector, but it must be understood clearly that, if this Government and Commonwealth Governments want Australia to continue to develop and provide a standard of living to which we have been accustomed, the basic ingredient for a successful agricultural enterprise is the family farming unit. The land tax reduction will help about 4 000 rural property owners in South Australia, and the change regarding succession duties will help young widows with children, on whom the duties have a serious effect.

However, there are other problems in agriculture, and we on this side understand them and also the benefits of the free enterprise system. We will, in Government, do everything we possibly can to assist, because we understand what agriculture and industry are all about. We do not have a large chip on our shoulder like certain members have, and we do not want to knock anyone who is successful. The first thing that a Liberal Government must do in its Budget to help agriculture is to get some sense and direction back into Government spending.

We must also look closely at the operations of the South Australian Meat Corporation. That organisation

was set up to rationalise and improve killing facilities in South Australia. It was going to correct all the wrongs that had occurred over the years. However, the first mistake was made when the legislation was introduced. The second mistake was that this Government failed to give the people which produce the meat at least one seat on the board. It is of no use building an expensive museum at Gepps Cross, but that is what we will have unless we are careful. Unless we have viable producers, we will not have any meat or products to produce.

Mr. Chapman: Would you like to tell the House how much it is in debt?

Mr. GUNN: I intend to do that. On page 48, the Auditor-General's Report states:

The total principal sum outstanding from all borrowings at June 30, 1976, was \$16 323 000.

The legislation was assented to in November, 1972, and there have been some amendments since. Samcor was set up in that year and since then it has incurred a debt of more than \$16 000 000. I want to know how that debt will be funded, because we still have the situation in South Australia where a person who wishes to process meat can take his meat to Melbourne, have it processed, and bring it back at a cheaper rate than that at which it can be processed at Gepps Cross.

For many years, two of the large councils in Melbourne conducted their own abattoirs, but the burden on their ratepayers became so great that they had to hand over to private enterprise. Today, those works are running efficiently and profitably, at no cost to the ratepayers or to the State Government. Obviously, this Government and the Minister of Agriculture will have to look realistically at the situation, because it still costs more to have meat brought from Gepps Cross to Adelaide than from Melbourne to Adelaide. There is no guarantee, when a person places an order for meat, that he will receive the quantity required on the day he requires it. As a political force in this community, when we become the Government we will amend the Act to give producers a say on the board of Samcor.

A similar situation will take place in relation to the State Planning Authority, which is taking up a considerable amount of revenue from the Budget. That organisation is top heavy, cumbersome, inefficient, and it is not carrying out the wishes of the people of this State. It is time for major overhaul, and it will receive major surgery. Last week I was told of the case of a constituent who wanted to subdivide three blocks of land at Ceduna, selling one to each of his sons, and giving one, at no cost, to a friend. He received the permission of the local council and the consent of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, but the State Planning Authority refused permission, and now he must appeal. Surely, if the local council does not know what is in the best interests of the people of the area, who would know? This is bureaucracy at its worst, run by people who do not know what it is all about. We will rectify that situation. Other members on this side can speak at length about that organisation. We are not ashamed to say what we will do about it when we become the Government. I turn now to the benefits of agriculture to the State. The 1975 annual report of the Bank of New South Wales states:

Rural Industry: The gross value of rural production fell by 9 per cent in 1974-75, but the impact of rising costs caused a fall of over 40 per cent in net farm incomes. Only the continued strength of world demand for grains and sugar prevented a more disastrous decline. Despite heavy support from the Australian Wool Corporation, receipts from a larger wool clip were almost a quarter lower, and

the sudden loss of the United Kingdom and Japanese markets for beef, together with reduced returns from shipments to North America and from local sales . . .

I should like to refer to a couple of tables appearing in the *Quarterly Review of Agriculture Economics*, January edition, clearly setting out the value to the nation of agricultural enterprise. I hope that members opposite will closely examine the document, so that they will be aware of the

situation. Unfortunately, rural industries have a large debt hanging over them. A table on page 20 of the document clearly sets out the volume and value of exports of rural origin over the past 15 years. As this table is of a statistical nature, I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

VOLUME AND VALUE OF EXPORTS OF RURAL ORIGIN

Year	Crops	Index of Volume of Rural Origin Base: 1969-70 to 1971-72 = 100		Value of Exports of Rural Origin (a)	Rural Exports as a Percentage of Total Exports
		Pastoral and Farmyard	Total		
Average 1960-61				\$m	%
to 1964-65	na	na	78	1757	74.2
1965-66	68	81	76	1856	68.3
1966-67	83	83	83	2020	66.0
1967-68	82	83	82	1843	59.6
1968-69	78	85	82	1877	54.9
1969-70	81	100	93	2114	50.5
1970-71	106	95	99	2111	47.6
1971-72	113	107	109	2425	48.9
1972-73	88	118	107	3323	53.0
1973-74	80	91	87	3513	50.2
1974-75(p)	105	82	91	3940(b)	45.4
1975-76(p)	109	106	107	4336(b)	na

(a) Includes ship's stores. (b) Excludes ship's stores. (p) Preliminary. na, not available.

Sources: Australian Bureau of Statistics and Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

Mr. GUNN: We have about 29 000 rural producers in this State employing, directly and indirectly, more than 40 000 people, including those working at silos and those involved in the machinery manufacturing industries. The latest release from the Australian Bureau of Statistics points out that the gross value from crops (including pasture) and cereals in 1975-76 was more than \$233 000 000; from dried fruits, \$35 000 000; and from livestock, \$112 000 000. That gives some indication of the extent of production, but neither the problem of costs nor irresponsible union activities can be overlooked. In the *Stock Journal* of September 9, 1976, appear one or two interesting articles. One was a statement by Mr. Cass, the Chairman of the Australian Wheat Board, under the heading "Unions blamed for decline in wheat industry's competitive edge", as follows:

But the rate for wheat to Indonesia from Sydney or Newcastle, a voyage of 10 sailing days, is \$15 or \$16 a tonne. From the west coast of North America to Indonesia, a journey of 21 sailing days, the freight rate is almost identical at \$16 to \$17 a tonne.

That is a problem caused on the waterfront, and the increases this Government intends to implement in the Budget will further increase those charges.

Mr. Evans: Are we exporting jobs again?

Mr. GUNN: Yes. The statement continues:

Comparison of Australian rail freights for wheat with those of the U.S. and Canada shows that the Australian rates are by far the highest, so that again the Australian graingrower has his competitive position compromised. It seems obvious that the high cost of Australian rail freight is due to a long-standing railway policy of basing charges on what appears to be the grain industry's ability to pay, rather than the actual cost of the transport plus a reasonable profit. Our dilemma is quite neatly summed up by the humble loaf of bread. In 1949 the Australian wage and cost structure was such that wheatgrowers were receiving 58 per cent of the proceeds from the sale of a loaf of bread. In 1976 the farmer's share is only 15 per cent.

One can see how costs have increased, and why it is necessary to combat inflation. Much has been said in this House today about union activity, and those people who have deliberately set out to put themselves above the law, the anarchists and Maoist communists who have set out to destroy the fabric of our society, will have much to answer for. Unless sanity prevails within the union movement, unions will defeat their own objective, and their own members will set about them in a fashion most of them will never forget. They will be kicked so far out of the responsible positions they hold today that they will wear out more than one pair of shoes walking back. Some of the ex-union secretaries who are now gracing this Parliament are a disgrace to the Parliamentary Party that elected them. Their activities, and the way they have been carrying on in another place—

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order, Sir. That is a reflection on members on this side, and I ask that it be withdrawn.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order, and ask the honourable member to withdraw that statement.

Mr. GUNN: If it is offensive, it is obvious that Labor Party officers must be guilty, and I withdraw the comment. Perhaps I can rephrase it. It would appear that, from the activities of certain people who are currently members of Parliament and from the way in which they have been carrying on in another place, it would be fair to say—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows that the debate and whatever has happened in the other place cannot be referred to in this House.

Mr. GUNN: I am not referring to debates; I am merely referring to the activities of certain people.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. He may not refer to proceedings in another place.

Mr. GUNN: I want to refer to what has been reported in the newspapers, and there is nothing in Standing Orders

to prevent me from doing that, Mr. Acting Speaker. I want to get it right, so that it is on the record.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have sat here when honourable members on both sides have made errors. I ask the honourable member to continue.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker. I was trying to say that I believe certain people are trying to destroy our Parliamentary system.

Finally, I sincerely hope that the Government, in the short time that it has left on the Treasury benches, will make some positive attempts to relieve the taxation system in this State. I strongly support the federalism policy which, I gather, the member for Playford supported during the course of his remarks. It is obvious that the Treasurer does not like it because it will make the State Government financially responsible. It will have to account for its actions and deeds, and that is something that most Governments do not like to do. The actions of the Fraser Government have my total support, and I am proud to belong to the same Party that has produced a Prime Minister who will probably go down in history as one of this country's greatest Prime Ministers.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): As a member of a responsible Opposition, I have much pleasure in participating in this debate. It was indeed an interesting period when we awaited the presentation of the Commonwealth Budget.

Members interjecting:

Mr. VENNING: Who is talking?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River will resume his seat. He knows that the Chair will decide who should be talking at a certain time. The honourable member has the floor and, if anyone is out of order or interjecting in any way, I will call him to order. I hope that the honourable member will stick to the Bill.

Mr. VENNING: Thank you, Sir. There was some doubt at one stage who had the floor, but I am pleased—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River has the floor, and I hope that he does not interfere in any way with what the Chair decides.

Mr. VENNING: Thank you. As I said, it was an interesting period while we awaited the presentation of the Commonwealth Budget on August 17. Because of the presentation of the Commonwealth Budget on that date, our Treasurer and Government decided that they would not introduce the State Budget, as usual, on the Thursday before the Adelaide Show, but would delay its presentation until after the Commonwealth Budget was introduced.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You know that's not correct.

Mr. VENNING: It is true. When the Commonwealth Budget was brought down in Canberra, one did not need to listen to the Federal Treasurer delivering it: one had merely to look at Government members' faces to see that it was a good Budget. They walked around this place with faces 2ft. long because they knew they had nothing to pin on the Federal Budget. I commend Mr. Lynch, the Commonwealth Treasurer, for taking on the difficult task that he and his Leader took on in redeeming the finances of this Commonwealth, and this siphons down to the States, as well.

We are now dealing with the State Budget and, although members opposite try day after day to slam the Fraser Government, I am sure that common sense will prevail

among the people of the State, who will realise that Mr. Fraser is doing an excellent job not only for South Australia but also for the whole Commonwealth. His tax-sharing scheme is something about which we are pleased. It was some time before we could get the State Government to agree to set up a commission to handle grants in this State. Throughout, we have had the job before us to push this Government into action, so that it would fall into line with requests made by our Commonwealth colleagues. However, slowly but surely things are taking shape, and eventually this State will benefit considerably. Although members opposite condemn our Federal colleagues, Mr. Wran, the Leader of their Party in another State, has shown sufficient common sense to say, "We'll give it a go." That should have been the attitude of this Government—to get behind Mr. Lynch and Mr. Fraser and their Budget in relation to allocations made to this State.

I listened with much interest to the Address in Reply speech made by the member for Whyalla about this State's shipbuilding industry. He condemned the plan put forward by Mr. Fraser regarding that industry, saying that the plan that had been suggested, in which the unions would be given an opportunity to line themselves up to compete with overseas shipbuilding interests, was poppycock. Although he condemned the plan put forward some little time later we found the Treasurer at last using a little common sense and getting behind Mr. Fraser's suggestion, and the Minister of Labour and Industry came out behind the Treasurer.

Mr. Dean Brown: Don't you think some people showed their insincerity by still remaining on strike?

Mr. VENNING: Yes, the painters and dockers. One would have thought that those who were experiencing trouble with their employment would do the right thing, even though it would be only natural to do certain things in the heat of the moment. However, the painters and dockers were on strike. I have commented on the request by the Treasurer and the Minister of Labour and Industry for the people of Whyalla to get behind the Prime Minister's suggestion. They have now decided to allow the ship at Whyalla to undergo its sea trials. I hope that, for the benefit of the people not only of Whyalla but of the whole State, common sense will prevail in this area and that this State's shipbuilding industry will be retained. I know that everything is being done at Whyalla to assist those who have been put off. Work, whether it be painting or cleaning up, has been made available by various Government departments to keep people employed, and to overcome this difficult unemployment situation.

I listened with much interest to what the member for Playford said this evening. He talked about the railway deal. The Treasurer made much play about this deal when it was agreed to with the Commonwealth Government last year. It makes me smile when fellows of the standing of the member for Playford say that it was a good deal. That gentleman criticised the Opposition for not going along with that deal. It has been suggested that the deal was such that this State was looking for the best of both worlds. The Government is saying that, as South Australians, we should agree to having the best of both worlds. However, in reality it does not work out that way. We must remember that, although we pay taxes to the State Government, we also pay Commonwealth taxes. Therefore, if this State makes a good deal with the Commonwealth, we as individuals must meet that expenditure in other areas.

As a result of the railways agreement, initially we received about \$10 000 000, and losses on the non-metropolitan area railway services were to be taken over

by the Commonwealth. However, the agreement has not yet been finalised. I have said many times at country meetings, at which people were discussing the closing of northern railway lines, that the agreement was a shonky deal, and only possible between two Labor Governments. Such an agreement would never have been accepted by a Federal Liberal Government: it would have to be a business-like deal or it would not have been accepted.

I agree with what the member for Playford said about Medibank. There was nothing wrong with the medical situation in this State before Medibank was introduced, and it has become an imposition applied to the people of Australia at great cost. If for no other reason, we will always remember the Whitlam Government, because it introduced Medibank. At least Malcolm Fraser will try to straighten it out in a commonsense way. My colleagues have referred to increases in Government charges and, as usual, the Treasurer has increased charges before he introduced the Budget. We all realise that this is what he has been doing for the past three or four years, but people are now appreciating the position and expect charges to be increased.

Water rates have been increased, and receipts from wharf charges this year will increase from \$10 000 000 to \$13 300 000. In 1975, the Government increased bulk handling charges by 100 per cent. This increase, with the additional wharfage charges, is causing concern to many primary producers, because these increased costs will price them out of overseas markets. In 1971, our average wages were \$3 a week below wages in the United States, but now average wages in the U.S. are \$30 a week below ours. That situation has occurred within five years. The U.S.A. has arrested its inflation, while ours is still a problem.

We are exporting jobs, and the leaders of our country should take strong action in this matter. The member for Eyre said that Jack Cass (Chairman, Australian Wheat Board) had outlined the problems of grain deliveries and marketing. Concern has been expressed about payment for pools and the industrial trouble disrupting grain movements in New South Wales. There would be silos in the northern parts of New South Wales from which there would not have been a grain of wheat moved by the time coming harvest deliveries are being made. That would give members some idea of industrial troubles in the Eastern States concerning grain movements. This problem applies not only to primary products but also to other industries, and it is a situation confronting both South Australia and the rest of the Commonwealth.

Mention has been made of \$21 000 000 having been spent on Monarto, but the Minister for Planning said recently that this figure was not correct and that \$10 000 000 had been allocated by the previous Federal Government toward Monarto and had nothing to do with State funding. The present policy of the Federal Government concerning financing is to make the States responsible for spending the money and that is a big improvement. Eventually, this State Government will realise that, when it becomes responsible in what it does, our State will progress. This State Government has often stated, "Let us get our hands on as much Commonwealth money as possible."

Obviously, it is not concerned about the way it spends it, as long as it comes to this State. I have heard that sort of comment made by the Deputy Premier, and that has been the attitude of this Government since it assumed office in 1971-72. However, it does not have a clue as to how to put the money to good use. Under the new plan this Government will have to accept its responsibilities, and I am sure it will eventually learn

from its mistakes. Unfortunately, in the meantime people of this State will suffer. Water rates have increased by 60 per cent in the past four years. Rural people are treated unfairly because they have had their own water supply; for example, mills. At one stage water was supplied at a reasonable figure and, consequently, they allowed their mills to go out of order, and they relied on the mains. Year after year the Government is using this as a means of raising revenue.

A member said tonight that the Government is still running its departments at a loss. It is about time the Government considered where it could streamline departments and make them efficient. If it were private enterprise, departments would be running at at least the break-even level and giving better service to the community. I support the Budget, and I hope that the rural areas, which produce at least 50 per cent of our exports, will experience favourable weather, thereby alleviating the effects of the present drought situation throughout the State. Unfortunately, nowadays the man on the land has to get an above-average crop to break even and, with the present drought and the Government's increased charges, it is not possible to do that. I hope that rural areas will receive more weather of the type experienced last week.

Mr. WOTTON (Heysen): We have heard a great deal of guff from the other side tonight. We have continually heard from the other side what a wonderful job of financial housekeeping the Dunstan Government is doing for South Australia. We have also heard claims about the Government's so-called great deals in connection with stamp duties, land tax, succession duties, and pay-roll tax. If South Australians only bother to look at the small type, they will realise how little they are gaining from the 1976-77 Dunstan Budget. Once again, the average man in the street is being hit.

Let us consider some of the likely results of this Budget. We have heard about the aid that is to be given to people on the land in connection with the Government's decision on rural land tax. I am the first to agree that the Government's move can only help people on the land, although many aspects of rural land tax need clarifying. When we read the Government's plans in the press, we are told what it might do; as a result, people come up to us and say, "It is pretty good that the Dunstan Government will do this and that." However, when people ask members what the Dunstan Government is actually doing or what it has actually done, we are unable to tell them because the appropriate legislation has not even been introduced.

On a number of occasions in my own district I have been asked to comment on what the Dunstan Government has done in regard to land tax, and I can only say, "Nothing, at this stage". I usually say that I will wait until I see the legislation before I comment. The Government's move in connection with land tax is purely a result of protests from the people and from Opposition members. In many cases, we do not know exactly what the Dunstan Government intends to do in regard to these matters. In March, 1975, farmers marched on Parliament House in regard to land tax. At that time the Treasurer said that he would help the people on the land, but all he did was to decrease the rate of land tax while increasing the valuations. This is happening at present to people who believed they would be so much better off because of what the Government said it would do in connection with land tax. When it comes down to tin tacks, they will find that they are no better off; actually, in many cases they will be worse off, particularly in the metropolitan area and in townships throughout the State.

While we appreciate what has been done in connection with succession duties as regards spouses, again purely as a result of Opposition protests, I point out that the Government has merely followed Liberal Party policies; this indicates the degree of the Government's sincerity. The Government needs to go much further than the proposed succession duties legislation. We need to examine what is happening at present to people who own properties and businesses and who want to hand them down from generation to generation. The emotional stress between spouses will be improved, but it will be extremely difficult for a person who has worked all his life to build up a farm or a small business to pass it on from one generation to another. The Opposition believes that such people need to be protected. They have had the initiative and the incentive to work for themselves, build up a business, and work generally a lot harder than people who are prepared to work in the Public Service or some other organisations. These people should have the right to pass on a farm or a business to a future generation. At present, this is not happening and, under the proposed legislation, it will still not happen. So, we see that it is still the man in the street who is being hit.

Although much has been said this evening about the Fraser Government's Budget, I do not intend to say much about it, other than that it is a change, as other Opposition members have said, to have a Budget brought down by a Treasurer who at least shows us where we are going: it is a positive Budget from Canberra, and that is much more than can be said about the Budgets brought down by the Whitlam Government. Under the Fraser Government, we are proud of the progress being made.

The Fraser Government has taken steps to recognise the many problems people in small businesses are facing today. The Fraser Government's Budget has allowed a meaningful increase in after-tax income to be retained by private companies. It has been recognised for some time by our side of the House that small businesses must provide a reasonable return to those involved. For far too long, people involved in small businesses have worked for nothing, and that will have to be changed. As I said earlier, for some time we have been hearing about the Treasury surplus in South Australia but, hitherto, we have not heard what the Government intends doing with that surplus.

We have not heard that it will help the man in the street. It may look like it on the glossy surface, but we have had no indication that it will actually help people in any way. Obviously, it will not help the private sector. On several occasions, we have heard the Treasurer criticising the tax-sharing proposals he publicly advocated some two years ago. How can he retain his credibility regarding these proposals? The Treasurer has made several misleading statements; the one with which I will deal relates to transport. We had a misleading statement from the Treasurer and the Minister of Transport.

Mr. Gunn: Only one!

Mr. WOTTON: I refer to one, in particular. The Minister of Transport blamed the Federal Government cut-backs for increases in registration and licence fees. He said that they had come about because of cut-backs by the Fraser Government, whereas if one looks back and sees what really happened, one will find that the Minister announced last February that there would be increases in motor registration and licence fees; yet, he has the audacity to come out and say now that

this is a result of the Federal Budget's cut-backs. I believe that any serious-minded person, any thinking Australian, would realise that the cut-backs brought about by the Fraser Government have been absolutely necessary and should have been made some time ago. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Minister for the Environment) moved;

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I raise again another serious situation in which we seem to be continually involved in the House. I refer particularly to the member for Davenport and the member for Alexandra and their attitudes to the industrial situation in South Australia. I refer particularly to my own district, because I say sincerely that there has been industrial unrest in Whyalla, but there are obvious reasons for this. The anti-working class and anti-union attitude generally of the member for Davenport and, in this instance, the member for Alexandra do them no credit, and it is not solving the industrial problem one little bit.

Mr. Dean Brown: Yes, but—

Mr. MAX BROWN: I will come to the honourable member's point directly. The question in the Whyalla shipyard is a real human problem that affects, for instance, a large percentage of the people of Whyalla. We should not be playing politics with this matter, but should be considering the question sincerely. I point out seriously that, as long as two parties are involved in the industrial situation (the worker and the employer), there will unfortunately always be misunderstanding and industrial unrest. I have said in the House before, and I say it again this evening, that the only real solution to these problems is negotiation or conciliation. I point out, particularly to the member for Davenport, that, if one has a disagreement with another person, or if one party has a disagreement with another party, arbitration does not solve the problem from either party's point of view (in this case, the employer or the employee). But, if the parties can settle down, negotiate, and come to a common agreement, even though it may not be fully accepted by one or other party, that agreement is much better understood by the two parties and is much more readily workable than any arbitration system could be.

Mr. Dean Brown: How do you do that?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I draw the attention of the member for Davenport, who seems to want to put that peculiar smirk on his face this evening, to the statement made by the member for Alexandra, as reported in the *Advertiser* of September 4. The report, under the heading "Oust shipyard militants—M.P.", states:

A Liberal M.P. yesterday called for the dismissal of militant union leaders at the Whyalla shipyard. Mr. Chapman, M.P. for Alexandra, said: "Let this dictating element be stood down and starved for a while."

Let us look at the people about whom he was talking.

Mr. Whitten: He wants them starved.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes, and that is not the first time he has said it. The dispute in question, namely, one delaying the sea trials of the gas turbine ship *Union Rotorua*, was brought to the attention of the company some months ago, whereby obviously there could be a redundancy in the shipbuilding industry. It was common knowledge that there was a possible lay-off, and the union, rightly, in my opinion, was looking after the interests of the people it represented by saying to the company, "If there is to be redundancy, what is your policy on this question; what have we to face up to?" The union and the company went before a commissioner, Commissioner Vosti of the Arbitration Court, and a case was made, put, and heard. The Commissioner recommended in this case that the company should look at redundancy and let the union know what its policy would be. The company refused and would not do so; it would not agree to the umpire's decision. And so the dispute came about. I say to the member for Alexandra clearly that, if this umpire's decision had been accepted, the *Union Rotorua* would not have been held up on a sea trial. It is a terrible state of affairs when such a situation develops.

Rightly, the Minister of Labour and Industry of this State has held a conference with the parties, and after negotiations (I point out to the member for Davenport that negotiations solved the problem; the Minister of Labour and Industry was the instigator of the negotiations, not the member for Davenport), the *Union Rotorua* has had its ban lifted and it will go on trial.

Mr. Mathwin: That is very good.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am pleased that the honourable member's colleague the member for Davenport accepts that. The second point I raised with the member for Davenport—he can laugh, but all I am pointing out to him is that his whole attitude in these matters of labour relationships is doing him no good—is that delegates of the Metalworkers Union applied for special leave to attend a legitimate union meeting, and were refused. Briefly, I will read some extracts of the policy put out by the Industrial Department of Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited. It is a gem of a policy, and we wonder why there are industrial disputes! The first extract reads:

In the Industrial Relations Department's experience, unions are increasingly disputing the merits of disciplinary action taken by employers against union members. Moreover, unions are having increasing success in upsetting same: so much so that the once unfettered right of an employer to hire and fire, particularly fire, has been seriously undermined.

Fancy telling a worker that this is the situation!

Mr. Chapman: Don't you think—

Mr. MAX BROWN: You listen to this.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, I think it is common courtesy in this House to refer to people by their electorates rather than "you".

The SPEAKER: Order! I must uphold the point of order. I ask the member for Whyalla to address members opposite as "the honourable member".

Mr. MAX BROWN: I take the point of order—the member for Alexandra. As I was reading:

From the point of view of the company, yourselves (the management), and the individual concerned, there is nothing worse than precipitous disciplinary action culminating in the company having to retract that action by way of negotiation or arbitration.

In other words, they do not want to negotiate at all. What led to this incident was discord. A little later we read:

It is your responsibility to ensure that all significant disciplinary action taken is recorded accurately and concisely on the employee's personal card.

In other words, it will be used. Dealing with shop delegates, it states:

They must obtain your prior permission to be absent from their work place just like any other employee, even when absent in pursuit of legitimate union business. We wonder why there is industrial unrest. I conclude by saying that, if the member for Davenport kept his nose out of the trade union business, the industrial situation in this State would be much better. When he seeks publicity on a question that is vital to humanity and to people in any community, his action ought to be deplored.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): So that there may be no misunderstanding on either side of the House, I point out that I was somewhat astounded to hear the statement this evening from this side of the House that, in Government, we would support having producer members on the South Australian Meat Corporation board. That statement, which was made by a colleague, does not have my support. The matter has not been discussed. I believe that the statement was made straight off the cuff, and the matter requires much more consideration before it would get my support.

Mr. Whitten: It sounds like another split in the Liberal Party.

Dr. EASTICK: I believe in putting the record straight. We will not talk about splits; we will talk about reality and fact, and that is what I have put to the House.

The next point involves a matter brought to my attention by a constituent who, last Sunday week, spent some time in Adelaide window-shopping and found that one of the book stores was open on that day. I believe that some of them open on Sundays. The point which she brought to my attention and which caused her much distress (and I bring it before the House because I believe the Government should consider it) was that, right in the centre of the main alleyway, where they were visible for all to see, were two booklets indicating how to grow marihuana, what species of hashish and the like to obtain and grow, and how to grow them, which would be legal within the State legislative system.

I appreciate the attitude of the Government, which is supported by many people in the community and by members in this House, that adult people should be able to read and have access to what they may wish to read, but certainly we do not want to be putting into the hands of the youth of this country, without their having any difficulty obtaining them, books that will give them the opportunity to flout the law, fly in the face of our rules and regulations, or act adversely to the policing of this important matter. The Government should consider this matter and, whilst accepting the general ability of people to have access to books of all kinds, at least ensure that books of this kind, which are at present on full view to the youth of the State, should not be readily available to young people.

The other matter that I wish to raise has been referred to the Minister of Works by a constituent. It relates to available water quotas. Earlier in this session, I asked the Minister to consider the current climatic conditions under which vegetable growers could see themselves in difficulties in supplying the Adelaide market. It was indicated later that it was not possible to give relief to this group of people. A letter, which has been forwarded to the Minister by a constituent, states:

As you know, the present quota system is based on a two-year period. Recently, Mr. Corcoran said that present quota levels would be maintained for at least five years. My suggestion is basically to increase the flexibility of the quota usage and, hopefully, increase the efficiency of water usage. Water requirements to maintain normal production vary considerably, depending on seasonal conditions, as can be seen from the following figures:

The constituent refers to his own water usage. He has an entitlement of 37 792 megalitres, reduced in 1974 to 25 604 Ml. In 1971 he used 18 395 Ml, in 1972 he used 23 895 Ml, in 1973 he used 18 954 Ml, and in 1974 he used 15 632 Ml. In every year, he was well within his quota and in most years he was using only about 50 per cent of the quota. The letter continues:

In general, the benefits of irrigation are greatest in dry years, both to producers and consumers. This year is a good example where, with severe drought, reduced production of many vegetables, fruit and fodder can only be overcome by increased irrigation. This can help reduce the escalation of prices which is certain to occur as shortages occur, viz., the present price of hay. The opposite situation occurs in favourable years when irrigated production adds to high production elsewhere, producing over supply and low prices. It seems desirable, therefore, to encourage irrigation in dry years to even out supply and price fluctuations.

The present system actually works against this. It encourages water use, irrespective of seasonal conditions and market supply, first, because quota allocations not used in the two-year period are forfeited and, secondly, because the original quotas were based on previous use, and most irrigators naturally conclude that failure to use the full quota will lead to future quota reduction.

Certainly, there has been evidence of that over a wide area of the Northern Adelaide Plains, where people have seen a reduction in their quotas. The letter continues:

Two possible quota systems are (1) allow a certain percentage of the annual quota to be carried forward to the following year and a percentage of the next year's quota to be used in the previous year, e.g., 100 per cent of quota transferable. Water usage can vary from nil to 200 per cent of annual quota in one year, provided usage over five years is within quota. An example pattern could be: year one, 150 per cent; year two, 75 per cent; year three, 50 per cent; year four, 50 per cent; year five, 175 per cent. A rule such as no more than one year's quota to be used in advance and no more than one year's quota to be accumulated would have a similar effect. (2) A more flexible scheme could be allowed by simply giving a five-year quota.

I foresee considerable difficulties with a five-year quota, particularly if it was used in the first year or two and the person then, for no reason known previously, found it necessary to sell the property and was unable to convey to the incoming person a forward quota. Certainly, in a year such as this I believe the first suggestion made by the constituent is worthy of consideration. It could have a most beneficial effect on the overall cost of vegetable production in the forthcoming summer, and a reduction in the cost of vegetables would have a significant effect on the food component of the consumer price index during the March and June quarters. The Minister should consider that point.

I should like briefly in the time remaining to take up a comment that I made earlier this evening regarding our racing industry. That it is a major industry, even though it be called a sport, cannot be denied. If one looks at page 285 of the Auditor-General's Report, one finds that there has been a marked increase in investments from \$109 000 000 in 1973-74 to \$138 000 000 in 1974-75, and to \$169 734 875 in 1975-76. That is a tangible increase. There are many grave problems in the racing industry, whether one looks at one code or another code. I believe

that South Australia urgently requires the introduction of a racing commission that will have oversight of the three codes.

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

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): We have listened to much criticism recently from Opposition members concerning the excessive and extravagant demands being made by trade unions. On August 17, in the debate on the Whyalla shipyard, we heard the member for Light say that the future of Australia and its industrial base depended on a reasonable attitude not just by employers and the Government but equally, and most importantly, by the union hierarchy, which, at present, was not speaking for its rank and file members. I wonder whether the member for Light would want the union hierarchy to speak for the rank and file members at present in the Chrysler situation.

Dr. Eastick: That is an entirely different rank and file, and you know it.

Mr. ABBOTT: I am sure that he would not. We can tell from the urgency motion moved in the House this afternoon that all Opposition members certainly would not want to do that. The honourable member went on in the same debate to quote many recent claims made by the Vehicle Builders Union on the General Motors-Holden's company. I indicated to him then that that was an ambit log of claims. Obviously, the honourable member does not understand what an ambit log of claims is.

Dr. Eastick: Having been in the bull ring in Detroit, I know full well what it is about.

Mr. ABBOTT: He continued by asking whether anyone could estimate the cost to the motor vehicle industry of an acceptance of the claims to which he had referred. He asked whether any member of the Government could disagree that, by making those sorts of claim on employers, the union was seeking to cut down worker involvement in the industry. What worker involvement? I thought the Opposition was against worker involvement and worker participation in industry. I assure the honourable member that every Government member understands what an ambit claim is.

One could say the same thing about employers' applications to the Prices Justification Tribunal for price increases. In my opinion, most of those claims are ambit claims. They ask for a 7 per cent increase and, when they receive only 2½ per cent or 3 per cent, they are pleased. What is more, they return within two or three months, make a fresh application, and pick up the balance of their original claim. The employers are smiling all the time.

The unions have never asked for any more than full employment and a fair standard of living. They have asked for nothing more, and nothing less, and surely that is a reasonable approach. The gains that were won by the log of claims that was served on the motor companies are as follows:

Special rates and allowances increased by 15 per cent; meal allowances increased from \$1.75 to \$2.40 and \$2.10; relief time increased to 46 minutes for "on-line" workers and 24 minutes for other workers; Sunday work to be at double time and one half; day's holiday when Anzac Day falls on a weekend; nine months maternity leave without pay, but with continuity of service protected; call back to be four hours instead of three; penalty rates for afternoon and night shift to be increased to 15 per cent; and extra \$3 for afternoon and night shifts at the weekend; sick leave to be 80 hours after five years service instead of 64 hours; unlimited accumulation of sick leave; dental treatment to be considered an illness with regard to sick leave.

Annual leave—adjustment in wage rates made during absence on annual leave to be made up on return to work; higher rate for mixed functions to apply after one hour instead of two hours. Bereavement leave to be widened: three days bereavement leave now available for death in Australia of grandparents and de facto wife or husband; three days for death outside Australia of husband, wife, child, father, mother, father-in-law, mother-in-law, grandparents, brother, sister or de facto wife or husband; one day's sick leave for death in Australia for grand-son or grand-daughter. Subsidy for boots to go from \$2 to \$4; special leave increased from four to 12 weeks; and relief areas to be examined and re-located where necessary.

These gains are nowhere near those claimed and quoted by the member for Light, and the cost to the industry would be infinitesimal compared to the granting of the full log of claims. The union hierarchy, as the honourable member calls it, has recommended acceptance of that offer. How the honourable member can say that the union hierarchy is not speaking for its members, is beyond me. The same can be said concerning the Civil Air Officers Association's claim for a 75 per cent pay increase. The Industrial Officer of that association (Mr. R. Garlick) said that the 75 per cent pay increase claim was an ambit claim. Ambit claims made by unions usually far exceed what they expect to receive, and are a device used to reduce legal costs in further claims. Mr. J. H. Portus, a commissioner under the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act and a member of the English and South Australian bars, in an article entitled "Australian Compulsory Arbitration, 1900 to 1970", under the heading "The Commonwealth Arbitration Act—Ambit of Disputes", on page 21, states:

Variations of awards highlights the importance of the ambit of the original dispute. For instance, if a union served a log of claims demanding a wage of \$50 a week and the employers refused the claim, then a dispute exists and the ambit or scope of that dispute is the \$50 claimed or any lesser amount, but there is no dispute as to payments in excess of \$50 a week, as the union is not seeking such a payment. This is significant for

it means that the dispute can only be settled by the awarding of \$50 or some lesser amount: \$55 cannot be awarded in settlement, for that is outside the ambit of the dispute. An employer who had been served with a log of demands for \$50 and notice of an Arbitration Commission hearing and had not attended could protest if the amount awarded was more than \$50 a week, because the commission would be awarding something not in dispute.

Assume \$50 a week was claimed and the dispute was settled by an award of \$47, and a few years later prices rise and a union considers there is a good case for increasing the rate from \$47 to \$55. If in these circumstances it applies for a variation of the award claiming the \$55, the variation cannot be granted, for the arbitrator in making the variation is still dealing with the original dispute and cannot make a legally binding award in excess of \$50. The important consequence is that a union will seek not only a suitable award for the present but also one which can be varied to meet future conditions. To do this unions serve logs of claims which contain much more extravagant demands than any employer would be prepared to concede or any arbitrator would at that time be prepared to award. This does not mean a lack of reality in the union's approach to an industrial matter, but merely that it is creating a dispute with a wide ambit with an eye to future variations.

It is obvious that the figures quoted would now be outdated; that is, a claim for a wage of \$50 a week would now be ridiculous. Actually, an increase of \$50 a week would be closer to the mark. However, as can be seen from the article, it covers the period 1900 to 1970, and much has changed since that period. I have other references here from law books, but time will not permit me to quote them. However, it is clear that most of the claims concerning which the Opposition criticises the unions are ambit claims, and the unions have never expected such ambit logs of claims to be granted in full.

Motion carried.

At 10.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 15, at 2 p.m.